

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No.25695 of 2013

Date of Decision.11.02.2015

Poonam

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. P.K. Ganga, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Keshav Gupta, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Anshul Jain, Advocate for
Mr. Amar Vivek, Advocate
for respondent No.4.

Mr. Vikas Chatrath, Advocate for
Mr. Kuldeep Tiwari, Advocate
for respondent No.5.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

-.-

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. The prayer in the writ petition is for consideration of the petitioner to the management quota for the BAMS Course for session 2013-2014. On the day when the case was brought for orders of 22.11.2013, the Court observed that the hurdle of the cut off date has paled into the background since the third counselling had not been held. The Court, therefore, observed that even the date of third counselling had not been informed and had merely ordered notice to the respondents. It also stated that in the event of a counselling to take place before the date when the Court had fixed the next date, the

petitioner would have the benefit of participation in the third counselling subject to the final outcome of the writ petition. It appears that the third counselling had been held but the petitioner is reported to have given representation to the respondent which was also not favourably considered. When the matter comes up now in 2015, the session 2013-2014 has come and gone and there is no scope for consideration for admission to a course which the petitioner has let go. It is simply a situation of the petitioner having missed the bus and there is no relief which is possible in this writ petition. If the petitioner is aggrieved that she is put to any monetary or mental loss, it will be appropriate for the petitioner to seek a suitable redress in a properly instituted civil action for damages. As of now, there is no relief possible.

2. The writ petition is dismissed.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

February 11, 2015
Pankaj*