

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-27655-2023

Date of decision : 08.12.2023

Robin Ali

... Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHLPresent: Mr.Mohammad Arshad, Advocate
for the petitioner.Mr.Anil Chawla, Advocate
for respondent no.1-UOI.**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, order or direction especially in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents particularly respondent no.2 to make correction in the eligibility certificate of the petitioner to the effect that petitioner has passed 12th class (Senior Secondary Examination) from Utopian Senior Secondary School, Punhana (Mewat) on regular basis not as private candidate.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner has given a representation dated 02.11.2023 (Annexure P-10) and at this stage, would be satisfied in case the said representation is considered by respondent no.2 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.

3. Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent no.2 to consider the representation dated 02.11.2023 (Annexure P-10) of the petitioner and decide the same, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of six weeks from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order 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 six weeks from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order.

4. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondent no.2 would consider and decide the representation independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

December 08, 2023.
Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No