



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 24-04-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

WP No. 15455 of 2026

K.Parveen Begum
W/o.Thameem,
No.19/2B, NN Garden 3rd Street,
Old Washermenpet, chennai - 600 021.


..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Chief Registrar
Birth and Death,
Greater Chennai Corporation,
Ripon Building, Chennai- 600 003.
2. The Zonal Officer
Department of Health and Preventive Medicine
Zone-5, Chennai Corporation,
Chennai- 600 021.

..Respondent(s)

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records connected with the notice in Ma.A5 Poo.Su.Thu.Na.Ka. No. 297/ 2026, dated 14.03.2026, issued by the 2nd respondent and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the 2nd respondent to change the petitioner name (mother name) as K.Parveen Begum instead of Umera in her children birth Certificate based on her representation dated 28.11.2025, in exercise of the powers conferred under section 15 of the Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1969 r/w Rule 11 of the TN Registration of Births and deaths Rules, 2000 and consequently direct the respondents to issue a rectified birth certificate after changes are made in a register within the time frame fixed by this Honble Court.



For Petitioner(s): Mr.Thamil Selvan T

For Respondent(s): Mr.Abishek Murthy

WEB COPY

ORDER

Challenging the notice issued by the second respondent in Ma.A5 Poo.Su.Thu.Na.Ka. No. 297/ 2026, dated 14.03.2026, the present Writ Petition has been filed. Further, the petitioner has sought for a direction to the second respondent to change the petitioner name (mother name) as K.Parveen Begum instead of Umera in her children birth Certificates based on her representation dated 28.11.2025, in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 15 of the Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1969 r/w Rule 11 of the Tamil Nadu Registration of Births and Deaths Rules, 2000 and consequently, to direct the respondents to issue a rectified birth certificate after changes are made in the register, within the time frame as fixed by this Court.

2. Heard the learned counsel appearing on either side. With the consent of both sides, the Writ Petition is taken up for hearing at the admission stage itself.


3. It is the case of the petitioner that the petitioner's children namely, T.Mohammed Salman and T.Niha Fathima are born on 25.06.2011 & 13.06.2014 respectively in RSRM Hospital, Cemetery Road, Chennai, however



in their birth certificates, the petitioner's nick name 'Umera' was mentioned instead of her real name 'K.Parveen Begum'. In regard to rectify the said defect

in the children's birth certificates, the petitioner made a representation dated 28.11.2025 to the respondents along with the related documents and also intended to furnish the required documents and to pay the necessary charges, however the same was not considered by the respondents. Thereafter, the petitioner filed a Writ Petition in W.P.No.50541 of 2025 and this Court on 05.01.2026 directed the respondents to consider the petitioner's representation dated 28.11.2025, for which the present impugned notice dated 14.03.2026 has been passed by the second respondent, rejecting the request of the petitioner and seeking an order from this Court for carrying out the said rectification in respect of the name change of the petitioner and hence, the present Writ Petition.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the present impugned notice is contrary to the Rule 11 (4) & 7 of the Tamil Nadu Registration of Births and Deaths Rules, 2000, wherein it has been stated that if any person asserts that any entry in the register of births and deaths is erroneous in substance, the Registrar may correct the entry in the manner prescribed under Section 15 upon production by that person a declaration setting forth the nature of the error and true facts of the case made by two credible persons having knowledge of the facts of the case and in every case in which an entry is corrected or cancelled under this Rule, intimation thereof should be sent to the



permanent address of the person who has given information under Section 8 or Section 9 respectively. He contended that the respondents have not followed

the aforesaid provisions of the Rules and hence, the impugned notice dated 14.03.2026 of the second respondent is liable to be set aside and the matter has to be remanded back to the respondents for a fresh consideration and thus, prayed for appropriate orders.

5. Per contra, the learned Standing counsel for the respondents Corporation submitted that admittedly, the birth certificates of the petitioner's children were issued in the year 2011 and 2014 respectively, however, the correction was sought for by the petitioner in regard to her name was only in the year 2025. He further submitted that if at all, the petitioner requires correction of her name, she has to produce the necessary documents sought for by the respondents but none of the documents were produced before the authority concerned and in the absence of production of any valid document to substantiate her name as Parveen Begum alias Umera, the authority is not in a position to issue any order in her favour and hence, prayed for dismissal of the Writ Petition.

6. I have heard the rival submissions made by the respective learned counsel and also perused the materials available on record.




7. The facts in the present case are not disputed. Admittedly, the petitioner has two children, who are born in the year 2011 and 2014 respectively, however, her nick name Umera was mentioned in their birth certificates instead of her real name K.Parveen Begum. To rectify the same, she approached the respondents, however, no order was passed as the petitioner has not produced any document to show that she is Umera either before the authority or before this Court and in the absence of any valid document, as rightly contended by the respondents, the second respondent rejected her request and hence, the same warrants no interference by this Court. However in the light of the Rules 11 (4) & 7 of the Tamil Nadu Registration of Births and Deaths Rules, 2000, liberty is granted to the petitioner to approach the authority concerned with a fresh application along with necessary documents which reflects that Umera and K.Parveen Begum is one and the same, if not, she can work out her remedy before the appropriate Civil Court.

8. With the above observations, this Writ Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

24-04-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

DP



To

1. The Chief Registrar
Birth and Death,
Greater Chennai Corporation,
Ripon Building, Chennai- 600 003.
2. The Zonal Officer
Department of Health and Preventive Medicine
Zone-5,
Chennai Corporation,
Chennai- 600 021.



WEB COPY

WP No. 15455 of 2



M.DHANDAPANI, J.

DP

WP No. 15455 of 2026

24-04-2026