

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-19400-2023

Date of decision : 02.09.2023

Dr.Raghav Sawal

... Petitioner

Versus

Baba Farid University of Health Science, Faridkot and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE VIKAS BAHLPresent: Mr.Deepak Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.**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 certiorari for quashing petitioner's result Annexure P-1 for Post Graduate Medical Exams as declared in August 2023.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that action of the respondent authorities is in violation of regulations (Annexure P-4) moreso, regulation no.18.2 and has submitted that at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied in case, the present petition is treated as his representation to the competent authority of respondent no.1 and the same is considered in a time bound manner and if after considering the same, in case, the plea raised by the petitioner is found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioner as expeditiously as possible.

3. Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the competent authority of

respondent no.1 to treat the present petition as a representation by the petitioner and decide the same, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of 4 weeks from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order alongwith a copy of the writ petition, which would be supplied by the petitioner 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 in case, the plea of the petitioner is not found to be meritorious, then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within the aforesaid period from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order and the copy of the writ petition.

4. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the competent authority of respondent no.1 would consider and decide the representation independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

September 02, 2023
Davinder Kumar

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