

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-17489-2023

Date of decision : 11.08.2023

Umang

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE VIKAS BAHLPresent: Mr.Jasbir Mor, Advocate
for the petitioner.Ms.Palika Monga, DAG, Haryana
for respondent no.1.Mr.Sukesh Kumar Jindal, Advocate
for respondents no.2 to 4.**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 the respondents to reevaluate/recheck the answer sheet/ books of the question paper of the petitioner in the subject of Physiology, Anatomy and Biochemistry of MBBS Ist year examination for academic session of the year 2022-23.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner has given a representation dated 03.08.2023 (Annexure P-10) to respondent no.3 and would be satisfied that in case respondent no.3 is directed to consider the same in accordance with law in a time bound manner and if after considering the

necessary relief be granted to the petitioner. It is further submitted that in case the representation of the petitioner is rejected, then the petitioner would not challenge the same.

3. Learned counsel appearing for respondents no.2 to 4 has submitted that respondent no.3 would consider the representation dated 03.08.2023 (Annexure P-10), in accordance with law.

4. Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent no.3 to consider the representation dated 03.08.2023 (Annexure P-10) of the petitioner, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, after considering the same, the plea of the petitioner is found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioner and as undertaken by learned counsel for the petitioner, in case, the representation is rejected, the petitioner would not further challenge the same.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondent no.3 would consider and decide the representation independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

August 11, 2023
Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No