



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

CWP-23386-2025

Date of decision: 29.09.2025

Sneha Bhardwaj

....Petitioner

Versus

IILM University and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Ms. Komal Balain, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Srivastava, Advocate,
for respondent No.1.

Mr. Hemen Aggarwal, Advocate, and
Mr. Dashim Garg, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)

1. Through the instant writ petition, as cast under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, a prayer is made for issuance of a Mandamus upon respondent No.1, to issue all the documents to the petitioner, with regard to her academic records, i.e. marksheets, transcripts etc., so that the same could be submitted with the University, where she has secured admission to pursue higher studies.

2. This Court, on 12.09.2025, had passed the hereinafter extracted order:-

“1. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent No.1 submits that his office has received an e-mail communication from the respondent No.1, to the effect that, they are making sincere efforts and are in the process of locating and digging out the relevant record, as sought by the petitioner. He seeks two weeks’



time to apprise this Court about the outcome of the efforts made by the respondent No.1.

2. List, as prayed for, on 29.09.2025 in the urgent list.

3. It is made clear that, on the subsequent date of hearing, no request for adjournment would be entertained on behalf of either side, except for strong and compelling reasons.

3. In response, learned counsel for respondent No.1 apprises this Court that except two documents, i.e. consolidated transcripts and scholarship certificate(s), all the original documents have been handed over to the petitioner in Court today. He, on instructions, fairly submits that the remaining two documents (supra), will be handed over to the petitioner within a period of three weeks from the passing of this order.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner does not dispute the abovesaid position, and submits that in view of the undertaking extended on behalf of respondent No.1, nothing substantive survives in the instant writ petition, and the same be disposed of, as such.

5. In view of the above, no further direction is required to be passed upon respondent No.1, and the instant writ petition is **disposed of**.

6. This Court is sanguine that respondent No.1, shall make every possible endeavour to handover the remaining documents to the petitioner, most expeditiously, and in any case, within the time line, as apprised to this Court, on its behalf.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

29.09.2025

Ak Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	Yes/No