

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CWP No.122 of 2014
Decided on : 26.09.2016**

Santosh Kumari & others ... Petitioners
Versus
State of Haryana & others ... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE G.S. SANDHAWALIA

Present : None for the petitioners.

Mr.J.S.Bedi, Addl.A.G., Haryana.

Mr.A.S.Virk, Advocate, for respondent No.4.

G.S. Sandhawalia, J. (Oral)

Petitioners seek declaration of the result of Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) course and for further direction to receive the application forms by respondent No.2, for appearing in the Haryana Teachers Eligibility Test (HTET).

Writ petition was initially disposed of on 09.01.2014, without issuing notice of motion, with a direction to respondent No.4 to intimate the result of the petitioners for the B.Ed. course, for the session 2012-13, within a period of 2 weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the order. It is not disputed that in pursuance of the said directions, respondents-University also intimated the result of the petitioners on 10.02.2014 (Annexure R4/15 to R4/18). LPA-668-2014 had also been preferred against the said order, which has eventually been allowed on 07.09.2015 and the order dated 09.01.2014 was set aside, with a direction to consider the question whether the direction is liable to be issued for declaration of the result.

In the meantime, the petitioners' had also preferred CWP-10665-2014, challenging the decision of the University to cancel the admission of ineligible students on account of having passed their qualifying examinations from the Eastern Institute for Integrated Learning in Management University, Sikkim (EIILM University), through distant mode.

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CWP-122-2014

-2-

This Court, vide order dated 17.12.2015, in CWP-8062-2014 titled *Devki Nandan & another Vs. Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra & others* (Annexure R4/14) decided the issue against the petitioners by holding that the University was justified in cancelling the admissions as EIILM University had no jurisdiction to issue the degrees by way of distant mode.

In the absence of any material or evidence furnished by the petitioners, they were held not entitled for the said benefit. Counsel for respondent No.4, rather, points out that in the subsequent petition filed by the petitioners, i.e., CWP-10665-2014, the petitioners, in para 2, have rather admitted that they did their 3 years degree course of Arts from EIILM University, through distance education. The averments have been reproduced in para 15 of the written statement. Accordingly, petitioners' second writ petition was also dismissed, in view of Devki Nandan's case (supra).

Keeping in view the above discussion and since the petitioners have not studied by way of regular studies and the said degrees have not been recognized by the respondent-University, the respondents cannot be ordered to supply any detailed mark-card/certificate to the petitioners. Resultantly, the present writ petition stands dismissed.

SEPTEMBER 26th, 2016
sailesh

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No