

226

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

CWP-17292-2020

Date of decision: 14.07.2023

Tasleema

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Joshi, DAG, Haryana
for respondent Nos.1 to 3.

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 in the nature of mandamus directing respondent No.4 to make the necessary corrections in the School Leaving Certificate issued by the office of respondent No.4 with respect to date of birth as well as the name of father of the petitioner and for issuance of a fresh School Leaving Certificate to her after making the necessary corrections.

2. Today, no one has put in appearance on behalf of the petitioner. None had appeared on her behalf on 10.10.2022 and 08.12.2022. As per report of the Registry, notice could not be issued to respondent No.4 due to non-filing of process fee.

3. This Court has perused the paper book and a perusal of the same would show that for the grievances raised in the present petition, the petitioner had given a representation dated 14.09.2020 (Annexure P-4) to respondent No.4. Since, a writ of mandamus is sought to be issued against respondent No.4, thus, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.4 to consider representation dated 14.09.2020 (Annexure P-4) as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of four 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 by the respondent No.4 then the respondent No.4 is directed to grant appropriate relief in accordance with law and in case, the respondent No.4 is of the opinion that the pleas raised by the petitioner are not found to be meritorious then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of four months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

4. This Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondent No.4 would consider and decide the case of the petitioner independently and in accordance with law.

5. It is made clear that in case, the petitioner is aggrieved with the present order passed, it would be open to the petitioner to file an application for recalling of the same.

14.07.2023*Pawan***(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE****Whether speaking/reasoned:-****Yes/No****Whether reportable:-****Yes/No**