

IN THE COURT OF MUHAMMAD AYAZ KHAN,

SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE, ORAKZAI AT BABER MELA

Civil Suit No.

96/1 of 2019

Date of Institution:

11/05/2019

Date of Decision:

16/10/2019

Mst Nazra Jan d/o Noor Alam Khan

Resident of Village Jamiraye, PO Kalaya, Tehsil Lower Orakzai & District Orakzai..... (Plaintiff)

VERSUS

- 1. Chairman, NADRA, Islamabad.
- 2. Director, General NADRA KPK Peshawar.
- 3. Assistant Director, NADRA District Orakzai.

(Defendants)

SUIT FOR DECLARATION & PERMANENT INJUNCTION

Plaintiff, Mst Nazira Jan, has brought the instant suit for

JUDGEMENT:

declaration-cum-permanent injunction against the defendants, referred hereinabove, seeking declaration therein that his correct senior civil Judge.

Senior Civil Judge.

Senior Civil Judge.

date of birth is 15/03/1998 while it has been wrongly mentioned as 01/01/1993 by the defendants, which is incorrect and against the facts, so, liable to be corrected. Hence, the instant suit.

2. 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 15/03/1998, while the date 01/01/1993 as mentioned in CNIC of the plaintiff is incorrect.
- 4. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the decree as prayed for?
- 5. Relief.
- Parties were directed to produce evidence of their own choice, which they did. Plaintiff produced three (03) witnesses.

PW-2, is Inayat Ali, uncle/attorney of the plaintiff appeared and recorded his statement, wherein he stated that the correct date of birth of the plaintiff is 15/03/1998. He produced and exhibited the CNIC of the plaintiff as Ex. PW-2/1. He also produced HSSC certificate of the plaintiff and exhibited the same as Ex. PW-2/2. He requested for grant of decree as prayed for. He is cross examined by the attorney of the defendants.

- 5. PW-1, is Syed Iqbal, witness of the plaintiff, who 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 15/03/1998. He was cross examined by the defendants.
- of PW-3, is Khan Ali, witness of the plaintiff, who 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 15/03/1998. He was cross examined by the defendants.

- 7. In rebuttal defendants produced an examined sole witness namely Habib Ullah Khan, representative, as DW-1 and recorded his statement as DW-1. He is cross examined by the plaintiff.
- 8. After conclusion of the evidence arguments pro and contra heard. Case file is gone through.
- 9. My issues wise findings are as under:

10. **Issue No.03**:

Perusal of record and evidence present on file reveals that correct date of birth of the plaintiff is 15/03/1998, which is solved correct date of birth of the plaintiff is 15/03/1998, which is evident from the HSSC certificate, exhibited as Ex. PW-2/2. It is settled law that whenever there is clash between the CNIC and HSSC certificate, in respect of date of birth, the HSSC certificate shall prevail. In present case, as per Ex. PW-2/2, the correct date of the birth of the plaintiff is 15/03/1998. Nothing is produced by the defendants to rebut the said document. 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.

Supreme Court page 849, "wherein it has been mentioned by the honorable Supreme Court of Pakistan that the best evidence to prove this fact (age or date of birth) was of those person who would have an ordinary course of life having personal knowledge. Statement of mother is at high pedestal as compared to other as she has given birth to him."

In present case, the uncle of the plaintiff has recorded his statement and mentioned the correct date of birth of the plaintiff as 15/03/1998. As per the said judgement, uncle of the plaintiff is in a good position to tell the real date of birth of the plaintiff. Hence, reliance is placed on the judgement, referred hereinabove. It is held that the correct date of birth of the plaintiff is 15/03/1998.

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. 01 & 04:

Both issues are taken together. 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.

These issues are 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 15/03/1998 forthwith.

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

Announced 16/10/2019

(Muhammad Ayaz Khan) Senior Civil Judge,

Orakzai at Baber Mela

CERTIFICATE

Certified that this judgment of mine consists **05** (five) pages, each has been checked, corrected where necessary and signed by me.

(MUHAMMAD AYAZ KHAN)

Senior Civil Judge, Orakzai (at Baber Mela).