

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

Civil Suit No. 95/1 of 2019
Date of Institution: 08/05/2019
Date of Decision: 07/11/2019

Muhammad Nisar s/o Nazar Khan

Resident of Village Baza Kalay, PO Thall, Ismail Zai & 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

JUDGEMENT:


MUHAMMAD AYAZ
Senior Civil Judge,
Orakzai, Hangu.

Plaintiff, **Muhammad Nisar**, has brought the instant suit for declaration-cum-permanent injunction against the defendants, referred hereinabove, seeking declaration therein that his correct date of birth is **06/02/2002** while it has been wrongly mentioned as **01/01/1995** by the defendants, which is incorrect and against the facts, so, liable to be corrected. Hence, the instant suit.

1. 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 **06/02/2002**, while the date 01/01/1996 as mentioned in CNIC of the plaintiff is incorrect.
4. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the decree as prayed for?
5. Relief.

2. Parties were directed to produce evidence of their own choice, which they did. Plaintiff produced three (02) witnesses.

3. PW-1, Muhammad Nisar, is the plaintiff himself, who recorded


MUHAMMAD AYAZ
Senior Civil Judge,
Orakzai at Hangu

his statement, wherein he stated that his correct date of birth is **06/02/2002** while it has been wrongly mentioned in his CNIC as 01/01/1996. He stated that he is a student of FSc and his date of birth according to the register of his primary school register is **06/02/2002**. He produced and exhibited the copy of school register as Ex.PW-1/1, copy of his Matric DMC as Ex.PW-1/2, copy of his CNIC as Ex. PW-1/3 and copy of SSC certificate as Ex.PW-1/4. As per the said document his correct date of birth is **06/02/2002**, the plaintiff added. Lastly, plaintiff requested for grant of decree as prayed for. He was cross examined by the attorney of the defendants.

4. PW-2, Mani Badshah, is the maternal uncle of the plaintiff, who appeared and recorded his statement. He stated that the real date of birth of the plaintiff is **06/02/2002**. He was cross examined by the defendants.

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


MUHAMMAD AYAZ
Senior Civil Judge,
Orakzai at Hangu

9. **Issue No.03:**

Perusal of record and evidence present on file reveals that correct date of birth of the plaintiff is **06/02/2002**, which is evident from the School certificates which are already exhibited as Ex. PW-1/2 and Ex. PW-1/4. It is settled law that whenever there is clash between the CNIC and school certificates, in respect of date of birth, the school certificate shall prevail. In present case, as per Ex. PW-1/2 and Ex. PW-1/4, the correct date of the birth of the plaintiff is **06/02/2002**. 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. In circumstances, the evidence of the uncle of the plaintiff is the best available evidence to tell the real date of birth of the plaintiff. Even otherwise, it is the fundamental right of the plaintiff to correct his date of birth in the CNIC, which cannot be denied to him. Moreover, it is even in the interest of NADRA to have correct database of the citizens of Pakistan including the present plaintiff. If the date of birth of the plaintiff is not corrected, it would serve no purpose.


MUHAMMAD AYAZ
Senior Civil Judge,
Orakzai at Hanou

In addition to, there is no legal bar on such correction and if the date of birth is corrected it would not affect the right of any third person. Even otherwise, the same is not rebutted by any documents by the defendants, hence, the said document is admissible in evidence, which is relied upon in present circumstances. Nothing is produced in rebuttal by the defendants.

Taking wisdom from the case law reported in PLD 2003 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 **06/02/2002**. As per the said judgement, uncle of the plaintiff is in a good position having personal knowledge to tell the real date of birth of the plaintiff. Hence, reliance is placed on the judgement, referred hereinabove

For above, it can be safely presumed that the correct date of the birth of the plaintiff is **06/02/2002** while it has been wrongly entered by the defendants in their record as 01/01/1995.



MUHAMMAD ARIFF
Senior Civil Judge,
Orakzai at Hangu

Hence, the issue in hand is decided in affirmative.

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 **06/02/2002** forthwith.

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

Announced
07/11/2019



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

CERTIFICATE

Certified that this judgment of mine consists **06** (six) pages, each has been checked, corrected where necessary and signed by me.



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