

(2011) 01 KL CK 0129

In the High Court Of Kerala

Case No : Writ Petition (C) No. 234 of 2011 (D)

M. Rajendera Prasad

APPELLANT

Vs

Central Board of Secondary Education, Regional Officer and
Principal, Sivagiri Sreenarayana Senior

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 05-01-2011

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2011) 01 KL CK 0129

Hon'ble Judges : Antony Dominic, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : R. Anilkumar, for the Appellant; No Appearance, for the Respondent

Judgement

Antony Dominic, J.—According to the Petitioner, his daughter Mridula M.R was a student of the school of which the 3rdRespondent is the Principal. It is stated that her date of birth is 1.3.1991 that was wrongly entered in the schoolrecords as 31.5.1992. It is stated that seeking correction of the said mistake, he made an application to the schoolauthorities which was forwarded to the 2nd Respondent. Second Respondent rejected the application by Ext.P3 andagain reiterated the same by Ext.P4. It is in the secircumstances, the writ petition has been filed.

2. From the submissions made by the learned standing counsel appearing for Respondents 1 and 2 what emerges is on receipt of the application without considering the same or making correction in the school records, 3rd Respondent forwarded the application to the 2nd Respondent. It is therefore that the 2nd Respondent issued Exts.P3 and P4.

3. Learned Counsel also submits that if an W.P (C) No. 234 of 2011 application for correction of date of birth is made, what is required is that, the school authorities should first consider the application and make corrections in the school records and if the application is forwarded thereafter then and there alone can the 2nd Respondent consider the request. Now that submissions have been

made by the learned standing counsel appearing for Respondents, what is required is that the 3rd Respondent should consider the application made by the Petitioner seeking correction of his daughter's date of birth and after correction is ordered, shall forward that application with his recommendation to the 2nd Respondent , who shall on receipt of the application shall pass appropriate orders.

4. Petitioner shall produce a copy of this judgment along with a copy of the writ petition before the 3rd Respondent, who shall take appropriate action as indicated above. It is directed that if the 3rd Respondent forwards the application to the 2nd Respondent, the 2nd Respondent shall reconsider the matter and pass fresh orders in the light of the recommendations made by the 3rd Respondent. This shall be done, as expeditiously as possible, at any rate, within eight weeks thereafter.

Writ petition is disposed of as above.