

KABR700022302025



IN THE COURT OF CIVIL JUDGE AND J.M.F.C.

AT KRISHNARAJAPURAM

Present : Vishwanath Savadi,
B.A., LL.B.(Hon's)
Civil Judge and JMFC,
Krishnarajapuram.

ORIGINAL SUIT No.1846/2025.

Dated : this the 23rd day of March-2026.

Plaintiff : Gowtham Reddy.S,
S/o Sri Rama Reddy,
Aged about 23 years,
R/at Avalahalli,
Chinnaganahalli,
Bidarahalli Hobli
Virgonagar Post,
Bangalore -560 049

(By Sri. P.V. Ramagiri, Advocate.)

V/s

Defendant/s : 1. The Head Master,
Sri Kumaran's English Primary &
Middle School,
Ramamurthy Nagar,
Bengaluru-560 016.

2. The Head Master,
Jai Gopal Garodia
Rashtrorathana Vidyalaya,

No.21, 2 K Cross, HRBR,
Bengaluru-560 043.

3. The Head Mistress,
Jai Gopal Garodia
Rashtrarthana Vidyalaya,
No.21, 2 K Cross, HRBR,
Bengaluru-560 043.
4. The Principal,
Silicon City Pre-University College,
A Unit of MJ Education Trust,
No.26/2, Ravindra Layout,
Near Police Quarters,
K.R.Puram,
Bengaluru-560 036.
5. The Deputy Director of Public Institution,
2M3R/HR4, Dooravaninagar,
K.R.Puram,
Bengaluru-560 036.
6. The Block Education Officer,
Opp: K.R.Puram Bus stop,
Devasandra, K.R.Puram,
Bengaluru-560 036.
7. The Secretary,
Karnataka Secondary Education
Examination Board,
6th Cross,
Malleshwaram,
Bangalore-560003.
8. The Secretary,
Department of Pre-University Education,
Sampige Road,
18th Cross,
Malleshwaram,
Bengaluru-560 003.
9. The Secretary,
Ministry of Home affairs,
Government of Karnataka,

Vidhanasoudha,
Bangalore-560001.

10. The Passport Granting Officer,
Regional Passport Office,
Shanthinagar,
Bangalore-560 027.

(D-1 : By Sri. R. Govindaraju, Advocate.)
(D-3 : By Sri. Dr. Vidya Selvamony, Advocate.)
(D-2, 4 to 10: placed exparte)

Date of Institution Suit	:	03-04-2024
Nature of Suit	:	Declaration and Mandatory Injunction.
Date of commencement of recording of evidence	:	07-03-2026
Date on which judgment is pronounced	:	23-03-2026
Total duration	:	Years Months Days 01 11 20

-:: JUDGMENT ::-

This Court, as per the notification from the Hon'ble Principal District and Sessions Judge, Bengaluru Rural District, bearing letter No. ADM/135/2007 dated 27.03.2025, has received the entire case file of Original Suit No. 644/2024 from the Hon'ble II Addl. Civil Judge, Bengaluru Rural District, dated 05.06.2025. Accordingly, this Court has assigned a new number to the said case, which is now renumbered as O.S.No.1846/2025.

2. The present suit is filed seeking a declaration and mandatory injunction.

3. Plaintiff's Case (in Brief):

It is the case of the plaintiff that he was born on 25.06.2000. His father's name is "Sri Rama Reddy" and his mother's name is "Lakshmi T." Due to errors and inadvertence, his father's name is incorrectly recorded as "Sree Ram Reddy" in some school records and as "Sreeram Reddy" in others. In the SSLC and PUC marks cards and PAN card, his father's name is shown as "Sriram Reddy." Similarly, due to error and inadvertence, his mother's name is shown as "Lakshmi" in the school records, whereas her correct name is "Lakshmi T." The name of the plaintiff's father is correctly reflected as "Sri Rama Reddy" in the Aadhaar and PAN records. Hence, the plaintiff seeks correction of his parents' names in the educational and other relevant records to "Sri Rama Reddy" and "Lakshmi T." in place of the incorrect entries "Sree Ram Reddy," "Sreeram Reddy," "Sriram Reddy," and "Lakshmi." The plaintiff has approached the concerned authorities (defendants) for such corrections, but the same has not been effected. Accordingly, the plaintiff has filed the present suit seeking appropriate declaratory and consequential injunctive reliefs.

4. In pursuance of the summons, the defendant No.1 and 3 appeared before the court through their counsel and filed separate written statement. Despite service of summons, the defendant No.2, 4 to 10 neither appeared in person nor through counsel. Consequently, the Court ordered that the defendant No.2, 4 to 10 be placed ex parte.

5. The brief defense of defendant No.1 in the written statement is as follows:

Defendant No. 1 denies all the averments of the plaint and specifically contends that the plaintiff is seeking correction of his parents' names in the school records after a long lapse of time. It is stated that, after scrutinizing and verifying the relevant records, Defendant No. 1 had recorded the names as "Sreeram Reddy" and "Lakshmi" at that time. The defendant further contends that it cannot now independently change or correct the names in the school records after such a long period. This educational institution is always bound by the directions or orders of a competent court. The legal notice of the plaintiff has been duly replied, stating that any correction of names will be effected strictly in accordance with an order passed by the competent court. Accordingly, Defendant No. 1 prays for dismissal of the suit with costs.

6. The brief defense of defendant No.3 in the written statement is as follows:

Defendant No. 3 denies all the averments of the plaint and specifically contends that at the time of the plaintiff's admission to the 10th standard, his parents submitted the admission form dated 23.04.2015, wherein the mother's name was recorded as "Lakshmi" and the father's name as "Sri Ram Reddy," which was forwarded to Defendant No. 7 as per school records. Defendant No. 3 further contends that any correction of the names in the school records or SSLC marks card can only be effected by Defendant No. 7, and this defendant has no power or authority

to make such changes. Accordingly, Defendant No. 3 prays for dismissal of the suit with costs.

7. Based on the pleading of the parties this Court has framed the following;

ISSUES

1. Whether the plaintiff proves that, his father and mother's correct name as Sri Rama Reddy and Lakshmi T., respectively and same are wrongly mentioned in educational records as Sree Ram Reddy/Sriram Reddy and Lakshmi ?
2. Whether the plaintiff is entitled for the relief as sought for?
3. What order or decree?

8. The plaintiff in order to prove his case, the plaintiff got examined before the court as PW.1. Along with the oral evidence the plaintiff has produced documentary evidence as per Ex.P.1 to 8. On the other hand the defendants did not lead their evidence.

9. Heard the arguments of plaintiff side. Despite being given sufficient opportunities, the Defendants have neither appeared to address oral arguments nor filed their written argument. I have perused the materials available on record.

10. The findings of this Court on above said issues are as under ;

ISSUE No.1 : In Affirmative.

ISSUE No.2 : In Affirmative.

ISSUE No.3 : **As per the final for the following**

REASONS

11. Issue No.1 :- It is the specific case of the plaintiff that, the plaintiff's father and mother name was wrongly mentioned in educational records as Sree Ram Reddy/Sriram Reddy and Lakshmi instead of *Sri Rama Reddy and Lakshmi T.*

12. The plaintiff in order to establish the aforesaid contention, the plaintiff got examined before the court as PW.1. The PW.1 in the examination-in-chief has reiterated the averments made in the plaint. Along with the oral evidence the plaintiff has produced documents as per Ex.P.1 to P.8. The defendants counsel subjected to the PW.1 for elaborate cross-examination.

13. On the other hand even though the defendants have raised the defence that as per the instructions given by the parents of the plaintiff's parents name has been entered in school records but the defendants to substantiate their defence have not stepped into the witness box and not produced any documentary evidence before the Court.

14. The burden lies upon the plaintiff to establish that he has duly changed his parents name from Sree Ram Reddy/Sriram Reddy and Lakshmi to *Sri Rama Reddy and Lakshmi T.* The plaintiff to substantiate the said contention along with the oral evidence he has produced 8 documents as per Ex.P.1 to P.8. Ex.P.1 is the SSLC marks card, Ex.P.2 is the PUC marks card, Ex.P.3 is the plaintiff's adhar card, Ex.P.4 is the PAN card, Ex.P.5 is the his father's adhar card, Ex.P.6 is the

his mother's adhar card, Ex.P.7 is the postal receipts and acknowledgments, Ex.P.8 is the office copy of Legal notice.

15. Ex.P.1 and Ex.P.2 comprise the SSLC and PUC marks cards of the plaintiff. A perusal of these documents reveals that the names of the plaintiff's parents are recorded as "Sree Ram Reddy" / "Sriram Reddy" and "Lakshmi," reflecting inconsistencies and errors in the earlier records. Ex.P.3, Ex.P.5, and Ex.P.6 consist of the Aadhaar cards of the plaintiff and his parents. A perusal of these documents shows that the names of the plaintiff's parents have been duly updated and correctly recorded as "Sri Rama Reddy" and "Lakshmi T.," reflecting their proper and accurate names.

16. Upon a careful and cumulative appreciation of the evidence in Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.8, this Court finds that the plaintiff has satisfactorily established that the correct names of his parents are "Sri Rama Reddy" and "Lakshmi T.," and not the earlier incorrect entries "Sree Ram Reddy" / "Sriram Reddy" and "Lakshmi." The defendants have failed to produce any material or evidence to rebut or controvert the plaintiff's claim regarding his parents' correct names. In the absence of any contrary evidence, the plaintiff's contention regarding the correct recording of his parents' names stands duly proved.

17. It is further evident from the documents that the inconsistencies in the educational records arose due to clerical errors and inadvertence, and not due to any deliberate misrepresentation. The plaintiff has also approached the relevant

authorities to rectify the records, demonstrating bona fide intention to ensure that his parents' names are accurately reflected across all official documents. The Court, therefore, finds merit in the plaintiff's claim for correction of the names in the educational and other relevant records. **Hence for the said reasons this court answers issue No.1 in the Affirmative.**

18. Issue No.2 : The plaintiff has claimed the relief of declaration about his parents name as Sri Rama Reddy and Lakshmi T., and the same has been established by the plaintiff by producing oral and documentary evidence. Therefore the plaintiff is entitled for the relief of declaration claimed in the plaint. Further the plaintiff has claimed the consequential relief of mandatory injunction for directing the defendants to rectify the plaintiff's name in the school records. Mere granting the relief of declaration will not serve the purpose and therefore it is necessary to give direction to the defendants to rectify the plaintiff's name in the school records. To avoid future technical difficulties it is necessary to grant the relief claimed by the plaintiff. Therefore the plaintiff is entitled for the relief claimed. By considering the nature of the suit and the parties involved in the suit, they should bear their own cost. **Hence for the said reasons this Court answers Issue No.2 in the Affirmative.**

19. ISSUE No.3 :- In the light of aforesaid discussions, this Court proceed to pass the following :

-:: ORDER ::-

The suit of the plaintiff for the relief of declaration and mandatory injunction is hereby decreed on following terms:

It is hereby declared that the names of the plaintiff's parents are Sri Rama Reddy and Lakshmi T.

The defendants are hereby directed to rectify the names of the plaintiff's parents in the educational records as Sri Rama Reddy and Lakshmi T., deleting the earlier entries recorded as Sree Ram Reddy / Sriram Reddy and Lakshmi.

By considering the nature of the suit and the parties involved in the suit, they should bear their own cost.

Draw decree accordingly.

(Dictated to the Stenographer directly on computer, typed by her, corrected by me and then pronounced in the Open court on this **23rd day of March -2026**)

23-03-2026
Vishwanath Savadi
Civil Judge & JMFC,
Krishnarajapura.

ANNEXURE

1. Witnesses examined on behalf of plaintiff:-

PW1 - Gowtham Reddy S.,

2. Documents exhibited on behalf of plaintiff:-

Ex.P.1 - SSLC marks card,
Ex.P.2 - PUC marks card,
Ex.P.3 - Plaintiff's adhar card,

- Ex.P.4 - PAN card,
Ex.P.5 - His father's adhar card
Ex.P.6 - His mother's adhar card,
Ex.P.7 - Postal receipts and acknowledgments,
Ex.P.8 - Office copy of Legal notice.

3. Witnesses examined on behalf of defendant:-

-NIL-

4. List of documents marked on behalf of the defendant:-

-NIL-

23-03-2026
Vishwanath Savadi
Civil Judge and JMFC,
Krishnarajapuram.