

\$~8

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(C) 570/2016 & C.M.No.2372/2016

AJAY JHANJHARIYA

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.J.S.Thakur with Mr.Manish
Malik, Advocates.

versus

CENTRAL BOARD OF SECONDARY EDUCATION & ANR

..... Respondents

Through Mr.Atul Kumar, Advocate for R-1.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN

ORDER

%

25.01.2016

At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner prays for respondent no.2 to be deleted from the array of parties.

Consequently, the respondent no.2 is deleted. Let an amended memo of parties be filed within a period of one week.

It is pertinent to mention that the present writ petition has been filed seeking a direction to respondent no.1 for making correction in the surname of the petitioner's father and mother in his matriculation certificate.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that his mother's name was written as Suman Singh Jhanjhariya instead of Suman and his father's name as Azad Singh Jhanjhariya instead of Azad Singh in his matriculation certificate. He states that the petitioner spotted this error in 2015. He also states that the petitioner requested respondent no. 1/CBSE for making the correction vide letter dated 30th May,

2015 but the same was refused vide letter dated 17th June, 2015 on the ground that change in the name/father's name/mother's name and other particular in the documents issued by the Board cannot be allowed as per rules.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the respondent has failed to appreciate that he is requesting for a correction in the surname of his father and mother and not change in names.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further states that the impugned letter dated 17th June, 2015 has been issued in accordance with the new rules.

Since the petitioner's application has been rejected not on the basis of the law prevalent on the date when the application was made, the impugned letter dated 17th June, 2015 is set aside and the respondent is directed to reconsider the petitioner's application in accordance with law that was prevalent on the date of the application.

The respondent is directed to dispose of the petitioner's representation as expeditiously as possible.

With the aforesaid direction, the present writ petition and the application are disposed of.

Order *dasti*.

MANMOHAN, J

JANUARY 25, 2016
KA