



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

WRIT PETITION NO. 10720 OF 2025

Pavan Sahebrao Pavale

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra Through Its Secretary And Others

Mr. S. C. Bhosle, Advocate for petitioner

Mr. A. M. Phule, AGP for respondent-State

**CORAM : Smt. Vibha Kankanwadi &
Hiten S. Venegavkar, JJ.**

DATE : 19th November, 2025

PER COURT :-

1. Present petition has been filed for correction of date of birth in the school record. The petitioner submits that his date of birth is 02.07.2007 however, in the school record it has been wrongly mentioned as 02.04.2007. The petitioner has filed his Birth Certificate issued by the Municipal Council, Umri, wherein it is stated that the correct date of birth of petitioner is 02.07.2007. It appears that an application dated 19.07.2025 is still pending before Education Officer, Zilla Parishad, Nanded. We therefore, dispose of the writ petition by directing respondent No. 2 Education Officer, (Secondary), Zilla Parishad, Nanded to decide the application dated 19.07.2025 filed by the College of the petitioner in view of the Full Bench decision of this Court in **Janabai Himmatrao Thakur vs. State of Maharashtra and others, [AIR**

OnLine 2019 Bombay 1055] within a period of 15 days.

2. We are coming across many such orders, in spite of the decision of this Court in ***Janabai Thakur*** (supra), stating that the applicant/petitioner is not taking education in the school and, therefore, the authority has no jurisdiction or power to make changes in the school record. While allowing the present petition, we direct respondent No.1 to apprise the concerned authorities about the Full Bench decision of this Court in ***Janabai Thakur*** (supra) and not to reject the applications on the ground that the person is not taking education in the school. The interpretation in respect of Rule 26.4 of Secondary School Code has been interpreted by this Court and that interpretation is binding on all the authorities. Even after apprising the authorities by respondent No. 1, if we come across such orders, then this Court will consider such orders as contempt.

3. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition stands disposed of.

(Hiten S. Venegavkar, J.)

(Smt. Vibha Kankanwadi, J.)

B. S. Joshi