

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (C) No. 149 of 2017**

Yajnaseni Singh aged about 18 years, Daughter of Bijayketan Singh, resident of village Gandhinagar Ward, Jagdalpur, Bastar, (Chhattisgarh).

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, Department of Health Education, Mantralaya Mahanadi Bhawan, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Director, Medical Education, Old Nursing Hostel, Near DKS Bhawan, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. Dean, Government Medical College, Ambikapur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	: Shri B.M.Roy, Advocate.
For Respondent/State	: Shri A.S.Kachhwaha, Additional Advocate General.

Hon'ble Shri Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri P Sam Koshy, J.

Judgment on Board**Per Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan, Chief Justice****27/03/2017**

1. The Petitioner was admitted to M.B.B.S course in the Government Medical College, Ambikapur. That admission stands cancelled. This is under challenge.
2. On the basis of the pleadings and materials on record, we have heard the learned counsel for the Petitioner and the learned Additional Advocate General for the State/Respondents.
3. Going by the writ petition, the return filed by the official Respondents and the rejoinder of the Petitioner, it is the indisputable fact that the Petitioner was admitted to the course by allotting a seat on the basis of reservation and that on further scrutiny of the cases of those candidates who were

allotted seats on reservation basis, it was noted that the Petitioner appeared under the State Quota whereas the caste certificate was issued in her favour by the Tahsildar, Ghatagaon of Orissa State, though the Petitioner was required to submit the caste certificate issued by the revenue officers of the State of Chhattisgarh. Hence, in conformity with Rule 12 of the Rules of 2016 which governed admission, the Petitioner was removed from the list of admitted candidates.

4. In response to the return of the official Respondents, the Petitioner attempted to make out a case by producing Annexure P/4. We have perused it. Even going by the affidavit filed for admission of that document and the rejoinder of the Petitioner, it is categorically admitted that the said document is only a domicile certificate. It does not refer to any fact that the Petitioner is a member of a community to which reservation is available in the State Quota in the State of Chhattisgarh. The domicile certificate which is attempted to be shown is insufficient to hold that the Petitioner's admission ought not to have been cancelled, going by the clear provisions of the rules which govern allotment of seats and admission under the State Quota.
5. For the following reasons, this writ petition fails. In the result, this writ petition is dismissed. Resultantly, any interim order already granted, including stay, will stand vacated.
6. The office will return the original Annexure P/4 which was produced in terms of the earlier order of this Court.

Sd/-

(Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-

(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE