



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

122

CWP-11413-2024**Decided on :16.05.2024**

Kirandeep Kaur and another

. . . Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

. . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHLPRESENT: Mr. Ankit Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Palika Monga, DAG, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. Present Civil Writ Petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus for directing respondent Nos. 3 and 4 to issue School Leaving Certificate and other relevant documents to the petitioners.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioners in the present writ petition, the petitioners would move a representation to the District Education Officer-respondent No. 2 and has prayed that respondent No. 2 be directed to decide the said representation as expeditiously as possible and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioners are found to be meritorious then to grant necessary relief in accordance with law.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that in case any such representation is made, then the respondent No. 2 would consider the said representation in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of five months from the date of receipt of the said representation.

**CWP-11413-2024**

4. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioners to move a representation to respondent No. 2 with respect to the grievances of the petitioners which have not been redressed till date and respondent No. 2 is directed to consider the said representation, if filed by the petitioners, in accordance with law and after hearing all the necessary parties concerned, within a period of five months from the date of receipt of said representation and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioners are found to be meritorious then the respondent No. 2 would grant necessary relief, in accordance with law and in case, respondent No. 2 is of the opinion that the pleas raised by the petitioners are not meritorious then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of five months from the date of receipt of the said representation.

5. This Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the respondent No. 2 would consider the case of the petitioners independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

16.05.2024*Mehak**Whether reasoned/speaking?**Yes/No**Whether reportable?**~~Yes~~/No*