



118+119

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

Date of Decision : 12-05-2025

1.

CWP-13440-2025

**DAV COLLEGE TRUST AND MANAGEMENT SOCIETY, CHITRA
GUPTA ROAD, NEW DELHI AND OTHERS**

.....Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

.....Respondent(s)

2.

CWP-13450-2025

**DAV COLLEGE TRUST AND MANAGEMENT SOCIETY, CHITRA
GUPTA ROAD, NEW DELHI AND OTHERS**

.....Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Rajdeep Singh Cheema, Advocate
for the petitioner in both the cases.

Ms. Gurmeet Kaur Gill, Senior Panel Counsel
For respondent-UOI.

Mr. T.P.S Chawla, Sr. DAG Punjab.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (Oral)

1. In the present set of two petitions, the grievance being raised by the petitioner-institution is that the petitioner(s)-institution is not being given its entitled payment of the dues under the Post Matric Scholarship Scheme, by the respondents.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner-institution submits that the issue raised in the present petition has already been answered by this Court in ***CWP No.13761 of 2024 titled “Akashdeep and ors. Vs. State of Punjab and ors.” and other connected cases***, decided on 09.01.2025 hence, the present set of two petitions be also disposed of in terms of the said order.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Ms. Gurmeet Kaur Gill, Senior Panel Counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-Union of India and Mr. T.P.S. Chawla, Senior DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents submits they have no objection in case, the present set of two petitions are disposed of in terms of ***CWP No.13761 of 2024 titled “Akashdeep and ors. Vs. State of Punjab and ors.” and other connected cases***, decided on 09.01.2025.

6. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.1-Union of India submits that though, the claim raised in the present petition has already been decided by this court while passing order in ***Akashdeep's case (supra)***, but the respondent No.1-Union of India, intends to file an appeal against the said order passed in ***Akashdeep's case (supra)***.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the case file with their able assistance.

8. Once, the issue raised in the present set of two petitions has already been decided by this Court while passing order in ***Akashdeep's case (supra)***, merely that respondent No.1-Union of India has decided to file an appeal against the said order passed in ***Akashdeep's case (supra)***, does not mean that the claim of the petitioner-Institution, which is *akin* to one which

was raised in *Akashdeep's case (supra)*, should not be disposed of in the same terms so as to avoid discrimination.

9. Keeping in view facts and circumstances of the present case, the present set of two petitions are disposed of in the same terms and conditions as stipulated in *Akashdeep's case (supra)*.

10. Civil miscellaneous application pending, if any, stands disposed of.

12-05-2025
Sapna Goyal

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking: YES
Whether reportable: NO