

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(107)

CWP-26344-2022

Date of decision: - 15.03.2023

Ashok Kumar Gupta

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Devender Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Upasana Dhawan, AAG, Haryana
for respondents No.1 to 5.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

This writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent No.2 to decide the complaint dated 10.07.2019 (Annexure P-2) which has been filed by the petitioner under Rule 158-A of the Haryana School Education Rules, 2003 amended vide Notification dated 28.01.2014 (Annexure P-1).

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that as per the provisions of Section 158-A of the above-said Act, the petitioner had filed a complaint dated 10.07.2019 (Annexure P-2) before respondent No.2, which is the Funds and Fee Regulatory Committee-cum-Divisional Commissioner Faridabad, District Faridabad and the same has not been

decided till date. It is submitted that the petitioner would restrict his prayer only for deciding the complaint dated 10.07.2019 (P-2) by respondent No.2 as expeditiously as possible, preferably, within a period of two months from the date of the certified copy of the present order.

Learned State counsel has submitted that every endeavour would be made by respondent No.2 to decide the complaint dated 10.07.2019 (Annexure P-2) after hearing all the parties concerned, as expeditiously as possible and preferably within a period of two months from the date of the certified copy of the present order.

Keeping in view above-said facts and circumstances, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to decide the complaint dated 10.07.2019 (Annexure P-2) as expeditiously as possible, preferably, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order and after following the principles of natural justice.

It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondent No.2 would decide the said complaint dated 10.07.2019 (Annexure P-2) independently, in accordance with law.

March 15, 2023
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No