

IN THE COURT OF IJAZ MAHSOOD, SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE,
ORAKZAI AT BABER MELA

Suit No.....82/1 (Neem) of 2026
Date of Institution..... 26.11.2025
Date of restoration 10.09.2026.
Date of Decision.....12.10.2026

= = = = =

Aurangzeb s/o Mir Haider
R/O Qoum Rabia Khel, Tappa Afzal Khel, Goda, PO
Samana, Gadaie Kalay, Tehsil Ismail Zai, District
Orakzai.
.....(Plaintiff)

Versus

1. Registrar General Nadra, Islamabad.
2. Deputy Registrar Nadra, Peshawar.
3. Registration Officer Nadra, District Hangu.
4. Registration Officer Nadra, District Orakzai.
5. Shah Zeb Khan
6. Alamzeb
7. Public At large

..... (Defendants)


=====

SUIT FOR DECLARATION & PERMANENT INJUNCTION

=====

JUDGMENT
12.10.2026


This judgment decides instant case filed by Mr.
Aurangzeb seeking removal of defendants No. 5 and 6 from his
family tree maintained by defendants



Pleadings:

Facts as recounted in the plaint reads that defendants No. 5 and 6, namely Shah Zeb Khan and Alama Zeb, are not his sons and have been wrongly entered in his family tree maintained by NADRA. It was averred that the registration number of the plaintiff's son mentioned in Form-B was the same as that reflected on the CNIC of defendant No. 6. The plaintiff further asserted that the defendants were strangers to him, had no concern with his family, and that the photographs affixed to their CNICs were entirely different from those of his sons. Consequently, the plaintiff sought removal of the names of defendants No. 5 and 6 from his family tree and blocking of their CNICs.

In rebuttal, the learned representative of the defendants controverted the plaintiff's claim and contended that defendant No. 5, Shah Zeb Khan, obtained a birth certificate from the Union Council on 21.10.2025, wherein the plaintiff verified the biometric particulars in the capacity of his father. Similarly, defendant No. 6, Alam Zeb, applied for a Smart National Identity Card through the NADRA Pak Identity Application, and the plaintiff verified the biometric particulars as his father. It was



further contended that, as per the NADRA record, the plaintiff himself had verified the biometric particulars of both defendants as his sons. On these grounds, the defendants sought dismissal of the suit.

The controversy as related in the pleadings was distilled into the following issues:

Issues:


1. *Whether suit is valid in its legal frame, and the court is competent to hear it?*
2. *Whether defendants No. 5 and 6 have been wrongly entered in the plaintiff's family tree?*
3. *Relief.*

Thereafter, both sides were invited to produce their evidence to establish the positions they had taken in their pleadings.

Witnesses/Exhibits:

Mr. Aurangzeb s/o Mir Haider, the plaintiff himself appeared as PW-01, Mr. Irfan Ullah, appeared as PW-02, Mr. Ali Akbar s/o Mir Haider, the brother of the plaintiff appeared as PW-03, and representative for defendants appeared as DW-01. They have exhibited the following documents;

- i. Copy of CNIC of plaintiff as Ex.PW-1/1.
- ii. Copy of CNIC of wife of plaintiff as Ex-PW-1/2.




- iii. Copy of CNIC of daughter of plaintiff as Ex.PW-1/3.
- iv. Picture of Alam Zeb as Ex.PW-1/4.
- v. Copy of CNIC of PW-02 as Ex.PW-2/1.
- vi. Copy of CNIC of PW-03 as Ex.PW-3/1.
- vii. Registration form and family trees of the plaintiffs as Ex. DW-1/1 to Ex. DW-1/3 respectively.
- viii. Online apply and Form "B" copy as Ex.DW-1/4 to Ex.DW-1/6, respectively,
- ix. CNIC's copy as Ex-DW-1/7 to Ex.DW-1/10 respectively.

Reasons/Reasoning:

Issue wise reasoning of the court following ruling on each issue, and finally on the suit is as follows:

Issue No 01:

This issue questions the legal validity of the frame of the suit, and the competence of the forum to hear it. Plaintiff has sought correction of his father's name, which clearly is a civil matter, and thus amenable to the jurisdiction of this court under section 09 of the civil procedure code. Other objections such as limitation etc, were not rigorously pressed, and upon examination of the corpus of the case by the court, were found inapplicable. Therefore, the issue is decided for the plaintiff.



Issue No 02:


This issue houses the heart of the suit: correct father's name of the plaintiffs. It is claimed that correct father of the plaintiff is Muhammad Javed.

Plaintiff as PW-01 and reiterated the contents of the plaint that defendants No. 5 and 6, namely Shah Zeb Khan and Alama Zeb, are not his sons and have been wrongly entered in his family tree maintained by NADRA. The PW-01 further asserted that the defendants were strangers to him, had no concern with his family, and that the photographs affixed to their CNICs were entirely different from those of his sons. Plaintiff sought removal of the names of defendants No. 5 and 6 from his family tree

PW-02, Mr. Irfan Ullah, reiterated the same facts and circumstances as deposed by PW-01.

PW-03, Mr. Ali Akbar, brother of the plaintiff, deposed that defendants No. 5 and 6 had been wrongly incorporated into the plaintiff's family tree maintained by NADRA.

During the course of cross-examination, plaintiff concedes that he was induced into verifying the registration of




11

Before the court are two mutually exclusive and contradictory statements of the plaintiff. In the former proceedings before NADRA, he concedes to have thumb impressed, given biometric verification, and solemn undertakings to record the defendants as his children. Today, he denies their status as such, and wants them removed from his family tree. Plaintiff has even denied being in their acquaintance in the pleadings, and in his cross examination, he admits to having entered into an illegal arrangement with them.

Upon consideration of the evidence produced by both sides, this Court finds that the plaintiff was required to establish, through cogent and convincing evidence, that the entries relating to defendants No. 5 and 6 in his family tree were incorrect. The plaintiff's witnesses supported his version; however, the official record relied upon by the defendants indicates that biometric verification had been carried out in connection with the registration of both defendants as the plaintiff's sons.

Plaintiff has failed to establish, on the basis of the evidence brought on record, that defendants No. 5 and 6 were wrongly incorporated into his family tree. Consequently, he has also failed to establish his entitlement to the consequential relief of removal of their names from the said family tree and blocking



Accordingly, Issue No. 2 is decided against the plaintiff.

RULING:

In view of the foregoing discussion and findings on the issues, the plaintiff has failed to prove his entitlement to the relief claimed in the plaint. Consequently, the suit is hereby **dismissed**. Costs shall follow the event.

File be consigned to record room after its necessary completion and compilation.

ANNOUNCED

12.10.2026



(Ijaz Mahsood)
Senior Civil Judge,
Orakzai (at Baber Mela)

CERTIFICATE

It is certified that this judgment consists of 07 pages. Each page has been dictated, read, corrected and signed by me.



(Ijaz Mahsood)
Senior Civil Judge,
Orakzai (at Baber Mela)