

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

(242)

**2023:PHHC:098505
CWP-8611-2022
Date of Decision: 01.08.2023**

Ravina

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & others

--Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL.

Present:- Mr. Devender S. Punia, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Joshi, DAG, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL.J (Oral)

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ, order or direction especially in the nature of mandamus directing respondent no.3-Commission to award 4 marks of higher education to the petitioner for the purpose of final selection.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner in the present writ petition, the petitioner had given a representation dated 17.2.2021 (Annexure P-10) to respondent No.3 and the petitioner would be satisfied at this stage, in case, respondent No.3 is directed to consider the said representation dated 17.2.2021 (Annexure P-10) in a time bound manner and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then to grant necessary relief, in accordance with law.
3. Learned State Counsel has submitted that respondent No.3 would consider the said representation dated 17.2.2021 (Annexure P-10) in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

4. Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with direction to respondent No.3 to consider the representation dated 17.2.2021 (Annexure P-10), in accordance with law, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then respondent No.3 would grant necessary relief, in accordance with law and in case, respondent No.3 is of the opinion that the pleas raised by the petitioner are not meritorious then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

5. This Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondent No.3 would consider the case of the petitioner independently and in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

01.08.2023

lucky

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No