

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS NO. 5574 OF 2020**

- Smt. Sudha Devi Singh W/o Late Janardan Singh Aged About 51 Years
Occupation Ecg Technician Grade-C, Secl, Central Hospital, Hasdeo Area,
Manendragarh, District Koriya Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner**versus**

1. South Eastern Coalfields Limited, through the Chairman-cum-Managing Director, Seepat Road, Basant Vihar, Bilaspur (CG)
2. The Director (Personnel), S.E.C.L., Basant Vihar, Bilaspur (CG)
3. The Chief General Manager, S.E.C.L., Baikunthpur, District Koriya (CG)
4. The Area Manager, Hasdeo Area, S.E.C.L., Baikunthpur, District Koriya (CG)
5. The Personnel Manager, Central Hospital, Manendragarh, District Koriya (CG)

... Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Ashok Kumar Shukla, Advocate.
For Respondents	:	Mr. Sudhir Kumar Bajpayi, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****01/02/2021**

1. The dispute in the present Writ Petition is with regard to the correct date of birth of Petitioner.
2. According to learned Counsel for Petitioner, the actual date of birth of Petitioner as per school records and other records available with the Petitioner shows as 7.8.1969; whereas, inadvertently the office records reflect the date of birth of Petitioner as 31.12.1962. Learned Counsel for Petitioner submits that from plain perusal of service records, it appears that there is some tampering or overlapping of the entry of date of birth of Petitioner in the service records. He further submits that the Petitioner right from initial stages herself approaching the authorities in the Department for correction of her date of birth which till date has not been accepted; whereas in the process she has left only 7 years of service but her date of birth has not been properly rectified.
3. Learned Counsel for Petitioner further submits that in the year 2017 the Petitioner was subjected to Age Determination Committee (in short, "ADC") who has examined the Petitioner, however, the outcome of the same has not been till date communicated to the Petitioner nor has she been given any intimation as regards the correction of her date of birth if made.

4. Learned Counsel for Respondents submits that since the Petitioner has already been subjected to ADC and her representation according to her is also pending, let the Writ Petition be disposed of directing the respondent authorities to intimate the Petitioner about the outcome of the ADC and, if not, the case of Petitioner be again scrutinized by the respondent authorities.

5. Given the said facts, taking into consideration the contents of Implementation Instruction No.76 which governs the policy in the respondent department so far as correction of date of birth is concerned and since the Petitioner has already been subjected to ADC, let Respondents No. 3, 4 & 5 take necessary steps in ensuring that the result of ADC is communicated to the Petitioner and her representation for correction of date of birth be also decided in accordance with the policy governing the field. Let a decision in this regard be taken by Respondents within an outer limit of 60 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

6. Writ Petition accordingly stands disposed of with the above observations.

/sharad/

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE