

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT SRINAGAR**

WP(C) 383/ 2026
CM 991/ 2026

GHULAM HASSAN MALIK

...Petitioner(s)/Appellant(s).

Through: Ms Arifa Jan, Advocate

Vs.

UT OF J K & ORS

...Respondent(s).

Through:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MOHD YOUSUF WANI, JUDGE

ORDER

03.03.2026

1. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner.
2. The short grievance of the petitioner, as agitated through the medium of the instant petition filed under provisions of Article 226 of the Constitution of India, is that he is the owner in possession of land measuring 1 kanal 12 marlas under Khasra No. 11 (New), Khewat No. 413 (New) and Khata No. 547 (New) situated at Umerhair, District Srinagar. That he approached the respondents with the request for issuance of the extract of the revenue record/Fard in respect of the aforesaid land which is not being issued to him despite repeated requests and representations, thereby constraining him to approach this Court for enforcement of his legal right.
3. The petitioner has accordingly sought the issuance of writ/direction in the nature of mandamus for commanding upon the respondents to issue the revenue extract/Fard in his favour in respect of the subject land, i.e., under Khasra No. 11 (New), Khewat No. 413 (New) and Khata No. 547 (New) situated at Umerhair, District Srinagar being owned and possessed by him as the legal heir of Mst. Mugli D/o Nabir Shah.
4. Perused the memo of the petition and the copies of the documents enclosed with the same.

5. It is submitted by the learned counsel that the khasra number mentioned in the petition has been provided to the petitioner by the concerned Patwari as being the new khasra number after settlement.
6. The copies of the documents in the shape of the revenue extracts appended to the petition, however, reflected different khasra numbers, and as per the said documents, the land mentioned thereunder appears to be hit by the provisions of the Agrarian Reforms Act.
7. Having regard to the case of the petitioner and the relief sought by him, this Court is of the opinion that the matter can be disposed of even at this stage by passing of appropriate orders, which the respondents are otherwise obliged under law to carry out.
8. Mst. Mugli, the alleged mother of the petitioner, appears to be one of the co-sharer. The petitioner, in respect of his alleged claim to the subject property as owner and possessor thereof, cannot be denied the extract of revenue record in respect of the same, as per the available revenue records. The respondents, at the most, can make an entry of any facto-legal matter in respect of the said land by appending a note to the required extract of revenue record/Fard.
9. Accordingly, the instant petition is disposed of with the direction to the respondents to issue the extract of revenue record/Fard in respect of the subject land in favour of the petitioner strictly as per the available and updated revenue records within a period of two weeks, with liberty to make mention of any facto-legal issue/fact concerning the land by way of a note appended to the same.

10. Disposed of.

(MOHD YOUSUF WANI)
JUDGE

SRINAGAR
03.03.2026
ARIF