

**Court No. - 35**

**Case :-** WRIT - A No. - 17729 of 2023

**Petitioner :-** Ramjee Verma

**Respondent :-** State Of U.P. And 3 Others

**Counsel for Petitioner :-** Seemant Singh

**Counsel for Respondent :-** C.S.C.

**Hon'ble Vikas Budhwar,J.**

Heard Sri Seemant Singh, learned counsel for the writ petitioner and Sri Shailendra Singh, learned Standing Counsel, who appears for Respondents 1, 2 and 3.

In view of the order, which is being proposed to be passed today, notices are not being issued to the fourth respondent.

The case of the writ petitioner is that he was initially appointed on the post of Assistant Professor subject Education in substantive capacity in Jagat Guru Ram Bhadrachardya Handicapped, University, Chitrakoot and in pursuance thereof he issued an appointment order on 01.12.2013 and he assumed the charge on 06.12.2013. It is further the case of the writ petitioner that his services stood confirmed on 19.12.2014, however, pursuant to the selections held by the U.P. Higher Education Service Commission, Prayagraj, he was accorded placement as an assistant professor on 18.09.2017 in the third respondent institution Shri Durga Ji Post-Graduate College, Chandeshwar, Azamgarh and an appointment order was issued on 03.10.2017, he assumed the charge on 05.10.2017 and he was also relieved from his earlier assignment on 04.10.2017. He further claims that his services stood regularised on 04.09.2019. The grievance of the writ petitioner is that his earlier services ought to be considered for the purposes of

career advancement as he seeks to rely upon the UGC notification dated 18.07.2018. Shri Ajeet Kuamr Singh, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel who appears for the respondent Nos. 1, 2 and 3 which as per the description of the parties is manned by the authorised controller submits that the issue as to whether the writ petitioner is entitled to inclusion of the services undergone in the earlier assignment needs determination at the first instance by the second respondent, Director of Education (Higher), U.P., Prayagraj and according to him, the writ petitioner may approach to the second respondent. He further submits that he does not propose to file any response.

To such a submission, learned counsel for the petitioner has no objection and he gracefully accepts the same.

Considering the submissions of the rival parties as well as stand taken by them, the writ petition is being disposed off without seeking any response from the respondents granting liberty to the writ petitioner to prefer a comprehensive representation along with the self-attested copy of the writ petition before the second respondent, who shall on the receipt of the same, proceed to decide the claim of the petitioner strictly in accordance with law, second respondent shall put to notice to the third and fourth respondent and thereafter to proceed to decide the entitlement of the writ petitioner strictly in accordance with the UGC guidelines dated 18.07.2018 within a period of three months from the date of presentation of the certified copy of the order.

Needless to point out that the writ petition has been decided without seeking any response from the respondents. Thus, passing of this order may not be construed to an expression that this Court has gone into the merits of the case.

With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition is **disposed off**.

**Order Date :-** 6.11.2023

A. Prajapati