

121

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

CWP-1008-2024
Date of decision: 16.01.2024

SPDM Senior Secondary School

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Mohit Garg, Advocate for the petitioner.

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 the respondent authorities to include the name of the school of the petitioner in the list of the schools for conducting the board examinations of Senior Secondary and Secondary to be conducted by respondent Nos.3 and 4 in the month of March/April 2024.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner would submit a detailed representation to respondent No.3-Board and would be satisfied at this stage, in case the said competent authority of respondent No.3-Board is directed to consider the said representation in a time bound manner and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then to

grant necessary relief in accordance with law.

3. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with observation that the petitioner would submit a detailed representation to respondent No.3-Board and the competent authority of respondent No.3-Board is directed to consider and decide the said representation in accordance with law within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of said representation and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then the competent authority would grant necessary relief, in accordance with law and in case, the competent authority is of the opinion that the pleas raised by the petitioner are not meritorious then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of the said representation.

4. This Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the competent authority of respondent No.3-Board would consider the case of the petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

16.01.2024
Pawan

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:-	Yes/No
Whether reportable:-	Yes/No