

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

237

CWP-12380-2017
Decided on :18.03.2024

Kamla Nehru College for Women, Phagwara

. . . Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

. . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

PRESENT: Mr. Aditya Narayan Arya Garg, Advocate for
Mr. Rahul Sharma-I, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Akshita Chauhan, DAG, Punjab.

None for respondent No. 5.

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 release the amount of Rs.22,92,320/-, being the amount due to the petitioner-college under the scheme of Post Matric Scholarships to the students belonging to Scheduled Castes for the year 2015-16.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the grievances raised by the petitioner, the petitioner would give a representation giving the details of the amounts which are outstanding, on account of payment to be made to the petitioner-College under Post Metric Scholarship Scheme for the students belonging to Scheduled Castes, to the competent authority of respondent no.1-State within a period of two weeks from today and at this stage, would be

satisfied in case the said representation is considered by the competent authority of respondent no.1-State in a time bound manner and if after considering the same, in case, the plea raised by the petitioner is found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioner.

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that the competent authority of respondent no.1-State would consider the said representation and decide the same within a period of two months 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-State to consider the representation which would be filed by the petitioner and decide the same, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of two months from the date of the receipt of said representation and in case, after considering the same, the plea of the petitioner is found to be meritorious, then necessary relief be granted to the petitioner and in case, the plea of the petitioner is not found to be meritorious, then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of two months 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-State would consider and decide the representation independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

18.03.2024
Mehak

<i>Whether reasoned/speaking?</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable?</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>