

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPC No. 4566 of 2021

- Minakshee Pandey W/o Dinesh Pandey Aged About 42 Years R/o Mig-2, 1016, Industrial Estate Near Jamul, Police Station- Bhilai, District- Durg, Chhattisgarh, District : Durg, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through - Secretary, Department Of Education Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. District Education Officer District- Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh, District : Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh
3. Board Of Secondary Education Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	: Mr. Praveen Das, Advocate.
For the respondents/State	: Ms. Priyamvada Singh, Dy. Govt. Adv.
For respondent No.3	: Mr. H.B. Agrawal, Sr. Advocate with Ms. Swati Agrawal, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant

Order on Board

22.11.2021

Heard on petition.

1. It is submitted by counsel for the petitioner that the actual date of birth of the petitioner is 8.4.1979(Annexure-P/1). The birth certificate issued by the authority, the Primary School Marksheet(Annexure-P/2), Mark-sheet of Middle School(Annexure-P/3), Transfer Certificate(Annexure-P/5) and various other documents are present, in which, the date of birth of the petitioner is mentioned is 8.4.1979. The mark-sheet issued to the petitioner for High School Examination (Annexure-P/4) mentions her date of birth is 8.4.1975, which is erroneous. The petitioner made representation to respondent No.3 praying for correction of her date of

birth in the mark-sheet of High School Examination, but the same is pending and has not been decided by the respondent No.3 to consider on the representation made by the petitioner.

Reliance has been placed on the judgment of Chhattisgarh High Court in the case of Sudhir Ram Bhagat Vs. Secretary, Madhyamik Shiksha Mandal, Raipur and another in (2009) 3 C.G.L.J. 103

2. Learned State counsel representing the respondents No.1 & 2 opposes the submissions made by counsel for petitioner.
3. Learned counsel for respondent No.3 submits that the representation made by the petitioner is already delayed and on the ground of delay, this petition cannot be entertained, therefore, it is prayed that petition be dismissed.
4. Considered on the submissions.
5. Perused the documents filed along with the petition, the petition is disposed off at motion stage. Respondent No.3 is directed to consider on the representation made by the petitioner at the earliest and take decision on the same without being influenced by any of the observations made by this Court in this order. It is further directed that the decision be taken by the respondent No.3 preferably within a period of two months.

Sd/-

(Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant)
Judge

Nisha