

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

The Hon'ble Sri Justice V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN
and
The Hon'ble Sri Justice M. GANGA RAO

WRIT PETITION No.36943 OF 2017

Between:

Smt. P. Uma Devi W/ o. Late P.R. Chennaiah,
Aged about 65 years, Occ: Housewife,
R/ o.H.No.6-3-164/ 3/ 9/ 16/ 1, Premnagar,
Khairtabad, Hyderabad.

...Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Telangana, rep.by its
Principal Secretary, School Education Department,
Secretariat, Hyderabad and others

... Respondents

For Petitioner

: Sri M. Adam

For Respondents

: Government Pleader for School
Education (TG)



HON' BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

AND

HON' BLE SRI JUSTICE M. GANGA RAO

WRIT PETITION No.36943 OF 2017

ORDER: (per V. Ramasubramanian, J)

The petitioner, whose husband was employed as an attender in the Social Welfare Department and who was retired from service on 30.06.2008, and also died on 12.07.2008, filed an application in O.A. No.113 of 2013 before the Andhra Pradesh Administrative Tribunal for alteration of date of birth of her husband in the Service Register. The Tribunal rejected the same forcing the petitioner to come up with the above writ petition.

2. Heard Mr.M.Adam learned counsel for the petitioner.

3. We do not know how an application for alteration of date of birth could have been made at the fag-end of the career of the petitioner's husband. The petitioner's husband joined service in the year 1973. At that time, his date of birth was entered in the Service Register as 10.06.1948. The claim of the petitioner is that the correct date of birth of her husband was 06.10.1948 and that the same came to light only in the year 2008 when he was about to retire.

4. The important aspect is that within 12 days of his retirement, the petitioner's husband also died. We do not know what benefit the petitioner is going to get even if her claim for alteration of date of birth has been allowed by the Tribunal.

5. The Rules clearly prescribe a period of limitation for making a claim for alteration of date of birth. The Supreme Court time and again condemns the practice of seeking an alteration of date of birth at the

fag-end of the career. Therefore, the Tribunal was right in rejecting the application.

6. Hence, the Writ Petition is dismissed. As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand dismissed. No order as to costs.

V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN, J

M. GANGA RAO, J

November 03, 2017

KTL

