

125

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

CWP-6870-2024
Date of decision: 21.03.2024

Gurkirat Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Baba Farid University of Health Sciences, Faridkot and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Yaseen Sethi, Advocate for
Mr. Manu Loona, 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 respondent Nos.1 and 2 to consider the request and conduct reassessment/revaluation of the marks granted in the examination answer sheets of Biomechanics, IInd year of Bachelor of Physiotherapy (BPT) (held on 16.10.2023) (Annexure P-4).
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner in the present writ petition, the petitioner had given representation dated 05.03.2024 (Annexure P-5) and he would be satisfied at this stage, in case, the competent authority of respondent No.1-University is directed to consider the said representation dated 05.03.2024 (Annexure P-5) 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 direction to the competent authority of respondent No.1-University to consider representation dated 05.03.2024 (Annexure P-5), in accordance with law, within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order 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 six weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

4. This Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the competent authority of respondent No.1-University would consider the case of the petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

21.03.2024
Pawan

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

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