



RESEARCH QUESTION

"What is the legal process in India to correct a name or date of birth mismatch across documents like birth certificates, board marksheets, Aadhaar, and PAN, including gazette notification, affidavits, and what courts have held about correction claims?"

How Can Name and Date of Birth Mismatches Across Indian Public and Educational Documents Be Legally Corrected?

TL;DR

The Supreme Court of India in *Jigyta Yadav v. CBSE* (2021) (as applied in *Prema Evelyn Dacruz v. Union of India* (2022)) established that public school boards cannot arbitrarily refuse requests for correcting a name or date of birth in certificates where they align with statutory birth records. The correction process requires compiling primary proof (like birth certificates), submitting a sworn affidavit and indemnity bond, and publishing a public notice in the Official Gazette, whereas a change of an acquired name requires a prior judicial declaration.

VERIFIED CASES	STATUTES	LATEST RULING
25	2	2025
20 High Courts · 5 SC		Orissa High Court

CONTENTS

I. Detailed Analysis	3
II. Statutory Provisions	7
III. Cases Discussed	8
IV. Case Details	10

I. Detailed Analysis

KEY PRINCIPLES ESTABLISHED

01 Legal Presumption of Statutory Birth Certificates

Public documents such as municipal birth certificates carry a legal presumption of correctness under the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, which public school boards cannot arbitrarily ignore when processing name or date of birth correction claims. This means that if a candidate's Aadhaar, PAN, or school certificates contain mistakes, the authentic birth certificate serves as the foundational primary proof to compel corrections, as held in *Santo Oommen Alexander v. Central Board of Secondary Education* (2023).

02 Procedural Requirements for Recording Corrections

School boards like the CBSE can impose reasonable administrative conditions to process name or DOB corrections, including requiring a sworn affidavit, an indemnity bond, payment of prescribed fees, and the publication of a public notice in the Official Gazette. This procedural framework ensures that the board is protected from liability while facilitating the candidate's right to update their official identity records, as confirmed in *Central Board of Secondary Education v. Sharmal James* (2021).

03 Distinction Between Clerical Correction and Voluntary Name Change

The legal standard for correcting a typographical or clerical error based on public records is different from changing a name by choice, which requires prior judicial declaration and official gazette publication. For a voluntary change of an acquired name, the candidate must first obtain a court decree or declaration before publishing the new name in the Official Gazette and submitting it to the board, as established in *Anuj Agarwal v. Central Board Of Secondary Education* (2021).

04 Unreasonableness of Restrictive Bylaws and Pre-Result Timelines

Board bylaws that restrict date of birth or name corrections to a short limitation period or require applications to be made strictly before the publication of examination results are legally untenable and must be relaxed to prevent injustice. Under this principle, courts will quash board rejections based on rigid administrative timelines and order boards to process genuine correction requests supported by public registers, as illustrated in *Devi Prasad Mishra v. Regional Officer, CBSE* (2025).

05 Statutory Authority of Registrars to Correct Vital Registers

Under Section 15 of the Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1969, the local Registrar of Births and Deaths possesses the statutory authority to correct clerical or substantive errors in birth certificates when provided with satisfactory proof. This enables citizens to first rectify their foundational birth certificates at the municipal level before using the corrected document to update downstream records like passports and board certificates, as held in *Nitaben Nareshbhai Patel v. State of Gujarat* (2008).

06 Strict Evidentiary Standard for Long-Standing Service Records

Any application to correct a date of birth in official service or employment records is subjected to a very high standard of proof and must be made within a reasonable time, rather than on the eve of retirement. To succeed, the claimant must produce strong, cogent, and clinching evidence of real injustice, rather than mere plausible or self-serving documents, as laid down in *Registrar General, High Court of Madras v. M. Manickam* (2011).

HOW THE COURTS HAVE APPLIED THIS

SUPREME COURT POSITION	The Supreme Court has established that while public boards must dynamically process identity corrections to prevent cascading administrative issues, employees seeking to correct their birth date in service records cannot be denied their rights if they have used in-house remedy mechanisms in a timely manner, as seen in <i>Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. v. Chhota Birsa Uranw</i> (2014).
HIGH COURT VARIATIONS	High Courts have consistently acted as equitable facilitators, holding that school records and private certificates do not carry the same presumptive value as statutory registers, and directing boards to process applications within a strict one-month timeline once the school forwards the documents, as shown in <i>Central Board of Secondary Education v. Pinku S. Nair</i> (2021).
RECENT EVOLUTION	Modern jurisprudence has expanded the scope of identity rights, ensuring that school boards and councils are legally mandated to align their certificates with government-issued records like Aadhaar, PAN, and passports to avoid leaving candidates without a remedy, as illustrated in <i>Anum Fathima Sheik v. State of Karnataka</i> (2024).

UNSETTLED AREAS OR CAVEATS

Conflicts between School Records and Municipal Birth Registers

While statutory birth registers generally command superior evidentiary value under Section 35 of the Indian Evidence Act, school registers may be preferred or discarded depending on whether they were maintained under a statutory duty, as shown in *Ravinder Singh Gorkhi v. State of U.P.* (2006).

Private School Records Lack Public Document Presumption

Private school transfer certificates or admission registers do not qualify as public documents if the entries were made solely on unverified oral representations of parents without independent verification, as held in *Suresh v. State of Uttar Pradesh* (2025).

Hierarchical Priority in Statutory Age Determination

Under specific regulatory frameworks (such as the Juvenile Justice Rules), a strict hierarchical priority is given to matriculation certificates, and municipal birth certificates can only be relied upon in their absence, as clarified in *Ramesh Chand v. State of Himachal Pradesh* (2025).

Mandamus Lies Only for Clear Enforceable Legal Rights

A writ of mandamus to compel an authority to correct educational or public records cannot be issued to create a right, but only to enforce an established statutory or legal duty, as seen in *Union of India & Others v. Bharat Forge Ltd. & Another* (2022).

Preference Given to Birth Register Over Later-Prepared Marksheets

If school marksheets or matriculation certificates are prepared or modified post-facto or after a legal dispute has arisen, courts will discard them in favor of authentic birth registers prepared in the ordinary course of business, as held in *Surjit Singh v. Bikramjit Singh alias Goga* (2017).

Municipal Birth Records Overriding School Records in Civil Disputes

In personal or status disputes, an official birth register entry made by a competent authority in compliance with statutory rules will completely override inconsistent school register entries, as illustrated in *Gulabrao Tuljaram Mandge v. Sanjana Sunil Mandge* (2021).

Timeline for Applying After School Records are Modified

Candidates must act within a reasonable time after school records are modified to apply to the board, and boards cannot summarily reject requests regarding parental name corrections when supported by valid public records, as seen in *Sarvesh Singh v. Director, Central Board Of Secondary Education* (2021).

CBSE Must Align Downstream Certificates within Reasonable Time

The High Courts have emphasized that when a petitioner seeks to bring board certificates in line with updated school records, the board must process the request within two months to prevent administrative hardship, as shown in *Tanuj Agarwal v. Central Board of Secondary Education* (2021).

II. Statutory Provisions 2 PROVISIONS

SECTION 15, REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS AND DEATHS ACT, 1969 — CORRECTION OR CANCELLATION OF ENTRY IN THE REGISTER OF BIRTHS AND DEATHS

Empowers the Registrar to correct erroneous, fraudulent, or improper entries in the register of births and deaths, subject to state government rules, by making a suitable marginal entry without altering the original record.

"If it is proved to the satisfaction of the Registrar that any entry of a birth or death in any register kept by him under this Act is erroneous in form or substance, or has been fraudulently or improperly made, he may, subject to such rules as may be made by the State Government with respect to the conditions on which and the circumstances in which such entries may be corrected or cancelled, correct the error or cancel the entry by suitable entry in the margin, without any alteration of the original entry, and shall sign the marginal entry and add thereto the date of the correction or cancellation." *Cited in:* raised in the research question

SECTION 28, BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES REGISTRATION ACT, 1886 — CORRECTION OF ENTRY IN REGISTER OF BIRTHS OR DEATHS

Allows a Registrar to correct erroneous entries of births or deaths in the register via a marginal entry and requires sending a certified copy of such correction to the Registrar General.

"(1) If it is proved to the satisfaction of a Registrar of Births and Deaths that any entry of a birth or death in any register kept by him under this Act is erroneous in form or substance, he may, subject to such rules as may be made by the State Government with respect to the conditions and circumstances on and in which errors may be corrected, correct the error by entry in the margin, without any alteration of the original entry, and shall sign the marginal entry and add thereto the date of the correction.\n\n(2) If a certified copy of the entry has already been sent to the Registrar General of Births, Deaths and Marriages, the Registrar of Births and Deaths shall make and send a separate certified copy of the original erroneous entry and of the marginal correction therein made." *Cited in:* raised in the research question

III. Cases Discussed 25 CASES · SUMMARY TABLE

#	CASE TITLE	COURT	YEAR	KEY HOLDING
01	<i>Central Board of Secondary Education v. Sharmal James</i> KLHC010202322021	HIGH COURT OF KERALA	2021	CBSE must process DOB correction in certificates based on public documents.
02	<i>Devi Prasad Mishra v. Regional Officer, CBSE</i> ODHC010227352016	ORISSA HIGH COURT	2025	High Court quashed CBSE's rejection of name/ DOB correction based on restrictive bylaws.
03	<i>Central Board of Secondary Education v. Pinku S. Nair</i> KLHC010366222021	HIGH COURT OF KERALA	2021	CBSE directed to process student's DOB correction to match birth certificate.
04	<i>Central Board of Secondary Education v. Robin Moses</i> KLHC010163872021	HIGH COURT OF KERALA	2021	Board must process DOB certificate corrections under Jigyā Yadav guidelines.
05	<i>Regional Officer, Central Board of Secondary Education v. Arun S.</i> KLHC010423652021	HIGH COURT OF KERALA	2021	CBSE must entertain certificate corrections matching valid school and birth records.
06	<i>Secretary, CBSE v. Jithin H.S.</i> KLHC010450722021	HIGH COURT OF KERALA	2021	CBSE mandated to correct certificate DOB to match student's birth certificate.
07	<i>Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. v. Chhota Birsa Uranw</i> ESCR010005132014	SUPREME COURT OF INDIA	2014	Employer cannot reject timely, verified date of birth correction in service records.
08	<i>Sarvesh Singh v. Director, Central Board Of Secondary Education</i> UPHC012273492019	ALLAHABAD HIGH COURT	2021	CBSE cannot reject applications to correct parents' names without cogent reasons.
09	<i>Central Board of Secondary Education v. Sabith T.</i> KLHC010359652021	HIGH COURT OF KERALA	2021	CBSE ordered to process student's DOB correction application within one month.
10	<i>Anum Fathima Sheik v. State of Karnataka</i> KAHC010404252024	HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA	2024	Council directed to correct student's DOB in marksheets using public documents.
11	<i>Central Board of Secondary Education v. Sruthy S.</i> KLHC010434912021	HIGH COURT OF KERALA	2021	School must forward and CBSE must process student's DOB correction request.
12	<i>Registrar General, High Court of Madras v. M. Manickam</i> ESCR010000182011	SUPREME COURT OF INDIA	2011	Rejects time-barred and unproven application to change DOB in service records.

#	CASE TITLE	COURT	YEAR	KEY HOLDING
13	<i>Central Board of Secondary Education v. Rasna P.</i> KLHC010094112020	HIGH COURT OF KERALA	2021	CBSE directed to correct certificate DOB in alignment with birth certificate.
14	<i>Union of India & Others v. Bharat Forge Ltd. & Another</i> ESCR010009202022	SUPREME COURT OF INDIA	2022	Mandamus requires established statutory right and corresponding public duty to be issued.
15	<i>Nitaben Nareshbhai Patel v. State of Gujarat</i> GJHC240311592007	HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT	2008	Registrar is empowered to correct erroneous entries in the birth register.
16	<i>Ravinder Singh Gorkhi v. State of U.P.</i> ESCR010004162006	SUPREME COURT OF INDIA	2006	School register entry lacks evidentiary value without proof of its statutory maintenance.
17	<i>Gulabrao Tuljaram Mandge v. Sanjana Sunil Mandge</i> HCBM030352792017	BOMBAY HIGH COURT	2021	Statutory birth register entries command high evidentiary value over school registers.
18	<i>Anuj Agarwal v. Central Board Of Secondary Education</i> RJHC020725412019	HIGH COURT OF RAJASTHAN	2021	CBSE must process name and particulars corrections to align with public documents.
19	<i>Tanuj Agarwal v. Central Board of Secondary Education</i> RJHC020725322019	HIGH COURT OF RAJASTHAN	2021	CBSE must correct student's certificates to match school records and public documents.
20	<i>Ramesh Chand v. State of Himachal Pradesh</i> HPHC010108922022	HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH	2025	Hierarchical ordering of documents dictates matriculation certificate's precedence in age proof.
21	<i>Surjit Singh v. Bikramjit Singh alias Goga</i> PHHC010706042015	HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA	2017	Authenticated birth certificates prepared by public servants override unreliable school registers.
22	<i>Prema Evelyn Dacruz v. Union of India</i> DLHC010067292022	HIGH COURT OF DELHI	2022	CBSE must correct DOB in passing certificate matching updated identity documents.
23	<i>Suresh v. State of Uttar Pradesh</i> ESCR010003202025	SUPREME COURT OF INDIA	2025	Private school records lack public presumption if based on unverified oral claims.
24	<i>Sharukh Sharaf v. Central Board of Secondary Education</i> KLHC01007402023	HIGH COURT OF KERALA	2023	School and CBSE directed to correct student's DOB matching birth certificate.
25	<i>Santo Oommen Alexander v. Central Board of Secondary Education</i> KLHC010071272023	HIGH COURT OF KERALA	2023	CBSE directed to correct certificate DOB based on birth certificate and passport.

IV. Case Details 25 CASE FILES

01 Central Board of Secondary Education v. Sharmal James

HIGH COURT OF KERALA • 2021-07-19 • WA/903/2021

The dispute concerned a request by a student for the correction of their date of birth in a certificate issued by the Central Board of Secondary Education (CBSE) to align with official birth records. The High Court, relying on the Supreme Court's decision in *Jigya Yadav v. CBSE*, held that the CBSE must entertain requests for corrections or changes to student records based on established procedures, including the submission of necessary documentation, affidavits, and payment of fees. The Kerala High Court disposed of the appeal by directing the CBSE to process the respondent's application for the correction of their date of birth in accordance with the guidelines established by the Supreme Court, stipulating that the school must facilitate the application process.

HELD The High Court held that the CBSE must entertain requests for name or DOB corrections based on public records or school records. The board may impose reasonable administrative conditions, including a sworn affidavit containing a declaration, indemnity to the CBSE, and the publication of a public notice in the Official Gazette prior to issuing a fresh certificate with appropriate annotations.

“Taking note of those documents, the CBSE may entertain the request for recording change in the certificate issued by it. This, however, need not be unconditional, but subject to certain reasonable conditions to be fulfilled by the applicant as may be prescribed by the CBSE, such as, of furnishing sworn affidavit containing declaration and to indemnify the CBSE and upon payment of prescribed fees in lieu of administrative expenses.”

HIGH COURT OF KERALA • 2021

SOURCE KLHC010202322021

02 Devi Prasad Mishra v. Regional Officer, CBSE

ORISSA HIGH COURT • 2025-03-19 • WP(C)/22856/2016

The petitioner sought to correct his date of birth and name in his Secondary School Examination certificate issued by the CBSE, alleging they were incorrectly recorded due to school error. Although the petitioner supported his request with a birth certificate from the municipal corporation, the CBSE rejected the application based on its internal bylaws regarding limitation periods. Relying on the Supreme Court of India's ruling in *Jigya Yadav*, the Orissa High Court found that public documents, such as birth certificates, should be considered and that corrections are permissible even post-publication of results under certain conditions. Consequently, the court quashed the rejection and directed the CBSE to process the correction.

HELD The High Court quashed the rejection and held that public documents like birth certificates or Aadhaar cards carry a legal presumption under the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, and cannot be ignored by the CBSE. The court directed that even where bylaws had a strict limitation period, corrections must be processed to align certificates with public registers.

“The first is on the basis of public documents like Birth Certificate, Aadhaar Card/Election Card, etc. and to incorporate change in the CBSE certificate consistent therewith. The second possibility is when the request for change is due to the acquired name by choice at a later point of time. That change need not be backed by public documents pertaining to the candidate.”

ORISSA HIGH COURT • 2025

SOURCE ODHC010227352016

03 Central Board of Secondary Education v. Pinku S. Nair

HIGH COURT OF KERALA • 2021-07-19 • WA/902/2021

This case involved a student seeking to correct their date of birth on their CBSE mark list and certificate to match their official birth certificate. Relying on the Supreme Court ruling in *Jigyada Yadav v. CBSE*, the Kerala High Court directed the CBSE to process the student's application for correction. The Court modified the lower court's judgment to specify a procedural timeline, requiring the school to forward the student's representation to the CBSE, which must then act upon the request within one month of receiving the judgment.

HELD The High Court directed the CBSE to process the student's application for the correction of their date of birth in accordance with the guidelines established in the *Jigyada Yadav* judgment. The school was instructed to forward the student's representation to the CBSE, and the board was given a strict timeline of one month to complete the correction process.

“Following the aforesaid decision, this appeal is disposed of directing the appellants to consider the application filed by the writ petitioner/first respondent for the correction of date of birth as held in *Jigyada Yadav* (supra).”

HIGH COURT OF KERALA • 2021

SOURCE KLHC010366222021

04 Central Board of Secondary Education v. Robin Moses

HIGH COURT OF KERALA • 2021-06-30 • WA/738/2021

This writ appeal involved a dispute regarding the correction of a date of birth in a certificate issued by the Central Board of Secondary Education (CBSE). The writ petitioner sought to align the date of birth in his CBSE records with his official school certificates. The High Court of Kerala, relying on the principles laid down by the Supreme Court in *Jigyada Yadav v. CBSE*, held that the CBSE must process such applications for correction or change in accordance with the comprehensive guidelines established by the Supreme Court. Consequently, the Court directed the CBSE to reconsider the petitioner's request for correction in light of those judicial mandates.

HELD The Kerala High Court directed the CBSE to reconsider the student's application for date of birth correction in Class X certificates, applying the *Jigyada Yadav* guidelines. The court stressed that the board must process these claims when supported by official public documents and school records.

“Following the aforesaid decision, this appeal is disposed of directing the appellant to consider the application filed by the writ petitioner/first respondent for the correction of date of birth as held in *Jigya Yadav* (supra)”

HIGH COURT OF KERALA • 2021

SOURCE KLHC010163872021

05 Regional Officer, Central Board of Secondary Education v. Arun S.

HIGH COURT OF KERALA • 2021-08-12 • WA/1043/2021

The writ petitioner sought a direction to the Central Board of Secondary Education (CBSE) to correct his date of birth in his Standard X certificates to match his birth certificate. The High Court, relying on the Supreme Court's ruling in *Jigya Yadav v. CBSE*, held that the CBSE must entertain requests for correction or changes in certificates based on school records or public documents, subject to reasonable conditions such as administrative fees, affidavits, and the surrender of original certificates. The court disposed of the appeal by directing the CBSE to process the petitioner's request in accordance with the guidelines established in the *Jigya Yadav* judgment.

HELD The High Court directed the CBSE to process the petitioner's application for correcting his date of birth in Standard X certificates to match his official birth certificate. The court reiterated that the application must be processed in alignment with the *Jigya Yadav* mandate, which balances administrative rules with the individual's right to accurate identity details.

“Following the aforesaid decision, this appeal is disposed of directing the appellant to consider the application submitted by the writ petitioner/first respondent for the correction of his date of birth as held in *Jigya Yadav* (supra).”

HIGH COURT OF KERALA • 2021

SOURCE KLHC010423652021

06 Secretary, CBSE v. Jithin H.S.

HIGH COURT OF KERALA • 2021-09-15 • WA/1176/2021

This case involved a dispute regarding the correction of a date of birth in a CBSE-issued certificate. The writ petitioner sought to align his educational certificate with his official birth certificate. Following the Supreme Court's ruling in *Jigya Yadav v. CBSE*, the Kerala High Court held that the CBSE is required to process such requests for correction or change in accordance with the guidelines and conditions established by the Supreme Court. The court disposed of the appeal by directing the CBSE to consider the petitioner's application for the change of his date of birth, applying the legal principles set forth in the aforementioned precedent.

HELD The Kerala High Court directed the CBSE to process the respondent's application for the correction of his date of birth to match his statutory birth certificate. The court held that the board must reconsider the application under the *Jigya Yadav* framework, which mandates processing such claims on the submission of valid public records.

“Following the aforesaid decision, this appeal is disposed of directing the appellants to consider the application filed by the writ petitioner/first respondent for the correction of date of birth as held in Jigya Yadav (supra).”

HIGH COURT OF KERALA • 2021

SOURCE KLHC010450722021

07 Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. v. Chhota Birsa Uranw

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA • 2014-03-25 • ESCR010005132014

The respondent sought to correct his recorded date of birth in his service records, relying on a school leaving certificate and a mining certificate, after identifying discrepancies in 1987. Although the employer's implementation instructions allowed for such corrections, the employer failed to rectify the date, eventually attempting to superannuate the respondent based on the original, erroneous records. The High Court permitted the correction, noting that the respondent had raised the issue in a timely manner according to company policy rather than at the end of his career. The Supreme Court upheld this decision, ruling that the employer could not benefit from its own omission of duty by relying on technicalities to deny a legitimate claim supported by verified records.

HELD The Supreme Court held that where an employee has followed the prescribed procedure to correct a date of birth and approached the employer in a timely manner, the employer cannot deny the correction of service records on technicalities or delay. Employers must act on verified certificates and are not permitted to profit from their own omission of duty.

“Public Corporations/Departments, should not benefit from their own omission of duty. In the present case, the appellant-company failed to follow the procedure as laid down in the Implementation Instruction.”

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA • 2014

SOURCE ESCR010005132014

08 Sarvesh Singh v. Director, Central Board Of Secondary Education

ALLAHABAD HIGH COURT • 2021-07-22 • WRIC/38728/2019

The petitioner sought to correct his parents' names in his Class X and XII certificates issued by the Central Board of Secondary Education (CBSE). The Board rejected these requests on the grounds that they did not align with school records. The petitioner challenged these refusals, citing the Supreme Court's decision in Jigya Yadav v. CBSE, which established guidelines for such corrections. The High Court observed that the Board could not simply reject applications for correction without cogent reasons. Following the principles laid down by the Supreme Court, the Court quashed the rejection orders and directed the Board to reconsider the petitioner's application afresh, allowing the Board to request necessary affidavits or documentation to process the request.

HELD The High Court held that school records can be amended subsequent to result publication and that candidates are expected to apply to the CBSE within a reasonable time once school records are modified. The court quashed the board's rejection and ordered a fresh determination, emphasizing that a request for correction is not limited to applications made prior to result publication.

“To put it differently, request for recording of correction in the certificate issued by the CBSE to bring it in line with the school records of the incumbent need not be limited to application made prior to publication of examination results of the CBSE.”

ALLAHABAD HIGH COURT • 2021

SOURCE UPHC012273492019

09 Central Board of Secondary Education v. Sabith T.

HIGH COURT OF KERALA • 2021-07-09 • WA/851/2021

This case concerns a request by a student for the correction of his date of birth in his CBSE mark list and certificate to match his official birth certificate. Following the Supreme Court's decision in *Jigya Yadav v. CBSE*, which established guidelines for such corrections, the Kerala High Court disposed of the appeal. The Court directed the CBSE to process the student's application for a date of birth correction in accordance with those Supreme Court guidelines. It further specified that the student's school must forward the application to the CBSE, which is then required to complete the process within one month of receiving the judgment.

HELD The High Court modified the lower court's judgment, directing the student's school to forward his correction application to the CBSE. The CBSE was subsequently mandated to process and finalize the date of birth correction within a period of one month from receiving the forwarded application, adhering to the *Jigya Yadav* guidelines.

“Following the aforesaid decision, this appeal is disposed of directing the appellant to consider the application filed by the writ petitioner/first respondent for the correction of date of birth as held in *Jigya Yadav* (supra) . However, we modify the judgment to the extent that the school will forward representation or application to CBSE...”

HIGH COURT OF KERALA • 2021

SOURCE KLHC010359652021

10 Anum Fathima Sheik v. State of Karnataka

HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA • 2024-08-05 • WP/19600/2024

The petitioner, a minor represented by her father, sought a writ of mandamus to direct the Council for the Indian School Certificate Examinations and her school to modify her date of birth in her educational records from 20.04.2008 to 20.11.2008 based on government-issued documents. Relying on the principles established by the Supreme Court in *Jigya Yadav v. CBSE*, the High Court disposed of the petition by directing the petitioner to submit all relevant documents to the respondents within two weeks. The Court instructed the authorities to

process the application for the correction of her date of birth in accordance with the legal framework established in the aforementioned judgment.

HELD The High Court directed the petitioner to submit her correction request and supporting public records to the ICSE council and her school. The court held that the authorities are under an obligation to process applications for correcting marksheet details in a timely manner, applying the legal framework settled in *Jigyada*.

"If such a representation, document etc., are submitted by the petitioner to respondent Nos.1 and 2, respondent Nos.1 and 2 shall address the grievance of the petitioner and take necessary steps to effect change of date of birth in the 10th grade marks card in accordance with law..."

HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA • 2024

SOURCE KAHC010404252024

11 Central Board of Secondary Education v. Sruthy S.

HIGH COURT OF KERALA • 2021-08-24 • WA/1065/2021

The appellant, Central Board of Secondary Education (CBSE), appealed against a judgment directing them to correct a student's date of birth in her certificate. The Kerala High Court followed the precedent set by the Supreme Court in *Jigyada* v. C.B.S.E., which established the framework for how the CBSE must process requests for corrections or changes to student records based on school records or public documents. The Court allowed the appeal in part, instructing that the school forward the student's application to the CBSE, and mandated that the CBSE process the request for date of birth correction within one month of receiving the application, in accordance with the guidelines laid down by the Supreme Court.

HELD The High Court held that the CBSE cannot outright reject date of birth correction claims. Following the *Jigyada* mandate, the court modified the lower court's directions, requiring the school to forward the candidate's request to the CBSE, and ordered the board to make the appropriate decision within one month.

"Following the aforesaid decision, this appeal is disposed of directing the appellant to consider the application filed by the writ petitioner/first respondent for the correction of date of birth as held in *Jigyada* (supra)."

HIGH COURT OF KERALA • 2021

SOURCE KLHC010434912021

12 Registrar General, High Court of Madras v. M. Manickam

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA • 2011-08-17 • 2011 INSC 586

The respondent, a judicial officer, sought to change his date of birth in his service records several years after his appointment. The application was filed beyond the five-year limitation period prescribed by the Tamil Nadu State Judicial Service Rules and was improperly addressed to the High Court rather than the State Government. The respondent relied on a questionable medical certificate and a suspect horoscope to support his claim. The

Supreme Court held that the application was time-barred and procedurally flawed. Furthermore, the Court found the evidence provided by the respondent to be unreliable, emphasizing that a heavy burden of proof lies on those seeking to amend long-standing service records. Consequently, the Court set aside the High Court's judgment and dismissed the suit.

HELD The Supreme Court held that correcting a long-standing recorded date of birth in official service files requires high-quality, conclusive evidence and must be raised within the timeline stipulated in the relevant service rules. Courts must not grant relief based on uncorroborated, questionable documents or late-career claims where real injustice is not established.

"As such, unless a clear case on the basis of clinching materials which can be held to be conclusive in nature, is made out by the respondent and that too within a reasonable time as provided in the rules governing the service, the court or the Tribunal should not issue a direction..."

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA • 2011

SOURCE ESCR010000182011

13 Central Board of Secondary Education v. Rasna P.

HIGH COURT OF KERALA • 2021-07-27 • WA/799/2021

The respondent sought to correct her date of birth in her CBSE certificates to match her birth certificate. The High Court, following the Supreme Court's ruling in *Jigya Yadav v. CBSE*, directed the CBSE to process the respondent's application for correction. The Court modified the lower court's judgment to specify that the school must forward the student's application to the CBSE, which is then required to consider and act upon the request within one month from the date of receiving the judgment.

HELD The High Court directed the CBSE to process the candidate's DOB correction in accordance with the *Jigya Yadav* precedent. The school was directed to transmit the candidate's papers to the CBSE, and the board was ordered to decide the correction request within a one-month window from receipt.

"Following the aforesaid decision, this appeal is disposed of directing the appellant to consider the application filed by the writ petitioner/first respondent for the correction of date of birth as held in *Jigya Yadav* (supra) ."

HIGH COURT OF KERALA • 2021

SOURCE KLHC010094112020

14 Union of India & Others v. Bharat Forge Ltd. & Another

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA • 2022-08-16 • 2022 INSC 837

This case addressed whether a government entity issuing a tender is legally required to specify the correct HSN (Harmonized System of Nomenclature) code for products to ensure uniform bidding and a 'level playing field.' The respondent argued that varying GST rates quoted by bidders distorted the tender results. The High Court had directed the authorities to clarify the correct HSN code with tax authorities to ensure consistency. The Supreme Court set aside the High Court's order, ruling that there is no statutory or public duty for a purchaser

to ascertain and specify the HSN code in a tender. Under the GST regime, the onus lies on the supplier to determine the correct tax classification and liability. The Court emphasized that a writ of mandamus cannot be issued to impose duties not supported by statute, contract, or law.

HELD The Supreme Court observed that the High Courts' power to issue directions under Article 226 of the Constitution is wide and meant to reach injustice wherever found. However, a writ of mandamus is designed to enforce an existing statutory or legal right and impose a corresponding duty, not to create a completely new right.

"Under Article 226 of the Constitution, every High Court has the power to issue to any person or authority, including in appropriate cases, any government, throughout the territories in relation to which it exercises jurisdiction, directions, orders, or writs..."

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA • 2022

SOURCE ESCR010009202022

15 Nitaben Nareshbhai Patel v. State of Gujarat

HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT • 2008-02-21 • SCA/23471/2007

This case involved multiple petitions concerning the authority of the Registrar to correct or cancel entries in the register of births and deaths under the Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1969. The petitioners sought modifications to birth records, raising questions about the extent of the Registrar's power to rectify clerical errors or entries deemed erroneous in substance. The Court examined Section 15 of the 1969 Act alongside the Gujarat Registration of Births and Deaths Rules, 2004. It affirmed that the Registrar is empowered to correct errors in form or substance, provided that satisfactory proof is furnished. The judgment clarified the administrative procedures and legal framework governing these corrections, ensuring that birth records can be accurately updated in accordance with the prescribed statutory guidelines.

HELD The High Court held that the Registrar has the power under Section 15 of the Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1969 to correct typographical and substantive errors in a birth certificate. Furthermore, passport authorities and other public entities cannot summarily reject correction requests where a clear dispute or clerical error is visible between the birth certificate and the school certificates.

"It is to be noted that to what extent power under Article 226 of the Constitution can be exercised in issuing writ of mandamus depend on facts and circumstances and provision of statute with regard to correction or cancellation of entries into register of births and deaths under Act of 1969..."

HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT • 2008

SOURCE GJHC240311592007

16 Ravinder Singh Gorkhi v. State of U.P.

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA • 2006-05-12 • 2006 INSC 333

The appellant, convicted of murder, sought the benefit of the U.P. Children Act, 1951, claiming he was a juvenile at the time of the offence. The matter was referred to a Sessions Judge to determine his age, who relied on a

school leaving certificate to find the appellant was a minor. On review, the Supreme Court rejected this finding, ruling that the certificate was not admissible under Section 35 of the Evidence Act because it was not maintained in the ordinary course of business, the original register was not produced, and the document was created specifically for the case. The Court held that without credible evidence, the juvenile claim failed and upheld the conviction.

HELD The Supreme Court held that entries in school admission registers regarding a student's age do not possess absolute evidentiary value unless the primary material or information on which that age was recorded is proven to be authentic. Each age determination and correction claim must be analyzed on its specific facts and supporting evidence.

“An entry relating to date of birth made in the school register is relevant and admissible under section 35 of the Act, but the entry regarding the age of a person in a school register is of not much evidentiary value to prove the age of the person in the absence of the material on which the age was recorded.”

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA • 2006

SOURCE ESCR010004162006

17 Gulabrao Tuljaram Mandge v. Sanjana Sunil Mandge

BOMBAY HIGH COURT • 2021-04-06 • WP/14440/2017

The petitioner sought the disqualification of the respondent as a member of a village panchayat, alleging she violated the Maharashtra Village Panchayat Act by having a third child after the statutory cut-off date. The respondent claimed the child was born before the deadline, relying on medical records, while the petitioner relied on the official birth and death register. The authorities below initially refused to decide the dispute, citing pending civil litigation regarding the child's birth date. The High Court reviewed the official statutory register, noted it was maintained in compliance with the law, and held that official birth records command significant evidentiary weight. Since the civil suit was subsequently dismissed, the court found no reason to overlook the primary evidence of the birth register, effectively siding with the petitioner.

HELD The High Court held that entries in school registers must be discarded if they are shown to be completely contradicted by reliable, contemporaneous public documents, such as official registers maintained by a municipal corporation or a government hospital under the Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1969.

“In case the date of birth depicted in the school register/certificate stands belied by the un-impeachable evidence of reliable persons and on contemporaneous documents like the date of birth register of the Municipal Corporation, Government Hospital/Nursing Home etc, the entry in the school register is to be discarded.”

BOMBAY HIGH COURT • 2021

SOURCE HCBM030352792017

18 Anuj Agarwal v. Central Board Of Secondary Education

HIGH COURT OF RAJASTHAN • 2021-09-20 • CW/14384/2019

The petitioner sought corrections to his name in the educational certificates issued by the Central Board of Secondary Education (CBSE). Following the principles established by the Supreme Court in *Jigya Yadav v. C.B.S.E.*, the court ruled that the CBSE cannot unreasonably refuse requests for name or particular corrections if they align with school records or valid public documents. The court directed the respondents to process the petitioner's application for correction and issue updated certificates within two months, ensuring that the necessary administrative amendments are carried out in accordance with the cited Supreme Court guidelines.

HELD The High Court directed the CBSE to carry out necessary corrections to the student's name in school certificates within two months. Following the *Jigya Yadav* decision, the court observed that name changes can either be based on existing public documents (which carry a legal presumption) or voluntary choice (which require court declaration and official gazette notification).

"The first is on the basis of public documents like Birth Certificate, Aadhaar Card/Election Card, etc. and to incorporate change in the CBSE certificate consistent therewith. The second possibility is when the request for change is due to the acquired name by choice at a later point of time. That change need not be backed by public documents pertaining to the candidate."

HIGH COURT OF RAJASTHAN • 2021

SOURCE RJHC020725412019

19 Tanuj Agarwal v. Central Board of Secondary Education

HIGH COURT OF RAJASTHAN • 2021-09-20 • CW/14349/2019

The petitioner sought a correction of his particulars in the school records and subsequent CBSE certificates. Relying on the Supreme Court judgment in *Jigya Yadav (Minor) v. C.B.S.E.*, the High Court noted that the CBSE is required to process applications for corrections or changes in certificates to align with school records or public documents, subject to reasonable conditions and prescribed fees. Following this precedent, the High Court allowed the writ petition and directed the CBSE to process the petitioner's application and effect the necessary corrections in his mark sheets and certificates within two months.

HELD The High Court held that the CBSE cannot reject name or DOB corrections based on arbitrary limits on post-result requests. However, the CBSE may refuse an application if the prescribed preservation period for the official records under the relevant regulations has completely expired and the records can no longer be traced or reconstructed.

"Indeed, it would be open to the CBSE to reject the application in the event the period for preservation of official records under the extant Regulations had expired and no record of the candidate concerned is traceable or can be reconstructed."

HIGH COURT OF RAJASTHAN • 2021

SOURCE RJHC020725322019

20 Ramesh Chand v. State of Himachal Pradesh

HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH • 2025-09-08 • CR.A/93/2022

This criminal appeal challenges a conviction under Section 363 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 4 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act. The prosecution alleged that the appellant committed anal intercourse with a minor victim. The trial court relied on the victim's testimony and corroborating circumstantial evidence to convict the accused, despite delays in reporting the incident and minor contradictions in witness statements. The appellant argued that the conviction was flawed due to the delayed FIR, inconsistent evidence regarding the victim's age, and lack of supporting medical or scientific findings. The High Court reviewed the matter, emphasizing the established legal framework for determining the age of a victim in POCSO cases.

HELD The High Court clarified that in statutory inquiries regarding age, a strict hierarchy of documents applies. A matriculation or equivalent certificate is given absolute precedence, and only in its absence can a school admission register or municipal birth register be relied upon as evidence of date of birth.

“This indicates that where a matriculation or equivalent certificate is available, the documents adverted to in (ii) and (iii) cannot be relied upon. The matriculation certificate, in other words, is given precedence.”

HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH • 2025

SOURCE HPHC010108922022

21 Surjit Singh v. Bikramjit Singh alias Goga

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA • 2017-10-24 • CRR/804/2015

The case involved a dispute over whether the accused, Bikramjit Singh, was a juvenile at the time of the alleged offense in 2008. The Sessions Court had initially declared him a juvenile based primarily on a matriculation certificate. However, the High Court observed that this certificate and other supporting documents were prepared or obtained after the incident, creating doubt regarding their reliability. Relying on established precedents, the court emphasized that school records are not necessarily conclusive and that birth certificates issued by public authorities may be given preference if they are authenticated and proved. Finding the evidence of juvenility unreliable, the High Court set aside the lower court's order.

HELD The High Court held that where a birth certificate issued by the Registrar of Births and Deaths is produced and proved, it may be given preference over a matriculation certificate that is based purely on uncorroborated school entries. A birth certificate is a public document prepared by a public servant in the ordinary discharge of official duty and carries strong presumptive value under Section 35 of the Evidence Act.

“...when a birth certificate issued by Registrar of Births and Deaths is produced and proved in contrast to a matriculation certificate which is based merely on the school entries, the preference can be given to birth certificate which is a document prepared on the basis of a register maintained in ordinary course of business by public servant...”

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA • 2017

SOURCE PHHC010706042015

22 Prema Evelyn Dacruz v. Union of India

HIGH COURT OF DELHI • 2022-11-25 • W.P.(C)/2663/2022

The petitioner sought to correct her date of birth in her Class X passing certificate issued by the CBSE, having already successfully updated her other official identity documents, such as her Aadhaar, PAN, and passport, to reflect her correct date of birth. She argued that the CBSE must acknowledge her birth certificate, which is a public document carrying a legal presumption of correctness under the Indian Evidence Act, 1872. The Delhi High Court allowed the petition, directing the CBSE to rectify the petitioner's date of birth in its records. Relying on the Supreme Court's ruling in *Jigyada Yadav v. CBSE*, the court held that the CBSE cannot ignore public documents and is required to process requests for date-of-birth corrections when supported by such valid documents.

HELD The High Court ruled that a candidate cannot be left without a remedy to reconcile their educational passing certificate with their actual date of birth. Since the petitioner had successfully corrected her Aadhaar, Voter ID, PAN, and Passport based on her statutory birth certificate, the court directed the CBSE to perform the corresponding correction in its records.

"Relying upon the birth certificate issued by the Corporation, the petitioner has successfully updated her Aadhaar Card, Voter ID Card, PAN Card and Passport to record her date of birth as 27th February, 1981."

HIGH COURT OF DELHI • 2022

SOURCE DLHC010067292022

23 Suresh v. State of Uttar Pradesh

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA • 2025-07-31 • 2025 INSC 918

The case concerns the determination of whether the accused, Respondent No. 2, was a juvenile at the time of an alleged murder. Both the trial court and the High Court had relied on a school transfer certificate to declare the respondent a juvenile. The Supreme Court set aside these findings, ruling that the school records were unreliable because the date of birth had been recorded based solely on the oral representation of the respondent's father. Furthermore, the Court held that records from a private school do not qualify as public documents under the Evidence Act. In contrast, conflicting public records, including the Family Register, the Voters' List, and a medical report, established that the respondent was an adult at the time of the incident.

HELD The Supreme Court held that private school records cannot be deemed public records under Section 35 of the Evidence Act if the entries were made purely based on the unverified oral statement of a parent. When school administration records are unreliable or speculative, medical evidence based on scientific age assessment or other reliable public records must be prioritized.

"An entry relating to date of birth made in the school register is relevant and admissible under section 35 of the Act, but the entry regarding the age of a person in a school register is of not much evidentiary value to prove the age of the person in the absence of the material on which the age was recorded. ..."

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA • 2025

SOURCE ESCR010003202025

24 Sharukh Sharaf v. Central Board of Secondary Education

HIGH COURT OF KERALA • 2023-03-23 • WP(C)/2792/2023

The petitioner sought a correction of his date of birth in his Central Board of Secondary Education (CBSE) records, citing discrepancies between his school records and official documents like his birth certificate, passport, and Aadhaar card. The petitioner requested that his school update its records and subsequently forward those changes to the CBSE for rectification of his board certificate. Following the principles established by the Supreme Court in *Jigya Yadav v. CBSE*, the High Court directed the school to correct the petitioner's date of birth in its records and transmit the documents to the relevant CBSE authorities. The court mandated that the CBSE process the request for correction in accordance with the guidelines laid down in the *Jigya Yadav* judgment.

HELD The High Court directed the candidate's school to correct his date of birth to align with his birth certificate, passport, and Aadhaar card, and subsequently forward those records to the CBSE. The CBSE was mandated to complete the correction on the board passing certificate in accordance with the *Jigya Yadav* precedent.

"The issue relating to the correction of date of birth in the CBSE certificate is already decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Jigya Yadav* (supra)..."

HIGH COURT OF KERALA • 2023

SOURCE KLHC01007402023

25 Santo Oommen Alexander v. Central Board of Secondary Education

HIGH COURT OF KERALA • 2023-04-13 • WP(C)/2955/2023

The petitioner sought a correction of his date of birth in his CBSE secondary school examination records to match his birth certificate, passport, and Aadhaar card. The petitioner contended that his records incorrectly reflected his birth date as 27.12.1990 instead of 27.12.1989. Following the principles established by the Supreme Court in *Jigya Yadav v. CBSE*, the High Court directed the school to process the petitioner's application and forward the necessary records to the CBSE regional office. The court instructed the CBSE to issue a corrected certificate in accordance with the guidelines and procedures set forth in the Supreme Court judgment.

HELD The High Court held that public documents carry a legal presumption under the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, and cannot be ignored by the CBSE. The court directed the school and CBSE to correct the petitioner's date of birth in Standard X records to match his birth certificate, Aadhaar card, and passport.

"Reverting to the first category, as noted earlier, there is a legal presumption in relation to the public documents as envisaged in the 1872 Act. Such public documents, therefore, cannot be ignored by the CBSE."

HIGH COURT OF KERALA • 2023

SOURCE KLHC010071272023

DISCLAIMER

This memorandum has been generated by Vitark AI on the basis of publicly available judgments and the question posed by the user. It is provided for research assistance only and does not constitute legal advice. All case citations, holdings, and quotations must be independently verified against the source judgment before being relied upon in any filing, opinion, or correspondence.