Muhammad Noor vs Director NADRA, Islamabad etc Page 1 of 5

IN THE COURT OF ZAHIR KHAN CIVIL JUDGE-I, TEHSIL KALAYA, ORAKZAI

	Suit No	23/1 of 2023.	
	Date of Institution	23.05.2023.	
	Date of Decision		
	Muhammad Noor S/O Fazal Noor R/O Qaum Utman Khel, Tappa Baranka Khel, Tehsil Lower, District Orakzai.		
	<u>VERSUS</u>	(Plaintiff)	
1.	Chairman NADRA, Islamabad.		
2.	2. Director General NADRA, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar.		
3.	Assistant Director NADRA, District Orakzai.		
		(Defendants)	

SUIT FOR DECLARATION & PERMANENT INJUNCTION

JUDGEMENT 30.05.2023

Through this judgement, I am going to dispose of the instant suit filed by plaintiff namely Muhammad Noor against defendants Chairman NADRA, Islamabad and two others for declaration and permanent injunction.

ZAHIR KHAN Civi! Judge/JM Kalaya Orakzai 30/65/02-3 Brief facts in the backdrop are that plaintiff has filed the instant suit against the defendants for declaration and permanent injunction to the effect that as per Secondary School Certificate, correct date of birth of plaintiff is 14.01.2006, however, defendants have incorrectly entered the same as 15.01.2001 which is wrong, illegal and liable to be rectified. That defendants were



Page 2 of 5

asked time and again to rectify date of birth of plaintiff but in vain hence, the present suit.

After institution of the suit, defendants were summoned, who marked their attendance through representative and contested the suit by filing authority letter and written statement.

From divergent pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed for adjudication of real controversy between the parties.

<u>ISSUES</u>

- 1. Whether plaintiff has got cause of action? OPP
- 2. Whether suit is within time? OPP
- 3. Whether correct date of birth of plaintiff is 14.01.2006 instead of 15.01.2001? OPP
- 4. Whether plaintiff is entitled to the decree as prayed for? OPP

5. Relief?

Upon submission of list of witnesses, both the parties on being provided with an opportunity to adduce their desired evidence, the parties produced their respective evidence.

ZAHIR KHAN Civil Judge/JM Kalaya Orakzai

30/05/023

After the completion of evidence, arguments of the learned counsel for the parties were heard and record of the case file was gone through with their valuable assistance.

During course of recording evidence, plaintiff produced one witness.

Page 3 of 5

Plaintiff himself appeared and deposed as PW-01. He reiterated the averments of plaint. He produced Matric Detail. Marks Certificate and Provisional Certificate as Ex.PW-1/2 and Ex.PW-1/3, according to which, date of birth of plaintiff is recorded as 14.01.2006. Copy of his smart card is Ex. PW-1/1. He lastly requested for decree of suit in his favour.

Thereafter, evidence of plaintiff was closed. Nothing contradictory could be brought on record from PW.

Irfan Hussain (Representative of NADRA, Orakzai) appeared as DW-01. Family tree, copy of birth certificate and processing form were exhibited as Ex.DW-1/1 to Ex.DW-1/3. He stated that plaintiff has been issued CNIC as per information provided by plaintiff and that he has got no cause of action and lastly requested for dismissal of suit. Thereafter, evidence of defendants was closed.

My issue wise findings are as under: -

ZAHIR KHAN Civil Judge/JM Kalaya Orakzai

30/05/023

ISSUE NO.2:

Plaintiff has been issued CNIC on 22.02.2019 while suit in hand was filed on 23.05.2023. As period of limitation under Article 120 of Limitation Act for filing declarative suit is six years, therefore, suit of plaintiff is within time. Issue no. 2 decided in positive.

ISSUE NO.3:

Page 4 of 5

Claim of plaintiff is that his true and correct date of birth is

14.01.2006 but defendants have incorrectly recorded the same as

15.01.2001 in their record, which entry is wrong and liable to be rectified. Plaintiff produced documentary evidence in support of his claim in shape of Matric DMC as Ex. PW-1/2 and Provisional Certificate as Ex.PW-1/3 per which date of birth of plaintiff is recoded as 14.01.2006. The same carries weight as presumption of correctness is attached to it. Oral evidence is also supportive to the averments of plaint.

Keeping in view the above discussion and documentary as well as oral evidence available on file, it is held that correct date of birth of plaintiff is 14.01.2006 which is correctly recorded in his Matric Detail Marks and Provisional Certificates. Date of birth of plaintiff to be rectified/modified from 15.01.2001 to 14.01.2006. Issue decided in favour of plaintiff and against the defendants.

ISSUE NO.1 & 4.

In the light of foregoing discussion, it is held that plaintiff has got cause of action and is entitled to the decree, as prayed for.

Both these issues are decided accordingly.

RELIEF.

Crux of my issue wise discussion is that suit of plaintiff is hereby decreed in his favor against the defendants as prayed for. No order as to costs. This decree shall not affect the rights of any other person interested, if any or service record of plaintiff, if any.

ZAHIR KHAN

30/05/023

Page 5 of 5

File be consigned to record room after its necessary

completion and compilation.

ANNOUNCED 30.05.2023

Zahir Khan

Civil Judge-I, Kalaya, Orakzai

<u>CERTIFICATE</u>

It is certified that this judgment consists of 05 pages. Each page has been dictated, read, corrected and signed by me.

Zahir Khan

Civil Judge-I, Kalaya, Orakzai