



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 26TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO. 26835 OF 2025 (LB-BMP)

BETWEEN:

KUM. DEEPANVITHA
D/O VENKATESH MURTHY,
AGED ABOUT 22 YEARS,
R/AT NO.2421, 1ST MAIN ROAD,
VIJAYANAGAR 2ND STAGE,
NEAR VIJAYANAGAR CLUB ROAD,
BENGALURU 560 040

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. MANIKANTA H B.,ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. ADDITIONAL DIRECTOR AND
CHIEF REGISTRAR OF BIRTHS AND DEATHS,
DIRECTORATE OF ECONOMICS AND STATISTICS
7TH FLOOR, V V TOWER,
DR. BR AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BENGALURU - 560 001
2. JOINT DIRECTOR (CNL),
DIRECTORATE OF ECONOMICS AND STATISTICS
7TH FLOOR, V V TOWER,
DR. BR AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BENGALURU - 560 001
3. THE COMMISSIONER,
BBMP, HUDSON CIRCLE,
BBMP HEAD OFFICE,
BENGALURU - 560 002
4. THE ZONAL COMMISSIONER,
SOUTH ZONE, BBMP, BBMP COMPLEX,





9TH CROSS, 9TH MAIN,
2ND BLOCK JAYANAGAR,
BENGALURU 560 011

5. THE JOINT COMMISSIONER,
SOUTH ZONE, BBMP,
BBMP COMPLEX, 9TH CROSS,
9TH MAIN, 2ND BLOCK JAYANAGAR,
BENGALURU 560 011
6. UNIQUE IDENTIFICATION AUTHORITY OF INDIA (UIDAI)
NEW DELHI AT 3RD FLOOR, TOWER II,
JEEVAN BHARATI BUILDING,
CONNAUGHT CIRCUS,
NEW DELHI 110001

REGIONAL OFFICE AT
KHANIJA BHAVAN, NO. 49,
3RD FLOOR, SOUTH WING RACE COURSE ROAD,
BENGALURU 560001
7. GOVT. OF INDIA
REP BY IT SECRETARY,
MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS,
NO.74B, SOUTH BLOCK
NEW DELHI-110001
8. REGIONAL PASSPORT OFFICER,
8TH BLOCK 80 FEET ROAD,
KORAMANGALA, BANGALORE 560 095
9. ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA,
NIRVACHAN SADAN, ASHOKA ROAD,
NEW DELHI 110 001
REPRESENTED BY CHIEF ELECTION COMMISSIONER
10. STATE ELECTION COMMISSION,
2ND AND 3RD FLOOR,
NO. 16, BALLARI ROAD,
SADASHIVANAGARA,
BENGALURU-560080
REPRESENTED BY
STATE ELECTION COMMISSIONER



11. CENTRAL BOARD OF SECONDARY EDUCATION (CBSE),
SHIKSHA KENDRA, 2,
COMMUNITY CENTRE,
PREET VIHAR, DELHI 110092

REGIONAL OFFICE AT
GNANA BHARATHI MAIN ROAD,
OPP. NATIONAL LAW SCHOOL OF INDIA UNIVERSITY,
CHANDRA LAYOUT EXTENSION II STAGE
NAGARBHAAVI
BENGALURU 560072

...RESPONDENTS

- (BY SRI. SHANTHI BHUSHAN H., ADVOCATE TO R7 TO R11;
SMT. SPOORTHY V. HCGP., FOR R1 & R2;
SRI. K.V. BATHE GOWDA., ADVOCATE FOR R3 TO R5;
SRI. B.M. KUSHLAPPA., ADVOCATE FOR R6)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 & 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR SUCH OTHER ORDER/WRIT DIRECTING RESPONDENT NO.1 TO 5 TO CLARIFY THAT WHETHER A BIRTH CERTIFICATE DATED 29/06/2015 BEARING REGISTRATION NO. RRJ/B/2015/00194/000664 HAS BEEN ISSUED CHANGING THE PETITIONERS FATHER NAME TO MAHESH MADEGOWDA PRODUCED AT ANNEXURE-D AND ETC.

THIS WRIT PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING IN 'B' GROUP, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

ORAL ORDER

1. The Petitioner is before this Court seeking for the following reliefs:



(1) Issue a writ of Mandamus or such other order/writ directing Respondent No.1 to 5 to clarify that whether a Birth Certificate dated 29/06/2015 bearing Registration No. RRJ/B/2015/00194/000664 has been issued changing the petitioner's father name to Mahesh Madegowda produced at ANNEXURE - D.

(2) Issue a writ of Mandamus directing Respondent No. 1 to 5 to issue a clarification as to the father's name in the Birth Certificate as contradicting names are being shown.

(3) Issue a writ of Mandamus or such other order/writ directing Respondent No.6 to change the father's name of the petitioner to Venkatesh Murthy from Mahesh Madegowda in the Aadhar Card.

(4) Issue a writ of Mandamus or such other order/writ directing Respondent No.7 & 8 to change the father's name of the petitioner to Venkatesh Murthy from Mahesh Madegowda in the Passport.

(5) Issue a writ of Mandamus or such other order/writ directing Respondent No.9 & 10 to change the father's name of the petitioner to Venkatesh Murthy from Mahesh Madegowda in the Voter ID.

(6) Issue a writ of Mandamus or such other order/writ directing Respondent No.11 to change the father's name of the petitioner to Venkatesh Murthy from Mahesh Madegowda in the School Records.



(7) Pass such other orders as this Hon'ble Court deems fit to grant in the interest of justice and equity.

2. The grievance of the petitioner is that, without any lawful justification, the name of her biological father, namely Venkatesh Murthy, has been substituted in the Register of Births by the name of her stepfather, Sri Mahesh Madegowda. The petitioner contends that such substitution has resulted in an incorrect reflection of her parentage in a statutory public record, thereby affecting her civil identity and personal status.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has now attained majority and is fully competent to assert her legal and civil identity. It is urged that identity, particularly in matters of parentage and surname, constitutes an essential attribute of personality and dignity. The petitioner desires to be identified with the surname and



paternal name of her biological father and not that of her stepfather. The continuation of the present entry in the Register of Births, it is contended, causes prejudice and requires rectification.

4. Per contra, respondents No.3 to 5 have placed on record documents demonstrating that Sri Mahesh Madegowda had instituted proceedings in C.Misc. No.6406/2015 before a competent court. By order dated 18.06.2015, the said court directed the respondents to register the date of birth of the petitioner, described therein as Deepanvitha, daughter of Mahesh Madegowda and Spurthi D.T., as 18.07.2003 in the Register of Births and to issue a birth certificate accordingly.
5. It is specifically pointed out that the operative portion of the order described the petitioner as the daughter of Mahesh Madegowda, and it is on that basis that the respondents incorporated his name in



the column pertaining to the father's name while effecting the correction of the date of birth.

6. The submission on behalf of the respondents is that they are statutory authorities obligated to maintain the Register of Births strictly in accordance with law and in conformity with judicial directions. Once the order dated 18.06.2015 directed registration in the manner indicated therein, the respondents had no discretion but to implement the same. It is therefore contended that no arbitrariness or independent alteration can be attributed to them; their action is merely consequential to a binding judicial order.
7. Having considered the material placed on record, this Court finds that the change in the entry relating to the father's name is directly traceable to the order passed in C.Misc. No.6406/2015 by a competent court. The respondents have acted in compliance with that order. In such circumstances, it cannot be said that the alteration was effected without the



authority of law. So long as the order dated 18.06.2015 remains valid and operative, the consequential entry in the Register of Births cannot be held to be illegal.

8. It is well settled that the writ jurisdiction of this Court cannot be invoked to indirectly nullify or circumvent a subsisting judicial order. If the petitioner is aggrieved by the manner in which her parentage has been described in the said order, or if she contends that the order does not reflect the true factual position, the appropriate course would be to challenge the order dated 18.06.2015 before the competent forum in accordance with law.
9. At this juncture, it is necessary to address the aspect of limitation. The order in C.Misc. No.6406/2015 is of the year 2015. However, the petitioner has now attained majority and seeks to assert her identity. The issue involved pertains to civil status and personal identity, which are continuing in nature and



have recurring consequences. In matters touching upon declaration of parentage and correction of public records reflecting such parentage, particularly when the aggrieved person was a minor at the time of the earlier proceedings, strict application of limitation would defeat substantive justice.

10. Therefore, it is observed that, if the petitioner initiates appropriate proceedings challenging the order dated 18.06.2015, the question of limitation shall be considered by the competent court in the light of the fact that the petitioner was a minor at the relevant point of time and that the grievance relates to her continuing civil identity. It is further clarified that the period during which the petitioner was a minor shall not operate to her prejudice, and the plea of limitation shall not, by itself, stand in the way of adjudication on merits.
11. In view of the above discussion, this Court finds no infirmity in the action of the respondents in effecting



the entry pursuant to the judicial order dated 18.06.2015. However, liberty is reserved to the petitioner to challenge the said order in appropriate proceedings. It is clarified that, in such proceedings, the issue shall be examined on its own merits and shall not be rejected solely on the ground of limitation.

12. With the above observations and reserving such liberty, the writ petition stands disposed of.

SD/-
(SURAJ GOVINDARAJ)
JUDGE

LN
List No.: 2 SI No.: 35