

223

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-33923-2019
Date of decision: 24.11.2023

SHAMSHER SINGHPetitioner

versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERSRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Davinder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kunal Muthreja, AAG, Punjab

Mr. Naresh Kumar, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a civil writ petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondent No.3 to allow the petitioner to submit his second proof of Microbiology supplementary examination form and to allow the petitioner to give the examination thereafter. A further prayer has been made to direct respondent Nos.1 and 2 to release the Post Matriculation scholarship for the year 2017-2018 and 2018-2019.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that his primary prayer with respect to allowing the petitioner to take the examination has been accepted by respondent No.4-University and the petitioner has taken the examination and thus, on the said aspect, the present petition has been rendered infructuous. It is further submitted that the petitioner is not being permitted to undergo internship with respondent No.3-Adesh Medical University, Bathinda, which has to be completed

within a period of 2 years of the completion of the course and has submitted that for the said remaining grievances, the petitioner would give a representation to respondent No.3-University and respondent No.3 be directed to decide the same in a time-bound manner.

4. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances and the limited prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

- (I) It would be open to the petitioner to move a representation to respondent No.3-University detailing the grievances of the petitioner which still remain.
- (ii) The competent authority of respondent No.3-University would consider the said representation as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of the said representation 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 a period of four weeks from the date of the receipt of the said representation.

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

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

24.11.2023
Davinder/sim