

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

115

CWP-23444-2025

Date of Decision : August 13, 2025

DEEPAK KUMAR

-PETITIONER

V/S

**THE BOARD OF SCHOOL EDUCATION HARYANA AND
ANOTHER**

-RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Parvesh Kumar Banwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Bhupender Singh, Advocate
for the respondents.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. Through the instant writ petition, prayer is made for quashing the reply dated 10.06.2025 to the legal notice, whereby the respondents-Education Board has refused to change or correct the name of the petitioner from Deepak Kumar to Deep Singh.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, the petitioner has changed his religion from Hinduism to Sikhism and also changed his name from Deepak Kumar to Deep Singh w.e.f. 07.01.2024. In this regard, the petitioner has sworn an affidavit dated 09.08.2024, and two different gazette notifications dated 14.09.2024 have also been issued. Not only this, publication has also been made in two different newspapers. Despite that, the categoric request for change of name, as made by the petitioner by serving a legal notice, has been declined by the respondents

and it has been replied that a revised certificate can be issued in the format “New Name alias/nee Old Name” and that too only upon submission of the required application form, which is not acceptable to the petitioner.

3. Perusal of the impugned reply dated 10.06.2025 reveals that the petitioner has only served a legal notice upon the respondents, but has not submitted any formal written application and valid supporting documents, especially a Birth Certificate reflecting the new name, for correction in name as per rules. It is further revealed that, despite reply of the respondents, the petitioner had not submitted the requisite application form and the supporting documents, rather he took a stand that until and unless the respondents-Education Board agrees to his request, he will not submit the requisite application form and documents. However, this assertion was not accepted by the respondents and was declined vide the impugned reply.

4. The submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner do not carry any merit, as the petitioner has himself, despite being specifically asked, failed to submit the requisite application form along with valid supporting documents to the respondents-Education Board. Hence, this Court does not find any reason to grant the asked for relief and the instant writ petition is accordingly **dismissed**.

5. However, liberty is reserved to the petitioner to approach the respondents-Education Board by submitting the requisite application form and valid supporting documents. If the petitioner does so, the respondents shall take apt decision on his request, as per rules. Moreover, in case, the petitioner has any grievance with the Rules and Regulations of the respondent, whereby a uniform pattern is adopted for issuance of revised

certificates in the format “New Name alias/nee Old Name”, he is at liberty to challenge the same by instituting an apt motion.

August 13, 2025
devinder

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No