



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 11TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO. 33191 OF 2025 (GM-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. MISS TENZIN DICKYI
D/O MR. SINGAY
AGED ABOUT 22 YEARS
RESIDING AT SINGAY
NO.78, CAMP NO.3, BYLAKUPPE,
PERIYAPATNA TALUK,
MYSORE DISTRICT-571 107

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. GIRISHA N.R., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
REVENUE DEPARTMENT
BENGALURU-560 001
2. THE REGISTRAR OF BIRTHS AND DEATHS
OFFICE OF VILLAGE ACCOUNTANT
BYLAKUPPE HARANAHALLI HOBLI,
PERIYAPATNA TALUK,
MYSORE DISTRICT-571 107
3. THE TAHASILDAR
PERIYAPATNA TALUK
PERIYAPATNA
MYSORE DISTRICT-571 107

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. MOHAMMAD JAFFAR SHAH, AGA)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED ENDORSEMENT DATED 05.08.2025 BEARING NO. TA. SUM.NI. NO/619/2025-26 ISSUED BY R3 AT ANNEXURE-A AND ETC.





THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING,
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:

- a. *To issue a writ of certiorari or any other writ or pass appropriate order to quash the impugned endorsement dated 05/08/2025 bearing No.TA.SUM.NI.NO/619/2025-26, issued by Respondent No.3 at **ANNEXURE-A** and;*
- b. *To issue appropriate order or writ directing the Respondent No.2 to cancel the registration of the birth of the Petitioner recorded in its in register vide registration No.D30 dated 05.03.2005 (Annexure-C);*
- c. *Pass any such other orders as this court may deem fit in the interest of justice and equity.*

2. The Petitioner is stated to have been born on 11.08.2002 at Lohani Sarai, Saharanpur, Uttara Pradesh to Mr. Singay and Ms. Yalo Methok. The parents having separated, the Petitioner was left in the Tibetan monastery at Dharamshala. Subsequently, the Petitioner was admitted to the Tibetan monastery at Bylakuppe, Periyapatna Taluk.



In order to take care of her School admission etc., the caretaker of the Petitioner in Bylakuppe had got her birth registered and obtained a birth certificate.

3. Subsequently, the Petitioner came to know that there was a birth certificate which had been issued by the jurisdictional Registrar of Births and Deaths in Uttar Pradesh. As such, she made an application for cancellation of the birth certificate issued in Bylakuppe. The said request came to be rejected by the respondents, and in that background the Petitioner is before this Court seeking for the aforesaid reliefs.
4. The submission of learned counsel for the Petitioner is that there being two birth certificates of the Petitioner, one issued in Uttar Pradesh and the other issued in Karnataka, the Petitioner would be put into a problem in respect of any application that she may make for various requirements. As such, he submits that it is for that reason that the Petitioner chose for



the registration certificate issued in Karnataka to be cancelled with the Uttar Pradesh birth certificates being in continuance, and as such, he submits that the respondents ought to have accepted the request of the Petitioner and cancelled the birth certificate issued in Karnataka.

5. Learned AGA submits that the birth certificate has not been issued on an application made by the parents and/or the caretaker. The birth certificate has been issued in pursuance of the orders passed in C.Misc.No.65/2005 by the JMFC, Periyapatna. The entry having been made in pursuance thereof, until the said order is modified and/or recalled, the respondents would be unable to cancel the birth certificate issued in the name of the Petitioner.
6. There is substance in the submission made by learned AGA inasmuch as it is in pursuance of the order passed by the Court that the birth certificate has been issued. As such, on the basis of an



application filed by the Petitioner, the respondents cannot cancel a birth certificate issued in pursuance of order passed by the Court.

7. In that view of the matter, this Court is of the considered opinion that it would always be available for the Petitioner to move the Court having jurisdiction over the matter for recall of the order passed in C.Misc.No.65/2005 and for a further direction to cancel the registration in terms of the order passed as sought for in the present petition.
8. If such an application were to be filed, the Court would have to consider the same as expeditiously as possible.
9. At this stage, learned counsel for the Petitioner expresses the possible difficulty if the file were not to be available and/or were to be destroyed. In that event, liberty is reserved to the Petitioner to approach this Court.



**NC: 2026:KHC:28515
WP No. 33191 of 2025**

10. With the above observations, the petition stands
disposed of.

**Sd/-
(SURAJ GOVINDARAJ)
JUDGE**

KTY
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 36