

IN THE COURT OF REHMAT ULLAH WAZIR, SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE, ORAKZAI AT BABER MELA

Civil Suit No.

77/1(neem) of 2021

Date of Original Institution:

21.12.2021

Date of Remand Back:

31.05.2022

Date of Decision:

31.05.2022

Muhammad Daud s/o Abdul Latif Khan, R/O Bilyanai, Orakzai

(Plaintiff)

VERSUS

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

(Defendants)

SUIT FOR DECLARATION-CUM-PERPETUAL AND MANDATORY INJUNCTION

JUDGEMENT:

Plaintiff Muhammad Daud has brought the instant suit for declaration-cum-perpetual and mandatory injunction against defendants Chairman NADRA, Islamabad, Pakistan, Director General NADRA, Peshawar, KPK, through Assistant Director,

THAT CIVIL AND PROPERTY WHEN CIVIL AND WHEN WHEN Senior Civil Barber whereas, defendants have wrongly and Senior Civil Barber whereas, defendants have wrongly and Senior Civil Barber whereas, defendants have wrongly and Corakzai at Barber whereas, defendants have wrongly and Corakzai at Barber whereas are considered as the correct date of birth of when the correct date of birth of the correct date of the correct date of birth of the correct date o 21.09.2003 in their record instead of 12.12.2003, which is wrong and ineffective upon the rights of the plaintiff and is liable to correction. That the defendants were asked time and

Muhammad Daud VS NADRA

Case No. 77/1 (neem)

Page 1 of

(39)

again for correction of date of birth of the plaintiff but they refused to do so, hence the present suit;

- 2. The case is remanded back to the undersigned by the worthy District & Sessions Judge, Orakzai vide judgment, Dated: 25.05.2022 upon the appeal of the defendants for recording DW statement.
- 3. Divergent pleadings of the parties were reduced into the following issues;

Issues:

- 1. Whether the plaintiff has got cause of action?
- 2. Whether the correct date of birth of the plaintiff is "15.03.2006" while defendants have wrongly mentioned the date of birth of the plaintiff as 21.09.2003 in their record?
- 3. Whether plaintiff is entitled to the decree as prayed for?
- 4. Relief?

Parties were given an opportunity to produce evidence, which they did

Issue wise findings of this court are as under: -

Issue No. 02:

4. The plaintiff alleged in his plaint that the correct date of birth of the plaintiff is 15.03.2006 according to his Matric certificate, whereas, defendants have wrongly entered the same as 21.09.2003 in their record instead of 12.12.2003 which is wrong and ineffective upon the rights of the plaintiff and is liable to correction. That the defendants were asked time and

again for correction of date of birth of the plaintiff but they refused to do so, hence the present suit;

The plaintiff produced witnesses in whom, the one Abdul Latif Khan, father of the plaintiff, appeared as PW-01, who supported the stance of the plaintiff by narrating the same story as in the plaint and exhibited his CNIC as Ex.PW-1/1. Further, he the one Manzoor Ahmad, relative of the plaintiff, appeared as PW-02, who supported the stance of the plaintiff and exhibited his CNIC as Ex.PW-2/1. Further, the plaintiff himself appeared as PW-03, who produced the copy of his Matric DMC and provisional certificate of Government Higher Secondary School, Dhoda Kohat and according to which his date of birth 15.03.2006, Further produced his CNIC as Annex-A

according to which his date of birth is 21.09.2003. WLLAH WAZIR

Senior Civil Judge JM, Orakzai at Baber MelaThe defendants produced only one witness. the representative of the defendants namely Syed Farhat Abbas appeared as DW-01, who produced the Processing Detail Form and according to that the first overseas card was issued to the plaintiff in in Abu Dhabi in 2006 which is Ex.DW-1/1. Further, produced the Family Tree of the plaintiff which is Ex.DW-1/2 and further fully denied the claim of the plaintiff.

Arguments heard and record perused.

(41)

After hearing of arguments and perusal of record, I am of the opinion that the plaintiff mainly rely on his school record which is earlier in time and bear the presumption of truth unless rebutted. Also, the DW has admitted in his cross examination that correction can be made up-to 05 years on the basis of Matric, therefore, the issue is decided in positive.

Issue No. 01 & 03:

Both these issues are interlinked, hence, taken together for discussion.

As sequel to my findings on issue No. 2, the plaintiff has got a cause of action and therefore entitled to the decree as prayed for. Both these issues are decided in negative.

RELIEF:

As sequel to my above issue wise findings, the suit of the plaintiff is hereby decreed as prayed for with no order as to costs.

File be consigned to the Record Room after its completion and compilation.

Announced 31.05,2022

(Rehmat Ullah Wazir) Senior Civil Judge,

Orakzai (at Baber Mela)AZIR REHMAT ULLAH Senior Civil Judge/JM, Orakzai at Baber Mela