

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Letters Patent Appeal No. 137 of 2014 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 25.02.2015

BPS Mahila Vishwavidayala, Khanpur Kalan, through its Registrar  
.....Appellant

versus

Dr. Pushpa Devi and others ..Respondents

**CORAM:** HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.J.VAZIFDAR, ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE.  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH.

**Present :** Mr. Tribhuwan Dahiya, Advocate, for the appellant.  
Mr. R.K.Malik, Sr. Advocate with  
Mr. Vijay Dahiya, Advocate, for respondent Nos. 1 to 9.  
Mr. Amar Vivek, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**S.J.VAZIFDAR A.C.J.** (Oral)

This appeal can be disposed of on the basis of the stand taken by the State Government in its affidavit in reply and on the basis of the submissions made before us.

2. The question is whether the communication from the University Grants Commission (UGC) to all the Central/Deemed/State Universities is binding on the appellant-university and the State Government. The communication as far as the appellant is concerned is dated 06.02.2010. By this letter the UGC conveyed its acceptance to the recommendations of the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Review Committee regarding the revised guidelines for the scheme of appointment/honorarium of Guest/Part-Time Teachers. The U.G.C. decided that the Guest/Part-time teachers with the qualifications prescribed therein should be paid ₹ 1000/- per lecture subject to a maximum of ₹ 25,000/- per month. The original petitioners i.e. respondent Nos. 1 to 9

were appointed as the Guest Lecturers pursuant to notice dated 17.06.2010 for “Walk-in-Interview” for the post of Guest Lecturers in the subjects mentioned therein. The amount payable to the Guest-Lecturers as per that notice was ₹ 250/- per lecture subject to a maximum of ₹ 10,000/- per month.

3. The question is whether the University Grants Commission’s instructions dated 06.02.2010 are binding on the appellant and the State Government.

4. Mr. Vivek, learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the State of Haryana has invited our attention to a judgment of the Division Bench of this Court dated 05.03.2013 in a group of writ petitions first of which was Civil Writ Petition No. 24447 of 2012 in the case of **Anil Kumar and another v. State of Haryana and others**. It is admitted that the issue is answered against the appellant and the State Government to the effect that the circular would be binding on them. The appellant itself had in its reply stated that if the State Government approves the U.G.C. guidelines it would have no hesitation in implementing the same.

5. In view of the above, the appeal is dismissed.

Needless to add that the concerned persons would be entitled to the benefit of circular subject to their fulfilling all the requirements stated therein.

(S.J.VAZIFDAR)  
ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)  
JUDGE

**25.02.2015**  
‘ravinder’