



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, AT DHARWAD
DATED THIS THE 24TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026
BEFORE
THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI M
WRIT PETITION NO. 104110 OF 2024 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

MR. SHABBIR RASULSAB MUJAWAR,
SON OF RASULAB MUJAWAR,
AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS,
R/O. TELSANG, TQ. ATHANI,
BELAGAVI-591 265.

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SABEEL AHMED, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. A.S. ZUBAIR AHMED KHAN, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
VIKAS SOUDHA, BENGALURU-560 001,
REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY.
2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
BELAGAVI DISTRICT,
BELAGAVI-590 001.
3. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER,
BELAGAVI DISTRICT,
BELAGAVI-590 001.
4. THE TAHSILDAR,
TELASANGA, TQ. ATHANI,
DIST. BELAGAVI-591 304.
5. THE KARNATAKA STATE WAKF BOARD,
DARUL AWKAF, NO.6 CUNNINGHAM ROAD,
BENGALURU-560 052,
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER.



6. PEER HAJI SAHEB DARGAH (SUNNI),
TELASANGA, ATHANI TALUK,
BELAGAVI DISTRICT-591 304,
REPRESENTED BY ITS
PRESIDENT/SECRETARY.

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MALA.B.BHUTE, AGA FOR R1 TO R4;
SRI. D.L. LADKHAN, ADVOCATE FOR R5;
NOTICE TO R6 IS SERVED AND UNREPRESENTED)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND
227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, SEEKING CERTAIN
RELIEFS.

THIS WRIT PETITION IS LISTED FOR PRELIMINARY
HEARING IN 'B' GROUP, THIS DAY, AN ORDER IS MADE AS
UNDER:

ORAL ORDER

Sri.Sabeel Ahmed., counsel on behalf of Sri.A.S.Zubair
Ahmed., for the petitioner, Smt.Mala B.Bhute., AGA for
respondents 1 to 4 and Sri.D.L.Ladkhan., counsel for respondent
No.5 have appeared in person.

2. The petition is filed seeking following reliefs:

*"a) Issue writ of certiorari and quash the Impugned updation
of revenue entries in respect of land bearing Sy. No. 850/1A,
measuring 4 Acres 34 Guntas, situated Telasang Village and
Hobli, Athani Taluk, Belagavi District by the Respondent No.
4 in favour of the Karnataka State Wakf Board, Bengaluru
and Peer Haji Saheb Dargah (Sunni), the Respondent No.5*



and 6 herein vide MR H205/2011-12 (Release of Rights) dated 03.01.2023 produced at Annexure-A.

b) Issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the Respondent No. 4 to restore the name of the Petitioner's father in respect Schedule Property bearing Sy. No.850/1A, measuring 4 Acres 34 Guntas, situated at Telasang Village and Hobli, Athani Taluk, Belagavi District by deleting the name of the Respondent Nos.5 and 6.

c) to pass such other order/s as this Hon'ble Court may deems fit in the facts and circumstance of the case, in the interest of justice and equity."

3. Counsel for the respective parties urged several contentions.

Counsel for the petitioner placed reliance on the following decision:

SRI.MOHAMMED ARBAB HAMEED KHAN V/S. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA IN W.P.NO.200863/2025 ALONG WITH CONNECTED MATTERS.

4. Heard the arguments and perused the papers with care.

5. The petitioner contends that he is the owner of the subject land. It is his case that the Tahsildar, vide order dated 15.10.2011, mutated the names of Respondent Nos. 5 and 6 in



the revenue records, and the corresponding entry was effected on the very same day. Aggrieved thereby, the petitioner seeks quashing of the said entry vide Annexure-A and a writ of mandamus directing Respondent No. 4 to restore the name of the petitioner's father in respect of the subject land.

6. Counsel for the petitioner, while advancing his arguments, strenuously contends that there is no delay in assailing the impugned entries. He draws the attention of this Court to the representation submitted by the petitioner on 08.01.2022. It is further contended that, pursuant thereto, the Revenue Inspector, by communication dated 20.01.2023, informed the Tahsildar that the petitioner is in possession of the property and recommended updating of the revenue entries. It is submitted that subsequent proceedings were initiated, in which the petitioner has participated.

However, the said contentions and reliance on the aforesaid documents do not come to the aid of the petitioner. The reason is evident. The mutation entry was effected in the year 2011, whereas the present writ petition has been filed in the year 2024. There is an inordinate delay of nearly thirteen



years in invoking the writ jurisdiction of this Court. Significantly, no satisfactory explanation has been offered in the writ petition to justify such delay and laches.

7. In view of the above, this Court is of the considered opinion that the writ petition is liable to be dismissed on the ground of delay and laches. Accordingly, the writ petition stands ***dismissed.***

8. Since the writ petition is dismissed on the ground of delay and laches, this Court has not examined the case on merits.

**Sd/-
(JYOTI M)
JUDGE**

MRP
LIST NO.: 1 SL NO.: 56