

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

WRIT PETITION NO. 6330 OF 2022

Balaji s/o Baliram Gitte
Age; 25 years, Occ; Education,
R/o; at Post- Talani, Tq. Ambajogai,
District- Beed.

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. The State of Maharashtra,
Through its Secretary,
School Education Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai -32.
2. The Deputy Director of Education,
Aurangabad Region, Aurangabad.
3. Maharashtra State Board of Secondary
and Higher Secondary Education, Pune.
4. The Divisional Secretary,
Maharashtra State Board of Secondary
and Higher Secondary Education,
Aurangabad Divisional Board,
Aurangabad.
5. The Principal,
Deogiri College,
Station Road, Aurangabad.

...RESPONDENTS.

...
Advocate for Petitioner : Mr.Sachin S. Bhise
AGP for Respondent Nos. 1 & 2-State : Mr.S.G.Sangle
Advocate for Respondent No. 4 : Ms. Nayana Patil h/f Mrs. Surekha
Mahajan.
...

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, AND
ANIL L. PANSARE, JJ.**

**RESERVED DATE : 24.06.2022.
PRONOUNCEMENT DATE : 12.07.2022**

ORAL JUDGMENT : (PER - ANIL L. PANSARE, J)

1. Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith. Heard finally, by consent of the learned counsel for the parties, at the admission stage.

2. The petitioner is seeking directions against respondent No. 4, the Divisional Secretary, Maharashtra State Board of Secondary and Higher Secondary Education, Aurangabad Divisional Board, Aurangabad and respondent No. 5 Principal, Deogiri College, Station Road, Aurangabad to decide his representation dt. 20.05.2022 thereby seeking directions to make correction in his name as “**Gitte Balaji Baliram**”, in place of “Gite Balaji Baliram”. According to the petitioner, respondent Nos. 4 and 5 have inadvertently mentioned his name as “Gite Balaji Baliram” instead of “Gitte Balaji Baliram”.

3. The petitioner has made a request to respondent Nos. 4 and 5 to make correction in his name, but both the respondents are not paying heed to his request. The petitioner is all set to complete his Engineering Degree and is preparing for various Competitive

Examinations. However, due to incorrect name in the record, he is facing great hardship. The petitioner further claims that for obtaining caste validity certificate and for other purposes, the petitioner is in need of the corrected record.

4. We find that the petitioner has placed on record certain documents in support of his claim. The first document is the statement of marks, issued by the Maharashtra State Board of Secondary and Higher Secondary Education, Pune. The statement of marks is issued in the month of March, 2014, in which the name of the petitioner is written as "Gite Bajaji Baliram". The second document is the School Leaving Certificate, dated 26.06.2014, issued by Shri Someshwar Vidyalaya (Boys) Ghatnandur, Tq. Ambejogai, District Beed, in which the name of the petitioner is written as "Gite Balaji Balairam". The third document is the extract of admission register, issued by Shri Someshwar Secondary and Higher Secondary and College, Ghatnandur. The said document is issued on 31st July, 2015, by the Principal, in which the name of the petitioner is written as "Gitte Balaji Baliram". However, there appears over writing in the word "Gitte". The next document is issued by the Principal, Zilla Parishad Primary School, Talani, Tq. Ambejogai, District Beed, which is the Extract of School Admission Register. It is dated 13th August, 2015. The surname is written as "Gitte". Here also, there appears

over writing in the word “Gitte”. The next document is the statement of marks issued by the Board, Pune, which shows the name of the petitioner as “Gite Balaji Baliram”. The document is dated February 2016. The next document is the College Leaving Certificate of Deogiri College, Aurangabad, dated 11.06.2017, issued by the Deogiri College, Aurangabad, which also shows the name of the petitioner as “Gite Balaji Baliram”.

5. We have noticed that the extract of admission registers of the School, which is hand written document, indicates the name of the petitioner as “Gitte Balaji Baliram”. However, there appears interpolation/overwriting in the word “Gitte”. Except for these documents, all other documents would show that the name of the petitioner is mentioned as “Gite Balaji Baliram”.

6. The learned Advocate for the respondent contends that none of the documents would support the claim of the petitioner. We do agree with these submissions. Most of the documents that are relied upon by the petitioner show that his name is mentioned as “Gite Balaji Balirm”. These documents don’t support his claim. The petitioner has not filed any document of his parents to show that their surname is “Gitte”. In absence thereof, it cannot be said that respondent Nos. 4 and 5 have made an inadvertent mistake in recording the surname of the petitioner as “Gite” as against “Gitte”, in

his school record.

7. There is thus, no substance in the petition and the same is liable to be dismissed and stands dismissed, accordingly. However, the dismissal of the petition would not preclude the petitioner to pursue his representations made before the respondent Nos. 4 and 5. The rule stands discharged.

(ANIL L. PANSARE)
JUDGE

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE)
JUDGE

mahajansb/