



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

KALABURAGI BENCH

DATED THIS THE 24TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP SINGH YERUR

WRIT PETITION NO.200490 OF 2026 (KLR-RR/SUR)

BETWEEN:

USMANSAB S/O FATRUSAB,
AGE: 75 YEARS, OCC: AGRICULTURE,
R/O MASIMADU VILLAGE,
TQ. BHALKI, DIST. BIDAR-585417.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. K. M. GHATE, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
R/P BY ITS PRL. SECRETARY,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA VEEDHI, VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BENGALURU-560001.
2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, BIDAR
DIST. BIDAR-585401.
3. THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER,
KARNATAKA STATE BOARD OF WAQF
NO.6, NEAR SRI. SAMPANGI RAMA TEMPLE,
CUNNINGHAM ROAD, BANGALORE,
KARNATAKA-560052, INDIA.
4. THE TAHSILDAR, BHALKI,
DISTRICT BIDAR-585328.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. VIRANAGOUDA M. BIRADAR, AGA FOR R1 R2 & R4;
SRI. P. S. MALIPATIL, ADVOCATE FOR R3)





THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO ALLOW THE WRIT PETITION A) ISSUE WRIT OF MANDAMUS/ORDER/DIRECTION, DIRECTING THE 2ND AND 4TH RESPONDENT TO CONSIDER THE APPLICATION FILED BY THE PETITIONER DATED 16.10.2025 VIDE ANNEXURE-D TO THE WRIT PETITION AND THEREBY PROCEED FOR REMOVAL OF NAME RESPONDENT NO.3 AUTHORITY FROM COLUMN NO.11 OF THE ROR OF THE PETITIONERS LAND BEARING SY NO.129/* / 1 MEASURING 2 ACRES 30 GUNTAS OF VILLAGE MASIMAD TQ. BHALKI, DISTRICT BIDAR FROM THE YEAR 2013-14 TO TILL DATE AND THEREBY ISSUE NECESSARY ROR IN FAVOUR OF THE PETITIONER B) ISSUE ANY ORDER/DIRECTION AS DEEMED FIT AND PROPER BY THIS HONOURABLE COURT DIRECTING THE RESPONDENTS TO PAY THE COST OF THE PRESENT WRIT PETITION TO THE PETITIONERS.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP SINGH YERUR

ORAL ORDER

Heard learned counsel for petitioner. Learned Additional Government Advocate is directed to take notice for respondent Nos.1, 2 and 4. Learned counsel Sri P. S. Malipatil, is directed to take notice for respondent No.3.

2. This petition is filed by the petitioner seeking a writ of mandamus directing respondent Nos.2 and 4 to consider the application filed by petitioner to remove the



name of respondent No.3 from the column No.11 of Record of Rights pertaining to land bearing Survey No.129/*/1 measuring 2 acres 30 guntas of Village Masimad, Taluk: Bhalki, District: Bidar.

3. It is contention of learned counsel that the petitioner is the absolute owner in possession and enjoyment of the land bearing Survey No.123 (old) and 129 (new) measuring 2 acres 30 guntas. Name of the petitioner is found in the revenue records. It is contended that one Maliksab Jatagar was the original owner and after his demise, his son Khajasab Jatagar succeeded the said property. On the death of Khajasab Jatagar, name of the petitioner is entered in the Record of Rights, as Khajasab Jatagar and father of petitioner namely Fatrusab were real brothers. The mutation entries were carried out in favour of the petitioner as absolute owner in possession and enjoyment of the said land.

4. This being the state of affairs, the agricultural land is in no way concerned to respondent No.3 nor is it



notified in any official gazette issued by respondent No.3. However, the name of respondent No.3 has been inserted in column No.11 of the Record of Rights. Being aggrieved, petitioner gave a representation for removal of the name of respondent No.3 in column No.11 pertaining to land bearing Survey No.129/*/1 measuring 2 acres 30 guntas of Village Masimad, Taluk: Bhalki, District: Bidar. The said that a representation has not been considered and no orders are passed removing the name of respondent No.3. Hence, petitioner is before this Court.

5. *Per contra*, learned Additional Government Advocate is appearing for the State, on verification of the records and documents, which are annexed along with the petition does not dispute the fact that the name of the petitioner was shown in the revenue records earlier and subsequently, the name of respondent No.3 is reflected in column No.11 of Record of Rights. He also does not dispute the fact that no notice has been issued to the petitioner, no enquiry is conducted and name of



respondent No.3 is included in the revenue records. So the representation came to be filed by the petitioner, which is not considered.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Government Advocate, apparently there is no dispute regard to the petitioner being the owner and in possession of the land in question, so also that the revenue records reflect the same. All of a sudden, the name of respondent No.3 is entered in the column No.11 of Record of Rights. The same cannot be done without issuing notice and neither conducting an inquiry. Therefore, there is substance in the arguments put forth by learned counsel for the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, I pass the following:

ORDER

- i. This petition is ***allowed***.
- ii. A writ of mandamus is issued directing respondent Nos.2 and 4 to remove the name of



respondent No.3 from column No.11 of the Record of Rights. Consequently, to include the name of petitioner in column No.11 of ROR.

- iii. Liberty is reserved to the respondent-authorities to initiate action, if any, of course by following due process of law and following the principles of natural justice.

Sd/-
(PRADEEP SINGH YERUR)
JUDGE

NJ
LIST NO.: 1 SL NO.: 7
CT:SI