



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-10830-2024
Date of decision : 09.05.2024

Shri Sanatan Dharam Kumar Sabha and another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr.Shreenath A. Khemka, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr.T.P.S. Walia, AAG, Punjab.

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 continue the benefits under the 1968 Scheme (Annexure P-2) to the petitioner-school or in the alternative to allow the petitioner-school to revert its status to an unaided private school or in the alternative to allow the petitioners to shut down the school on account of severe financial distress.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioners, although the petitioners had given a representation but would give a detailed representation to the competent authority of respondent no.1 and at this stage, would be satisfied in case the

said representation is considered by the competent authority of respondent



no.1 in a time bound manner and if after considering the same, in case, the pleas raised by the petitioners are found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioners.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that the competent authority of respondent no.1 would consider the said representation and decide the same within a period of six weeks from the date of the receipt of the said representation.

4. 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.1 to consider the representation which would be filed by the petitioners and decide the same, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of six weeks from the date of the receipt of said representation and in case, after considering the same, the pleas of the petitioners are found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioners and in case, the pleas of the petitioners are not found to be meritorious, then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of six weeks from the date of the receipt of representation.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the competent authority of respondent no.1 would consider and decide the representation independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

May 09, 2024
Davinder Kumar

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