



IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH AT SHIMLA

CWP No.8472 of 2023

Decided on: 24.11.2025

Priyanka Devi

....Petitioner

Versus

HPU and Anr

. ...Respondents

Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua

¹ *Whether approved for reporting?*

For the petitioner:

Mr. Sparsh Bhushan, Advocate.

For the respondents:

Mr. Nitin Thakur, Advocate, for
respondent No.1.

Mr. Vikrant Thakur, Advocate, for
respondent No.2

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

This writ petition has been filed for the grant of
following substantive reliefs: -

“i). That an appropriate writ, order or directions may kindly be issued and Annexure P-7, Annexure P-9 and Annexure P-10 may kindly be quashed and set aside by directing the respondent University to declare the petitioner pass in MA, History on the basis of Annexures P-2, P-4, P-5 and P-6 and thereafter issue the consolidated detail-cum-marks sheet on the basis of such results already declared

¹ *Whether reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment?*



by showing the petitioner to have qualified MA, History in March, 2022.

- (ii) *That an appropriate writ, order or directions may kindly be issued and the respondent University may kindly be directed to issue the consolidated detail marks sheet by granting average marks in paper 3 (c) with further directions that the petitioner be shown to have qualified the MA degree (His-tory) in March 2022 in the interest of law and justice.”*

2. In terms of the interim order passed in this writ petition on 04.11.2023, respondent No.2 was directed to provisionally allow the petitioner to participate in selection process for recruitment to the post of Lecturer (School New) History under the advertisement No.10/10-2023, issued by respondent No.2.

When the matter was taken up on 02.04.2025, learned counsel for respondent No.2 placed on record instructions memo and submitted that the petitioner though was provisionally permitted to participate in the selection process for recruitment to the post in question, however, she was not able to find place in the zone of consideration.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that surviving grievance of the petitioner concerns



respondent No.1 having not issued a consolidated mark-sheet for the Course of M.A.(History) undertaken by the petitioner. The case file shows that the petitioner had never represented to respondent No.1 regarding this grievance till date.

4. In view of above, this writ petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to represent to respondent No.1/Competent Authority for redressal of above grievance within ten days. In case such representation is so made, it shall be considered and decided in accordance with law, within two weeks thereafter. In case petitioner is held entitled to consolidated mark-sheet, the same be issued to her accordingly.

Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also to stand disposed of.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

November 24, 2025

R.Atal