

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

103

CWP-29307-2017

Date of Decision: 21.12.2017

MANJEET KAUR

...PETITIONER

VS

PUNJABI UNIVERSITY PATIALA AND ORS.

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. S.P.Soi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

AJAY TEWARI, J.(Oral)

By this petition the petitioner has challenged the reply to the notice i.e. Annexure P-12.

Brief facts of the case are that the petitioner had applied for Ph.D in the year 2011. She had to submit her synopsis for evaluation to the Department of Research Board (DRB) by March 2013 which she did. She was asked to make certain modification in the synopsis. She did the same and submitted the revised synopsis on 28.1.2015. A meeting was scheduled for 17.2.2015, however the same was postponed because neither the petitioner nor supervisor were present. The petitioner thereafter kept silent for one year and ten months and wrote a letter on 20.12.2016 requesting the respondent-University for some information which was supplied to her. Now she has filed the present writ petition claiming that she is entitled to be considered as

registered candidate on resubmission of synopsis. It may be mentioned here that by letter Annexure P-12, the University has advised the petitioner that even now if the petitioner submits the synopsis with the standard of excellence expected of Ph.D thesis, the University have no objection in her pursuing the Ph.D programme.

Learned Counsel stated that in this view of the matter the petitioner could not press this petition and would work at the Ph.D programme in terms of the document Annexure P-12.

The petition stands disposed of.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending C.M, if any, also stand disposed of.

21.12.2017
anuradha

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned - Yes/No

Whether reportable - Yes/No