



2026:AHC:30777

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 2081 of 2026

Raghuvir Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Ramendra Kumar Shukla
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Heard Sri Ramendra Kumar Shukla, learned counsel for the writ petitioner and Sri Rahul Malviya, learned Standing Counsel for the State.

2. The writ petitioner claims to have been engaged as a Daily Wager in Forest Department in January 1986. According to him, the date of birth is 01.12.1968, however, he has been retired treating it to be 04.01.1966. The petitioner earlier approached this Court while filing Writ-A No.19074 of 2025 (*Raghuvir Singh vs. State of U.P. and others*) which came to be disposed of directing the respondents to consider the claim of the writ petitioner on 17.12.2025 and now, an order impugned dated 29.01.2026 has been passed negating the claim of the writ petitioner.

3. Questioning the same, the present writ petition has been preferred.

4. Learned Standing Counsel has sought to argue that in the year 2001, ossification test was done according to which the age of the writ petitioner is 13 years. Contention is that the date of birth of the writ petitioner is 01.12.1968 and not 04.01.1966.

5. Learned Standing Counsel on the other hand submits that whatever might be, at the time when the writ petitioner was inducted on the basis of the Class-VIII certificate and T.C., the date of birth was 04.01.1966 and merely on the basis that there was an ossification test would not give a right to the writ petitioner to get the date of birth altered, particularly when entire proceedings have been triggered at the behest of the writ petitioner at the fag end of his service/ retirement.

6. I have heard the submissions so made across the Bar and perused the record carefully.

7. Apparently, the writ petitioner claims correction in the date of birth from 04.01.1966 to 01.12.1968. The impugned order recites that the date of birth of the writ petitioner is 04.01.1966, as the same is apparent from the Class VIII Certificate as well as Transfer Certificate. At the fag end of the career/retirement, there cannot be any corrections in the date of birth. In *Hindustan Lever Ltd. Vs S.M. Jadhav & anr., (2001) 4 SCC 52*, the same issue has also been dealt.

8. Bearing in mind the categorical finding stands recorded in the order impugned, which is not being seriously assailed, thus no good ground is made out.

9. The writ petition is **dismissed**.

February 11, 2026

N.S.Rathour

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)