

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

CWP No.17449 of 2018

Date of Decision : 19.07.2018

Agamjot Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: Mr. Kanwar Pahul Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MAHESH GROVER, J. (Oral)

The petitioner impugns the decision of the University dated 16.05.2018 (Annexure P-3) reducing the reservation of seats intended for sports persons to 1%.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the policy of the Government of Punjab mandates 2% reservation and, therefore, reduction in intake of sports persons by reducing the percentage of reservation is not only contrary to the policy of the State but also discourages the sports persons of eminence to gain admission in the courses of the University.

We have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and have perused the impugned order which though while reducing the percentage has increased the intake considering the performance of the University in sports by directing that two supernumerary seats of sports persons be created in each course. This, according to the University, is likely to double the intake of sports persons.

If that is so, we cannot test the decision of the University being a policy matter which does not ipso facto show any arbitrariness or conflict with law. Suffice it to say that reservation for sports persons is intended to encourage the students involved in sporting activities to the educational streams. If this objective is sought to be achieved by any other means, then merely because the percentage of reservation has been reduced to 1% would be inconsequential, particularly when these reservations are not flowing from a constitutional mandate. We would thus find no ground to interfere in the present petition.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner states that he has made a representation and if seats are available, his candidature be considered.

We would not comment on the merits of the case but leave it open for the University to consider the representation and look into the claim set out by the petitioner in his representation, as expeditiously as possible.

Disposed of.

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE

19.07.2018
dss

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No