

105

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CM-21805-CWP-2023 in/and
CWP-28933-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision: 09.01.2024

Vasu ...Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Ajit Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Ram Darshan Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Brijeshwar Singh Kanwar, Sr. Panel Counsel
Advocate for respondent No.1-UOI.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

CM-21805-CWP-2023

1. This is an application filed under Order 9 Rule 9 read with Section 151 CPC for restoration of the case and recalling of order dated 04.12.2023.
2. For the reasons stated in the application which is duly supported by an affidavit, the present application is allowed and order dated 04.12.2023 is recalled and the main case is restored to its original number.

Main case

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 correct the name of the petitioner as ‘Vasu’ instead of ‘Vasu Yadav’ in the marks sheet of Senior School Certificate Examination, 2012 issued by respondent No.3.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that for the

grievances raised by the petitioner in the present writ petition, the petitioner had given representation dated 30.10.2017 (Annexure P-11) and he would be satisfied at this stage, in case, the competent authority of respondent No.3-Board is directed to consider the said representation dated 30.10.2017 (Annexure P-11) 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.3-Board to consider representation dated 30.10.2017 (Annexure P-11) in accordance with law within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order 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 six weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the present order.

4. This Court has not opined on the merits of the case and the competent authority of respondent No.3-Board would consider the case of the petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

5. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand disposed of in view of the abovesaid order.

09.01.2024

Pawan

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

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