

(3)

IN THE COURT OF MUHAMMAD AYAZ KHAN,
SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE, ORAKZAI AT BABER MELA

Civil Suit No. 7/1 of 2019
Date of Institution: 21/03/2019
Date of Decision: 18/09/2019

Muzamil Shah s/o Niaz Badshah

Resident of Village Tairee, PO Ghiljo, Tehsil upper Orakzai & District Orakzai.....
(Plaintiff)

VERSUS


1. **Registrar, General NADRA, Islamabad.**
2. **Deputy, Registrar General NADRA KPK Peshawar.**
3. **Assistant Registrar General, NADRA District Orakzai.**

(Defendants)

SUIT FOR DECLARATION & PERMANENT INJUNCTION

JUDGEMENT:

1. Plaintiff, **Muzamil Shah**, has brought the instant suit for declaration-cum-permanent injunction against the defendants, referred hereinabove, seeking therein that his correct date of birth is **01/01/1970** while it has been wrongly mentioned as **1979** by the defendants, which is unnatural as the difference between the age of the plaintiff and his elder son is **09 years**, which is against the natural gape. Hence, the instant suit.


MOHAMMAD AYAZ
Senior Civil Judge
Orakzai District

Defendants were summoned, who appeared through attorney namely Habib Ullah Khan and submitted written statement, which is placed on file.

Divergent pleadings of the parties were reduced into the following issues;

Issues:

1. Whether the plaintiff has got any cause of action?
2. Whether suit of the plaintiff is within time?

3. Whether the correct date of birth of the plaintiff is 01/01/1970, while the date 1979 as mentioned in CNIC of the plaintiff is incorrect.
 4. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the decree as prayed for?
 5. Relief.
-
3. Parties were directed to produce evidence of their own choice, which they did. Plaintiff produced two (02) witnesses including his relative who was examined as PW-1.
 4. PW-1 is Muzamil Shah, plaintiff, who stated that his real date of birth is 01-01-1970. He produced his CNIC and exhibited the same as Ex.PW-1/1. He further added that the date of birth of his son is 1988, which is unnatural as the difference between him and his son is 09 years, which is not possible. He produced and exhibited the CNIC of his elder son as Ex. PW-1/2. He requested for grant of decree. He was cross examined by the defendants.
 5. PW-2, Aman Gul, witness of the plaintiff appeared and recorded his statement, wherein he supported the contention of the plaintiff and stated that the real date of birth of the plaintiff is 01/01/1970. He further stated that the gape between the plaintiff and his elder son is only 09 years which is unnatural. He is cross examined by the defendants through attorney.
 6. In rebuttal defendants produced an examined sole witness namely Farhat Abbas, representative, as DW-1 and recorded his statement as DW-1. He is cross examined by the plaintiff.
 7. After conclusion of the evidence arguments pro and contra heard. Case file is gone through.


MUHAMMAD AYAZ
Senior Judge,
Orakzai at Hangu

8. My issues wise findings are as under:

9. **Issue No. 03:**

Perusal of record reveals that correct date of birth of the plaintiff is 01/01/1970, which is evident from the evidence of the plaintiff. Further, if we presume 1979 the real date of birth of the plaintiff, then, only 09 years of difference exists between him and his father, which is unnatural and not appealable to any prudent mind. This factum is admitted by the attorney of the defendants at the time of arguments. Facts admitted need not to be proved as per article 113 of Qanun-e-Shahadat. Even otherwise, the same is not rebutted by any documents by the defendants, hence, the said documents are admissible in evidence, which is relied upon in present circumstances.

Nothing is produced in rebuttal by the defendants.


MUHAMMAD AYAZ
Senior Civil Judge,
Zai at Hangu

If this unnatural gape is not corrected, it will create problems for the plaintiff in future. In circumstances, the claim of the plaintiff, as mentioned above, is proved through cogent and reliable evidence. Hence, the issue in hand is decided in affirmative.

Issue No. 02:

The instant suit is for declaration and the limitation for the instant suit is 06 years. As per the available record, suit of the plaintiff is within time. Onus of proof was upon the defendants to establish that suit is barred by time. However, nothing is produced by the defendants in this regard and the onus has not

been discharged by the defendants. Resultantly, the issues in hand is decided in negative.

Issue No. 04:

For what has been held in issue No. 3, this court is of the opinion that plaintiff has got cause of action and he is entitled to the decree as prayed for.

The issue is decided in affirmative.

Relief:

Consequently, suit of the plaintiff succeeds and is hereby decreed as prayed for. Defendants are directed to correct his date of birth as 01/01/1970 forthwith.

10. Parties are left to bear their own costs.
11. File be consigned to the record room after its completion.

Announced
18/09/2019



(Muhammad Ayaz Khan)
Senior Civil Judge,
Orakzai at Baber Mela

CERTIFICATE

Certified that this judgment of mine consists 04 (four) pages, each has been checked, corrected where necessary and signed by me.



(MUHAMMAD AYAZ KHAN)
Senior Civil Judge,
Orakzai (at Baber Mela).