

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.10486 of 1996
Date of Decision: 03.03.2016

Doctor Ravi Kumar Anu

... Petitioner

Versus

Punjabi University Patiala and others

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Mr. Amit Jain, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ajay Vir Singh, Advocate.

Mr. K.S. Sidhu, Sr. Advocate,
with Mr. A.S. Sandhu, Advocate,
for respondent No.3.

1. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
2. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J.(Oral)

1. The appointment of the 3rd respondent Dr. Chaman Lal as Reader in Hindi Department in the Punjabi University, Patiala has been challenged on the ground of bias and the Vice Chancellor showing favour to the respondent in a selection in which the petitioner participated but withdrew his candidature at the eleventh hour.

2. The Vice Chancellor and the 3rd respondent are arrayed as respondents by name. Having withdrawn his candidature at the last minute, the petitioner lost his *locus standi* to challenge the selection. Neither has the petitioner prayed for *quo warranto*, therefore, he cannot be said to be person aggrieved by the selection of the 3rd respondent. Besides, public interest has not been invoked in the appointment for this Court to have treated the

petition as a Public Interest Litigation and sent it to the appropriate roster Bench to consider such an issue.

3. The specific prayer in the petition is for a direction declaring the decision of the University to create the post of Reader in Hindi was an arbitrary, mala fide act motivated by extraneous considerations and, therefore, the selection of the 3rd respondent should be set aside. There is no material on record nor could possibly be that decision to create a post of Reader in Hindi in University of the status of the Punjabi University, Patiala would be coloured by bias and mala fides. It is very easy to allege mala fides, array parties by name and then squander time of this Court on a lifeless cause.

4. Learned counsel for respondent No.3 informs the Court that the respondent No.3 retired from service in 2013 as a Professor in Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi.

4. No ground is made out to interfere.

5. The petition stands dismissed.

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

03.03.2016
manju