

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA & THE STATE OF ANDHRA
PRADESH

* * *

WRIT PETITION No. 31002 of 2012

BETWEEN

Pedapudi Nithyanandam

... PETITIONER

AND

The Government of Andhra Pradesh, rep. by its Principal Secretary and
others

...RESPONDENTS

Date of Order pronounced: 22.07.2015

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

-
-

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR

- | | |
|--|--------|
| 1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers
may be allowed to see the Judgments? | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether the copies of judgment may be
marked to Law Reporters/Journals? | Yes/No |
| 3. Whether their Lordship wish to see the
fair copy of the Judgment? | Yes/No |

ORDER:-

The complaint of the petitioner in this case was that his applications dated 02.07.2012 and 29.09.2012 for correction of his date of birth were not being considered by the respondent authorities. The petitioner seeks correction of his date of birth as 15.04.1968 in stead of 15.04.1966. The incorrect date of birth is stated to be reflected in the secondary school certificate of the petitioner and his other educational records.

2. The District Educational Officer, Krishna, Machilipatnam, filed a counter stating that the request of the petitioner for alteration of his date of birth was rejected by the District Educational Officer under a speaking order contained in proceedings bearing Rc.No.152/R4 (D7)/2012 dated 13.10.2012. The District Educational Officer further stated that the Commissioner and Director of School Education was not competent to alter the date of birth in the secondary school certificate and that he could only effect corrections within a period of three years from the date of completion of the course.

3. Though the counter affidavit was filed as long back as in December, 2012, the petitioner did not choose to file a reply rebutting the averments made therein. Thus, as the matter stands, the request of the petitioner stands rejected under the proceedings dated 13.10.2012 which have not even been subjected to challenge. The prayer in this writ petition therefore cannot be accepted in the light of the subsequent rejection.

The writ petition is devoid of merit and is accordingly dismissed. Pending miscellaneous petitions shall also stand dismissed. No order as to costs.

SANJAY KUMAR, J

July 22, 2015
LMV