

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

CWP No.27007 of 2018

Date of Decision : 22.10.2018

Priti

....Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

....Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL**

**Present: Mr.Vishal Nehra, Advocate
for the petitioner.**

MAHESH GROVER, J. (Oral)

This writ petition has been filed with a prayer that Annexure P-2, an undated communication of October 2018, be quashed.

Although the petition does not disclose the facts as it ought to have but the bare reading of Annexure P-2 makes it clear that the petitioner was admitted to the institute (respondent No.3) for a diploma course. Later on it was discovered by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities that the institute in question as also some others were not equipped appropriately to impart the education for the courses. Consequently, the admissions to the respondent No.3 as also some other institutes were cancelled but in order to rehabilitate the students who have got themselves enrolled in the said institute, Annexure P-2 was issued whereby it was directed that the six students mentioned therein would be accommodated in the colleges/institutes

in the vicinity.

The grievance of the petitioner is limited. She states that she being physically challenged would have to go to attend the classes to an institute which is far off.

After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner, we are of the opinion that the present petition probably is a proxy battle on behalf of the affected institute. The petition has evidently been propped up. The institute which stood to lose is not before us and nor do we have the advantage of the material that has been taken against the institute while cancelling the admission.

Consequently, we do not find any merit in the petition where the Government on its own has taken action against the errant institute and to safeguard the students has attempted to rehabilitate them in other institutes which are of requisite standards. We decline interference but direct the respondent No.2 to take into consideration the limited grievance of the petitioner of her inability to go to a far off institute and if possible adjust her in an institute which is closer to her place of residence.

Petition stands disposed of.

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE

22.10.2018
dss

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

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