

(2013) 08 RAJ CK 0024

In the Rajasthan High Court

Case No : Civil Writ Petition No. 10826 of 2013

Mohan Lal Meena

APPELLANT

Vs

The State of Rajasthan and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 30-08-2013

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2014) 1 WLN 196

Hon'ble Judges : Govind Mathur, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : R.L. Jangid and Additional Advocate General, assisted by Mr. Rishabh Tayal, for the Respondent

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

Govind Mathur, J.—Admit. Issue notice.

2. Mr. Rishabh Tayal, learned assisting counsel to Mr. R.L. Jangid, learned Senior Advocate and Additional Advocate General, accepts notice on behalf of all the respondents. Service, as such, is sufficient.

3. Looking to the narrow amplitude of the controversy involved in this petition for writ, the petition is heard finally at this stage.

4. In the year 2006, the petitioner preferred an application for admission in the Teachers Training Course conducted by the District Institute for Education and Training. The admission was denied to the petitioner for certain reasons and being aggrieved by the same, he preferred a petition for writ (S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6170/2006) before this Court. By order dt. 26.10.2006, the petition for writ aforesaid was admitted for hearing and as an interim measure, the respondents were directed to admit the petitioner provisionally in B.S.T.C. Course - 2006 at the District Institute for Education and Training, Udaipur. In pursuant to the direction aforesaid, the petitioner was admitted to the course concerned and was also allowed to appear in the first year examination of B.S.T.C. On completion of first educational session, his result too was declared and he was

permitted to join second year of B.S.T.C. He was also allowed to appear in the second year examination of the course, however, result of the same was not declared due to pendency of the writ petition bearing No. 6170/2006. The writ petition aforesaid came to be dismissed under an order dt. 01.04.2013 as becoming infructuous in view of the fact that the issue involved in that was pertaining to admission of the petitioner in B.S.T.C. in the year 2006. After dismissal of the petition for writ, the respondents are not prepared to declare the result of the petitioner, hence, he has again approached this Court.

5. As already stated, the petitioner has already qualified the first year examination of B.S.T.C. and the respondents at their own allowed him to face the second year examination, therefore, the admission so given stood validated, as such, no reason exists for not declaring the result of the petitioner. Beside this the equity demands to issue a direction to the respondents to declare result of the petitioner in view of the fact that the petitioner has already acquired the qualification concerned much back in the year 2008. Accordingly, this petition for writ is allowed. The respondents are directed to declare result of the petitioner relating to B.S.T.C. second year examination expeditiously, as far as possible within a period of four weeks from today.