

KABC0A0025512025



Form No.9 (Civil)
Title Sheet for Judgment in suit
(R.P. 91)

**IN THE COURT OF THE LXXII ADDL. CITY CIVIL
& SESSIONS JUDGE AT MAYO HALL
BENGALURU, (CCH-73)**

Present:

**Sri. Sreepada N,
B.Com., L.L.M.,**

LXXII Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge, Bengaluru.

Dated this the 6th day of July 2026.

O.S.No.25807/2025

Plaintiff:-

Nagamanju (Manjeeth.N)

*S/o Nagaraj.M.V.,
Aged about 37 years,
Residing at No.499,
Bellandur,
Devarabisanahalli,
Bengaluru-560 103.*

[By Sri. N. Ravindra – Adv.,]

V/s

Defendants:-

1. The Head Master,
*Vimanapura East,
English Primary School,
Marathahalli, G.B.J Colony,
H.A.L., Bangalore-560 087.*

2. The Head Master,
Kairalee Nilayam High School,
Vimanapura South,
Bangalore-560 017.

3. The Secretary,
Karnataka Secondary Education
Examination Board Bangalore,
Bengaluru District.

4. The Regional Passport Officer,
Marathahalli,
Bangalore.

5. The Chief Secretary,
Government of Karnataka ,
Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Veedhi,
Vidhana Soudha,
Bengaluru-560 001.

**[By ADGP for D.3 & 5]
[D.1, D.2 & D.4 – Ex-parte]**

Date of Institution of the suit	4.8.2025		
Nature of the (Suit or pro-note, suit for declaration and possession, suit for injunction, etc.)	Declaration Suit		
Date of the commencement of recording of the Evidence.	19.6.2026		
Date on which the Judgment was pronounced.	6.7.2026		
	Year/s	Month/s	Day/s
Total duration	00	11	02

**LXXII ADDL.CITY CIVIL AND SESSIONS JUDGE,
Mayohall Unit: Bengaluru.**

J U D G M E N T

This suit is by the Plaintiff against the Defendants to declare he has changed his name as Manjeeth.N and also direct the Defendants to insert his name as Manjeeth.N by replacing/deleting the existing name Nagamanju in the records of the Defendants and for other consequential reliefs.

2. The case of the Plaintiff, sans details, is that the Plaintiff is born on 28.5.1988 in Bengaluru and his parents are Sri. Nagaraj.M.V and Smt. Nagarathna.N. At the time of his birth, his parents have named him as Nagamanju as per his birth date by first word in Janmakundali. The said name is entered in all his educational documents and other records as Nagamanju. All the religious rights and rituals have been performed by the parents of the Plaintiff in the name of Nagamanju. At the time of Plaintiff joining in the 1st Defendant's School, his name was registered as Nagamanju. But after 37 years, he along with his parents have met numerologist and he suggested that his name is not

correct and the same has to be changed to Manjeeth.N on 7.10.2024. After that the Plaintiff has already changed his name in the Aadhar Card, Pan Card and Voter ID from Nagamanju to Manjeeth.N. Thereafter, when the Plaintiff approached the Defendants to change his name in their records as Manjeeth.N, by deleting the existing name Nagamanju, they advised him to approach civil court and obtain decree so that they can change his name. Therefore, the Plaintiff approached this Court for the relief of declaration.

3. Pursuant to summons, the Defendant No.3 & 5 have entered appearance through their counsels and the Defendant No.1, 2 & 4 have remained absent, hence, they were placed ex-parte.

4. The Defendant No.3 & 5 have filed written statement specifically denied the plaint averments and contended that the suit filed by the Plaintiff is not maintainable. Whatever information given by the parents while admitting the child, the same is entered in the school records during admission and the same will be continued and reflected in student's school

and educational records. As per the circular issued by the commissioner of the education department, there is no provision to change the Plaintiff's name in the school records. There is no mistake or fault of the above Defendants. If the suit is allowed, then the above Defendants department will be put to lot of hardship and changing of Plaintiff's name in the school and educational records involves laborious procedures to be followed by the Department and unnecessarily consumes the precious public time and money for the Defendants, which were meant to be devoted for the purpose of Education. To satisfy the personal interest, whims and fancies of the public, the litigation expenses spent by the government and Defendant's Department must be borne by the Plaintiff in the above case. The suit is barred by limitation, as the suit is filed after lapse of considerable time and the Plaintiff has not given any reasons for delay to change his name. There is no cause of action to file this suit and the alleged cause of action is imaginary. Hence, prayed to dismiss the suit with cost.

5. Based on the pleadings of the parties, this court has framed the following issues:

- 1. Whether the Plaintiff proves that, he wanted to change his name as Manjee.N in his educational records of Defendant No.1 and records of Defendant No.4?**
- 2. Whether the suit is suffering from non-joinder of necessary parties?**
- 3. Whether the suit is barred by law of limitation?**
- 4. Whether the Plaintiff is entitled for the reliefs of Declaration and Mandatory injunction as claimed in the above suit?**
- 5. What order or decree?**

6. The Plaintiff got examined as PW.1 and got marked Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.7 documents and closed his side.

7. Heard both sides.

8. Perused the evidence and documents on record. On appreciation of the evidence on record, my findings on the above issues are as under:

Issue No.1 : In the Affirmative.

Issue No.2 : In the Negative.

Issue No.3 : In the Negative.

Issue No.4 : In the Affirmative.

***Issue No.5 : As per final order for
the following:***

REASONS

9. Issue No.1 to 4:-

In order to avoid repetition of facts, both the issues have been taken up together for consideration.

10. As aforesaid, the above suit is filed Plaintiff by the Plaintiff against the Defendants to declare that he has changed his name as Manjeeth.N and also direct the Defendants to insert the name of the Plaintiff as Manjeeth.N by replacing/deleting the existing name Nagamanju in the records of the Defendants and for other consequential reliefs.

11. The Plaintiff born on 28.5.1988 in Bengaluru and his parents are Sri. Nagaraj.M.V and Smt. Nagarathna.N. At the time of his birth, his parents have named him as Nagamanju as per his birth date by first word in Janmakundali. The said

name is entered in all his educational document and other records as Nagamanju. All the religious rights and rituals have been performed by the parents of the Plaintiff in the name of Nagamanju. At the time of Plaintiff joining in the 1st Defendant's School, his name was registered as Nagamanju. But after 37 years, he along with his parents have met numerologist and he suggested that his name is not correct and the same has to be changed to Manjeeth.N on 7.10.2024. After that the Plaintiff changed his name in the Aadhar Card, Pan Card and Voter ID from Nagamanju to Manjeeth.N. Thereafter, when the Plaintiff approached the Defendants to change his name in their records as Manjeeth.N, by deleting the existing name Nagamanju, they advised him to approach civil court and obtain decree so that they can change his name. Therefore, the Plaintiff approached this Court for the relief of declaration.

12. To prove his case, the Plaintiff got examined himself as PW.1 and got marked Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.7 documents. Ex.P.1 is the original Passport of the Plaintiff. Ex.P.2 is the 7th Marks Card. Ex.P.3 is the

SSLC Marks Card. Ex.P.7 is the notarized copy of Driving License of the Plaintiff. In Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.3 & 7 the name of the Plaintiff is mentioned as Nagamanju. Ex.P.4 is the notarized copy of Aadhar Card. Ex.P.5 is the notarized copy of PAN Card. Ex.P.6 is the notarized copy of Election ID Card. In Ex.P.4 to Ex.P.6 already the name of the Plaintiff has been changed as Manjeeth.N from Nagamanju.

13. The Defendant No.3 & 5 in their written statement specifically denied the plaint averments and contended that the suit filed by the Plaintiff is not maintainable. Whatever information given by the parents while admitting the child, the same is entered in the school records during admission and the same will be continued and reflected in student's school and educational records. As per the circular issued by the commissioner of the education department, there is no provision to change the Plaintiff's name in the school records. There is no mistake or fault of the above Defendants. If the suit is allowed, then the above Defendants/department will be put to lot of hardship and changing of Plaintiff's name in the

school and educational records involves laborious procedures to be followed by the Department and unnecessarily consumes the precious public time and money for the Defendants, which were meant to be devoted for the purpose of Education. To satisfy the personal interest, whims and fancies of the public, the litigation expenses spent by the government and Defendant's Department must be borne by the Plaintiff in the above case. The suit is barred by limitation, as the suit is filed after lapse of considerable time and the Plaintiff has not given any reasons for delay to change his name. There is no cause of action to file this suit and the alleged cause of action is imaginary. Hence, prayed to dismiss the suit with cost.

14. From the aforesaid documents, it could be seen that in Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.3 the name of the Plaintiff is mentioned as Nagamanju whereas in Ex.P.4 to Ex.P.6 the name of the Plaintiff is mentioned as Manjeeth.N. In spite of request to the Defendants, they have not changed the name of the Plaintiff as prayed for by him. The documents would support the

contention of the Plaintiff. However, as aforesaid only the Defendant No.3 & 5 have contended that they have mentioned the name as per their records which were submitted by the Plaintiff and his parents and now they cannot change the same.

15. There is no challenge to the evidence of PW.1 and the documents placed on record. Though the Defendant No.3 & 5 entered appearance through their counsel and filed written statement and though cross-examined the PW.1 to prove their case, but in order to rebut the case of Plaintiff, no oral and documentary evidence placed on behalf of the Defendants.

16. The evidence of PW.1 regarding his name as "Manjeeth.N" in the place of "Nagamanju" remains unimpeached. If the name of the Plaintiff is changed as "Manjeeth.N" in the place of "Nagamanju" no prejudice would be caused to the Defendants. Therefore, in the absence of contra evidence or materials on record, there is no reason to disbelieve or discard the evidence of PW.1 and to doubt the genuineness of the documents placed on record. Even

though the Defendant No.3 & 5 contended that the relief is barred by law etc., but in this regard also no oral or documentary evidence placed on behalf of them.

17. The Learned ADGP during the course of arguments submitted that the Plaintiff wanted to change his name from Nagamanju to Manjeeth.N. There is no fault committed by the Defendants in entering the name of the Plaintiff in his school records as Nagamanju and as admitted by PW.1, as per the instruction given by the parents at the time of his admission to the school only his name has been entered. Even though he has knowledge about his name entered as Nagamanju in the school records, he has not approached the Court at the earliest stage of the proceedings. Accordingly, she prayed to dismiss the suit.

18. The Learned Counsel for the Plaintiff during the course of arguments submitted that except in school records in all other his personal records and government records his name has been already changed as Manjeeth.N and he is recognized in the

society as Manjeeth.N. Already in his Aadhar Card, PAN Card and Election ID Card his name has been reflected as Manjeeth.N. In order to change in the educational records his name as Manjeeth.N., he filed this suit and it is right of the Plaintiff to change his name and it cannot be objected by anybody including the State. The change of name of the Plaintiff will not prejudice to anybody, therefore, he prayed to decree the suit.

19. This Court relied upon the unreported decision of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in **RFA No.1570/2007 (DEC) dtd: 23.2.2023 in between Beena.N V/s The Chief Secretary and another**. In the above decision, the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka held thus:

7. The right to give a name to a person would vest only with that person, though, in practice a name is given or chosen by parents. If a person therefore seeks for a change of name, the same cannot be objected to by anybody, including the State. The State in recognition of this right has issued a circular and the only

condition that the State has imposed is that a decree should be obtained by the person seeking for a change of name, for it to entertain the request.

8. The plaintiff has approached the Civil Court with a request to declare that she be called as 'Yamini N' instead of Beena N. Since, it cannot be in dispute that a person has the right to choose a name for himself in substitution of the name chosen for him by his parents, the right of Beena N to rename herself as 'Yamini N' cannot be curtailed by a court of law. Further, as already held by this Court in RFA No.947/2013, the change of name would not prejudice anybody, much less the State. In this view of the matter, the judgment and decree of the Trial Court cannot be sustained.

20. Admittedly, the principles of the above decision squarely applicable to the case on hand. In this suit, also the Plaintiff wanted to change his name from Nagamanju to Manjeeth.N., and if he seeks for change of name, the same cannot be objected by anybody including the State and even the State in

recognition of this right has issued a circular and the only condition that the State has imposed is that a decree should be obtained by the person seeking for a change of name, for it to be entertain the request. Therefore, this Court is of the opinion that the Plaintiff is entitled for the relief as prayed for.

21. The Defendants have taken up specific defense in their written statement that the DDPI or BEO are not a party to this suit and in the absence of them, the suit filed by the Plaintiff is not maintainable, as the suit is suffering from non-joinder of necessary party. The Plaintiff has made the Secretary, Karnataka Secondary Education Examination Board and The Chief Secretary, Government of Karnataka as Defendant No.2 & 5 in this suit. Therefore, question of dismissing this suit for non-joinder of necessary party does not arise.

22. Further the Plaintiff in his plaint has clearly mentioned that on 7.10.2024 he along with his parents have approached the numerologist and he has advised him to change his name to Manjeeth.N., and the present suit is filed on 4.8.2025. Therefore,

the suit filed by the Plaintiff is within the period of limitation.

*23. Under the above circumstances, the Plaintiff has been able to establish that his name has to be changed in the records of the Defendants and as such he is entitle for the relief claimed in the above suit. Accordingly, **Issue No.1 & 4 are answered in the Affirmative and Issue No.2 & 3 are answered in the Negative.***

24. Issue No.5:-

In view of the findings on the above issues, the suit of the Plaintiff deserves to be decreed. Accordingly, I proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

The suit of the Plaintiff is hereby decreed. No costs.

It is hereby declared that the name of the Plaintiff is "Manjeeth.N".

The Defendants are directed to change the name of the Plaintiff as “Manjeeth.N” in the place of “Nagamanju” in their respective records and to issue fresh certificates.

Draw decree accordingly.

(Dictation given to the Stenographer, transcribed by her, after correction, signed and pronounced by me in the open court on this the 6th day of July 2026)

[Sri. Sreepada N]
LXXII Addl.City Civil & Sessions
Judge, Bengaluru. (CCH-73)

ANNEXURES

LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

PW.1: Manjeeth.N.

LIST OF EXHIBITS MARKED FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

- Ex.P.1 : Original Passport.
Ex.P.2 : 7th Standard Marks Card.
Ex.P.3 : SSLC Marks Card.
Ex.P.4 : Notarized copy of Adhaar Card of Plaintiff.

Ex.P.5 : Notarized copy of PAN Card.

Ex.P.6 : Notarized copy of Election ID Card.

Ex.P.7 : Notarized copy of Driving License.

LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED FOR THE DEFENDANTS:

None.

LIST OF EXHIBITS MARKED FOR THE DEFENDANTS:

Nil.

[Sri. Sreepada N]
LXXII Addl. City Civil & Sessions
Judge, Bengaluru. (CCH-73).