

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(112)

CWP-25345-2023

Date of decision: - 09.11.2023

ITFT Consultancy Private Limited

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Rajesh Punj, Advocate, and
Ms. Sahaj Punj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Palika Monga, DAG, Haryana
for respondents No. 1 to 3.

Ms. Gurmeet Kaur Gill, Advocate
for respondent No.4-UOI.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present writ petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to release the Post Matric Scholarship under the Government of India Scheme for students belonging to Scheduled Castes and Backward Classes in the account of the petitioner along with interest @ 18 % per annum.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances of the petitioner, the petitioner has given a legal notice dated 18.08.2023 (Annexure P-12) and the petitioner would be satisfied in case the competent authority of the respondent-State considers the same in

accordance with law, within a specified time frame and in case the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious, then, grant the appropriate relief to the petitioner.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that the competent authority of respondent-State would consider the said legal notice dated 18.08.2023 (Annexure P-12), filed by the petitioner, in accordance with law and the same would be done within a period of three months from the date of certified copy of this order.

4. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the competent authority of the respondent-State to consider the legal notice dated 18.08.2023 (Annexure P-12) filed by the petitioner within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order and in case the competent authority of the respondent-State is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritorious, then, the necessary relief be granted to the petitioner as expeditiously as possible. In case the competent authority of the respondent-State is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioner are meritless, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim be passed within the aforesaid period of three months.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the competent authority of the respondent-State would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

November 09, 2023

naresh.k

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No