



\$~76

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 12846/2025**

JITENDRA KUMAR MEENA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ankit Singh Sinsinwar, Mr.
Ravi Kumar and Mr. Dhananjay
Kumar, Advocates.

versus

**POWER FINANCE CORPORATION
LIMITED & ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Viplav Acharya, SPC for UOI

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER
25.08.2025

%

1. The petitioner has filed the present writ petition challenging an Office Memorandum ["OM"] dated 16.12.2014, to the extent it restricts an employee from making a request for change of date of birth beyond five years from entering government service. He also assails an order of respondent No. 1 – Power Finance Corporation Limited ["PFCL"], dated 27.11.2024, rejecting his application for correction of date of birth.
2. The petitioner joined PFCL as an Officer (Finance) on 02.05.2016, at which time his date of birth was recorded as 01.10.1992, based on his Secondary School Examination certificate. A copy of his Class 10 certificate, issued by the Board of Secondary Education, Rajasthan, is annexed to the writ petition at Annexure P-5 and records his date of birth



as 01.10.1992.

3. It is the petitioner's contention, relying upon his school admission form and report cards from his School issued between 2000 and 2003, that his date of birth is, in fact, 01.06.1995. He has also produced a Birth Certificate, issued by the Government of Rajasthan, which reveals his date of birth as 01.06.1995. However, this certificate seems to have been issued pursuant to a registration of the birth recorded only on 07.05.2024.

4. Mr. Viplav Acharya, learned counsel for the Union of India, submits that the documents relied upon by the petitioner are not credible, as they indicate that he would have passed his Class 10 examination at the age of 13 years, graduated with a B.Com degree in 2014 at the age of 19 years, and qualified as a Chartered Accountant at the age of 20 years, following which he was recruited by PFCL even before completing 21 years of age.

5. Be that as it may, these contentions do not call for adjudication at this stage, as Mr. Ankit Singh Sinsinwar, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the petitioner seeks to challenge the decision of the Board of Secondary Education, Rajasthan, dated 07.02.2025, by which his request for correction was rejected as time-barred. He, therefore, prays for permission to withdraw the writ petition at this stage, with liberty to approach the jurisdictional High Court against the said decision of the Board.

6. The writ petition is thus dismissed as withdrawn, with liberty as aforesaid.

7. In the event the Class 10 certificate is corrected, it shall be open to the petitioner to make a fresh representation to his employer. However, it



is clarified that the employer is not represented today, and nothing in this order shall be construed to prejudice the rights and contentions of PFCL, including its right to rely upon the OM dated 16.12.2014.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

AUGUST 25, 2025
SS/JM/