



109

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

CWP-11591-2024

Date of decision: 17.05.2024

Joginder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Kurukshetra University and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Ishnoor Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Vikram Singh, 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 the respondents to issue corrected detailed mark sheets to the petitioner for 1st and 3rd semester in the course of B.Tech and further directing the respondents to correct the detailed mark sheet of the petitioner for the 4th semester dated 28.12.2016 (Annexure P-5) with the Roll No.1412415 instead of 6312437.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner in the present writ petition, the petitioner would give a detailed representation to the competent authority of respondent No.1-University 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 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 the abovesaid representation, in accordance with law, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the abovesaid representation 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 three months from the date of receipt of the said representation.

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.

17.05.2024
Pawan

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

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