

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9889 of 2022

=====

Md. Nasim Son of Md. Faijuddin, Raghunathpur, P.S.-Amdabad, District-Katihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through The Secretary Human Resources Department, Patna.
2. The District Education Officer, Katihar
3. The Secretary, Bihar School Examination Board, Bihar Patna.
4. The Bihar School Examination Board, Regional Office Purnea, Division Purnea.
5. The Principal, Indrawati High School Amdabad, Katihar..

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ajit Kumar Singh
For the BSEB	:	Mr. Girijish Kumar
For the Respondent/s	:	Smt. Binita Singh (SC-28)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

- 8 15-07-2025 **1.** The petitioner has filed the present writ application for correction of his date of birth in the Matriculation Certificate issued in the year 1993 from 01.03.1979 to 12.12.1979.
- 2.** Mr. Ajit Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the petitioner appeared in the Matriculation Examination in the year 1993 having Registration No. 1141-30/3418, Roll Code 11403 and Roll No. 0070 and passed the examination in second division.
- 3.** The original matriculation certificate of the petitioner was issued, in which, his date of birth is indicated as 01.03.1979 instead of 12.12.1979. The petitioner submitted his



application for correction of his date of birth before the Board in the year 2019 with supporting documents, but the same has been ignored and date of the birth of the petitioner has not been corrected. From supporting documents, it appears that the correct date of birth of the petitioner is 12.12.1979. The petitioner is working as Panchayat Teacher since 2010.

4. On the other hand, Mr. Girijish Kumar, learned counsel for the Bihar School Examination Board, as well as Standing Counsel-28, learned counsel for the State, submits that the petitioner passed his Matriculation Examination in the year 1993 having date of birth as 01.03.1979 and he approached for correction of his date of birth for the first time after a lapse of about 27 years.

5. Learned counsel for the Board argues that regarding discrepancy in the date of birth, the Board has taken a policy decision inasmuch as after 10 years the correction in date of birth cannot be allowed. Furthermore, if the date of birth of the petitioner had been recorded incorrectly as 12.12.1979, his age on the date of passing of the matriculation examination would be less than 14 years, consequently, he would not have been eligible for appearing in the matriculation examination.

6. He relied upon the order passed by a Co-ordinate



Bench of this Court on similar issue, in CWJC No. 8537 of 2022, dated 26.08.2022.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the materials available on records.

8. It is an admitted case of the petitioner that he passed the Matriculation Examination in the year 1993 having his date of birth as 01.03.1979. The petitioner applied for change/correction of date of birth as mentioned in the Matriculation Certificate after about 27 years. The policy decision of the Board is very clear on this point that correction in the date of birth shall not be allowed beyond the period of ten years. The petitioner has approached the Board for correction of his date of birth after a long delay of about 27 years.

9. Considering the aforesaid, this Court is of the opinion that after 27 years of passing of the matriculation examination, correction of date of birth cannot be allowed and the writ application of the petitioner is devoid of any merit.

10. This writ application is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

ashwani/-

U			
---	--	--	--

