Order Sheet

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH AT KARACHI

CP No.D-2492 of 2026

(Chanda Begum v. Government of Sindh and others)

Date	Order with signature of Judge

Before:

Mr. Justice Riazat Ali Sahar

Mr. Justice Ali Haider 'Ada'

For hearing of main case

Date of hearing & order: 05.11.2026

Petitioner, Chanda Begum, present in person
Mr. S. Masroor Ahmed Alvi, advocate for the Respondent No.2
Mr. Mr. Arshad Lodhi, advocate for Respondent No.3
Ms. Farkhunda Shaheen, advocate for the Respondent No.4

ORDER

RIAZAT ALI SAHAR, J. Through this petition, the petitioner, who was born on 03-01-1987 and was named **Chanda Begum** by her parents, seeks directions to the respondents to issue fresh Matric, Intermediate and B.A. (Honours) certificates and marksheets in the name of "**Sajida Ansari**".

2. The petitioner's case is that her name "Chanda Begum" has brought her hardship and ill luck in her personal and domestic life, that people twist and distort the name, and that religious scholars and an astronomer advised her and her father to change it. On this basis, she changed her name in the NADRA record and now wants her educational certificates changed to match.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent Board of Intermediate Education opposed the petition, arguing that the petitioner cannot change her name on the basis of an alleged story, that she obtained a CNIC in the new name from NADRA by misrepresentation and by suppressing material facts, and that the Board's refusal to issue a fresh certificate is therefore lawful.

4. Heard petitioner present in person as well as learned counsel for the respondents.

5. It appears that the petitioner has not pointed to any statute, rule or regulation that gives her a vested right to have her certificates re-issued in a new name, or that places a corresponding duty on the respondents. Without such a right and duty, the writ jurisdiction cannot be invoked.

6. An educational certificate is a record of the candidate's identity as it stood when she appeared in the examination. The petitioner passed Matric in

2002, Intermediate in 2004 and B.A. (Honours) in 2008 under the name "Chanda Begum", and all her certificates correctly carry that name. The respondents committed no error or omission, and there is nothing to correct. Re-issuing the certificates would rewrite a record that was accurate when made.

7. The only reason given for the change is that the name is unlucky and that an astronomer and religious scholars advised a change. This is a purely personal belief and does not create a legal right. It is also unsupported by any affidavit or statement from the scholars or the astronomer, who are not even named. The assertion that people distort the name is vague and unsubstantiated. The petitioner is a mature adult, and the claimed hardship, depression and mental agony are bare assertions with no proof.

8. The petitioner relies on the change made in the NADRA record and on her Family Registration Certificate. A change of name in NADRA's record is an administrative act for identity documentation. It does not bind educational institutions, and it does not oblige them to alter their records. She has placed no material on record to show that any lawful procedure was followed or that any public notice or declaration supports the change, and the explanation for the change is a bare personal belief. The learned counsel for the respondent has alleged misrepresentation and suppression of facts in obtaining the new CNIC. On this record we cannot say that the allegation is unfounded, and the petitioner, who seeks equitable and discretionary relief, has not come with clean hands.

9. The petitioner passed her last examination in 2008 and has taken no step for about eighteen years. She has not explained why a name she considers unlucky was kept for so long on her educational record. Such unexplained delay and sudden change of position also weigh against the exercise of discretion in her favour.

10. For these reasons, the petition is **dismissed** along with the pending applications, with no order as to costs. However, the petitioner would be at liberty to approach the concerned trial Court for redressal of her grievances.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Nadir*