

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

114

CWP-13512-2025

Date of Decision : May 26, 2026

GAGAN DEEP BANSAL

-PETITIONER

V/S

CENTRAL BOARD OF SECONDARY EDUCATION AND OTHERS

-RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Ms. K.T. Rau, Advocate, with
Ms. Archana Arora, Advocate, and
Mr. Yadvinder Pal Markan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Beant Singh Seemar, Advocate, with
Mr. Grusha Sethi, Advocate
for the respondents No.1 to 4- CBSE.

Mr. Randhir Singh Thind, Advocate
for the respondent No.5.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. The relief yearned through the instant writ petition appertains to restoration of the name of the biological mother, namely Late Mrs. Kavita Bansal, in the CBSE records of the petitioner's minor daughter. The petitioner also seeks quashing of the alleged unauthorized and fraudulent entry of the name of his second wife, namely Mrs. Monika Bansal, in place of the biological mother in the said records.

2. Succinctly stated, the petitioner was initially married to one Kavita Bansal, and out of the said wedlock, a daughter, namely Garima Bansal, was born on 07.11.2008. Unfortunately, Kavita Bansal, the biological mother of the minor child, passed away on 14.05.2009.

Thereafter, the petitioner married one Monika Bansal (respondent No.5) in April, 2010. It is the case of the petitioner that in the school records as well as CBSE records, the name of the stepmother (respondent No.5) has been recorded as the mother of the minor child instead of the biological mother. Accordingly, the petitioner seeks correction of the mother's name in the school and CBSE records by restoring the name of the biological mother.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent No.5 opposes the writ petition and submits that the minor daughter is being brought up by her stepmother (respondent No.5) and, therefore, her name has been correctly recorded as the mother in the school records with the consent of the petitioner, which has been subsequently reflected in the CBSE records. It is further submitted that the instant writ petition is an offshoot of a matrimonial dispute between the petitioner and respondent No.5.

4. This Court posed a specific query to learned counsel for the respondent No.5 as to how the name of the stepmother could be substituted in place of the biological mother in the school and CBSE records of the minor child. However, learned counsel has not been able to satisfactorily answer the said query.

5. Furthermore, learned counsel appearing for the CBSE submits that the petitioner has not approached the Board through the prescribed channel, i.e. by submitting the requisite application along with supporting documents, and therefore no occasion arises for the CBSE to take any decision in respect of the requested correction.

6. In view of the aforesaid stand of the CBSE, this Court is of the considered view that the instant writ petition is premature at this stage and,

as such, is not maintainable. The petitioner is first required to approach the CBSE in accordance with the prescribed procedure by submitting the requisite application along with supporting documents. In the event such an application is submitted, the competent authority shall consider the same and pass a speaking order thereon, after affording due opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

7. The writ petition stands disposed of accordingly.

**May 26, 2026
devinder**

**(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE**

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