

Santosh

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA
WRIT PETITION NO. 682 OF 2018

Krishna Rama Gawas. Petitioner.
Versus
State of Goa, through Chief
Secretary & others. Respondents.

Ms. Smita S. Gawas, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Coram : N.M. Jamdar &
Prithviraj K. Chavan, JJ.

Date : 2 July 2018.

P.C.:

By this Petition, the Petitioner has challenged the orders dated 10 January 2017, 13 November 2017 and 12 December 2017.

2. The Petitioner joined the services of the State Government on 8 July 1980 as a Worker on regular establishment, attached to the Public Works Department. The Petitioner, at the time of his initial appointment, had submitted an affidavit stating his birth date as 11 June 1953. The Petitioner was due to retire on superannuation in the year 2017. The Petitioner made a representation for alteration of his date of birth from 11 June 1953 to 3 January 1959. The Authorities rejected the same by the impugned orders on the ground that the Petitioner had not sought

alteration of the date of birth within five years of his entry into Government service.

3. The learned Counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the Petitioner was not aware of the date of his birth at the time of his initial entry and, subsequently, in the year 1999 he came across a Portuguese document which showed his date of birth as 3 January 1959 and an application for alteration made in the year 1999 came to be rejected in the year 2017.

4. Firstly, the document which the Petitioner seeks to rely upon is completely unreadable. Secondly, no copy of the application, alleged to have been made in the year 1999, is produced on record. There is no reference to the same in any official correspondence. From the impugned orders, it is seen that the Petitioner has made the representation only in the year 2017. Even assuming the application was made in the year 1999, no efforts stated to have been made by the Petitioner to get his date of birth corrected. The Authorities, therefore, have rightly referred to the fact that the alteration would have to be made within five years of entry in Government service.

5. From the Petition what appears is only a belated attempt to some how seek extension in the Government service. At such a

stage, and on the basis of such facts a relief to the Petitioner cannot be granted. The Petitioner already stands superannuated and the services of the Petitioner have already ended in the year 2017.

6. The Petition is, accordingly, rejected.

Prithviraj K. Chavan, J.

N.M. Jamdar, J.