CGHC010349202026 2026:CGHC:45158

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCC No. 912 of 2026

1 - Pratik Singh S/o Shri Jai Singh Aged About 30 Years R/o Flat No. 408, Puja Paradise In Front Of Science College, New Sarkanda, Bilaspur Chhattisgarh District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

... Applicant(s)

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through - The Secretary, Department Of School Education, Mantralaya Mahanadi Bhawan Atal Nagar Naya Raipur Chhattisgarh District Raipur Chhattisgarh

2 - The Guru Ghasidas University Koni, Bilaspur Through Its Registrar Bilaspur Chhattisgarh, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

3 - The Secretary Chhattisgarh Board Of Secondary Education Raipur Pension Bada Raipur Chhattisgarh District Raipur Chhattisgarh

4 - The Secretary Central Board Of Secondary Education Shiksha Kendra, 2 Community Center Preet Vihar Delhi, 110092, District New Delhi, Delhi

... Respondent(s)

For Applicant (s)	:	Shri Harshmander Rastogi, Advocate
For Respondent/State	:	Shri Anand Gupta, Dy.G.A
For Respondent No.3	:	Shri Alok Bakshi, Advocate
For Respondent No.4	:	Ms. Veethika Choubey, Adv. on behalf of Shri T.K.Tiwari, Advocate

({Hon’ble Shri Justice Sachin Singh Rajput})

Order on Board

26/10/2026

This MCC has been filed for modification of order dated 19/08/2026 passed by the coordinate Bench of this Court in WPC No.2366/2020.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that a writ petition was filed by the applicant seeking relief in respect of correction of the name of his father in his educational records i.e. in Class X, Class XII and mark sheet of under graduation. He submits that the name of the father of the applicant has been changed and for which, necessary changes are also required in Class X, Class XII and college mark sheets. Thus, for seeking the above stated relief, the writ petition was filed. He further submits that the coordinate Bench of this Court while disposing off the writ petition directed respondent No.3/competent authority to decide his representation dated 11/05/2020 (Annexure P/6) on its own merits and depending upon the result, he was permitted to make representation before respondent No.2/ University and respondent No.2 was directed to consider and decide the representation in accordance with law. He submits that until and unless the change is made in Class X mark sheet by respondent No.4, subsequent change of name of his father in the Class X, Class XII and college mark sheets cannot take place. He submits that there is a typographical error in the impugned order. Instead of respondent No.3, respondent No.4 ought to have been directed to decide the representation.

3. Be that as it may, the perusal of record would indicate that this Court has directed respondent No.3 to decide the representation dated 11/05/2020 (Annexure P/6). Thereafter, liberty was granted in favour of the petitioner to make representation before respondent No.2/University. This Court does not find any typographical error in the impugned order. If the petitioner is aggrieved by the order, he may file a fresh petition or seek remedy against the impugned order.

4. With the aforesaid observation and direction, this MCC is dismissed.

Sd/-

(Sachin Singh Rajput)
JUDGE

Deepti

DEEPTI HARIKUMAR
Digitally signed by DEEPTI HARIKUMAR
Date: 2026.10.28 10:48:07 +0530