

(101) IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.14052 of 2017
Date of decision: 15.01.2020

Monika Chahal Petitioner

Versus

M.D. University Rohtak and ors. Respondents

Before: Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S. Walia.

Present: Mr. Sandeep Singh Sangwan, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Anurag Goyal, Advocate for the respondents.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] Result of the candidates who had appeared in the interview including result of the petitioner who was allowed to appear in the interview under orders of the Court has been produced in a sealed cover. The same on opening reveals the marks obtained by the candidates against the three posts of Assistant Professor in the Department of Management under the General Category. Details of the marks obtained by the candidates recommended at serial Nos.1 to 3 as well as the marks obtained by the petitioner are reproduced as under:-

Sr. No.	Application No.	Name and Father's Name	Remarks, if any.
1.	10	Ms. Aarti D/o Sh. Kartar Singh	61.0
2.	69	Dr. Ishwar Mittal S/o Sh. B.R. Mittal	60.0
3.	284	Ms. Pooja Vyas D/o Sh. Sita Ram Vyas	59.0
4.	300	Ms. Monika Chahal D/o Sh. Karan Singh	42.3

[2] The mark-sheet produced by learned counsel for the respondents has also been shown to learned counsel for the petitioner who states that out of the 75 marks allocated for academics, the petitioner was awarded only 32.3 as against her entitlement to award of 47 marks.

[3] Learned counsel for the respondents states that although not admitted, yet even if the petitioner is awarded the marks as are claimed by her i.e. 47 out of 75 in academics as against the 32.3 marks awarded to her, even then the total marks obtained by the petitioner would be 57 whereas the last candidate recommended has been awarded 59 marks.

[4] Faced with the aforementioned situation, learned counsel for the petitioner states that he does not wish to pursue the writ petition any further.

[5] In view of the position as noted above, the writ petition is dismissed as not pressed.

[6] Result of the petitioner be resealed and returned to the learned counsel for the respondents.

[7] Stay granted by this Court vide order dated 24.08.2017 stands vacated.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

15.01.2020
amit

1. Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No.
2. Whether reportable : Yes/No.