

***IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION***

WRIT PETITION NO. 10345 OF 2014

Kum.Vijaya Bhanudas Savant

... Petitioner

v/s

State of Maharashtra & ors.

... Respondents

Mr.V.S.Deokar for the petitioner.

Mr.A.H.I. Patel, A.G.P. for respondent No.1.

Mr.Vijay Killedar for respondent No.2

***CORAM: SMT. VASANTI A. NAIK &
SHRI C. V. BHADANG, JJ.***

DATED : 3RD FEBRUARY 2015

P.C.:

Heard.

By this petition, the petitioner impugns the order of the Education Board, Solapur, dated 9th September, 2014 rejecting the application filed by the petitioner for altering the date of birth. According to the petitioner, the date of birth of the petitioner was wrongly recorded as 1st June 1959 in the Primary School in which the petitioner was admitted. The petitioner was appointed as a Assistant Teacher on 1st June, 1987. It is the case of the petitioner that, she became aware on 1st January, 1992 that her date of birth

was 30th March, 1961 and not 1st June, 1959. According to the petitioner, the petitioner made an application for change of her name and also for correction of her date of birth in the year 1992. However, the Education Board, by the impugned order dated 9th September 2014, rejected the application filed by the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner had not applied for change of date of birth within five years from the date of her appointment. It is stated in the impugned order that the petitioner had not applied for change of date of birth on 25th May, 2014 and not in January, 1992.

We do not find any merit in the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner. There is nothing on record to show that the petitioner had applied for change of date of birth in January, 1992. Though a bald statement is made that the petitioner had applied in the year 1992 for change of date of birth, the learned counsel for the petitioner fairly states that the petitioner does not possess a copy of any such application. It is also stated that on a query made by the petitioner under the Right to Information Act in regard to the application filed in the year 1992, it is informed by the Information Officer that an application dated 17th February, 1992 is not to be found with the Board. We find that the petitioner has tried to make out a case that the petitioner had applied for the correction of the date of birth within five years from the date of her appointment though she had not.

We do not find any fault with the order of the Education

Board rejecting the application filed by the petitioner.

Since there is no merit in the writ petition, the same is dismissed with no order as to costs.

(C. V. BHADANG, J.)

(VASANTI A. NAIK, J.)