



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

KALABURAGI BENCH

DATED THIS THE 4TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP SINGH YERUR

WRIT PETITION NO.200053 OF 2026 (KLR-RR/SUR)

BETWEEN:

1. YELLAMMA W/O BHEEMANNA,
AGE: 53 YEARS, OCC:AGRICULTURE & COOLIE,
R/O HALISAGAR VILLAGE,
TQ. SHAHAPUR, DIST. YADGIR
2. SHAIZADA BEGUM
W/O ABDUL RAZAK,
AGE: 41 YEARS, OCC:AGRICULTURE & COOLIE,
R/O HALISAGAR VILLAGE,
TQ. SHAHAPUR, DIST.YADGIR.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. MAHADEV S. PATIL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPT BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE.
M.S BUILDING, AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BANGALURU-560001.
2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
YADGIRI, DIST.YADGIRI-585201.
3. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER,
YADGIR SUB-DIVISION, YADGIRI
DIST. YADGIRI-585201.

Digitally signed
by RENUKA
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



4. THE TAHASILDAR,
SHAHAPUR TALUKA, SHAHAPUR
DIST. YADGIRI-585201.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. VIRANAGOUDA M. BIRADAR, AGA)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT OF MANDAMUS DIRECTING THE 3RD AND 4TH RESPONDENT TO CONSIDER THE REQUEST OF THE PETITIONERS FOR GRANT OF CERTIFIED COPIES OF ORDER VIDE NO.ಸ.ಕ.ಭೂಮಿ/122/15-16 MR NO.H52 DATED 21.10.2016 MUTATION ORDER DATED 28.06.2017 IN RESPECT OF LAND SY NO.597/*/* AND 598/*/* HALISAGAR VILLAGE, TQ.SHAHAPUR AS PER THE REPRESENTATION DATED 08.01.2025, 14.08.2025 AND 12.11.2025 (ANNEXURE-K AND L, L1 AND L2).

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 the petitioners.

2. Learned Additional Government Advocate is directed to take notice for respondent Nos.1 to 4.

3. The petitioner No.1 claims to be the owner of land bearing Survey No.598/*/* measuring 03 acres and



petitioners No.2 claims to be the owner of land bearing Survey No.597/*/* measuring 03 acres situated at Halisagar Village, Shahapur Taluk.

4. It is the grievance of petitioners that the name of Government of Karnataka has been entered in column Nos.9 and 12 of the record of rights by deleting the name of husband of petitioners No.1 and petitioners No.2, by mutation order dated 13.01.2017 vide MR-H52/2016-17. Counsel for the petitioners submits that on coming to know of the name of the Government of Karnataka having been inserted, petitioners made efforts to secure the document on which basis, the name of Government of Karnataka is included in the revenue records. It is contended that the petitioners are still in possession and cultivation of the said land.

5. The petitioners applied for the issuance of certified copy of mutation order dated 13.01.2017 to respondent No.4 authority. However, they were informed that there is no such record available in the office of the



Tahasildar. Later, the petitioners came to know that mutation has been effected on the order of respondent No.3 vide No.ಸ.ಕ.ಭೂಮಿ/122/15-16 MR No.H52 dated 21.10.2016. Hence, petitioners approached the office of respondent No.3 by applying certified copy on the said mutation order. Despite several requests made and applications made for securing the certified copy of the mutation order, it is informed that the same is not available. Hence, petitioners gave a representation to respondent No.4 on 30.12.2024, who in turn issued an endorsement stating that the mutation order bearing No.MR-H-52/2016-2017 has not been received by his office. Once again petitioners made a representation dated 08.01.2025 to respondent No.3 requesting certified copy. Despite which the certified copy of the mutation order is not furnished. Hence, aggrieved by the same, petitioners are before this Court.

6. Learned Additional Government Advocate representing the State contends that the reply has been



given by respondent No.4 stating that the documents are not available with him. Hence, he seeks to dismiss the petition.

7. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned Additional Government Advocate for respondent-State.

8. Apparently, whenever an application is made to the statutory authorities for issue of a certified copy, if one of the authorities say that the records are not available, it becomes the duty of the other authority, namely respondent No.3 to furnish or atleast to reply to the application so made. In the present case, having not done so, the present petition calls for indulgence by this Court.

9. Accordingly, I pass the following:

ORDER

- i. Writ petition is ***allowed***.



- ii. A writ of mandamus is issued directing the respondent Nos.3 and 4 to consider the representation made by the petitioners and pass suitable orders within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of copy of the order.

Sd/-
(PRADEEP SINGH YERUR)
JUDGE

VNR
List No.: 1 SI No.: 7
CT:SI