

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 6421 OF 2025

Ujwal Hanmant Rasal

...Petitioner

Versus

The State Of Maharashtra & Ors

...Respondents

Mr. Chinmay R. Deshpande, Advocate for the
Petitioner.

Ms Shyamali Gadre (through VC), for Respondent No.2.
Shri. A.K. Naik, AGP for Respondent Nos.1 to 4-State.

CORAM : GAURI GODSE AND
SOMASEKHAR
SUNDARESAN, JJ.

DATE : MAY 29, 2025
(VACATION COURT)

ORDER:

1. This Writ Petition has been filed seeking a direction to Respondent No.2 to change the date of birth of the Petitioner to ***October 1, 2006*** in place of *October 1, 2007* on the Certificate evidencing the Petitioner having passed the Secondary School Certificate Examination. The request for the change is based on the premise that it is an error that needs to be rectified, which would have implications for the Petitioner throughout her academic future and career. In

seeking such correction, the Petitioner seeks to rely upon and has produced the birth certificate (found at Exh. 'A' to the Petition), which evidently records the date of birth as *October 1, 2006*.

2. Learned Counsel for Respondent No.2 contends that Respondent No.2 would require confirmation of the need to change the date of birth, to be issued by an officer of the State Government, which confirmation must state that the date of birth recorded is an obvious mistake. She does confirm that Respondent No. 2 is initiating action against the school for the error, but still insists that a confirmation from Respondent No. 4 that the rectification must be carried out, would be necessary.

3. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner draws our attention to an actual written confirmation already issued by the Education Officer (Secondary) Satara (Respondent No.4), who has in fact examined the record and confirmed in writing that the date of birth deserves to be corrected from *October 1, 2007* to ***October 1, 2006***.

4. In the course of the hearing, Learned Counsel for Respondent No. 2 has instructions to assert that the phrase “obvious mistake” has not been used by Respondent No.4. Such an objection on behalf of Respondent No.2 is untenable and inappropriate. Evidently, the Petitioner’s request for rectification is supported by not only the birth certificate, but also by the confirmation from the concerned officer having jurisdiction, who had already examined the same and also issued the confirmation. We are surprised that a citizen has to approach a Constitutional Court in such a factual matrix to get the rectification to be done, necessitating a writ of mandamus to correct an evident confirmed mistake, and making the Petitioner run from pillar to post. We leave it at that and say nothing more, provided Respondent No. 2 complies with this order forthwith to rectify the mistake as directed herein.

5. Having examined the record and having heard the Learned Counsel for the parties, it would be appropriate to direct that the certificate evidencing the Petitioner having passed the Secondary School Certificate Examination be corrected to record the date of birth as ***October 1, 2006***.

All consequential changes in the educational records of Petitioner shall also be carried out on the basis of this order.

6. Respondent No.2 is directed to issue a fresh certificate which should depict the corrected date of birth with a footnote highlighting that the correction has been effected pursuant to this order. The rectified certificate and a freshly re-issued certificate evidencing the correction with the aforesaid footnote shall be issued to the Petitioner forthwith, and in any event, no later than June 2, 2025, which Learned Counsel for the Respondent No. 2 undertakes shall be done.

7. List on ***June 3, 2025*** for reporting compliance.

8. The Writ Petition is allowed and ***disposed of*** in the aforesaid terms.

[SOMASEKHAR SUNDARESAN,J.] [GAURI GODSE,J.]