

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPC No. 2260 of 2020**

Lakhan Lal Maravi S/o Manharan Lal Maravi, Aged About 54 Years R/o Datta Colony, Near Sant Harkebal School, Ambikapur, District Surguja Chhattisgarh., District : Surguja (Ambikapur), Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Central Board Of Secondary Education, Through - Its Chairman, Shiksha Kendra, 2, Community Centre, Preet Vihar, Delhi - 110092.
2. Regional Officer, C.B.S.E. (R.O.), 6th Floor, Alok Bharti Complex, Shahid Nagar, Bhubaneswar, (Odisha).
3. The Principal, Kendriya Vidyalaya Ambikapur, District Surguja Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Keshav Prasad Gupta, Advocate
For Respondents No.1 & 2	:	Mr. T.K. Tiwari, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

06/10/2020

1. The grievance of the petitioner in the present writ petition is the incorrect date of birth that is reflected in the 10th standard mark-sheet issued by the respondents No.1 & 2, which the petitioner undertook from the respondent No.3-school
2. The counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had passed the class10th examination in the academic session 2011-12 and when the mark-sheet was received, the petitioner found that there is a discrepancy in the date of birth. The date of birth in

the mark-sheet was mentioned as 13.06.1996 whereas his actual date of birth is 13.03.1996.

3. According to the petitioner, he had immediately moved an application for correction of his date of birth with the respondent No.3 on 07.08.2012 itself, however there was no further response on the said application, hence he moved another application on 30.06.2015, which was duly forwarded by the respondent No.3 to the respondent No.2 on 01.07.2015. However thereafter there is no response from the respondent No.2 also. Meanwhile, the petitioner had been pursuing in his other educational courses till now. At this juncture, the counsel for the petitioner submits that looking to the further career prospects the discrepancy in the marksheet so far as the date of birth is required to be corrected at the earliest, which has led to the filing of the present writ petition.
4. Mr. T.K. Tiwari, however submits that though it appears that the petitioner has moved an application in the year 2015 and it seems to have been forwarded by the respondent No.3 also in the year 2015, however there is no further persuasion on the part of the petitioner on this aspect and now he has filed the writ petition at a belated stage.
5. Given the limited grievance that the petitioner has and the fact that his application has been duly considered and forwarded by the respondent No.3-school to the respondent No.2 where the decision is pending, the writ petition at this juncture can be

disposed of directing the respondent No.2 to take a decision on the application of the petitioner seeking correction of the date of birth at the earliest preferably within a period of 90 days from the date of receipt of the copy of this order.

6. With the aforesaid observations, the present writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge

Ved