

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-6393-2024
Date of decision : 18.03.2024

Raj Kumar and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Ms.Manju Sharma, Advocate for
Mr.Dalbir Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr.Ravi Pratap Singh, DAG, Haryana.

Mr.Vipul Aggarwal, Sr.Panel Counsel
for respondent no.4.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. This is a civil writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to make the payment of entire amount of the stipend to the petitioners for the course of M.Phil. Clinical Psychology (two years) with a further direction to the respondents to make the payment of entire amount of the stipend along with arrears thereof with interest.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that for the grievance raised by the petitioners, the petitioners had given a representation dated 01.01.2024 (Annexure P-11) and at this stage, would be satisfied, in case, the representation is considered by the competent authority of respondent no.3 in a time bound manner and if after considering

the same, in case, the plea raised by the petitioners is found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioners.

3. Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the competent authority of respondent no.3 to consider the representation 01.01.2024 (Annexure P-11) of the petitioners and decide the same, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of three months from the date of the receipt of certified copy of the present order and in case, after considering the same, the plea of the petitioners is found to be meritorious, then, necessary relief be granted to the petitioners and in case, the plea of the petitioners is not found to be meritorious, then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of three months 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 the competent authority of respondent no.3 would consider and decide the representation independently, in accordance with law and all the aspects including the aspect of delay would be seen by the competent authority of respondent no.3.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

March 18, 2024
Davinder Kumar

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