

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

(131)

CWP-19592-2023

Date of decision: - 05.09.2023

Ravneet Singh**....Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab and another****.....Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL**

Present:- Mr. Neeraj Yadav, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of an appropriate writ especially in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to carry out necessary correction in Matriculation certificate (Sr. No.019234) issued in favour of petitioner with incorrect date of birth (14.02.1991 instead of his actual/correct date of birth i.e. 14.02.1994) issued on 10.12.2010 (Annexure P-6).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that as per the Punjab School Board (Correction in Date of Birth or Father' Name) Regulations, 1988 (hereinafter referred as 'Regulations of 1988), the change/modification in date of birth can even be considered in case the same has been applied after a period of five years and the same has to be done by a committee, which is to be constituted by the Board under the Regulations of 1988. It is further submitted that the petitioner has

submitted the application form (Annexure P-8), but no final decision has been taken by respondent No.2-Board. It is also submitted that the petitioner would be satisfied in case the Competent Authority of respondent No.2/Board is directed to take a final decision in the matter in a time bound manner and in case the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, necessary relief be granted to him in accordance with law.

3. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to consider the application form (Annexure P-8), within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order and in case, respondent No.2 is of the opinion that there is merit in the plea raised by the petitioner, then, take appropriate action, in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible and in case, respondent No.2 is of the opinion that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritless, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim of the petitioner be passed within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

4. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondent No.2 would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

September 05, 2023
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No