

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPC No. 1025 of 2015

1. Anuradha Jain D/o Shri P.C. Jain Aged About 22 years Shanti Vatika Near Anuradha Appt. Geeta Nagar, Choubey Colony, Raipur Chhattisgarh 492001

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. The Convener, Common Law Admission Test (CLAT-2015) Dr. Ram Manohar Lohiya National Law University (RMNLU) Sec. D1, LDA Colony, Kanpur Road Scheme, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh India 226012
2. Oil And Natural Gas Corporation Limited (ONGC) Through Deputy General Manager (IE)Rectt. Green Hills Tel Bhawan, Dehradun
3. Tehri Hydro Development Corporation Ltd (THDC) Through Deputy General Manager (Personnel - Policy) Ganga Bhawan, Pragatipuram Bypass Road, Rishikesh, Uttarakhand 249201
4. Metals And Minerals Trading Corporation (MMTC) Through General Manager (Personnel) Core -1, Scope Complex, 7 Institutional Area, Lodhi Road New Delhi 110003
5. Power Grid Corporation Of India Limited (PGCIL) Through General Manager B -9, Qutab Institutional Area Kotwaria Sarai, New Delhi 110016 Email Id et20@powergrid.co.in.

---- Respondent

For Petitioner : Ms. Akanksha Jain, Advocate.
For Respondent No.1 : Shri Sumesh Bajaj, Advocate.
For Respondent No.3 : Shri Neeraj Malhotra, Advocate.
For Respondent No.4 : Smt. Meena Shastri, Advocate.
For Respondent No.5 : Smt. Fouzia Mirza, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Pritinker Diwaker

Order On Board

06/07/2015

Main grievance of the petitioner is that while conducting Common Law Admission Test (in short "CLAT") examination for Post Graduate Course there were several irregularities committed by respondent No.1. The

petitioner has prayed for direction to the respondents to produce the entire record pertaining to the result of CLAT, to quash the result of the said examination and then to conduct fresh examination. It has been further prayed by the petitioner to cancel all those admissions which have been made pursuant to the result declared by respondent No.1 and that private respondents No. 2 to 5 be restrained from initiating recruitment process on the basis of result declared by respondent No.1.

In the return filed by respondent No.1 it has been stated that admission process has already been completed and classes in most of the law universities have also started. It has also been pleaded by respondent No.1 that almost similar petition was filed before the Bombay High Court and pursuant to direction issued by the Bombay High Court vide Annexure R-1/1, respondent No.1 is willing to reconsider all the questions and their model answers as pointed out by the petitioner in the present petition. Learned counsel submits that all the nine questions, of which reference has been given in the petition, would be referred to the committee of expert and accordingly, necessary orders would be passed.

In view of submission made in the return, counsel for the petitioner submits that at this stage she is not pressing any other relief and would be satisfied if all the nine questions mentioned in the petition are referred to the committee of expert and direction may be issued to the said committee to take steps expeditiously.

Considering the submissions made by the parties, the present petition is disposed of. As assured by respondent No.1, the expert committee would take decision on the questions referred to in the petition by the petitioner and then would take further steps in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible.

Sd/-

(Pritinker Diwaker)

JUDGE