

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

1) CWP No.22738 of 2013 (O&M)

Guru Nanak Girls College, Model Town, Ludhiana ...Petitioner

Versus

The Panjab University, Chandigarh and others ...Respondents

2) CWP No.19908 of 2013 (O&M)

Guru Nanak Girls College, Model Town, Ludhiana ...Petitioner

Versus

The Panjab University, Chandigarh and others ...Respondents

Date of decision: 21.12.2015

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEKHER DHAWAN**

Present: Mr. Rajiv Atma Ram, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Arjun Partap Atma Ram, Advocate,
for the petitioner (s).

Mr. Amar Vivek, Advocate,
for respondents No.1 and 2.

SATISH KUMAR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

This order shall dispose of two Civil Writ Petitions which have been filed under Article 226/227 of Constitution of India to issue a writ in the nature of certiorari quashing the provisions of 9.1, 9.2 and 9.3 of the Panjab University Regulations contained in Chapter VIII(E) Volume I (2007 edition) and Regulation 10.2 of Chapter II A(i) of the Panjab University Calendar, 2007 as are ultra vires, the provisions of Article 19 of

the Constitution of India, the provisions of Punjab Affiliated Colleges (Security of Service of Employees) Act, 1974 and the provisions of Sections 8 and 11 of the Punjab University Act, 1947 and beyond the Regulations making power contained in Section 31 of the Panjab University Act, 1947 and also directing the respondent-University to place on record the enquiry report with all documents relied by the respondent in passing of the impugned order dated 16.08.2013, for quashing the impugned orders dated 16.08.2013 as well as for directing respondent Nos. 2 and 3 to forthwith initiate disciplinary action against respondent No.4.

When these petitions were filed, the entire setup of the Panjab University was different.

Counsel for the respondent-University states that now the entire setup has been changed and if the petitioner is having any grouse, he can make a representation with that regard to the University and if such representation is filed, the same shall be considered after providing opportunity for hearing to the petitioner before passing a speaking order expeditiously, preferably within a period of 2 or 3 months.

Accordingly, with the aforesaid liberty, both the petitions stands disposed of.

In case the petitioner still not satisfied with any order passed, it will be open for the petitioner to challenge the same in accordance with rule.

(SATISH KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

(SHEKHER DHAWAN)
JUDGE

December 21, 2015