



CWP-17665-2025

-1-

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

131

CWP-17665-2025

Date of Decision :01.07.2025

SGGS Khalsa College Mahilpur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Sameer Sachdeva, Advocate for the petitioner.

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

* * *

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner-College is not being given the entitled due amount to be given to the petitioner-College under the Post Matric Scholarship Scheme (S.C.) and the said issue has already been decided by this Court while passing order in **CWP-13761-2024 titled as Akashdeep and others vs. State of Punjab and others decided on 09.01.2025** along with other connected cases and prays that the present petition be also disposed of in terms of the said order.

2. Notice of motion.

3. Mr. T.P.S. Chawla, Senior DAG, Punjab, who is present in Court accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State.

4. Ms. Gurmeet Kaur Gill, Senior Panel Counsel for Union of India accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.4-UOI.



CWP-17665-2025

-2-

5. Learned counsel for the respondent No.4-UOI submits that appeals have been filed by the respondents being LPA No.1648-2025 and 1650-2025 against the judgment passed in **Akashdeep's case (supra)** wherein, notice as well as notice regarding stay has already been issued but concedes the fact that the judgment passed in **Akashdeep's case (supra)** has not been stayed.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

7. 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 the respondents have filed the appeals against the said order passed in **Akashdeep's case (supra)**, does not mean that the claim of the petitioner-college, 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 especially, when the operation of the judgment passed in **Akashdeep's case (supra)**, has not been stayed.

8. Keeping in view the above, present petition is disposed of in terms of the the order passed by this Court in **Akashdeep's case (supra)**.

July 01, 2025
aarti

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No