Nagina Begum v. Union of India & Ors.

WP(C) No. 1432/2026

WP(C) No. 1432/2026, decided 19 May 2026 | 2026-05-19

Aadhaar–PAN mismatch representations: speaking order directed within four weeks from 19 May 2026.

No Income-tax Act section expressly identified in this order.

High Court of Jammu and Kashmir and Ladakh | Justice Moksha Khajuria Kazmi | Justice Moksha Khajuria Kazmi

Assessment years: Not specified in supplied order

Scope of this order

Procedural relief requiring a reasoned administrative decision, rather than a judicial direction granting the requested delinking outright.

01 FACTS OF THE CASE

Nagina Begum alleged that her Aadhaar had been linked to another person's PAN and sought delinking and linkage with her own PAN. Counsel referred to representations dated 2 February 2023, 27 May 2023 and 8 July 2024.

Source: PDF p. 1

02 DISCUSSION BY THE HON'BLE COURT

The petitioner accepted disposal through a direction to consider those representations. Respondents' counsel did not oppose that course. The Court did not itself determine the correct linkage or order a completed technical correction.

Source: PDF p. 1

03 JUDICIAL DECISION

Respondents 2 and 3 were directed to consider the three representations and pass a speaking order within four weeks from the passing of the order on 19 May 2026. The petition was disposed of.

Source: PDF p. 2

04 OUTCOME / IN WHOSE FAVOUR

Procedural relief requiring a reasoned administrative decision, rather than a judicial direction granting the requested delinking outright.

Source: PDF p. 2

05 EXPERT COMMENTS

Match the relief to the operative direction — The prayer sought delinking and relinking, but the actual direction requires consideration and a speaking order. Publishing the prayer as the result would overstate the relief secured.

Use the pronouncement date for the period — The PDF distinguishes pronouncement on 19 May from uploading on 20 May 2026. The four-week period expressly runs from passing of the order, not upload or receipt.

Preserve the representation trail — The three dated representations define what respondents 2 and 3 must consider. The source does not establish their eventual decision or prove that the database mismatch has since been corrected.

Source: PDF p. 1

SOURCE & VERIFICATION

High Court of Jammu and Kashmir and Ladakh official judgment PDF - AKHB Repository (20260519_JKHC020028302026.pdf)

Complete 2-page court PDF read for this correction.

Complete source text and every original page visually reviewed; identity and SHA-256 checked. AI-assisted source analysis.

Open cited source rendition

All 2 physical source pages read and visually inspected. SHA-256: c034c13c3ba65c2d1a147c4e00d97eb95c99107ca4c57342d976afebf60d0718.

STATUTORY SCOPE

Only expressly identified provisions are indexed. No unprinted tax provision or assessment year is inferred.

LATER TREATMENT

Source checked 2026-10-21. Subsequent judicial treatment has not been independently verified.

AI DISCLOSURE

AI-assisted research checked against the identified source. Extraction, interpretation or omission errors remain possible. Source review does not mean independent approval by a practising professional. Verify every material statement against the complete original judgment.

PROFESSIONAL DISCLAIMER

General research information only; not legal or tax advice, a certified judgment or a substitute for the full order. Applicability depends on facts, assessment year, statutory version and jurisdiction. Subsequent treatment is unverified unless identified sources are expressly stated. Downloading does not create a professional engagement. Obtain case-specific advice before reliance.