

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(134)

CWP-295-2023

Date of decision: - 09.01.2023

Amanpreet Kaur

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Ms. Neha Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ferry Sofat, Additional Advocate General, Punjab
for respondent No.1.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

This writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent to issue the correct matric certificate of petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in the certificate dated 28.05.2016 issued by the Central Board of Secondary Education, Delhi/respondent No.2, name of father of the petitioner has been mentioned as “Sukhwinder Singh”, whereas, the correct name of father of the petitioner is “Sukhvinder Singh”. It is further submitted that that the entire issue with respect to corrections to be made in the certificate issued by the Central Board of Secondary Education has been adjudicated upon by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in a detailed judgment

passed in case titled as **Jigyada Yadav (minor) (through Guardian/father Hari Singh) Vs. CBSE (Central Board of Secondary Education) and others** and other connected matters reported as **2021(7) SCC 535** by a three Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and has prayed that the petitioner be permitted to file representation keeping in view the parameters laid down in the abovesaid judgment and prays that the respondents be directed to consider the said representation and pass a speaking order within a period of four weeks from the date the said representation is received by the respondents.

Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of in the following terms:-

- 1) The petitioner is granted liberty to file a detailed representation and annex all the documents in light of the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Jigyada Yadav (minor)'s case (supra)**.
- 2) Respondent No.2 is directed to decide the said representation as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of the said representation, in accordance with law.

January 09, 2023
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No