

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT
JODHPUR**

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 459/2023

Pukh Raj @ Pukha Ram Choudhary S/o Shri Teja Ram Choudhary, Aged About 65 Years, By Caste Seervi, Resident Of Rebadiyon Ka Baas, Selagate, Subhash Basti, Bali, Tehsil Bali, District Pali (Raj.).

----Appellant

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary Department Of Agriculture, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. The Additional Director, Department Of Agriculture And Farmers Welfare, Sirohi (Raj.)
3. The Assistant Director, Agriculture Extension, Sirohi (Raj.)

----Respondents

For Appellant(s)	:	Mr. Samuel Masih
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. I.R. Choudhary, AAG with Mr. Pawan Bharti

**HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE PUSHPENDRA SINGH BHATI
HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE NUPUR BHATI**

Order

26/05/2026

1. The present Special Appeal has been filed challenging the order dated 17.04.2023 passed by the learned Single Judge of this Court in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 13787/2021, whereby the writ petition filed by the appellant/petitioner seeking a direction to the respondents to change his name in the service book from 'Pukha Ram' to 'Pukhraj' was dismissed.
2. The appellant seeks to change his name to 'Pukhraj Choudhary'.

3. Learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the respondent-State submits that the learned Single Judge has rightly dismissed the writ petition. He contends that the appellant is seeking change of his name in the service records of the respondent-department after retirement of 16 years. It is further submitted that the appellant's name in the school records was 'Pukha Ram', which was consistently continued by the department in all official records. After retirement, the appellant cannot seek a retrospective change of name in the service book, as no such retrospective alteration is permissible in law.

4. This Court has considered the submissions and finds itself in complete agreement with the reasoning and conclusion recorded by the learned Single Judge. A change of name in service records sought 16 years after retirement is not permissible in law.

5. In view of the above, the present Special Appeal is dismissed.

(DR.NUPUR BHATI),J

(DR.PUSHPENDRA SINGH BHATI),J

27-Sudheer/-