

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19595 of 2024**

=====

Kumari Punam @ Punam Devi wife of Baikunth Kumar Mahto, resident of  
Village-Amarpur, P.O.-Chutiya, P.S.-Banka, District-Banka-813102.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Department of Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Secretary, Department of Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Chairman, Bihar School Examination Board, Patna.
4. The Secretary, Bihar School Examination Board, Patna.
5. The Principal plus2 Shivdhari Sukdev Ucch Vidyalaya, Ganoul, Narayanpur, Bhagalpur.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                      |   |                              |
|----------------------|---|------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s | : | Mr.Ravi Raj                  |
| For the Respondent/s | : | AC to Standing Counsel 20    |
| For the BSEB         |   | Mr. P.K. Shahi, Sr. Adv.     |
|                      |   | Mr. Girijesh Kumar, Advocate |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

- 2      22-04-2025      1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
counsel for the respondent / Bihar School Examination Board.
2. The petitioner has filed the present writ application for  
correction of her date of birth in the matriculation certificate  
inasmuch the date of birth of the petitioner has been mentioned  
as 01.04.1979 instead of 01.04.1974.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner  
passed the matriculation examination in 1992 having roll no.



0327. He further submits that petitioner received matriculation certificate having date of birth 01.04.1979 and came to know about the incorrect date of birth. She took steps for correction of her date of birth in 1992 itself and kept on filing representations for correction but no step was taken by the Bihar School Examination Board (for short “Board”). Hence the present writ application has been filed.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the Board submits that it appears that in the year 2015 for the first time the petitioner filed an application for correction of her date of birth i.e. after lapse of twenty three years. Though, copy of the representation of 2015 has not been attached along with the writ application however as would be evident from paragraph – 11 of the writ application the Secretary of the Board vide memo no. BP / 169 dated 11.09.2015 called for the records of the petitioner kept in school from the Principal, +2 Shivdhari Sukdev High School, Ganoul, Narayanpur, Bhagalpur and in response to the aforesaid letter the Principal vide letter no. 99/2015 dated 27.11.2015 addressed to the Secretary, B.S.E.B. Patna stated that the required original records relating to the petitioner were not available and the same has been swept away in the flood. Learned counsel for the Board submits that in



paragraph-12 of the writ petition the petitioner has mentioned regarding letter no. 33 / 2024 dt: 05.02.2024 addressed to the Secretary, B.S.E.B. in which the Principal has reiterated that required original records relating to the petitioner could not be supplied for the reason that same has been swept away in the flood. Accordingly, submission is even if considering the statement of the petitioner in paragraph 11 & 12 of the writ application as true, it appears that the petitioner after lapse of twenty three years from the date of passing her matriculation examination for the first time has filed a representation for correction of her date of birth in 2015. As per the regulations of the Board maximum time for correction of date of birth is ten years. As of today, now thirty two years have passed and at this stage the correction of date of birth is not possible.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that petitioner has filed delayed representation for correction of her date of birth in the matriculation certificate i.e. after lapse of twenty three years, at present, after lapse of thirty two years, no direction can be issued to the respondent / Board to correct the date of birth of the petitioner.

6. It is also to be kept in mind that records of the petitioner



is not available in the school as would be evident from the statement made by the petitioner herself in paragraph no. 11 of the writ application.

7. Accordingly, I do not find any merit in this application.  
The same is dismissed.

**(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)**

praful/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

