DECREE SHEET



In the court of Muhammad Ayaz Khan, Senior Civil Judge/JM, Orakzai at Baber Mela

Civil Suit No.

161/1 of 2019

Date of Institution:

12/09/2019

Date of Decision:

12/11/2019

Peena Bibi w/o Abdul Hameed

(Plaintiff)

Vs

Registrar, General NADRA, Islamabad.
Deputy, Registrar General NADRA KPK Peshawar.
Assistant Registrar General, NADRA District Orakzai.

(Defendants)

SUIT FOR DECLARATION AND PERMANENT INJUNCTION

Judgement

Plaintiff Mst Noor Mela Jan has submitted the instant suit for Declaration and permanent injunction against the defendants, stated that her correct date of birth is **06.06.1980** while it has been wrongly entered as **06.06.1986** by the defendants, which is unnatural as the difference between the age of the plaintiff and her elder son is **11 years**, which is against the natural gape. Hence, this creates irreparable loss for the plaintiff, the defendant is directed to correct the necessary.

Order

Vide my detailed separate judgement of today i.e 12/11/2019, consist of 05 pages, suit of the plaintiff is hereby decreed as prayed for and defendants are directed to correct the date of birth of the plaintiff as **06.06.1980** forthwith. No order as to costs.

(Muhammad Ayaz Khan)

Senior Civil Judge/JM Orakzai at Baber Mela



IN THE COURT OF MUHAMMAD AYAZ KHAN,

SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE, ORAKZAI AT BABER MELA

Civil Suit No.

161/1 of 2019

Date of Institution:

12/09/2019

Date of Decision:

12/101/2019

Peena Bibi w/o Abdul Hameed

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

VERSUS

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

(Defendants)

SUIT FOR DECLARATION & PERMANENT INJUNCTION

JUDGEMENT:

SAYA CAMMAHUM Senior Civil Judge.

Orakzaj at Hangu

- Plaintiff, Peena Bibi, has brought the instant suit for declaration-cum-permanent injunction against the defendants, referred hereinabove, seeking declaration therein that her correct date of birth is 06.06.1980 while it has been wrongly mentioned as 06.06.1986 by the defendants, which is unnatural as the difference between the age of the plaintiff and her elder son is 11 years, which is against the natural gape. Hence, the instant suit.
- Defendants were summoned, who appeared through attorney 2. namely Syed Farhat Abbas 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?
- Whether suit of the plaintiff is within time? 2.
- Whether the correct date of birth of the plaintiff is 3. 06.06.1980, while the date 06.06.1986 as mentioned in CNIC of the plaintiff is incorrect.
- 4. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the decree as prayed for?
- 5. Relief.

4.

SAYA DAMMAHUM

Senior Civil Judge Orakzal at Hangi

- Parties were directed to produce evidence of their own choice, 3. which they did. Plaintiff produced three (02) witnesses.
 - PW-1, Syed Ullah, who is the son and attorney of the plaintiff. He produced and exhibited copy of his CNIC as Ex. PW-1/1, copy of CNIC of the plaintiff as Ex. PW-1/2, copy of CNIC the plaintiff's elder son namely Muhammad Anwar, as Ex. PW-1/3 and exhibited his power of attorney as Ex. PW-1/4. He stated that the correct date of birth of the plaintiff is 06.06.1980 while it has been wrongly mentioned as 06.06.1986 by the defendants, which is unnatural as the difference between the age of the plaintiff and her elder son namely Muhammad Anwar is 11 years, which is against the natural gape. He requested for decree as the plaintiff has prayed for. He is cross examined by the attorney of the defendants.
- PW-2, Abdul Hameed, is husband of the plaintiff, who appeared 5. and recorded his statement. He produced and exhibited copy of

5

his CNIC as Ex. PW-2/1. He supported the contention of the plaintiff. He is cross examined by the defendants.

- 6. 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.
- 7. After conclusion of the evidence arguments pro and contra heard. Case file is gone through.
- 8. My issues wise findings are as under:

Issue No. 02:

instant suit is 06 years. As per the available record, suit of the plaintiff is within time. Onus of proof was upon the defendants plaintiff is within time. Onus of proof was upon the defendants of civil Judge, or civil Judge, or civil Judge, 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.

The instant suit is for declaration and the limitation for the

9. <u>Issue No.03:</u>

Perusal of record reveals that correct date of birth of the plaintiff is **06.06.1980**, which is evident from the evidence of the plaintiff. Further, if we presume **06.06.1986** the real date of birth of the plaintiff, then, only 11 years of difference exists between her and her elder son namely Muhammad Anwar, which is unnatural and not appealable to any prudent mind. Even as

(b)

per present CNIC of the plaintiff, the age of plaintiff at the time of birth of her first son is 11 years, which is not possible and against the law of nature and society. 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, it is the fundamental right of the plaintiff to correct her date of birth in the CNIC, which cannot be denied to her. 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. In addition to, there is no legal bar on such correction and if the date of birth is corrected

MUHAMMAD AYA2

MUHAMMAD AYA2

Senior Civil Judge,

Serior Civil Judge,

Grakzal at Hang defendants. Nothing is produced in rebuttal by the defendants.

Interestingly, in present case plaintiff sought increase in her date of birth instead of decrease, so, this factor cannot be ignored while deciding the case. It shows the bona-fide intention of the plaintiff.

it would not affect the right of any third person. Even

If this unnatural gape is not corrected, it will create problems for the plaintiff and her son 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. 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 she is entitled to the decree as prayed for.

The issues are decided in affirmative.

Relief:

Consequently, suit of the plaintiff succeeds and is hereby decreed as prayed for. Defendants are directed to correct her date of birth as 06.06.1980 forthwith.

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

Announced 12/11/2019

> (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).

IN THE COURT OF MUHAMMAD AYAZ KHAN,

SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE, ORAKZAI AT BABER MELA

Order 12/11/2019 Plaintiff present. Attorney of the defendant present. Vide my detailed separate judgement of today, consists of 05 (five) pages, suit of the plaintiff is hereby decreed as prayed for. No order as to cost.

Case file be consigned to record room.

Announced 12/11/2019

(Muhammad Ayaz Khan),

Senior Civil Judge, Orakzai at Baber Mela