

IN THE COURT OF ZAHIR KHAN
Civil Judge-I, Kalaya, Orakzai

Suit No.....25/1 of 2023.

Date of Institution.....25.05.2023.

Date of Decision.....05.06.2023.

= = = = =

Mst. Qainoos Begum W/O Hikmat Ali, Qaum Mani Khel Tappa
Zakaria Khel, Tehsil Lower, District Orakzai.

.....(Plaintiff)

Versus

1. Chairman NADRA, Islamabad.
2. Director General NADRA, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.
3. Assistant Director NADRA, District Orakzai.

..... (Defendants)

SUIT FOR DECLARATION & PERMANENT INJUNCTION**JUDGEMENT**

05.06.2023

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

Brief facts in the backdrop are that plaintiff has filed the instant suit for declaration cum-permanent injunction to the effect that, true and correct date of birth of plaintiff is 01.01.1976, however, defendants have incorrectly entered the same as 01.01.1981 which is wrong, illegal and ineffective upon the rights of plaintiff and liable to



05/06/23

ZAHIR KHAN
Civil Judge/JM
Kalaya Orakzai

be rectified. That due to this wrong entry, there is unnatural age difference of about 13 years between plaintiff and her elder son namely Rasheed Ali whose date of birth, as per CNIC, is 10.02.1994. That defendants were 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. The controversial pleadings of the parties were reduced into the following issues:

ISSUES

1. Whether plaintiff has got cause of action? OPP
2. Whether suit of plaintiff is within time?
3. Whether correct date of birth of plaintiff is 01.01.1976 and defendants have entered the same as 01.01.1981? 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.



05/06/23

ZAHIR KHAN
Civil Judge/JM
Kalaya Orakzai

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.

Plaintiff produced one witness in support of her claim while defendants produced one witness in defense.

Rasheed Ali, son and special attorney of plaintiff appeared and deposed as PW-01. He reiterated the averments of plaintiff. Special power of attorney is Ex.PW-1/1. Copy of his CNIC is Ex. PW-1/2. Copy of CNIC of plaintiff is Ex. PW-1/3.

Thereafter, evidence of plaintiff was closed.

Irfan Hussain (Representative of NADRA, Orakzai) appeared as DW-01. He stated that plaintiff has been issued CNIC as per information provided by her and that she has got no cause of action. He produced Family Tree (Beta) of plaintiff which is Ex. DW-1/1.

Thereafter, evidence of defendants was closed.

The above discussion boils down to my following issue-wise findings.

ISSUE NO.2

Plaintiff has been issued CNIC on 02.06.2021 with expiry date of 02.06.2031 while suit in hand was filed on 25.05.2023. As period of limitation under Article 120 of Limitation Act is six years,



05/06/2023
ZAHIR KHAN
Civil Judge/JM
Kalaya Orakzai


therefore, suit of plaintiff is held to be within time. Issue No. 2 decided in positive.

ISSUE NO.3

Claim and contention of plaintiff is that her true and correct date of birth is 01.01.1976, however, defendants have incorrectly entered the same as 01.01.1981 which is wrong, illegal and ineffective upon the rights of plaintiff and liable to be rectified. That due to this wrong entry, there is unnatural age difference of about 13 years between plaintiff and her son namely Rasheed Ali whose date of birth, as per CNIC is recorded as 10.02.1994. Plaintiff produced reliable documentary evidence in support of her claim and contention. As per Ex. PW-1/2, date of birth of plaintiff's son is recorded as 10.02.1994 resulting into unnatural age difference of 13 years between plaintiff and her son. Plaintiff is not a government servant. The rectification/modification sought by plaintiff will not affect rights of others. If date of birth of plaintiff is not modified, it will result into inconvenience to plaintiff and her family members. Oral evidence produced by plaintiff is also supportive to the averments of plaintiff.

Keeping in view the above discussion, documentary as well as oral evidence available on file. Issue No. 3 decided in favor of plaintiff against the defendants.

ISSUE NO.1 & 4.


05/06/23
ZAHIR KHAN
Civil Judge/JM
Kalaya Orakzai


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 in positive in favor of plaintiff.

RELIEF:

Crux of my issue wise discussion is that suit of the plaintiff is hereby decreed in her favor against the defendants as prayed for. No order as to cost. This decree shall not affect the rights of other persons interested, if any.

File be consigned to record room after its necessary completion and compilation.

ANNOUNCED
05.06.2023



Zahir Khan
Civil Judge-I, Kalaya, Orakzai

CERTIFICATE

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