

120

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

CWP-1831-2024
Date of decision: 30.01.2024

Lakhpreet Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Nitesh Sanghi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Kunal Muthreja, AAG, Punjab.

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 certiorari for setting aside the order dated 02.10.2022 (Annexure P-4) passed by respondent No.5, vide which, the petitioner has been held to be not eligible with respect to freeship/scholarship card.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is eligible for freeship/scholarship card which is required to be issued to the students belonging to Scheduled Castes (SC) under the scheme of Government of Punjab but respondent No.5 has rejected the same vide order dated 02.10.2022 and has held the petitioner to be not eligible without giving any reason. It is further submitted that the petitioner would give a detailed representation giving all the details of his being eligible for the said freeship/scholarship card and has submitted that at this stage, the petitioner

would be satisfied, in case, the said respondent No.5 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. Learned State Counsel has submitted that respondent No.5 would consider the abovesaid representation in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of the abovesaid representation.

4. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with direction to respondent No.5 to consider the abovesaid representation in accordance with law within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of the abovesaid representation and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then respondent No.5 would grant necessary relief, in accordance with law and in case, respondent No.5 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 four weeks from the date of receipt of the abovesaid representation.

5. This Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondent No.5 would consider the case of the petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

30.01.2024
Pawan

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable:- Yes/No