



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 26TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.I.ARUN

WRIT PETITION NO. 3459 OF 2026 (LB-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. SRI. VISHNU KUMAR C.
S/O SRI. CHANDREGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS
RESIDING AT FLAT NO.69
CHIKKEGOWDANA KOPPALU
YELWALA POST, YELWALA HOBLI
MYSORE TALUK & DISTRICT MYSORE
MYSORE - 571 130.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. C.MUDDURAJ, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE CHIEF REGISTRAR OF BIRTH AND DEATH
7TH FLOOR, VISHWESHWARAYA MAIN TOWER
DR.B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BENGALURU - 560 001.
2. THE REGISTRAR OF BIRTH AND DEATH
MYSORE CITY CORPORATION
MYSORE-572 024.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. SPOORTHY V., HCGP FOR R1;
SRI. PALLAVA R., ADVOCATE FOR R2)

Digitally
signed by
GEETHA P G
Location:
HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



THIS PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR DIRECTION TO THE RESPONDENTS TO ISSUE BIRTH CERTIFICATE UNDER REGISTRATION OF BIRTH AND DEATH ACT 1969 AND THE RULES THEREOF, BY SETTING ASIDE THE ENDORSEMENT DATED 04.10.2025 BEARING NO. ಮೈನಪಾ/ಜ.ಮ.ಶಾಖೆ/4340/2025-26 IN ANNEXURE-K, ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE.

THIS PETITION COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THROUGH PHYSICAL HEARING/VIDEO CONFERENCING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.I.ARUN

ORAL ORDER

The case of the petitioner is that a birth certificate has been issued by respondent no.2 to his minor daughter Hanvika K. (vide Annexure-A to the writ petition), wherein, name of the father (petitioner herein) has been wrongly mentioned as 'Krishna Kumar C.' instead of 'Vishnu Kumar C.' and his daughter's name is wrongly shown as 'Hanvika K.' instead of 'Hanvika V.'. Hence, he has made a request to respondents to change his name and his daughter's name in the said certificate. However, the respondent no.2 has issued an



endorsement at Annexure-K to the writ petition refusing to do the same. Aggrieved by the same, the present writ petition is filed with a prayer to set aside the impugned endorsement.

2. In the course of arguments, petitioner also prays that a suitable direction may be issued to respondents to change the name as requested. Reliance is also placed on the order of this Court in W.P.No.6370/2024.

3. Learned counsel for respondents upon instructions fairly submits that, the writ petition may be disposed of in terms of the order passed in the aforementioned writ petition.

4. In the aforementioned writ petition, it has been held that concerned authority of respondents is required to consider the request of the petitioner by conducting necessary enquiry as per Section 15 of the Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1969 ('the Act' for short), read with relevant Rules and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law. I do not see any reason why a similar order should not be passed in the instant writ petition also.

5. Hence, the following:



ORDER

- i. The impugned endorsement dated 04.10.2025 (vide Annexure-K to the writ petition) passed by respondent no.2 is hereby set aside;
- ii. Respondent No.2 is directed to consider the request of the petitioner by conducting the necessary enquiry as per Section 15 of the Act read with relevant Rules and also in the light of the order passed in W.P.No.6370/2024 and pass appropriate orders accordingly;
- iii. The same shall be done within a period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order;
- iv. The writ petition stands ***disposed of*** accordingly.

**Sd/-
(M.I.ARUN)
JUDGE**