

AFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 5201 of 2014**

1. Dr. Mrs. Bhawna Nigam wife of Shri Deepak Nigam, aged about 38 years, resident of C/o R.C.Saxena, Vinoba Nagar, Opposite Gayatri Mandir Temple, Bilaspur, Police Station Civil Line, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
2. Smt. Archana Khare daughter of Late Shri Vijay Kumar Khare, aged about 44 Years, resident of Vishnu Nagar, Kududand, Police Station Civil Line, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
3. Jeevan Lal son of Dwarika Prasad aged about 28 Years, resident of Village Dhaba, Post Limtara, Police Station Khamhari, District Durg, Chhattisgarh
4. Akhilesh Kumar Dhiwar son of Shri Indal Ram Dhiwar, aged about 27 Years, resident of Village and Post Korasi, Police Station Kharora, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
5. Rajendra Kumar Vijaywar son of Manharan Lal Vijaywar, aged about 36 Years, resident of Village and Post Sukli, Police Station Janjgir, District Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh
6. Smt. Nisha Singh Aditya wife of Shri Manish Aditya, aged about 35 Years, resident of Village and Post Baradwar, Police Station Baradwar, Tahsil Sakti, District Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh
7. Mahendra Kumar Sahu son of Shri Aasharam Sahu, aged about 37 Years, resident of Ganga Nagar, Sector-2, Bilaspur, Police Station Civil Line, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
8. Rajesh Kumar Shriwas son of Jeevanlal Shriwas, aged about 38 Years, resident of Ward No. 17, Nawapara, Police Station and District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
9. Pankaj son of Radhe Govind, aged about 38 Years, resident of Behind Mahila Hospital, Darripara, Ambikapur, Police Station Ambikapur, District Surguja, Chhattisgarh
10. Bhuneshwar Lal Sahu son of Teerath Ram Sahu, aged about 36 Years, resident of Village Kalley, Post Anwary, Police Station and Tahsil Kurud, District Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh
11. Dr. Swati Sharma wife of Shri Vikas Sharma, aged about 35 Years, resident of Seepat Road, Nagoi Mode, Bilaspur, Police Station Sarkanda, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
12. Pankaj Kumar Pal son of Shri Prabhat Kumar Pal, aged about 35 Years, resident of D.C.Road, Mahavir Ward, Ambikapur, Police Station Ambikapur, District Surguja, Chhattisgarh
13. Daleshwar Prasad Sahu son of Vishal Ram Sahu, aged about 37 Years, resident of Village Aouri, Post Jamgaon, Tahsil and Police Station Patan, District Durg, Chhattisgarh
14. Dr. Durga Singh Rajput son of Shri Gajanand Singh Rajput, aged about 37 Years, resident of Ward No.13, Kundrapara, Police Station and Tahsil Lormi,

District Mungeli, Chhattisgarh

15. Abhishek Kumar Giri son of Janardan Giri, aged about 31 Years, resident of Boirdadar, Malidipa, Police Station Chakradharnagar, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh
16. Smt. Neelmani Sodhi wife of Mankuram Sodhi, aged about 42 Years, resident of Hospital Ward No.16, Post Office Kondagaon, Police Station and District Kondagaon, Chhattisgarh

---- **Petitioners**

Versus

1. The Union of India, through the Secretary, Ministry of Human Resources Department, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi
2. State of Chhattisgarh, through the Secretary, Higher Education Department, Mantralaya, New Raipur, Police Station Rakhi, Civil & Revenue District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The University Grant Commission, through the Secretary, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi - 110002
4. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, through the Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- **Respondents**

Writ Petition (S) No. 5226 of 2014

Amit Kumar Dewangan son of Shri Devchand Dewangan, aged about 34 years, resident of Dabripara Chantidih, Seepat Road, Police Station Sarkanda, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- **Petitioner**

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through the Secretary, Higher Education Department, Mantralaya, New Raipur, Police Station Rakhi, Civil & Revenue District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, through the Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- **Respondents**

Writ Petition (S) No. 5266 of 2014

1. Vidya Bhushan Kurre, S/o Shri Jhuderam, aged about 38 years, R/o Plot No.36/2, Ashish Nagar, East Risali, Bhilai Nagar, District Durg, Chhattisgarh, Pin 490023
2. Dr. Anjan Kumar S/o Late D. Murti aged about 38 Years, R/o D-201 Anandpuram, Phase - I, Junwani Road, Kohka, Bhilai, District Durg, Chhattisgarh, Pin 490023

3. Mrs. Rupa Dilliwar W/o Ashok Kumar Dilliwar, aged about 42 Years, R/o Block No. 61 -A, Street No. 16, Sector -2, Bhilai Nagar, District Durg, Chhattisgarh, Pin 490023

---- Petitioners

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through the Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, Capital Complex, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission Through its Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The Union of India, Ministry of Human Resources Development, New Delhi

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5271 of 2014

1. Suresh Kumar Diwakar S/o Shri Santu Ram Diwakar, aged about 35 years, Category- Schedule Caste, R/o Near Uslapur Overbridge, Anand Nagar, Bilaspur, P.S. Chakarbhata, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
2. Manoj Kumar Banjare S/o Shri Maansingh Banjare, Aged about 39 Years, Category- Schedule Caste, R/o Village Bhaishajhar, Post Bhaishajhar, P.S. Ratanpur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
3. Jai Prakash Sonwani S/o Shri Chhedilal Sonwani, Aged about 36 Years, R/o Indrasen Nagar, 27 Kholi, P.S.- Civil Line Bilaspur, Tahsil & District- Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through : Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Commissioner Higher Education, Indravati Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Secretary, Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. University Grants Commission, Through : Its Secretary, Bahadurshah Jafar Marg, New Delhi 110002

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5284 of 2014

1. Digamber Das Mahant S/o Shri Ganga Das Mahant, aged 42 years R/o Purani Basti, Dewangan Mohalla Akaltara, District- Janjgir-Champa Chhattisgarh
2. Biras Kumar Markandey S/o Shri Ramgopal Markandey, aged 38 years R/o Village- Chandania PO- Pandaria Block- Akaltara, District- Janjgir-Champa

3. Nakul Prasad Tengwar S/o Panchram Tengwar, aged 41 years R/o Gram-Madai, Post- Khamaria District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
4. Ganesh Ram Chaturvedani S/o Shri Rikhi Ram Chaturvedani, aged 40 years, R/o Gram-Post- Bitkuli, Via- Bilha District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
5. Manish Kumar Mathur S/o Sri Purushottam Lal Mathur, aged 39 years, R/o Gram- Khairkhundi, PO- Sarwandeori, P.S. Ratanpur, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
6. Mukesh Kumar Rai S/o Shri D.P. Rai, aged 36 years, R/o Sai Mandir Road, Gopal Marg Near Taj Masjid, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
7. Glaidish Simmi Minz D/o Shri Petrus Minz, aged 30 years, R/o Ayodhya Nagar, Ring Road No. -2, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
8. Smt. Rajni Kujur W/o Shri Tobias Kujur, aged 40 years, R/o Shubham Vihar, Mangla Chowk, Near Lata Gas Agency, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
9. Dr. Shyam Lal Roy S/o Shri M.L. Roy, aged 40 years, R/o Gembopara, Mungeli, P.S. Mungeli, District Mungeli Chhattisgarh
10. Dr. Dinesh Kumar Kathutiya S/o Shri Phool Sai Kathutiya, aged 35 years, R/o Village-Post- Mopka, Vivekanand Nagar, Mopka, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary to the Government of Chhattisgarh, Department of Higher Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, PS- Rakhi, Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission Through The Secretary, Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. University Grants Commission Through The Secretary University Grants Commission, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5285 of 2014

1. Bhushan Kumar S/o Shri Kishori Mandal, aged 37 years, R/o Plot No. 12, Maa Sharda Vihar Mopka Road, Rajkishore Nagar, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
2. Ashok Kumar Satpathi S/o Shri K.R. Satpathi, aged 40 years, R/o Ganga Nagar, Sector-2, Behind 36th, City Mall, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
3. Shahid Hussain S/o Shri M.D.Hussain, aged 29 years, R/o Bhavani Nagar, Sirgitti, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners

Vs

1. The State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary to the Government of Chhattisgarh, Department of Higher Education, Mahanadi Bahwan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission Through The Secretary, C.G. Public Service Commission, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. University Grants Commission Through The Secretary, University Grants Commission, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5303 of 2014

Arvind Chandraker S/o Shri Devsharan Chandrakar, aged about 29 years, R/o Kurmipara Ward No. 17, Behind Ramjanki Temple Mahasamund, Civil & Revenue District Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through its Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Capital Complex, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Commissioner, Higher Education Department, Secretariat, Indrawati Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, Through its Secretary, Shankar Nagar Road, Bhagat Singh Square, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. University Grant Commission, Through Secretary, Bhadur Shah Zafar Marg New Delhi

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5316 of 2014

Danuj Kumar Markam S/o Shri Surat Singh Markam, aged about 31 years, R/o Village Pandariya Post- Usarwahi, PS Pandariya, Tehsil Bodala, Civil & Revenue District Kawardha, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. The Union of India Through the Secretary, Ministry of Human Resources Department Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi
2. State of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, Department of Higher Education Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, the Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. The University Grant Commission Through the Secretary, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5327 of 2014

Santosh Kumar Sahu, S/o Shri Tilakram Sahu, aged about 33 years resident of Village Khursi, Post Kodwa (Bani), Tehsil & District Mungeli, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through the Secretary, Higher Education Department, Mantralaya, New Raipur, Police Station Rakhi, Civil and Revenue District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, through the Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. University Grants Commission Through its Chairman, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi 110002

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5329 of 2014

Robert Sanjeev Ekka son of H. Ekka, aged about 41 years, resident of Ganga Nagar Sector- I, Near Mangla Chowk, P.S. Civil Lines, Tahsil, Civil and Revenue District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through the Secretary, Higher Education Department, Mantralaya, New Raipur, Police Station Rakhi, Civil and Revenue District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, through the Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. University Grants Commission Through its Chairman, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi 110002

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5337 of 2014

1. Satyendra Chandravanshi S/o Shri Chhoturam Chandravanshi, Aged about 29 years, R/o Rajmahal Colony, Ward No. 6, Kawardha District Kabirdham Chhattisgarh
2. Shanta Chandrakar D/o Shri Gorelal Chandrakar, Aged about 31 years, R/o Near Mukul School, Sarkanda Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
3. Sangeeta Gond D/o Shri Ramu Singh Gond, Aged about 37 Years, R/o In Front of Harbans Rice Mill, Lodhipara Old Sarkanda Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
4. Sangeeta Mishra W/o Sidharth Shankar Mishra, Aged about 44 Years, R/o Prabhu Kutir, Gandhi Chowk, Baloda Bazar Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through the Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Post & PS Mandir Hasaud, Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission Through its Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Post & PS Shankar Nagar, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. University Grants Commission Through its Secretary, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5355 of 2014

Ajay Chandravanshi S/o Shri Arjun Lal Chandravanshi, aged about 36 years, R/o House No. 38, Mathpara Ward Sarodha Marg Kawardha, P.S. Kawardha, Civil & Revenue District Kawardha, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. The Union of India Through the Secretary, Ministry of Human Resources Department, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi
2. State of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, Department of Higher Education Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, the Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. The University Grant Commission Through the Secretary, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5361 of 2014

Smt. Mamta Dewangan W/o Deepak Dewangan, aged about 29 years, category OBC, R/o Dewanganpara, Ward No. 12, P.S. Thankhamhariya, Civil & Revenue District Bemetara Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, High Education Department, Mantralaya New Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Commissioner, Higher Education Department, Indravati Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. Secretary, Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. University Grants Commission, through its Secretary, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi 110002

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5366 of 2014

Milan Hait S/o Shri Shrikant Hait, aged about 36 years, R/o B-18, Kranti Nagar, Bilaspur, Police Station & Post Tarbahar, Civil & Revenue District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through the Secretary, Higher Education Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, Police Station & Post New Raipur, Civil & Revenue District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, through its Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5318 of 2014

Sunil Kumar Bhardwaj S/o Daras Ram Bhardwaj, aged about 35 years, R/o Village Dewarmal, P.O. Kudurmali, via Bhaisma, P.S. Unga (Korba) Tahsil & District Korba, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh through the Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. The Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, through its Secretary, Shankar Nagar Road, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5416 of 2014

Abhay Ram Mahilange, S/o Budga Ram, aged about 38 years, R/o Village Bartunga, PO Deorghata, PS & Tahsil Dabhra, District Janjgir Champa, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh through the Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, through its Secretary, Shankar Nagar Road, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5447 of 2014

1. Rohit Lal Dewangan S/o Shri Ghasiya Ram Dewangan, aged about 45 years, Address: Shriram Medical Stores, Village & Post- Arjuni (Rawan), Block Baloda-Bazar, District Baloda-Bazar- Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh
2. Santosh Kumar Suryavanshi S/o Shri Jagdish Prasad Suryavanshi, aged about 44 years, R/o Village Chichirda, Post Saida, P.S. Chakarbhata, Tahsil Takhatpur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

3. Darashjee Darshan S/o Late Shri Sudhramji Darshan, aged about 42 years, Adress: Qr. No. 262, in the back of PHE Office, Shivanand Colony, District Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Public Service Commission, through its Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. University Grant Commission Through its Secretary, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi Pin 110002

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5282 of 2014

1. Dr. Vijayshree Yadav D/o Shri K.S.Yadav, aged about 33 years, resident of Imlipara, Bilaspur, Police Station Civil Lines, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
2. Dr. Jayshree Yadav D/o Shri K.S.Yadav, aged about 31 Years, resident of Imlipara, Bilaspur, Police Station Civil Lines, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
3. Uttam Kumar Banjare S/o Namdas Banjare, aged about 35 Years, resident of Daunadih, Nawagarh, Police Station Nawagarh, District Bemetara, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners

Vs

1. The Union of India, Through the Secretary, Ministry of Human Resources Department, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi
2. State of Chhattisgarh, Through the Secretary, Higher Education Department, Mantralaya, New Raipur, Police Station Rakhi, Civil & Revenue District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The University Grant Commission Through The Secretary, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi 110002
4. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission Through The Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5263 of 2014

1. Dr .Meenakshi Bajpai W/o Late Shri R.K.Bajpai, aged about 45 years, resident of C/o Shri Sunil Tiwari, 206, Palash Heights, Mahaveer Nagar, Police Station Mahaveer Nagar, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Shyam Sunder Tiwari S/o Shri J.P.Tiwari, aged about 30 Years, resident of Village Belgahna, Police Station Belgahna, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

3. Dr. Tankeshwary Patel D/o Shri H.R.Patel, aged about 32 years, resident of Village & Post Navrangpur, Police Station Sarangarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh
4. Pranjal Pathak son of Shri Vinay Kumar Pathak, aged about 35 Years, resident of C/62, Agyeya Nagar, Bilaspur, Police Station Civil Lines, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners

Vs

1. The Union of India, Through The Secretary, Ministry of Human Resources Department, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi
2. State of Chhattisgarh, Through The Secretary, Higher Education Department, Mantralaya, New Raipur, Police Station Rakhi, Civil & Revenue District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The University Grant Commission, Through The Secretary, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi 110002
4. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, Through The Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5401 of 2014

1. Dr. Amit Kumar Pandey, S/o Shri Harishankar Pandey, aged about 33 years R/o Ramkrishnalaye, Shantinagar, R/4, Near House No. D/1, P.S.- Bilaspur, Civil & Revenue District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
2. Dr. Smt. Triveni Patel W/o Shri Bhupendra Kumar Patel, aged about 41 Years R/o Shanti Nagar, Mirani Colony, In Front Of Railway Station, Champa, Police Station Champa, District Jangir – Champa, Civil & Revenue District Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh
3. Dr. Vinay Prabha Ekka D/o Shri Theodor Ekka aged about 39 Years R/o Mahamaya Lodge, Bus Stand, Police Station Jashpurnagar, District- Jashpur, Chhattisgarh, Civil & Revenue District- Jashpur, Chhattisgarh
4. Dr. Anjali Patel S/o Shri Shayam Kumar Patel, aged about 34 Years R/o C/o Mr. Santosh Swarankar Ward No. 11, Raipur Road, Sarangarh, Police Station Sarangarh, Chhattisgarh, Civil & Revenue District- Raigarh, Chhattisgarh
5. Shri Dinesh Kumar Sahu S/o Shankar Lal, aged about 38 Years R/o Naam Dev Colony, Dallirajhara, Police Station Dallirajhara, Distt Balod, Civil District- Durg, Revenue District – Balo, Chhattisgarh
6. Swadesh Rahi S/o Shatrughan Prasad, aged about 36 Years R/o Govt. High School. Kapri, Latabod, Police Station Balod, Distt Balod, Chhattisgarh Civil District- Durg, Revenue District- Balod, Chhattisgarh
7. Sushma Nirmalkar W/o Mahesh Nirmalkar, aged about 39 Years R/o House No. 250/1, Lalpur, Tahsil Bagbahara, Police Station Bagbahara, Civil & Revenue District Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh

8. Sagar Deewan S/o Shri Udai Ram, aged about 26 Years, R/o Guru Ghasidas Nagar, House No. 51/431, New Water Tank, Raipur, Police Station Raipur, Civil & Revenue Dist Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners

Vs

1. The State Of Chhattisgarh, Through The Secretary, Department Of Higher Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, Dist Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Commissioner, Department of Higher Education, Government Science College Campus, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh`
3. State Public Service Commission Chhattisgarh, Through The Secretary, Raipur, Dist Raipur, Chhattisgarh`
4. University Grants Commission, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi- 110002

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5417 of 2014

Ashwani Kumar S/o Mehataru Ram, aged about 28 years R/o Village Devada, PO Uparwah, Police Station Ghumka, Tahsil and District Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through The Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary, Shankar Nagar Road, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5418 of 2014

Ramnarayan Khunte S/o Nammu Ram Khunte, aged about 39 years, R/o Village & P.O. Amgaon, Via & Tah Jaijaipur, Police Station Jaijaipur, Dist Janjgir Champa, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through the Secretary, Department Of Higher Education, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission Through Its Secretary, Shankar Nagar Road, Raipur, Dist Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5317 of 2014

Amrit Lal Chandrabhas S/o Firat Ram Chandrabhas, aged about 40 years, R/o Village Jogidipa Pirda, Malkharoda, P.S. Malkharoda, District Janjgir Champa Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through The Secretary, Department Of Higher Education, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. The Chhattisgarh State Public Service Commission, Through Its Secretary Shankar Naagar Road, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5228 of 2014

Dr. Abhimanyu Prasad Sharma, S/o Shri Narayan Sharma, aged about 44 years R/o Village and Post Halora, Police Station Masturi, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Higher Education Department, Mantralaya, New Raipur, Police Station Rakhi, Civil & Revenue Distt Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, Through The Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, Dist Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5379 of 2014

Dr. (Smt.) Savita Yadav, aged about 35 years, W/o Dr. Rajan Yadav R/o Teacher Colony, Indira Kala Sangeet Vishwavidyalaya Parisar, Khairagarh, Police Station & Post Khairagarh, Civil & Revenue District Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur.
2. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission Through The Secretary, C.G.Public Service Commission, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. University Grant Commission Through The Secretary, University Grant Commission, Bahadur Shah Zafar Margd, New Delhi

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5391 of 2014

Dr. Navneet Dwivedi S/o Shri Shiv Dayal Dwivedi, aged about 42 years, R/o Kota Ward No. 12, Near Ravishanker Stadium Bid. Raipur, Dist Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through the Secretary, Higher Education Department, Mantralaya, New Raipur, Police Station Rakhi, Civil & Revenue District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, Through The Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. University Grant Commission, Through Chairman Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi 110002

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5393 of 2014

Shatrughan Prasad S/o Mr. Gandhi, aged about 35 years R/o A -2145, Narmada Vihar NTPC Jamnipali P.O. Jamnipali, P.S. Darri, Distt. Korba, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. Union Of India, Through The Secretary, Ministry Of Human Resources Department, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi
2. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through the Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, the Secretary, Shanker Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh`
4. The University Grant Commission Through The Secretary, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi.

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5394 of 2014

Rampal Dev Khatkar S/o Shri Chaitram Khatkar, aged about 43 years R/o Shivam Heights, Sundaram 402, Kalpana Vihar, Nehru Nagar, PO Nehru Nagar, Police Station City Kotwali, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. The Union Of India, Through The Secretary, Ministry Of Human Resources Department, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi
2. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Higher Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

3. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, The Secretary, Shanker Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. The University Grant Commission Through The Secretary, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5395 of 2014

1. Bedram Dilawar, S/o Sulut Ram Dilawar aged about 44 years, Resident of Q.No. 11/3, Ghurdewa Colony, Post Bankimongra, Tah Katghora, Distt Korba, Chhattisgarh
2. Dineshwar Baghel S/o Shri Bajjo Ram Baghel aged about 36 Years R/o Village Udkuda, Post Lakhanpuri, Tah Charama, District Kanker, Chhattisgarh
3. Kanshi Lal Dilawar S/o Samaru Ram Dilawar aged about 43 Years R/o C/o Shanti Lal Miri, Jail Road, Mohlain Bhata, Post Katghora, Tah Katghora, District Korba, Chhattisgarh
4. Prem Das Vaishnav S/o Shri Kanhaiya Das Vaishnav, aged about 28 Years R/o Village Domanpur, Post Bandha, Tah Takhatpur, Dist Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners

Vs

1. The Union Of India, Through The Secretary, Ministry Of Human Resource Department, Shastriya Bhawan, New Delhi
2. University Grant Commission Through Its Secretary, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi
3. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through its Secretary, Higher Education Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. Public Service Commission Through Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5374 of 2014

1. Dr. Smt. Lalita Pandey W/o Shri Ajay Pandey, Aged About 34 years R/o C/o Shri J.P. Pandey, Bouripara, Near Sagun Garden, Ambikapur P.S. Ambikapur, District Surguja, Chhattisgarh
2. Aradhana Tiwari, daughter of Sri Chandraprakash Tiwari, aged about 27 Years, resident of behind Civil Court Advocate Colony, Surajpur, Police Station and District Surajpur, Chhattisgarh
3. Tijeshwar Prasad Tandon, S/o Late Shri Maniram Tandon, aged about 35 Years, resident of Village Salni, Police Station Jaijaipur, District Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh
4. Lalit Kumar Latiya, son of Late Shri Ram Latiya, aged about 39 years, resident of Village Dokla, Police Station Mohla, District Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh
5. Devkumar Salame, son of Fagun Ram Salame, aged about 34 years, resident of Village Madiyakatta, Post Bharritola, Police Station Doundi, District Balod, Chhattisgarh

6. Nitin Pandey, son of Shri M.L. Pandey, aged about 38 years, resident of Shanti Vihar Colony, Danganiya, Raipur, Police Station Pt. Deendayal Nagar, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
7. Harsh Kumar Pandey, S/o Shri Sant Lal Pandey, aged about 40 years, R/o Vinoba Nagar, Bilaspur, P.S. Tarbahar, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
8. Ramkrishna Maheshwari, S/o Shri Resham Lal Maheshwari, aged about 33 years, R/o Village Chakravay, Post Maro, Tahsil & P.S. Navagarh, District Bemetara, Chhattisgarh
9. Murlee Kumar Chandrakar, S/o Shri Sammatram Chandrakar, aged about 30 years, R/o Village Rapa, Post & P.S. Kunda, District Kabirdham, Chhattisgarh
10. Dr. Satyabhama Sauraj, W/o Shri Praveen Sauraj, aged about 40 years, R/o 37, Shri Ram Vihar Colony, Purena, P.S. Telibandha, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners

Vs

1. The Union of India, through the Secretary, Ministry of Human Resources Department, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi
2. State of Chhattisgarh, through the Secretary, Higher Education Department, Mantralaya, New Raipur, Police Station Rakhi, Civil & Revenue District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The University Grants Commission, through the Secretary, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi - 110002
4. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, through the Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5377 of 2014

Roshan Kumar Sahu, S/o Shri Raja Ram Sahu, aged 35 years, R/o Village Jevara, Tahsil Than Khamariya, District Bemetara, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. The Union of India, through the Secretary, Ministry of Human Resources Department, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi
2. State of Chhattisgarh, through the Secretary, Higher Education Department, Mantralaya, New Raipur, Police Station Rakhi, Civil & Revenue District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The University Grants Commission, through the Secretary, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi 110002
4. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, through the Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5873 of 2014

Smt. Simran Tekchandani @ Manju Kodwani, W/o Shri Shyam Sunder Lal Tekchandani, aged about 34 years, R/o "MANURAJ", Rajendra Nagar, Police Station Civil Lines, Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh), Civil & Revenue District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through the Secretary, Higher Education Department, Mantralaya, New Raipur, Police Station Rakhi, Civil & Revenue District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, through the Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, Tahsil and District Raipur, Civil & Revenue District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5987 of 2014

Yashwant Arya, S/o Shri Sunil Kumar Arya, aged about 29 years, R/o Club Para, Ward No. 19, Mahasamund, District Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. The Union of India, through the Secretary, Ministry of Human Resources Department, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi
2. State of Chhattisgarh, through the Secretary, Higher Education Department, Mantralaya, New Raipur, Police Station Rakhi, Civil and Revenue District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The University Grants Commission, through the Secretary, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi 110002
4. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, through the Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5865 of 2014

Rajesh Kumar Gautam, S/o Shri Manaharan Singh Gautam, aged about 33 years, C.S.E.B. Baloda Bazar, Address: O.A. Grade-II, Tahsil and District Baloda Bazar, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

2. Public Service Commission, through its Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. University Grants Commission, through its Secretary, Bahadur Singh Zafar Marg, New Delhi, Pin 110002

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5855 of 2014

Dr. Annapurna Dewangan, D/o Shri Kamal Narayan Dewangan, aged about 39 years, R/o Dewangan Electronics, Purana Bazar Chowk, Kurud, Post & P.S. Kurud, District Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through the Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Post and P.S. Mandir Hasaud, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, through its Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Post and P.S. Shankar Nagar, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. University Grants Commission through its Secretary, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 6032 of 2014

Prashant Sukdeve, aged about 42 years, S/o Shri Maniram Sukhdeve, R/o Kaurinbhatha, Ward No. 39, Rajnandgaon, Police Station Basantpur, District Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Mahanadi Bhavan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, the Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The University Grants Commission, through the Secretary, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5304 of 2014

Dr. Rakesh Kumar Sao S/o Shri R.R. Sao, aged about 44 years, Occupation-Service Posted as Head Master at Primary School Kurrupara, Vikas Khand Pussore, Police Station Pussore, Civil & Revenue District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through its Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Capital Complex, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Commissioner Higher Education Department, Secretariat, Indrawati Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, Through its Secretary, Shankar Nagar Road, Bhagat Singh Square, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. University Grant Commission, Through Secretary, Bhadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 6181 of 2014

Tikendra Kumar Yadu, S/o Late Dayalu Ram Yadu, aged about 39 years, R/o MIG-280, Padmanabhpur, Police Station Padmanabhpur, Tehsil and District-Durg, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary Higher Education Department, Mantralaya, Capital Complex, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, Police Station Rakhi, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, Raipur, Through its Secretary, Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. University Grants Commission Through its Secretary, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi
4. Union of India Through its Secretary, Department of Human Resources Department, Department of Higher Education, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi 110001

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 6092 of 2014

Dr. Ajay Kumar Sinha S/o V.P. Sinha, aged about 47 years, Resident of- In Front of Maheshwar Mandir, Godhanpur, Ambikapur, Police Station Ambikapur, District Surguja, Civil & Revenue District Surguja, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. The State of Chhattisgarh, Through the Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Mahandi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Commissioner, Department of Higher Education, Government Science College Campus, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

3. State Public Service Commission Chhattisgarh, Through The Secretary, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. Union of India, through the Secretary, Ministry of Human Resources Department, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi
5. University Grants Commission, through Secretary, Bahadur Sah Jafar Marg, New Delhi

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 6070 of 2014

Dr. Chaitram Ratre, S/o Shri Firturam, Aged about 47 years, R/o MIG I-355, Sector-1, Pandit Deendayal Uapdhyay Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through the Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Ministry, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, Police Station Rakhi, Civil and Revenue District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, Through the Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. University Grants Commission, Through the Secretary, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi- 110002

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5931 of 2014

Pratap Bhanu Patel S/o Shri Ramprasad Patel, aged about 47 years, Address : H. No. 241, Aam Bagicha Sunder Nagar Post Sunder Nagar Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Public Service Commission, through its Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. University Grant Commission, through its Secretary, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi, PIN 110002

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5378 of 2014

Ashok Kumar Bhardwaj S/o Suraj Kumar Bhardwaj, aged about 37 years, Resident of Behind Raghuraj Stadium Imalipara Road, Bilaspur, Post & Police Station Civil Line, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through its Secretary, Higher Education Department Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, Civil & Revenue District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, through its Secretary Shankar Nagar Raipur, Civil & Revenue District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The University Grant Commission, through the Secretary, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi PIN 110002
4. The Union of India through its Secretary, Ministry of Human Resources Department, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5648 of 2014

1. Ramesh Kumar Mehara S/o Shri Goverdhan Prasad Mehara, aged about 41 years, R/o Village Mauhadih, Post Kapan, Police Station and Tahsil Akaltara, Civil & Revenue District Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh
2. Vivek Patle, S/o Shri Amrit Lal Patle, aged about 27 Years, R/o Village Gadhola, Post Tilai, Police Station Janjgir, Tahsil Akaltara, Civil & Revenue District Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh through the Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission through the Secretary, Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. University Grants Commission through the Secretary, University Grants Commission, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5588 of 2014

Smt. Madhu Tiwari, W/o Shri Chandrika Prasad Tiwari, aged about 43 years, R/o Village & Post Kapsada, Via Police Station Kumhari, Tahsil Dhamdha, District Durg, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh through the Secretary, Higher Education Department, Mantralaya, New Raipur, Police Station Rakhi, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Public Service Commission through the Secretary, Shankar Nagar Road, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. University Grants Commission through the Secretary, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi, India

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5492 of 2014

Jafir S/o Basir, aged about 30 years, R/o C/o Nasheer Ahmad, Chandmari Road, Nawagarh, Ambikapur, Police Station Sadar Kotwali, Ambikapur, District Surguja, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh through the Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Capital Complex, Naya Raipur, Post Office Rakhi, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission through its Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The University Grants Commission through its Secretary, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi 110002

---- Respondents

Writ Petition (S) No. 5491 of 2014

Vinod Choudhary, S/o Late Narayan Choudhary, aged about 38 years, R/o Behind of Bhatthapara Manipur School, Ambedkar Ward No. 45, Ambikapur, Police Station Sadar Kotwali, Ambikapur, District Surguja, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. State of Chhattisgarh through the Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Capital Complex, Naya Raipur, Post Office Rakhi, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission through its Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The University Grants Commission through its Secretary, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi, 110002

---- Respondents

AND

Writ Petition (S) No. 5470 of 2014

Dr. Rajni Manhar D/o G.P.Manhar, W/o Anil Chand Banjare, aged about 38 years, R/o Rahod, Pamgarh, Police Station Shivrinarayan, District Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh, Civil & Revenue District Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh

---- **Petitioner**

Vs

1. The State of Chhattisgarh through the Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Commissioner, Department of Higher Education, Government Science College Campus, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. State Public Service Commission Chhattisgarh through the Secretary, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. University Grants Commission, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi 110002

---- **Respondents**

For Petitioners	: Shri Kishore Bhaduri, Shri Prateek Sharma, Shri P.P.Sahu, Shri Mateen Siddique, Shri Arvind Dubey, Shri Vivek Chopda, Shri Anup Majumdar, Shri Pawan Kesharwani, Shri Chandresh Shrivastava, Shri Sameer Uraon, Shri Anurag Dayal Shrivastava, Shri A.K.Shukla, Shri Rakesh Dubey, Ms. Ruchi Nagar, Shri Sunil Sahu, Shri Ajit Singh, Shri Jitendra Pali, Shri Maneesh Upadhyay, Shri Kunal Das, Shri A.K.Prasad, Shri Ravindra Agrawal, Shri Alok Kumar Dewangan, Shri Ravi Maheshwari, Ms. Neha Verma, Advocates.
For Respondent/State	: Shri J.K.Gilda, Advocate General with Shri A.S.Kachhwaha, Additional Advocate General.
For Respondent/Union of India	: Shri Narendra Kumar Vyas, Assistant Solicitor General.
For Respondent/CGPSC	: Shri Abhishek Sinha, Shri Ashish Shrivastava, Shri Y.C.Sharma, Shri B.D.Guru, Shri G.S. Patel, Advocates.
For Respondent/UGC	: Shri Sachin Singh Rajput, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Navin Sinha, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Pritinker Diwaker, J

C A V Order

Per Navin Sinha, Chief Justice

27/08/2015

1. The Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission (hereinafter referred to as 'the Commission') published an advertisement on 10.9.2014 for appointment of 966 Assistant Professors in various subjects. The recruitments were to be made under the Chhattisgarh Educational Service (Collegiate Branch) Recruitment Rules, 1990 as amended on 5.2.2014 (hereinafter called 'the Recruitment Rules'). The last date for submission of applications was 9.10.2014, subsequently extended.
2. Writ Petition (S) No. 5201 of 2014 is dismissed with regard to Petitioners 1,2,10,11,13 and 14 as covered by the pronouncement in (2015) AIR SCW 2769 (P. Suseela v. University Grants Commission).
3. Rule 8, Schedule III of the Recruitment Rules prescribed the essential eligibility as a "good academic record" with at least 55% marks or Grade of "B" in the 7 point grading system obtained at the Master's degree level in the relevant subject or an equivalent degree from a Foreign University. Besides the above the candidate was also required to have passed the NET/SLET examination. The 'Note' in the advertisement defined "good academic record" as minimum 50% at the Higher Secondary and Under Graduate level. The advertisement also provided for 5% relaxation to reserved category candidates at the Under Graduate and Post Graduate Levels only but provided no such relaxation at the Higher Secondary Level. Age relaxation was provided for Shiksha karmis / Panchayat karmis for as many years as they may have worked in that capacity and also to those in contract employment subject to a

maximum age of 38 years. The conversion table of Grades as per the University Grants Commission (hereinafter referred to as 'the UGC') was as follows :-

<u>Grade</u>	<u>Grade Point</u>	<u>% Equivalent</u>
O	5.50-6.00	75-100
A	4.50-5.49	65-74
B	3.50-4.49	55-64
C	2.50-3.49	45-54
D	1.50-2.49	35-44
E	0.50-1.49	25-34
F	0.00-0.49	0-24

4. Learned Counsel for the remaining Petitioners in Writ Petition (S) No. 5201 of 2014 submitted that they were just short of the 50% requirement at the Higher Secondary Level only. Petitioner No. 3 had obtained 49.60%, Petitioner No. 4 had obtained 48%, Petitioner No. 5 had obtained 43.77%, Petitioner No. 6 had obtained 48.22%, Petitioner No.7 had obtained 48.37%, Petitioner No.12 had obtained 45.77% and Petitioner No. 16 below 50%. Similarly Petitioner No. 8 had secured 48.80% at the Under Graduate Level, Petitioner No. 9 had secured 49.77% and Petitioner No. 15 had secured 49.94%. Except for the same, they fulfill all other conditions of eligibility to be considered for selection and appointment. Relying on the general power of relaxation contained in Rule 24 of the Recruitment Rules it was submitted that by invoking the same directions may be issued to round off the marks of the Petitioners making them eligible for consideration.

5. Learned Counsel further submitted that the Recruitment Rules are an off take of the Madhya Pradesh Educational Service (Collegiate Branch) Rules, 1990. Rule 8 in Schedule III originally provided for a minimum of 55% at the Post Graduate Level and 50% at the Under Graduate Level. There was no requirement for having minimum 50% at the Higher Secondary Level. On

15.9.2005, the State Government amended the Rules by removing the requirement for minimum of 50% at the Under Graduate Level. On 3.8.2007 further amendments were made to the Recruitment Rules but it did not interfere with the earlier decision deleting the minimum 50% requirement at the Under Graduate level.

6. In the UGC Regulations published on 18.9.2010, Clause 4.4.1 prescribing the qualifications for Assistant Professors provided that good academic record would mean as defined by the concerned University with at least 55% marks at the Post Graduate level. The State Government then amended the Recruitment Rules on 5.2.2014 in Schedule III providing for “good academic record” with minimum 55% at the Post Graduate level. The legislative competence of the State Government was not disputed.

7. It was but contended that fixation of minimum 50% marks at the Higher Secondary and Under Graduate Level was not only irrational and arbitrary but was a classification among applicants possessing the same qualifications based on no intelligible criteria having any nexus with the object to be achieved for appointment of good teachers. It was thus violative of Article 14 of the Constitution creating two classes of applicants with similar qualifications. Reliance was placed on (1985) 1 SCC 305 (D.S.Nakara v. Union of India) to submit that micro classification was impermissible and the Court could strike down the offending portion of the law only leaving the rest. A candidate may have had Maths subject in class XII and may have got below 50% marks, in College he may have had Geography and secured less than 50% marks, at Post Graduate Level he may have had History securing 56% marks and may have also passed NET/ SLET examination. The UGC did not define “good academic record” but left it to be as defined by the concerned University. No standard has been laid down by any University in Chhattisgarh defining “good academic record”.

8. The requirement for passing of NET/SLET examination was the result of a well thought and considered decision making process by experts. Opining that standards in Universities were not uniform, and to ensure appointment of quality teachers only, NET/SLET was devised to have a standardized procedure for selection all over the country and ensure that persons with a basic minimum standard only were appointed. The experts who devised these norms including the R. C. Mehrotra Committee did not consider it necessary to lay down any further requirement of minimum marks at the Higher Secondary and Under Graduate Levels. The laying down of such criteria was a superimposition over the recommendations of the experts. Testing proficiency level of 55% at the Post Graduate Level coupled with the requirement for preparation of research papers etc. as part of the course was sufficient to test the capacity of the person for shouldering higher responsibilities of teaching and there was no relevance at all in going back to the High School or Under Graduation Level to test such proficiency. Reliance was placed on AIR 1995 SC 336 (University of Delhi v. Raj Singh) for the recommendations of the R.C.Mehrotra Committee as follows:-

"(i) Qualifying at the National Test conducted for the purpose by the UGC or any other agency approved by the UGC.

(ii) Master's degree with at least fifty five per cent marks or its equivalent grade and good academic record. (emphasis added by us)"

9. The last submission was that such a requirement for minimum 50% at the High School and Under Graduate level as "good academic record" for appointment as Assistant Professor has not been incorporated in any other State of the Country.

10. Learned Counsel for the Petitioners in Writ Petition (S) No. 5366 of 2014 and Writ Petition (S) No. 5855 of 2014 adopted the arguments in Writ Petition (S) No. 5201 of 2014.

11. Learned Counsel for the Petitioners in Writ Petition (S) No. 5266 of 2014 submitted that they had secured more than 50% and 55% at the Under Graduate and Post Graduate Levels but fell short of 50% at the Higher Secondary level and some of them had done Ph. D and M. Phil also. It was an highly irrational and illogical act to deny them consideration merely because they had not secured 50% at the Higher secondary Level only.

12. Learned Counsel for the Petitioners in Writ Petition (S) No. 5284 of 2014 submitted that denial of 5% relaxation at the Higher Secondary Level to reserved category candidates while granting the same at the Under Graduate and Post Graduate Levels was arbitrary, essentially debarring a reserved category of the benefit of reservation by taking away from one hand the benefit given by the other.

13. Learned Counsel for the Petitioners in Writ Petition (S) No's. 5318 of 2014, 5416 of 2014, 5417 of 2014, 5418 of 2014, 5317 of 2014 and 5316 of 2014 adopted the arguments in Writ Petition (S) No. 5284 of 2014. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner in Writ Petition (S) No.5865 of 2014 submitted that he was an OBC candidate and had 47% at the Graduation level. Recruitments on the post of Assistant Professor have not been held for a considerable long time. The State is a model employer. It cannot behave like a private person and was required to provide maximum opportunities for appointment and employment and must consider relaxation of the terms of the advertisement to provide better opportunities.

14. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner in Writ Petition (S) No. 5391 of 2014 assailing the prescription for "good academic record" additionally contended that not granting age relaxation to contract Professors alike that given to Shiksha Karmis, was discriminatory and that mandamus be issued in like

manner as directed in Writ Petition (S) No. 3719 of 2010 as the State did not put forth any justification for denial. It was lastly submitted with reference to Clause 4 (XI) of the advertisement, that since now the maximum age prescribed for appointment in government service is 40 years, the age relaxation of 35 years was required to be extended beyond the former.

15. It was next submitted that the Ravishanker Shukla State University in Revised Ordinance-4 approved at the 64th meeting of the Co-Ordination Committee on 20.12.2000 defined good academic record as Second division in Higher Secondary and Under Graduate Level. It was however fairly acknowledged that subsequently it had been superseded by the resolution of the Co-Ordination Committee meeting held on 6.6.2011 referring to the UGC Regulations dated 30.6.2010 and it contains no definition of good academic record unlike that contained in the earlier ordinance. It was further submitted that Chhattisgarh Board of Higher Secondary Education in the year 2015-16 has defined Second Division as above 45% but below 60%. But the impugned advertisement defines “good academic record” as minimum 50% at the Higher Secondary level. The amendment to Rule 8, Schedule III dated 5.2.2014 of the Recruitment Rules does not provide for “good academic record” as 50% at the Higher secondary and Under Graduate Level. It cannot be incorporated in the advertisement by a ‘Note’ in absence of statutory insertion. If the State wants to test the academic acumen of a candidate at the Higher Secondary and Under Graduate Level it must do so with reference to the standards set by academicians for judging the same. It is not open for the Government to set its own standards for judging academic acumen at variance with that done by academicians. If the academician considers a good academic record to mean Second Division and which ranges 45% to 60%, the State Government cannot impose a restriction for a minimum of 50% at the Higher Secondary and Under Graduate level.

16. Learned Advocate General on behalf of the State, submitted that the writ petition was completely devoid of substance. No grounds have been pleaded why the prescription of “good academic record” as defined, at the Higher Secondary and Graduation Level was arbitrary or discriminatory. A plea of arbitrariness or discrimination is required to be specific for invoking Article 14 of the Constitution.

17. The requirement for a “good academic record” as defined had a salutary purpose. Teaching is a serious profession and has repercussions beyond the individual. It would ensure induction only of quality teachers with a proven academic record so that excellence is maintained in standards of higher education in the State. The State does not desire to appoint only the best candidates but the excellent among the best constituting the cream. Laying down qualifications for appointment was the prerogative of the employer. Judicial review cannot be invoked to rewrite the conditions of eligibility unless the qualifications prescribed were on the face of it arbitrary and irrational which was not the case presently. The power and authority of the State to amend the Recruitment Rules has not been assailed. Article 14 of the Constitution has no application as each State has the authority in law to formulate its own policies.

18. The UGC Regulations do not prohibit a State from laying down or prescribing additional qualifications. The seed prescription of a “good academic record” is to be found in the UGC Regulations itself. The essential eligibility prescribed by the UGC for the post of Assistant Professor has not been violated.

19. Reliance in support of the submissions was placed on (1994) 4 SCC 391 (S.Satyapal Reddy v. Govt. of Andhra Pradesh), (1993) 2 SCC 310 (Government of Andhra Pradesh v. P. Dilip Kumar), (2011) 3 SCC 436 (State

of Orissa v. Mamata Mohanty), (2013) 1 SCC 223 (National Council for Teacher Education v. Venus Public Education Society) and (2013) 10 SCC 519 (University Grants Commission v. Neha Anil Bobde (Gadekar)).

20. It was lastly submitted that decision not to grant 5% relaxation to reserved category candidates at the Higher Secondary Level while granting the benefit at the Under Graduate level was a policy decision and beyond the purview of judicial review.

21. Learned Counsel for the Commission submitted that it was only a recruiting body which published the advertisement and will conduct selection in accordance with the Recruitment Rules and the requisition received from Higher Education Department.

22. Learned Counsel for the UGC submitted that fixation of good academic criteria by the State does not violate or deviate from any UGC Regulations or guidelines.

23. The Assistant Solicitor General appearing on behalf of Union of India submitted that the Petitioners can approach the State Government for consideration and redressal of their grievances under the relaxation clause incorporated in Rule 24 of the Recruitment Rules.

24. The respective submissions on behalf of the parties including the relevant Regulations of the UGC and the Recruitment Rules have been considered. There is no challenge to the Recruitment Rules as amended on 5.2.2014 incorporating the requirement for a “good academic record”. The ‘Note’ in the advertisement specifying “good academic record” as 50% at the Higher Secondary Level and Under Graduate Level therefore has a statutory

basis which the Petitioners have also unequivocally accepted. The R.C Mehrotra Committee relied upon by the Petitioners also visualized the importance of “good academic record”.

25. The importance of higher education in today's competitive world hardly needs to be emphasized. If school education lays the foundation, higher education is the edifice on which superstructure of life is built. A person aspiring to be appointed as an Assistant Professor therefore is required to be of high caliber and which will include academic excellence signifying that he has the capacity not only to imbibe the matters in himself but also to communicate and transmit it to pupils. Academic excellence cannot be measured in the void only on basis of the number of degrees or qualifications acquired. There has to be some yardstick for the same. A “good academic record” can well be described as a yardstick to assess academic excellence and the capacity to transmit that excellence to others through education.

26. The fact that a person may have passed examinations cannot be sufficient justification to claim academic excellence. If that were to be so, fixation of standards for performance in examinations would become redundant. Teaching, generally speaking is yet to acquire dignity and status of a career option with popularity in the country. In (1989) 1 SCC 392 (Andhra Kesari Educational Society v. Director of School Education), it was observed as follows:

“20....Though teaching is the last choice in the job market, the role of teachers is central to all processes of formal education. The teacher alone could bring out the skills and intellectual capabilities of students. He is the 'engine' of the educational system. He is a principal instrument in awakening the child to cultural values. He needs to be endowed and energized with needed potential to deliver enlightened service expected of him. His quality should be such as would inspire and motivate into action the benefiter. He must keep himself abreast of ever-changing conditions. He is not to perform in a wooden and unimaginative way. He must eliminate dissipated tendencies and attitudes and infuse nobler and national ideas in younger

minds. His involvement in national integration is more important, indeed indispensable. It is, therefore, needless to state that teachers should be subjected to rigorous training with rigid scrutiny of efficiency. It has greater relevance to the needs of the day. The ill-trained or sub-standard teachers would be detrimental to our educational system; if not a punishment on our children. The Government and the University must, therefore, take care to see that inadequacy in the training of teachers is not compounded by any extraneous consideration.”

27. Likewise, in (1998) 3 SCC 88 (Meera Massey (Dr.) v. Dr. S.R.Mehrotra) it was again observed emphasizing the importance of quality teachers in higher education as follows:

“24. University imparts education which lays foundation of wisdom. Future hopes and aspirations of the country depends on this education, hence proper and disciplined functioning of the educational institutions should be the hallmark. If the laws and principles are eroded by such institutions it not only pollutes its functioning, deteriorating its standard but also exhibits to its own student the wrong channel adopted. If that be so, how could such institutions produce good citizens? It is the educational institutions which are the future hope of this country. They lay the seed for the foundation of morality, ethics and discipline. If there is any erosion or descending by those who control the activities all expectations and hopes are destroyed.”

“26.....The most important factor in the field of higher education is the type of person entrusted with teaching. Teaching cannot be improved without competent teachers.... The most critical problem facing the universities is the dwindling supply of good teachers...The supply of the right type of teachers assumes, therefore, a vital role in the educational advancement of the country.”

28. The UGC Regulations stipulate a “good academic record” for appointment as an Assistant Professor and leaves the definition of the same as may be prescribed by the University concerned. No material has been placed before us with regard to laying down of such criteria by any University in the State of Chhattisgarh or otherwise except by Ravishankar Shukla State University on 20.12.2000 which also has subsequently been done away with on 6.6.2011. We are therefore not required to deal with the issue if the definition “good academic record” prescribed by the State Government is at variance with that of any University. Even if the Chhattisgarh Board of Higher

Secondary Education has defined second division as above 45% but below 60% and the Respondents have fixed a benchmark of 50% at the Higher Secondary Level to qualify as “good academic record”, no illegality can be said to have been committed.

29. It is difficult to accept that all those who may have passed Higher Secondary and Under Graduate examination constitute one class of eligible persons to be considered for appointment and that no classification is permissible amongst them on basis of marks under Article 14 of the Constitution. A classification based on marks incorporates intelligible criteria and has a direct nexus for appointment of quality teachers assessed on academic performance. Likewise, we find it extremely difficult to hold that if a candidate has secured 55% marks at the Post Graduate level and has passed NET/SLET, whether the candidate had a good academic record at the Higher Secondary and Under Graduate level is irrelevant. The cumulative assessment sought to be done by the Respondents to assess the capability and suitability based on overall performance of an aspirant for the post of Assistant Professor cannot be called an irrelevant, irrational or illogical exercise. If the academicians and experts did not consider passing of NET/SLET examination as sufficient for appointment and sought a “good academic record”, even if the candidate succeeded in the selection process, the Court cannot substitute its views in the garb of judicial review to prescribe qualifications for appointment. In D.S.Nakara (supra) relied upon by the Petitioners it was observed :-

“15. Thus the fundamental principle is that Article 14 forbids class legislation but permits reasonable classification for the purpose of legislation which classification must satisfy the twin tests of classification being founded on an intelligible differentia which distinguishes persons or things that are grouped together from those that are left out of the group and that differentia must have a rational nexus to the object sought to be achieved by the statute in question.”

30. The qualifications for appointment pertain to the domain of the employer who is best suited to prescribe eligibility and requirements according to the needs of the employer. The statutory authority alone is entitled to frame the statutory rules laying down the essential qualifications for appointment to a particular post and the terms and conditions of service. The jurisdiction of the Court shall be only to interpret the same and not to supplant or supplement the same. The Court cannot direct an employer to lay down a particular qualification or relax the same as observed in (2006) 8 SCC 42 (Sanjay Kumar Manjul v. Chairman, Uttar Pradesh Service Commission). Similar view has been taken in (2002) 8 SCC 65 (Union of India v. Joginder Sharma). The contention of the State needs to be noticed that it does not only want the best of teachers but excellent among them constituting the cream. In absence of any yardstick for definition of “good academic record” by the UGC, it cannot be said that the State Government is incompetent or is transgressing the UGC Regulations merely because it may have fixed a benchmark for what may be classified as “good academic record”.

31. A similar question arose for consideration before a Division Bench of Rajasthan High Court in a batch of appeals led by (DB) Civil Special Appeal (Writ) No. 532 of 2002 – RPSC Ajmer v. Smt. Pushpa Panwar) disposed on 8.4.2010. (Coram: Hon’ble The Chief Justice Jagdish Bhalla and Hon’ble Mr. Justice Dinesh Maheshwari). The advertisement published by Rajasthan Public Service Commission inviting applications for the post of Lecturers in various subjects under the College Education Department required the candidates to have minimum 55% marks at the Post Graduate level, passed NET/SLET examination with a “good academic record” which was defined as minimum second class in Under Graduation. The Respondents did not secure second division marks in Graduation and were consequently rejected. It was similarly urged that they possessed all other essential qualifications for

appointment like Post Graduation with minimum 55%, had cleared NET/SLET and rejection merely on the ground of not having second class in Under Graduation was illegal, arbitrary and violative of Article 14 of the Constitution. The Learned Single Judge held that when a person steps further or acquires a higher qualification, the lower qualification loses its importance and rejection of the candidature with reference to Graduation marks was palpably arbitrary, illegal and violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India, more so when they had also passed NET/SLET observing as follows :-

“In my considered opinion, when the petitioner has secured 55% marks in post graduation examination in the subject concerned and furthermore when, she has qualified the National Educational Test Eligibility for Lecturership conducted by the University Grants Commission and State Level Eligibility Test for Lecturership, 1999 conducted by the RPSC, therefore, rejection of the candidature of the petitioner for the post of Lecturer in Hindi on the ground that she did not possess graduation (BA degree) with second division, is absolutely per se illegal and arbitrary.”

32. Disagreeing with the Learned Single Judge, the Division Bench held that the Learned Single Judge erred in not appreciating that the expression “good academic record” had its foundation in the Rajasthan Educational Service (Collegiate Branch) Rules, 1980 under which the advertisement had been published and the recruitment was to be made. Alike the present case, there was no challenge to the Rules. It was further held that laying down of the requirement for “good academic record” was only a part of the essential qualification prescribed by the UGC observing as follows:

“Once “good academic record” became a part of essential qualifications for the post of lecturer; and when this term had otherwise not been defined in the rules, a suitable definition was called for in order to fill in the gap and to make the rules workable. Hence, the action on the part of the State Government to define the term “good academic record” remains unexceptionable.”

33. Reiterating the principle that laying down of requisite qualification was the competence of the employer and that there was no arbitrariness or

illegality in defining the term “good academic record”, it was observed that marks obtained in Graduation do not become redundant after obtaining Post Graduation and clearing NET/SLET. If the latter were held sufficient, the requirement for “good academic record” would become redundant, an interpretation which was to be avoided.

34. The contention of the Petitioners that alternatively marks at the Higher Secondary or Under Graduation level may be relaxed or rounded off under Rule 24 of the Recruitment Rules also merits no consideration by the Court. The power of relaxation cannot be applied to essential conditions of eligibility. Alternately, the Court cannot usurp the power of the State with regard to invocation of relaxation clause. It is for the State to consider the same if the aggrieved approaches for that relief. The issue has been raised in Court directly without approaching the authorities first and which is the first principle for mandamus. Likewise, the issue for relaxation of age by the employer also pertains to the executive domain of the employer and it shall be wholly inappropriate exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution to usurp that power of the employer and substitute it by the views of the Court with regard to who may be suitable or unsuitable for the post of Assistant Professor. In (2001) 9 SCC 356 (Union of India v. Shivbachan Rai) it was observed :-

“4.....Prescribing of any age limit for a given post, as also deciding the extent to which any relaxation can be given if an age limit is prescribed, are essentially matters of policy.....”

35. The State Government cannot be said to have violated any UGC Regulations in laying down the criteria for “good academic record” and which on the contrary draws sustenance for its incorporation from the UGC Regulations itself. But the same conclusion cannot be arrived at with regard to denial of 5% of relaxation to reserved category candidates at the Higher Secondary level while granting it to them at the Under Graduate level.

No justification has been placed before us for this classification and purpose to be achieved by the same with regard to the same candidate. This sub-classification is therefore held to be unsustainable. The State Government is required to reconsider the same appropriately in accordance with law.

36. Mamata Mohanty (supra) relied upon by the Learned Advocate General refers to Meera Massey (supra). S.Satyapal Reddy (supra) and P.Dilip Kumar lay down the justifiability of prescribing higher qualifications than the minimum prescribed and giving of preference to the former. Presently, in our opinion the State Government by defining “good academic record” has only acted in furtherance of the UGC Regulations and cannot be said to have even prescribed higher qualifications. Venus Education Society (supra) again highlights the importance of good quality teachers and their responsibilities. Neha Anil Bobde (supra) holds that the UGC has the authority to lay down “any qualifying criteria” which has a rational nexus with the object to be achieved for maintaining standards in teaching, by regulating conditions for appointment of Assistant Professors in Universities as standards of the teaching faculty has a direct nexus with the maintenance of standards of education to be imparted to students.

37. Resultantly the writ petitions are dismissed and all interim orders are vacated, except to the limited extent for reconsidering grant of 5% relaxation to reserved category candidates at the Higher secondary level. If the other Petitioners invoke Rule 24, it is for the State to consider matters in accordance with law.

Sd/-
(Navin Sinha)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-
(Pritinker Diwaker)
JUDGE