

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIRCUIT BENCH AT KOLHAPUR
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 1299 OF 2026

Rutuja Balasaheb Bhosale
Versus

...Petitioner

The State Of Maharashtra
Thr. Secretary And Ors

...Respondents

Mr. Abhay G. Deshmukh, (Through VC), Advocate for petitioner.
Ms. Tejas J. Kapre, AGP for respondent-State.

Coram : Madhav J. Jamdar &
Pravin S. Patil, JJ.

Date : April 21, 2026.

P. C. :

1. RULE. Rule is made returnable forthwith. With the consent of the learned counsel for the parties, the writ petition is taken up for final disposal.

2. By the present writ petition, the petitioner seeks relief contending that the order dated 16th December 2025 passed by the Education Officer (Secondary), Zilla Parishad, Solapur is contrary to the law laid down by the Full Bench of this Court in *Janabai d/o. Himmatrao Thakur vs. State of Maharashtra and others*, 2019(6) Mh.L.J. 769. Paragraph 39

thereof, which contains the answers to the reference, reads thus:

39. This being the position, we answer Question Nos.(A)

and (C) in the following terms:-

“(a) An application for alteration in the entries in the General Register is permissible, with the previous permission of the appropriate authority at any time when the pupil is attending the school.

(b) No application for alteration in the figure of date of birth is permissible, after the student has left secondary school, except correction in the nature of 'obvious mistakes' as indicated in Clause 26.3 i.e. of a nature where the date of a particular month which does not exist in the calendar and likewise.

(c) Thus, in light of the above, an application for change in the name, surname or caste, either due to reasons/cause unnoticed before or even occurring subsequently, being errors which fall within the category of 'obvious mistakes', can be made, even after the student has left school in light of the language of Clause 26.3 in the manner as indicated by Appendix Six in the forms as prescribed in the S.S. Code.

(d) For the purposes like admission to another educational institution, in cases of obvious mistakes as prescribed in Clause 26.4, a change/correction in the school leaving certificate, so as to make the entry consistent with the corresponding entries in the General Register of the School is permissible, which in fact is in consonance with (c) above.”

3. In view of the law laid down by the Full Bench of this Court, it is clear that where there is an ‘obvious mistake’ in the school record, the same can be corrected by the competent authority.

4. In the present case, the petitioner seeks correction in the name of

his father from “Rutuja Balaso Bhosale” to “Rutuja Babasaheb Bhosale.” In our considered opinion, this constitutes an ‘obvious mistake’. The Education Officer has committed an error in rejecting the petitioner’s proposal by order dated 16th December 2025.

5. The order of Education Officer (Secondary) Zilla Parishad, Solapur dated 16th December 2025 is hereby quashed and set aside.

6. Education Officer (Secondary) Zilla Parishad, Solapur is hereby directed to consider the proposal dated 16th September 2025 forwarded by respondent no.4-Headmaster of school positively and thereby correct the name of petitioner as “Rutuja Balasaheb Bhosale” in the entire school record within one month from date of this order.

7. Rule made absolute in above terms. No order as to costs.

[Pravin S. Patil, J.]

[Madhav J. Jamdar, J.]