

118

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

CWP-10037-2023

Date of decision : 09.05.2023

David Chandekar

...Petitioner

Versus

Maharishi Dayanand University and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Kunal Dawar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rao, Advocate for
Mr. Anurag Goyal, Advocate for respondent No.1.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondent Nos.1 and 2 to issue Roll Number/Admit Card for 6th semester examination of 3 year LLB Course so that he may take part in the Practical as well as in Theoretical Examination scheduled to be conducted from 09.05.2023 to 12.06.2023, which has been denied on account of shortage of attendance and the fact that the petitioner is in custody.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner would be satisfied in case, the present writ petition is treated as a representation and respondent No.1 considers the same as expeditiously as possible and in case, respondent No.1 finds merits in the same then permit

the petitioner to give 6th semester examination from the date the said decision is taken.

3. On the other hand, learned counsel for respondent No.1 has submitted that every endeavour would be made by respondent No.1 to consider the present writ petition as a representation within a period of one week from today and in case, any merit is found in the plea raised by the petitioner, then, to take necessary action in pursuance of the same, in accordance with law.

4. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with directions to respondent No.1 to consider the present writ petition as a representation and to consider the same, in accordance with law, within a period of one week from today and in case, respondent No.1 finds merit in the plea raised by the petitioner, then to take necessary action, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible.

5. It is, however, made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case of the petitioner and it would be open to respondent No.1 to consider the present writ petition as representation independently and in accordance with law.

09.05.2023

Pawan

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes/No

Whether reportable:-

Yes/No