



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(116)

CWP No. 14157 of 2025

Date of Decision : 22.05.2025

Dr. Kumari Punam

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Yagyadeep, Advocate and
Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. T.P.S. Chawla, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

Ms. Gurmeet Kaur Gill, Senior Panel Counsel
for respondent No. 5-UOI.

Harsimran Singh Sethi J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, the grievance being raised by the petitioner is that she has not been reimbursed/paid the fee of ₹29,23,478/- under the Post Matric Scholarship Scheme by the respondents.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is seeking reimbursement of the fees which she had paid while undergoing the MBBS Academic Course 2015-2020, which was liable to be refunded under the Post Matric Scholarship Scheme envisaged for the Scheduled Caste Candidates but the said benefit is not being extended to her and that too without any valid justification.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner 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 petition be also disposed of in terms of the said order.

4. Notice of motion.

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

6. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that they have no objection in case, the present petition is 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.

7. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.5-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.5-Union of India, intends to file an appeal against the said order passed in ***Akashdeep's case (supra)***.

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

9. Once, the issue raised in the present petition has already been decided by this Court while passing order in ***Akashdeep's case (supra)***, merely that respondent No.5-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, 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.



10. Keeping in view facts and circumstances of the present case, the present petition is disposed of in the same terms and conditions as stipulated in *Akashdeep's case (supra)*.

May 22, 2025
kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No