

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-6904-2019

Date of decision : 17.11.2023

Paramjeet Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Ms.Sonia G. Singh, Legal Aid Counsel
for the petitioner.

Mr.Ravi Sharma, Standing Counsel
for respondent no.2.

Mr.Kannan Malik, Advocate
for respondent no.3.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. This is a civil writ petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of an appropriate writ, order or direction especially in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to declare the result of the petitioner of NEET conducted in 2018.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner would give a detailed representation to the competent authority of respondent no.2 and at this stage, would be satisfied in case the said representation is considered by the competent authority of respondent no.2 in a time bound manner and if after considering the same, in case, the plea by the petitioner is found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for respondent no.2 has submitted that the

competent authority of respondent no.2 would consider the said representation and decide the same within a period of 6 weeks from the date of the receipt of the said representation.

4. Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the competent authority of respondent no.2 to consider the representation of the petitioner and decide the same, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of 6 weeks from the date of the receipt of the representation and in case, after considering the same, the plea of the petitioner is found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioner and in case, the plea of the petitioner is not found to be meritorious, then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of 6 weeks from the date of the receipt of the representation.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the competent authority of respondent no.2 would consider and decide the representation independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

November 17, 2023.
Davinder Kumar

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