



HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR TIWARI

AND

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE PANKAJ PUROHIT

Writ Petition Service Bench No. 260 of 2024

05 June, 2026

Dr. Urmila Rana

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Uttarakhand & others.

...Respondents

Counsel for the petitioner	:	Mr. Jitendra Chaudhary, learned counsel
Counsel for the respondent no. 1	:	Mr. Yogesh Pandey, Deputy Advocate General and Mr. Sushil Vashistha, Standing Counsel for the State of Uttarakhand.
Counsel for respondent nos. 2 to 4	:	Dr. Kartikey Hari Gupta, learned counsel.
Counsel for respondent nos. 5	:	Mr. Atul Bhatt, learned Standing Counsel for the Union of India.

JUDGMENT : (per Sri Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J.)

By means of this writ petition, petitioner has challenged order dated 12.02.2024, passed by Registrar, HNB Garhwal University, whereby petitioner's claim for regularization was turned down.

2. Petitioner contends that she was engaged as Guest Teacher in the said University after due selection, in the year 2000; she served in that capacity for 17 long years, as such, she earned a right to be regularized against a teaching post. It is further contended that petitioner holds



all requisite qualifications for regular appointment as Assistant Professor, therefore, there is no valid reason for not regularizing her services.

3. Per contra, learned counsel appearing for the University submits that petitioner was engaged in HNB Garhwal University while it was State University; the said University became Central University under provisions of Central Universities Act, 2009 w.e.f. 15.01.2009; petitioner served in HNB Garhwal (Central) University only till January, 2017, and thereafter, she accepted appointment as Guest Teacher in a Government College affiliated to a State University w.e.f. 03.02.2017. Thus, it is contended that since there is no relationship of 'employer-employee' left between HNB Garhwal (Central) University and petitioner after 03.02.2017 and petitioner has become employee of State Government, therefore, she does not have any claim regarding regularization in the Central University. Learned counsel appearing for the University thus submits that petitioner's claim was rightly rejected by the Registrar.

4. Petitioner in his representation relied upon the judgment rendered by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Somesh Thapliyal v. Vice Chancellor, the Registrar, in the impugned order, held that the facts of the present case are different from that of the judgment relied by petitioner. It is not in dispute that petitioner was appointed on part time



2026:UHC:4496-DB

basis as Guest Teacher in HNB Garhwal University and he attained age of superannuation during pendency of the writ petition. After completing age of superannuation, there cannot be any direction to regularize the services of the petitioner. Mr. Somesh Thapliyal on the other hand was not appointed as part time teacher.

5. Learned counsel for the University is right in submitting that petitioner's claim for regularization, if any, can be considered by the State Government, as petitioner served after 03.02.2017 till her superannuation, in a Government College but he has not sought any relief against State Government or its authorities.

6. For the aforesaid reason, there is no scope for interference in the matter. Accordingly, the writ petition fails and is dismissed.

(Pankaj Purohit, J.)

(Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J)

05.06.2026

Navin