

112

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

CWP-22664-2023

Date of decision: 09.10.2023

Avtar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Rohit Mittal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. A.G., Haryana
for the respondents.

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 Nos.1 and 2 to correct the marks sheet issued by the respondent Department on 13.07.2023 (Annexure P-5) wherein the petitioner has been shown failed in Geography by getting 11 marks which is in contradiction of the earlier marks sheet dated 18.05.2017 (Annexure P-3). Further prayer has been made for the issuance of a new amended mark sheet of the petitioner for 12th class.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied, in case, the present writ petition is treated as a representation and respondent No.2 is directed to consider and

decide the same in accordance with law and 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.2 would consider and decide the same in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of four weeks 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 that after treating the present writ petition as representation, respondent No.2 is directed to consider and decide the same in accordance with law within a period of four weeks 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.2 would grant necessary relief, in accordance with law and in case, respondent No.2 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 four weeks 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.2 would consider the abovesaid representation independently and in accordance with law.

09.10.2023*Pawan***(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE****Whether speaking/reasoned:-****Yes/No****Whether reportable:-****Yes/No**