

CWP No.10601 of 2016

[1]

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

**CWP No.10601 of 2016
Date of decision:25.05.2016**

Harnoor Momak Walia

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rakesh Kumar Jain

Present: Mr. Sukhdeep Singh Sandhu, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Rakesh Kumar Jain, J.

The petitioner is allegedly a domicile of Punjab, passed her MBBS from Shri Ram Rai Medical College, Dehradun, appeared in the PGET-2016, secured 604 marks and her name appeared at Sr. No.100 in the merit list. It is alleged that in the case of **Dr. Mitthat and others vs. State of Punjab and others**, CWP No.4324 of 2015, decided on 13.04.2015, the reservation for the "Punjab Residents Status" was held illegal by this Court and, therefore, she was told that she is no more eligible as she cannot be selected on the basis of "Punjab Residents Status". It is averred that on 19.05.2016, she came to know from her friend that the University had conducted 2nd counselling and some of the candidates of General Category, who had passed their MBBS from Punjab, were selected by the University in the MD Course. The petitioner allegedly submitted her application on 19.05.2016 which was received in the office of the Registrar at 5.30 p.m. and it was explained to the petitioner that since the time of the counselling was over, therefore, nothing can be done.

CWP No.10601 of 2016

[2]

Counsel for the petitioner has not disputed that there is no further counselling at present and the 2nd round of counselling has already been held from 17.05.2016 to 19.05.2016 but he has submitted that the petitioner is entitled for admission on the basis of her rank in the PGET-2016.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and examined the available record with his able assistance.

The prayer made by the petitioner for quashing the 2nd counselling of the General Category for the MD course and the selection list on the ground that she should have also been considered is totally misplaced because the petitioner has already missed the bus as she had reached at the counselling at 5.30 p.m. when it was already over.

Hence, there is no scope for interference in this petition and the same is hereby dismissed.

Before parting, it is pertinent to mention that when the writ petition was filed, an objection was raised by the Registry about the filing of Annexure P-4, which is just a page out of the decision of some case, but in reply to the objection, the petitioner had alleged that she had taken the printout of the order and the same has been appended with the writ petition with the remark "put up as it is". It was the duty of the petitioner to have attached the entire order passed by this Court of which the said page was a part. In any case, it is just a piece of advice to the petitioner to be more careful in future.

May 25, 2016
vinod*

(Rakesh Kumar Jain)
Judge