

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPC No. 1724 of 2017**

Purushottam Kumar Adile S/o Jethu Ram Adile aged about 42 years,
R/o Village and post-Barpali, Tehsil-Kartala, Dist-Korba (CG)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh through Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Dist-Raipur (CG)
2. The Secretary, Chhattisgarh Board of Secondary Education, Raipur, Dist-Raipur (CG)
3. The District Education Officer, Korba, Dist-Korba (CG)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr.Lalit Jangde, Advocate
For State	:	Mr.Arvind Dubey, P.L.
For Respondent No.2	:	Mr.Alok Bakshi, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order on Board

18/7/2017

1. The petitioner has filed this writ petition for correction of his name as Purushottam which has been recorded in the marksheets of class 5th, 8th, dakhil kharij register and in the nomination form of Higher Secondary Education, but in class 10th marksheet his name has been recorded as Purshoham which is incorrect, whereas in class 12th marksheet his name has correctly been recorded as Purushottam Kumar Adile S/o Jethu Ram Adile. However, the Board has submitted that after 20 years such an error cannot be corrected.
2. Mr.Lalit Jangde, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, would submit that the Board has to consider the application of the petitioner for correction of his name on its own merit and merely on the ground of delay of 20 years, such an application cannot be rejected.
3. Mr.Alok Bakshi, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2,

would submit that after 20 years such a mistake cannot be corrected.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties, considered their rival submissions made hereinabove and also gone through the record with utmost circumspection.
5. It is true that the petitioner's name is Purushottam S/o Jethu, whereas in class 10th marksheet it has been recorded as Pursoham S/o Jethu. However, in other marksheets, it has correctly been recorded.
6. Taking into considering the aforesaid fact, respondent No.2 is directed to consider the case of the petitioner on merits and to pass reasoned and speaking order within a period 45 days from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. It is made clear that the Board will not reject the application of the petitioner only on the ground of delay.
7. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition finally stands disposed off. No order as to cost(s).

Sd/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

B/-