

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

232

CWP-13828-2022
Decided on :27.02.2024

Rizwan Khan

. . . Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

. . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

PRESENT: Mr. Mandeep Singla, Advocate and
Mr. Suvir Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen Singh Panwar, DAG, Haryana
for respondent No. 1.

Mr. Anil Ghanghas, Advocate for
Mr. Sunil Panwar, Advocate
for respondent No. 2.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. Present Civil Writ Petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari quashing the notice Ref. No. GUG/2022/PHYSIO/368 (Annexure P-6) issued on 17.06.2022 by respondent No. 2 vide which brother of the petitioner namely Rihan was found not eligible to appear in the examination of his 4th year.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in pursuance of the order dated 29.06.2022 passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court, the brother of the petitioner has already appeared in the examination and has also given the expenses to the tune of Rs.5,000/- as was ordered on the said date. It is submitted that however, the result of the brother of the petitioner has not been declared and for the said aspect, the

petitioner would move a representation to respondent No. 2 and has prayed that respondent No. 2 be directed to decide 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. Learned counsel for respondent No. 2 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 six weeks from the date of receipt of the said representation.

4. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to move a representation to respondent No. 2 with respect to the grievances of the petitioner which have not been redressed till date and respondent No. 2 is directed to consider the said representation in accordance with law within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of said representation and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner 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 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 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 petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

27.02.2024
Mehak

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