

108

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

CWP-16113-2023

Date of decision: 28.07.2023

Shubham Atal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Shailender Kashyap, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. A.G. 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 an appropriate writ order or direction especially in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to grant additional three (03) marks to the petitioner in lieu of MA qualification from MDU Rohtak, as per clause 3.2 of Advertisement (Annexure P-5).
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 application/representation dated 10.11.2022 (Annexure P-13) to respondent No.3-Secretary, Haryana Staff Selection Commission, and he would be satisfied at this stage, in case, the said respondent No.3 is directed to consider the said application/representation dated 10.11.2022 (Annexure

P-13) 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 application/representation dated 10.11.2022 (Annexure P-13) 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 abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with direction to respondent No.3 to consider application/representation dated 10.11.2022 (Annexure P-13) 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.

28.07.2023*Pawan/Mahima***(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE****Whether speaking/reasoned:-****Yes/No****Whether reportable:-****Yes/No**