



CWP-34913-2024

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(222)

CWP-34913-2024

Date of Decision : 28.11.2025

Garv Attri (minor) through his Natural Guardian

...Petitioner

Versus

Maharaja Ranjit Singh, Armed Forces
Preparatory Institute and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Gulshan Sharma, Advocate
for respondents No.1 and 2
(through video-conferencing).

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(ORAL)

1. The Coordinate Bench of this Court, vide order dated 20.12.2024, at the time of issuing notice of motion, had passed the hereinafter extracted order, upon the instant writ petition :-

“The petitioner, who is a minor, is being represented by his father. The grievance of the petitioner is that the lower age limit stipulated for appearing in the entrance examination at Maharaja Ranjit Singh Armed Forces Preparatory Institute, SAS Nagar, Mohali is causing prejudice as otherwise, the petitioner is eligible in all respects.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. J.S. Gill, Additional Advocate General, Punjab, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents and submits that the Institute itself has already written to the



authorities concerned for removing the lower age limit provided for admission.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, the petitioner (minor) will be allowed to appear in the entrance test provisionally subject to the outcome of the present petition.

Adjourned to 21.01.2025.”

2. Learned counsel for the respondents No.1 and 2, who has caused appearance, through virtual platform, apprises this Court that in deference to the directions (supra), the petitioner was allowed to appear in the entrance test provisionally. However, the petitioner remained unsuccessful, and could not qualify the said entrance test. Therefore, the prayer made through the instant writ petition has become infructuous.
3. There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner, today in the Court.
4. In view of the specific statement suffered by the learned counsel for the respondents No.1 and 2, the instant writ petition is **dismissed as having been rendered infructuous.**
5. However, the petitioner is at liberty to get the instant writ petition revived, by moving apt motion, in case, any cause of action still survives.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

November 28, 2025
Manpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned

:

Yes/No

Whether reportable

:

Yes/No