

IN THE COURT OF FARMAN ULLAH,

SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE, ORAKZAI AT BABER MELA

Civil Suit No.

309/1 of 2020

Date of Institution:

04/07/2020

Date of Decision:

15/03/2021

Rehmat Ullah s/o Mir Khan

Section: Mamo Zai, Sub Section: Abdul Raheem Khel, PO Ghiljo, Tehsil Upper & District Orakzai. (Plaintiff)

VERSUS

- 1. Chairman, NADRA, Islamabad.
- 2. Director, General NADRA Hayatabad KP.
- 3. Assistant Director, Registration NADRA District Orakzai.

(Defendants)

SUIT FOR DECLARATION, PERMANENT & MANDATORY INJUNCTION

JUDGEMENT:

15.03.2021

Brief facts of case in hand are that the plaintiff, Rehmat Ullah s/o Mir Khan, has brought the instant suit for declaration, permanent and mandatory injunction against the defendants, referred hereinabove, seeking declaration, therein, that his correct date of birth is 10.12.1992 while defendants have wrongly mentioned the same in their record as 01.01.1986, which is incorrect and liable to be corrected. That the correct date of birth of plaintiff has also been recorded in his education record as 10-12-1992. That he

FARMANULLAH
Semior Civil Judino
Orakzai at Baber Mona



repeatedly asked defendants to correct his date of birth by issuing CNIC but they refused. Hence, the present suit.

Defendants were summoned, who appeared through attorney namely Syed Farhat Abbas and submitted written statement, wherein they contested the suit of plaintiff on various grounds.

Divergent pleadings of the parties were reduced into the following issues;

Issues:

- 1. Whether plaintiff has got cause of action?
- 2. Whether the correct date of birth of the plaintiff is "10.12.1992" while defendants have wrongly mentioned the same as **01.01.1986** in their record?
- 3. Whether plaintiff is entitled to the decree as prayed for?
- 4. Relief.

Parties were provided opportunity to produce evidence in 3.90% support of their respective contention, which they did. Plaintiff produced his witnesses as PW-1 to PW-3.

Syed Farhat Abbas CNIC processing detail form, family tree and form "A" of plaintiff and exhibited the same as Ex. DW-1/1 to Ex. DW-1/3.

- After conclusion of the evidence arguments pro and contra 7. heard. Case file is gone through.
- In the light of available record and arguments of learned 8. counsel for the parties my issues wise findings are as under:

Issue No.02:

Plaintiff contended in his plaint that his correct date of birth is 10.12.1992 but it was wrongly recorded by defendants in their record as 01.01.1986. Hence, the record is liable to be corrected.



Plaintiff in support of his contention has appeared as PW-1 and he repeated the contents of plaint in his examination in chief. He also produced his Matric certificate and DMC as Ex.PW-1/2 and Ex. PW-1/3 while PW-02, stated in his examination in chief that plaintiff is his nephew and the correct date of birth of the plaintiff is 10.12.1992. PW-03 stated in his examination in chief that plaintiff is his cousin and the correct date of birth of plaintiff is 10-12-1992. PW-01 to PW-03 were subjected to cross examination but nothing substantial was brought on record which could have shattered their testimony rather they remained consistent regarding the facts uttered by them in their examination in chief. Their testimony is also corroborated by the Matric DMC and certificate of plaintiff produced by PW-1 as Ex.PW-1/2 and Ex.PW-1/3; wherein, the date of birth of plaintiff has been recorded as 10.12.1992. Moreover, the SSC DMC and certificate are maintained and issued by BISE Kohat under mandate, provided under the law. Hence. presumption of truth is attached to the same unless rebutted by any other oral or documentary evidence. In instant case no such oral or documentary evidence is available in rebuttal. So, the oral and documentary evidence produced by the plaintiff establishes that the correct date of birth of the plaintiff is 10.12.1992. The incorporation of date of birth of the plaintiff as 01.01.1986 in the record of NADRA appears to be a mistake. Hence, the issue No. 2 is decided in positive.

15.3-2031

Semor Class Judge Orakzai at Bober Mela

Issue No. 01 & 03:

These issues are taken together. For what has been held in issue No. 2, this court is of the opinion that plaintiff has got

(38)

cause of action and he is also entitled to the decree as prayed for.

The issues are decided in positive.

Relief:

Consequently, suit of the plaintiff succeeds and is hereby decreed as prayed for. Defendants are directed to correct their record by incorporating the date of birth of the plaintiff as 10.12.1992. Parties are left to bear their own costs.

File be consigned to the record room after its completion

and compilation.

Announced

15/03/2021

me.

(Farman Ullah)

Semior Civil Judge, Orakzai (at Baber Mela).

FARMANULLAH Seriior Civil Judge Orakzai at Baber Mela

CERTIFICATE

Certified that this judgment of mine consists of 04 (four) pages, each page has been checked, corrected where necessary and signed by

(Farman Ullah)

Senior-Civil Judge, Orakzai (at Baber Mela).

> FARMANULLAH Semior Civil Judge Orakzai at Baber Mela