IJASRM

International Journal of Advanced Scientific Research and Management, Volume 11 Issue 10, Oct 2026

www.ijasrm.com

ISSN 2455-6378

Standardisation of Personal Name Formats Across Birth Registration, Educational Records, Aadhaar and PAN in India: Administrative Challenges, Legal Implications and a Framework for Citizen-Centric Reform

Kailasasundaram Parameswaran[1] and Somesh Bharathwaj Kailasasundaram[2]

[1] Sanitary Inspector, Sankarankovil Municipality, Tamil Nadu, India

[2] B.Tech Computer Science, Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India

Study Location: Sankarankovil Municipality, Tamil Nadu, India
Study Period: 1 August 2026 – 30 September 2026
Research Design: Descriptive, retrospective administrative study

Abstract

Personal-name consistency is an important component of reliable public administration, identity verification and access to government services. In India, differences in naming conventions, the placement of initials, abbreviations, punctuation, spelling and the recording of parental names can create discrepancies across birth certificates, educational records, Aadhaar and Permanent Account Number (PAN) documents. These discrepancies may lead to repeated correction applications, additional documentary requirements and administrative burdens for citizens and public authorities.

This study examines 267 applications for corrections to birth-registration records received at Sankarankovil Municipality, Tamil Nadu, during August and September 2026. The applications were classified into 15 categories relating to initials, name formatting, children's names, parental particulars, address and spacing. The analysis reveals that 210 applications (78.65%) concerned initials and name-formatting issues, while 50 applications (18.73%) involved corrections to children's or parents' names. The remaining seven applications (2.62%) concerned address and spacing corrections.

An important administrative observation was that citizens were reportedly instructed by various authorities to correct their birth certificates when discrepancies arose in official name records. This practice appears to have contributed to the demand for birth-record corrections during the study period, although the number of applications directly attributable to such instructions was not separately measured.

The study examines the implications of Rule 5(4) of the Tamil Nadu Registration of Births and Deaths Rules, 2025, which prescribes the first-name, middle-name and last-name format and prohibits abbreviations in names appearing in the prescribed forms. It argues that effective implementation requires clear operational guidance, evidence-based correction procedures, careful treatment of legacy records and coordination among the authorities responsible for maintaining identity information.

A Culturally Responsive Name Data and Identity Continuity Framework is proposed to improve name-data quality, administrative accountability and citizen convenience without compromising the legal integrity of personal identity. The study contributes an application-based perspective to the discussion of name standardisation and offers practical

https://doi.org/10.36282/IJASRM/11.10.2026.2010

recommendations for municipal administration, birth-registration authorities and related public institutions.

Keywords: *Personal-name standardisation; birth registration; educational records; Aadhaar; PAN; Tamil Nadu Registration of Births and Deaths Rules, 2025; administrative reform; digital identity; public administration; citizen-centric governance.*

1. Introduction

Personal names are fundamental identifiers in public administration. They connect individuals with birth-registration records, educational qualifications, identity documents, taxation records, employment records and access to public services. Consistency in personal-name information is therefore essential for accurate record maintenance, efficient verification and the prevention of avoidable administrative disputes.

India's diverse linguistic and cultural traditions produce a wide range of naming practices. Depending on regional and family conventions, a name may include a given name, a parent's name, a family name or an initial representing one of these elements. The position of an initial may vary, and some individuals may not use a conventional surname. Names may also be represented differently across handwritten records, printed certificates and digital databases.

These variations can become problematic when administrative systems require information to be entered into predefined fields. A name recorded with an initial in a birth certificate may appear with an expanded name in an educational record. A parent's initial may be placed before the child's name in one record and after it in another. Full stops, spacing and spelling may also differ.

Although some discrepancies are merely differences in presentation, others may involve genuine errors in the recorded particulars. The distinction is important because correcting a formatting variation, correcting a clerical error and changing a person's substantive name may involve different evidence and legal procedures.

The Tamil Nadu Registration of Births and Deaths Rules, 2025, provide an important regulatory context for examining these issues. Rule 5(4) establishes a prescribed name format for the forms governed by the Rules and prohibits abbreviations in names appearing in those forms. The implementation of this requirement raises practical questions about name-entry procedures, existing records, initial expansion and the treatment of culturally diverse naming conventions.

The present study examines these challenges through 267 correction applications received at Sankarankovil Municipality during August and September 2026. In addition to analysing the categories of correction requests, the study considers the reported practice of directing citizens to correct their birth certificates when discrepancies arise in other official records.

The central argument is that personal-name standardisation should be treated as a coordinated public-administration and identity-continuity issue rather than solely as a clerical correction exercise.

2. Objectives of the Study

The study has the following objectives:

1. To classify and quantify birth-record correction applications received at Sankarankovil Municipality during the study period.

2. To identify the proportion of requests relating to initials, name order, punctuation and formatting.

3. To examine corrections involving children's names and the names of fathers and mothers.

4. To analyse the implications of Rule 5(4) of the Tamil Nadu Registration of Births and Deaths Rules, 2025.

5. To examine the administrative challenges associated with discrepancies across birth certificates, educational records, Aadhaar and PAN.

6. To discuss how instructions from other authorities may contribute to demand for birth-record corrections.

7. To propose a practical framework for improving name-data consistency, correction procedures and citizen experience.

3. Background of Naming Practices and Administrative Records in India

3.1 Diversity in personal-name structures

Indian naming practices reflect regional languages, cultural traditions, family structures and personal preferences. A personal name may contain a given name, a parental name, an inherited family identifier or an initial representing a longer name.

In some naming conventions, initials are commonly used as part of a person's recorded name. In other cases, the family name follows the given name. Some individuals use a single name or a structure that does not correspond neatly to the conventional first-name, middle-name and last-name arrangement.

Administrative systems, however, often depend on standardised data fields. The resulting mismatch can lead to different representations of the same person's name across records.

An effective standardisation policy should distinguish between the structure used to store a name and the substantive identity represented by it. Uniform formatting should not lead to unsupported assumptions about a person's surname, parental name or identity.

https://doi.org/10.36282/IJASRM/11.10.2026.2010

3.2 Birth registration as a foundational record

Birth registration establishes an official record of a birth under the applicable legal framework. The information recorded may subsequently be used in school admissions, educational documentation, identity verification and other administrative processes.

An error in the original entry may therefore have consequences beyond the registration office. Conversely, a difference between a birth certificate and a later document does not automatically establish that the birth entry is erroneous.

The competent authority must consider the nature of the discrepancy, the evidence available and the legal provisions governing correction of the entry.

3.3 Educational records and identity documents

Schools, examination boards and universities may preserve names according to their respective admission and correction procedures. Aadhaar and PAN are maintained under separate administrative and regulatory arrangements.

The Unique Identification Authority of India provides procedures for updating Aadhaar demographic information, including names, subject to applicable requirements and supporting documentation. The Income Tax Department likewise provides a separate procedure for changes or corrections in PAN data. These processes demonstrate that corrections are institution-specific and that a change in one record does not necessarily update every other record automatically.

Consequently, citizens may have to approach multiple institutions when their records differ. Without clear guidance, they may be directed to correct one document before the receiving authority has fully explained the nature of the discrepancy.

4. Legal and Regulatory Framework

4.1 Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1969

The Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1969, provides the principal statutory framework for the registration of births and deaths in India.

Section 15 addresses the correction or cancellation of entries in the register. It provides for correction or cancellation where an entry is established to be erroneous in form or substance, or has been fraudulently or improperly made, subject to the applicable state rules.

This provision is important because a correction request must be considered through the relevant statutory procedure. An applicant's preference for a different name format, by itself, does not establish that an existing entry is legally incorrect.

The competent authority must examine the request in accordance with the applicable law, the nature of the correction and the evidence presented.

4.2 Rule 5(4) of the Tamil Nadu Registration of Births and Deaths Rules, 2025

The Tamil Nadu Registration of Births and Deaths Rules, 2025, were notified through the Tamil Nadu Government Gazette on 31 July 2025, under Notification No. SRO A-20(a)/2025, issued pursuant to G.O. Ms. No. 351 of the Health and Family Welfare Department.

Rule 5(4) states:

"Name, wherever it occurs, in the Forms in these Rules shall be provided in the format of (first name) (middle name) (last name) and name shall not contain any abbreviations."

The provision establishes two requirements for names appearing in the forms governed by the Rules:

• Prescribed name format: names are to be represented in the first-name, middle-name and last-name sequence.

• Prohibition of abbreviations: abbreviations are not to be used in names appearing in those forms.

These requirements are directly relevant to the applications analysed in this study, particularly those involving initial addition, initial placement and punctuation.

However, the provision should be applied with attention to its legal scope and the procedures governing existing records. It should not be interpreted, without further legal authority, as permitting the automatic rewriting of every legacy entry or the invention of a surname for a person who does not use one.

The implementation of the prescribed format requires clear guidance on how name components should be recorded, when clarification from the applicant is necessary and how existing entries should be handled under the applicable correction provisions.

The rule therefore provides an opportunity to improve consistency while also creating an administrative need for careful interpretation, training and transparent procedures.

4.3 Implications for Aadhaar and PAN

Aadhaar and PAN have separate administrative purposes and correction procedures. Aadhaar updates are governed by UIDAI requirements, while PAN corrections follow the procedures prescribed by the relevant income-tax authorities and authorised service providers.

A correction to a birth certificate does not automatically guarantee a corresponding change in Aadhaar, PAN or educational records. The receiving

https://doi.org/10.36282/IJASRM/11.10.2026.2010

authority may require a separate application and supporting evidence.

For the purposes of this study, discrepancies can be classified into three broad types:

1. Formatting variation: differences in punctuation, spacing or the placement of initials.

2. Documentary discrepancy: differences in spelling or recorded particulars requiring verification.

3. Substantive name change: a request to adopt a different name rather than merely correct an existing entry.

These categories are analytical distinctions proposed for the study; the actual legal procedure and evidentiary requirements depend on the relevant authority and applicable rules.

The distinction is particularly important when citizens are instructed to correct a birth certificate to resolve a discrepancy in another document. A coordinated approach should identify the nature of the discrepancy before directing the citizen to undertake a correction.

5. Research Methodology

5.1 Research design and location

The study adopts a descriptive, retrospective, application-based research design.

The study location is Sankarankovil Municipality, Tamil Nadu, India. The study period covers 1 August 2026 to 30 September 2026.

A total of 267 birth-record correction applications, classified under 15 categories, form the dataset for analysis.

5.2 Data source and classification

The study uses the category-wise counts supplied from the administrative correction records. The categories cover initials, name order, punctuation, children's names, parental names, address and spacing.

The study analyses the frequency and percentage of each category to identify the predominant forms of correction demand.

The data are treated as counts of applications, not as counts of unique individuals across all government databases. The figures do not establish that every applicant experienced discrepancies in every document system.

5.3 Statistical method

The percentage for each category was calculated using the following formula:

Percentage = (Number of applications in category / Total applications) × 100

The individual categories were also grouped into broader analytical themes to examine the overall contribution of initial-related and formatting requests to the correction workload.

5.4 Administrative context

During the study period, an important administrative observation was that citizens were reportedly instructed by various authorities to correct their birth certificates when inconsistencies arose in official name records.

This observation provides context for the receipt of correction applications. However, the available dataset does not separately identify the number of applicants who were referred by another authority or establish that such instructions caused every application.

The study therefore treats the reported instructions as a contextual administrative factor rather than a quantitatively established causal relationship.

5.5 Limitations

The study is limited to one municipality and a two-month period. Its findings cannot be generalised to the entire population of Tamil Nadu or India without comparative data.

The dataset does not provide individual application dates, year-wise trends beyond the specified study period, reasons for each correction, supporting documents, processing times, approval or rejection outcomes, or the cost incurred by applicants.

It also does not establish the prevalence of name discrepancies across all four document systems. The study is intended to identify patterns in the recorded correction workload and develop practical administrative recommendations.

6. Results and Quantitative Analysis

6.1 Category-wise distribution of applications

Table 1. Distribution of birth-record correction applications at Sankarankovil Municipality, August–September 2026

S.No	Category of correction	Apps	%
1	Initial addition	40	14.98
2	Initial deletion	1	0.37
3	Initial expansion	0	0.00
4	Initial prefix-to-suffix change	48	17.98
5	Initial suffix-to-prefix change	6	2.25
6	Dot deletion	36	13.48
7	Child-name correction	5	1.87
8	Father's-name spelling correction	10	3.75
9	Mother's-name spelling correction	20	7.49
10	Father's-name initial change/addition	37	13.86
11	Mother's-name initial change/addition	42	15.73
12	Father's-name correction	8	3.00
13	Mother's-name correction	7	2.62
14	Address correction	2	0.75
15	Spacing correction	5	1.87
	Total	**267**	**100**

Note: Percentages rounded to two decimal places. Totals may show minor differences when rounded percentages are added.

https://doi.org/10.36282/IJASRM/11.10.2026.2010

6.2 Initial-related and name-formatting corrections

The first six categories in Table 1 comprise initial addition, deletion, expansion, changes in initial placement and dot deletion. Together, they account for 131 applications, representing 49.06% of the total.

A further 79 applications concern changes or additions to the initials of fathers and mothers. When these categories are combined, 210 applications, or 78.65%, relate to initials and name-formatting issues.

This is the principal quantitative finding of the study. Nearly four out of every five recorded applications concerned initials or the way names were represented in birth-registration records.

The result suggests that name formatting constitutes a substantial component of the correction workload in the studied records. It also supports the need for clear data-entry instructions and a consistent procedure for recording and verifying name components.

The figures do not establish why every application was made. Nevertheless, they identify initial-related corrections as a priority area for administrative improvement.

6.3 Initial prefix-to-suffix changes

The largest individual category is the change of an initial from prefix to suffix, with 48 applications (17.98%). Initial addition accounts for 40 applications (14.98%), and changes or additions to fathers' initials account for 37 applications (13.86%).

These results demonstrate the practical significance of initial placement in the studied administrative records.

The differences may arise from varying naming conventions, institutional data-entry practices or applicants' preferred name representation. The available figures do not distinguish between these possible explanations.

A standardised procedure should therefore require clarification and appropriate evidence where necessary rather than relying on assumptions about the meaning or position of an initial.

6.4 Removal of punctuation

Dot deletion accounts for 36 applications, representing 13.48% of the total.

Punctuation may appear minor, but differences in its use can affect the visual representation and automated comparison of names. An initial followed by a full stop may be displayed differently from the same initial without punctuation.

The number of applications in this category supports the need for clear instructions regarding punctuation in prescribed name fields.

However, the study does not establish that punctuation differences caused failures in Aadhaar, PAN or educational-record verification. Such a relationship would require additional evidence.

6.5 Corrections involving children's and parents' names

The child-name correction category contains five applications (1.87%). Father's-name spelling corrections account for 10 applications (3.75%), and mother's-name spelling corrections account for 20 applications (7.49%).

A further eight applications concern fathers' names and seven concern mothers' names.

Together, these five categories account for 50 applications, representing 18.73% of the total.

This finding demonstrates that the correction workload extends beyond the child's own name to include the parental particulars recorded in birth-registration entries.

A parental-name discrepancy may require comparison with relevant supporting records. The appropriate procedure should distinguish between a minor spelling error, an initial-related change and a substantive change to a recorded name.

6.6 Address and spacing corrections

Address corrections account for two applications (0.75%), while spacing corrections account for five applications (1.87%).

Together, these categories account for seven applications, representing 2.62% of the total.

Although numerically small, these requests demonstrate that the correction workload includes non-name particulars and the formatting of recorded information.

The low number of address corrections should not be interpreted as proof that address data are generally accurate. It indicates only that few applications in this dataset were classified under that category.

6.7 Consolidated thematic findings

Table 2. Broad classification of correction applications

Broad category	Apps	%
Initial and name-formatting issues, including parental initials	210	78.65
Child-name and parental-name corrections	50	18.73
Address corrections	2	0.75
Spacing corrections	5	1.87
Total	**267**	**100**

The consolidated findings establish that initial-related and formatting corrections dominate the applications analysed at Sankarankovil Municipality during the study period.

This distribution provides an empirical basis for prioritising standardised name-entry procedures,

https://doi.org/10.36282/IJASRM/11.10.2026.2010

clearer correction guidance and more consistent treatment of initial-related requests.

7. Discussion

7.1 Name standardisation as an administrative challenge

The findings indicate that name standardisation is not merely a question of spelling. The representation and placement of initials, the use of punctuation and the recording of parental names form a substantial part of the correction workload.

These variations may appear minor individually, but repeated applications can generate administrative work for registrars and additional procedural requirements for citizens.

The findings support the need to address name consistency at the point of original registration wherever possible, rather than relying exclusively on subsequent corrections.

7.2 Institutional instructions and the demand for birth-record corrections

An important observation from the study is that citizens were reportedly instructed by various authorities to correct their birth certificates when discrepancies arose in official name records.

Such instructions may lead citizens to approach the birth-registration office even when the underlying difference concerns formatting or the conventions used by another institution.

The resulting correction demand raises a policy question: should every difference between two official documents result in a change to the birth-registration record, or should the responsible authorities first determine the nature and origin of the discrepancy?

A more appropriate process would distinguish between an error in the original entry, a formatting difference and a substantive name change. This would help identify the competent authority and the appropriate procedure for each case.

The study does not establish that all applications resulted from such instructions or that every instruction was inappropriate. The observation instead highlights the need for clearer coordination and better communication between institutions.

7.3 Legacy records and prospective compliance

The 2025 Rules establish a prescribed name format for the forms governed by the Rules. Existing records, however, may have been created under different administrative practices.

A legacy entry containing an initial or a different name arrangement should not automatically be treated as erroneous without considering the applicable law and circumstances of the original registration.

Administrative procedures should distinguish between:

- applying the prescribed format to new registrations;
- correcting a demonstrable error in an existing entry;
- recording a properly supported expansion or change requested by an applicant; and
- processing a substantive name change under the applicable procedure.

This distinction would help implement the prescribed format without treating every historical variation as an error requiring automatic alteration.

7.4 Fragmented institutional responsibility

Birth-registration authorities, schools, examination boards, universities, UIDAI and PAN authorities operate under different legal and administrative arrangements.

A correction completed in one system does not necessarily update another system. Citizens may therefore have to submit separate applications and provide supporting documents to different institutions.

This institutional fragmentation can create uncertainty about which record should be corrected first and what evidence is necessary.

A coordinated approach should provide clear guidance while preserving the independent legal responsibilities of each authority.

7.5 Accuracy versus uniformity

Uniformity and accuracy are related but distinct objectives. A database can be uniformly formatted and still contain an incorrect name. Conversely, two records may use different formats while referring to the same individual.

A punctuation difference may be a formatting variation, while a materially different spelling may require documentary verification. A missing surname may also reflect a legitimate naming convention.

Consequently, standardisation should combine consistent data representation with reliable identity verification and culturally responsive treatment of names.

7.6 Citizen burden and administrative efficiency

Correction applications can require citizens to obtain documents, prepare applications, travel to offices and follow up on pending requests. These activities also consume the time of public officials.

The 267 applications analysed in this study illustrate the volume of correction work recorded during the two-month period. The study does not quantify the financial cost or processing time, but it identifies categories where clearer initial-entry procedures and guidance could plausibly reduce avoidable requests.

https://doi.org/10.36282/IJASRM/11.10.2026.2010

The reported instructions from other authorities further highlight the importance of ensuring that citizens are directed to the appropriate correction procedure rather than being required to undertake unnecessary changes.

8. Proposed Framework: Culturally Responsive Name Data and Identity Continuity Framework (CR-NDICF)

This study proposes a Culturally Responsive Name Data and Identity Continuity Framework (CR-NDICF) to improve the consistency and reliability of personal-name information across public records.

The framework is a policy proposal developed from the study findings. It is not an existing government programme.

8.1 Structured name entry

Registration forms and data-entry systems should provide clear fields for the name components required under the applicable rules.

Operational guidance should explain how to proceed when a person's naming convention does not correspond neatly to a conventional three-part name structure. Staff should seek clarification where necessary instead of inventing missing name components or assuming that an initial represents a particular name.

9. Policy Recommendations

9.1 Standard operating procedure for name entry

A written standard operating procedure should explain how names are to be entered in accordance with Rule 5(4) and the applicable forms.

The procedure should include examples of common naming patterns, instructions for handling initials and guidance on when clarification from the applicant is necessary.

9.2 Separate procedures for different correction types

Formatting issues, spelling errors and substantive name changes should be distinguished for administrative assessment.

The competent authority should determine the applicable evidence and procedure under the relevant rules. A single unnecessarily burdensome process should not be imposed on every category.

9.3 Better coordination among authorities

Authorities that identify name discrepancies should explain the precise nature of the problem and the procedure applicable to the relevant record.

Before directing citizens to correct birth certificates, the responsible institution should clarify whether the discrepancy concerns the original birth entry, a formatting variation or a matter that must be addressed through another authorised process.

This recommendation seeks to reduce avoidable applications without discouraging legitimate corrections.

9.4 Staff training

Registrars and data-entry personnel should receive training on the prescribed name format, the treatment of initials, documentary verification, correction categories and the importance of preserving the integrity of original entries.

Training should also address culturally diverse naming conventions and the risks associated with making assumptions about missing name components.

9.5 Citizen awareness

Public notices and application guidance should explain the procedure for initial addition, deletion, expansion, repositioning, punctuation removal and correction of parental names.

Citizens should be informed about the relevant authority, the documents that may be required and the distinction between correcting an existing entry and changing a name.

9.6 Administrative monitoring

Municipalities should periodically review correction applications to identify recurring categories and opportunities for process improvement.

Suggested indicators include:

- Number of applications by correction category and month.
- Number of applications reportedly arising from instructions by other authorities.
- Average processing time by category.
- Applications approved, rejected or returned for additional evidence.
- Repeat applications concerning the same entry.
- Common reasons for incomplete applications.
- Corrections attributable to documented data-entry errors.
- Citizen complaints concerning inconsistent records.

These indicators would enable future studies to evaluate whether improved procedures reduce avoidable correction demand.

9.7 Lawful data coordination and privacy

Any future mechanism for sharing or matching personal-name information across institutions should operate within applicable legal authority and privacy safeguards.

https://doi.org/10.36282/IJASRM/11.10.2026.2010

Access controls, data minimization, appropriate consent where required and auditability should be integral to any proposed system.

The objective should be to improve consistency and service delivery without creating unnecessary centralization or unauthorized alteration of personal information.

10. Research Implications and Future Scope

The study provides an application-based view of name-correction demand within a municipal administration. Its findings identify initial-related and formatting corrections as the principal categories in the studied records.

Future research should examine whether similar patterns occur in other municipalities and districts. Comparative studies could assess how administrative practices, local naming conventions and institutional instructions influence the categories of applications received.

A longitudinal study could compare correction applications before and after the implementation of standardized name-entry procedures. Such research would require reliable dates and comparable records to distinguish genuine changes in demand from differences in recording practices.

Further investigation should also document the reasons applicants give for seeking corrections. In particular, researchers should record whether applicants were instructed by schools, examination boards, identity-document authorities or other institutions to correct their birth certificates.

Where ethically and legally permissible, interviews with applicants and registration personnel could clarify the practical consequences of name discrepancies. Such research would help establish whether repeated correction requests result primarily from original data-entry errors, differences in institutional formats or broader inconsistencies in administrative guidance.

A comparative study of the correction procedures followed by birth-registration authorities, educational institutions, UIDAI and PAN authorities could also identify opportunities for better coordination.

11. Limitations of the Study

The study is limited to 267 correction applications recorded at Sankarankovil Municipality during August and September 2026. The results should not be interpreted as representing all municipalities or the entire population of Tamil Nadu or India.

The dataset provides category-wise counts but does not contain detailed information about individual applicants, supporting documents, reasons for correction or processing outcomes.

Although citizens were reportedly instructed by various authorities to correct their birth certificates, the number of applications directly attributable to such instructions was not separately recorded in the supplied data. The study therefore identifies this practice as an important administrative observation but does not establish a quantified causal relationship.

The study also does not establish that every applicant experienced a discrepancy across birth registration, educational records, Aadhaar and PAN. The cross-document implications discussed in the article represent administrative concerns and policy questions requiring further empirical investigation.

Finally, the data do not provide a before-and-after comparison of the 2025 Rules. The study cannot therefore establish whether the Rules caused an increase or decrease in correction applications.

These limitations define the scope of the conclusions while identifying priorities for future research.

12. Recommendations for Policy and Administrative Reform

1. National name-data standardisation: The Government of India should consider establishing a common name-data standard for birth registration, school and university records, Aadhaar, PAN, passports and other public databases, covering name order, initials, abbreviations, fonts, character encoding and data formats.

2. Notified implementation cut-off date: A common implementation date should be notified after consultation with central and state authorities, supported by phased implementation and a transition period for legacy records. Existing valid documents should not be invalidated automatically.

3. Verified parental particulars at birth registration: Subject to appropriate legal authority and authorised technical integration, the birth-registration system should facilitate verification and pre-population of the names of both parents using reliable source records, including Aadhaar where legally permitted. The reporting individual or institution should verify the particulars before submission, and the registration authority should retain responsibility for the accuracy and legality of the entry.

4. Address recording and historical preservation: The system should incorporate a provision for the automatic retrieval and recording of both parents' names and addresses from their Aadhaar records, subject to applicable legal authorisation and data-protection requirements. The mother's Aadhaar address at the time of birth registration should be captured as the address at the time of birth, while the father's Aadhaar address should be recorded as the permanent address. These particulars should be captured and preserved as a one-time historical record

https://doi.org/10.36282/IJASRM/11.10.2026.2010

at the time of birth registration and should not be automatically modified when either parent subsequently updates their Aadhaar address. Any correction to the recorded birth particulars should be made only through the applicable authorised procedure.

5. One-time capture with controlled reuse: Verified parental particulars should be captured at the original registration stage and reused in subsequent authorised processes where legally permissible, instead of repeatedly requesting citizens to enter the same information. Any correction should follow the applicable statutory procedure, with an auditable record of changes.

6. Legal and privacy safeguards: Implementation should comply with the Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1969, the applicable Tamil Nadu Registration of Births and Deaths Rules, 2025, and the legal framework governing Aadhaar and personal data. Aadhaar numbers should be collected or accessed only where authorised and necessary; alternative verification methods, access controls and data-minimisation safeguards should be provided as required.

7. Monitoring administrative burden: Municipalities should monitor correction frequency, repeat applications, processing time, document requirements and citizen costs. The proposed Name Correction Burden Index (NCBI) and Citizen Transaction Burden (CTB) measures may be used to evaluate whether the reforms reduce avoidable correction demand and improve service delivery.

References

[1] Government of India, The Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1969, Act No. 18 of 1969, as amended. India Code. (1969). https://www.indiacode.nic.in/

[2] Government of Tamil Nadu, Health and Family Welfare Department, The Tamil Nadu Registration of Births and Deaths Rules, 2025. Tamil Nadu Government Gazette Extraordinary, No. 417, Part III, Section 1(a), 31 July 2025. Notification No. SRO A-20(a)/2025, G.O. Ms. No. 351. (2025). https://www.stationeryprinting.tn.gov.in/

[3] Unique Identification Authority of India, Updating Data on Aadhaar. Government of India. (n.d.). https://uidai.gov.in/pa/updating-data-on-aadhaar

[4] Unique Identification Authority of India, List of Acceptable Documents for Aadhaar Enrolment and Update. Government of India. (n.d.). https://uidai.gov.in/

[5] Income Tax Department, Government of India, PAN Services and Information: Changes or Correction in PAN Data. (n.d.). https://www.incometaxindia.gov.in/en/pan

https://doi.org/10.36282/IJASRM/11.10.2026.2010