

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPC No. 2270 of 2016**

Shashank Kumar S/o Gama Ray, Aged About 22 Years R/o Police Line,
Hotel Shish Mahal, Tilkamanjhi, P.S. & District Bhagalpur (Bihar)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Union Of India, Through – Secretary, All India Council Of Technical Education (A I C T E), New Delhi
2. The Director, All India Council Of Technical Education (A I C T E), New Delhi
3. The Director, University Grant Commission, New Delhi
4. The Vice Chancellor, M A T S University, Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
5. The Examination Controller, M A T S University, Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
6. The Registrar, M A T S University, Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
7. The Director, M A T S School Of Engineering & Tech, M A T S University, Gullu Arang, Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. R.R. Sinha, Advocate
For Respondent No.2	:	Mr. M.K. Jaiswal, Advocate appears under instructions from Mr. Sandeep Dubey, Advocate
For Respondent No.3	:	Mr. S.S. Rajput, Advocate
For other respondents	:	None appears

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava**Order On Board****23/03/2017**

Heard.

Though, notice was issued by this Court for appearance of the Registrar, MATS University today, the concerned Officer is not present in the Court in the first round.

Let the case be called for hearing at 2:15 PM.

Sd/-

(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)

J U D G E

Later on

Heard.

1. In this case, when none appeared for respondents No. 4 to 7 despite service of notice, this Court directed the Registrar, MATS University, Raipur to appear in person today.
2. The office report shows that order dated 17.02.2017 of this Court has been communicated to respondent No.6 by e-mail and the sending report is also attached.
3. No reply has been filed by respondent No.6 nor he appeared despite service of notice and he has not even respected the order of the Court directing personal appearance. Therefore, in these circumstances, instead of issuing any coercive process for appearance, it would be appropriate that the matter, itself, is decided finally.
4. The petitioner has come out with the grievance that even though, the petitioner has passed all the eight semesters examination but degree is not being provided to the petitioner by respondent No.6. The counsel appearing for respondent No.1 and 2 submit that they have No Objection to relief framed by the petitioner and it is for the University to oppose.
5. The petitioner has clearly stated that he has cleared all the dues and fee and has passed all the eight semesters examination. The respondent No.6 is, therefore, directed to issue necessary certificate to the petitioner within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order.
6. Observing that respondent No.6 despite notice is not appearing, this Court has to caution that if the order of the Court is not complied with within the time stipulated, this Court would be construed to initiate appropriate proceeding.
7. With the aforesaid observation, the petition is allowed.

Sd/-

(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)

J U D G E