

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(108)

CWP-10882-2023

Date of decision: - 19.05.2023

Jashandeep Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Manik Makkar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ of mandamus or any other writ, order or direction directing the respondents to correct the mother's name of the petitioner from 'Daljit Kaur' to 'Dalbir Kaur' in the National Trade Certificate (Annexure P-1) dated 03.06.2021 issued by the Controller of Examination, Director General of Training, Ministry of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship/respondent No.2 to the petitioner on completion of course of Electrician.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised in the present writ petition, the petitioner has given a representation dated 18.10.2021 (Annexure P-9) to respondent No.2 and the petitioner would be satisfied in case respondent No.2 is directed to consider the representation dated 18.10.2021 (Annexure P-9) within a

specific time frame and in case the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, the necessary relief be granted to him.

3. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to consider the representation dated 18.10.2021 (Annexure P-9), within a period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order and in case, respondent No.2 is of the opinion that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritorious, then, the appropriate relief be granted to him. In case, respondent No.2 is of the opinion that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritless, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim of the petitioner be passed within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

4. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondent No.2 would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

May 19, 2023
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No