

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

(126)

CWP-162-2024

Date of decision: - 08.01.2024

Shivani Bharti and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Sandeep S. Majithia, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Kunal Muthreja, AAG, Punjab.

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 issue certificate for qualifying 06 months training in Ultrasonography duly signed by respondent No.2 as well as countersigned by appropriate authority i.e. respondent No.1 as per Rule 14 of the Pre-Conception and Pre-Natal Diagnostic Techniques (PCPNDT) Act, 1994 (Prohibition of Sex Selection) (Six months Training) Rules, 2014 and 2020.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioners, they have given individual legal notices, but till date their grievances have not been addressed. It is further submitted that the petitioners would give a joint detailed representation to respondent No.2 mentioning all the details and would raise all the grievances and prays that at this stage, the petitioners would

be satisfied in case respondent No.2 considers the said representation, in accordance with law, in a specified time frame and in case the pleas raised by the petitioners are found to be meritorious, then, grant the appropriate relief.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that respondent No.2 would consider the said representation in accordance with law, within a period of four weeks from the date of submission of the same.

4. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of in the following terms: -

- (i) It would be open to the petitioners to give a joint detailed representation to respondent No.2 within a period of two weeks from today.
 - (ii) In case any such representation is filed by the petitioners, respondent No.2 would consider the same within a period of four weeks from the date of submission of the said representation and in case after considering the said representation, respondent No.2 is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioners are meritorious, then, the appropriate relief be granted to them as expeditiously as possible. In case respondent No.2 is of the view that the pleas raised by the petitioners are meritless, then, a speaking order rejecting the claim be passed within the aforesaid period of four weeks.
5. 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 matter independently, in accordance with law.

January 08, 2024
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No