

Sr.No.210

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CWP No. 9289 of 2016

Date of decision:07.02.2017

Sagar Jangra

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mr.Justice Rakesh Kumar Jain

Present: Mr. Rakesh Dhiman, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanisha Peshawaria, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. N.K.Setia, Advocate
for respondents No. 3 & 4.

Rakesh Kumar Jain, J.(Oral)

Petitioner has challenged the validity of the order dated 27.08.2015(Annexure P-7) passed by respondent No. 3 declining his prayer for correction/change of his surname in the certificates of Xth and XIIth in which his name has been recorded as 'Sagar Gangra' instead of 'Sagar Jangra'.

During the course of hearing, counsel for respondent No. 4 has produced the school record in which the spelling of surname of the petitioner has been corrected from 'Gangra' to 'Jangra'. Incidentally, counsel for respondent No.4 also appears for respondent No.3 as well and has submitted that only difficulty before respondent No.3 in correcting the spelling of surname of the petitioner was the existence of the incorrect entry of surname of the petitioner in the school record. It is submitted that since the school record has also been corrected in which surname of the petitioner has been rightly spelt as 'Sagar Jangra'. Therefore, respondent No. 3 shall

also look into this matter.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts and circumstances of this case, the present petition is hereby allowed, quashing the impugned order dated 27.08.2015(Annexure P-7) and directing respondent No. 3 to look into the issue involved in regard to correction in the spelling of the surname of the petitioner which is required to be corrected from 'Gangra' to 'Jangra' especially in view of the fact that the school record of the petitioner in this regard has already been corrected. Needful shall be done by respondent No. 3 within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

It is needless to mention that case of the petitioner is covered by the unamended provisions of Rule 69.1(ii) of the examination bye-laws as the application was filed by the petitioner before the said rule amended on 25.06.2015.

7th February, 2017

Shivani Kaushik

**[Rakesh Kumar Jain]
Judge**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No