

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.14878 of 2016

Date of Decision: 28.07.2016

Pradeep Kumar

... Petitioner

Versus

Maharishi Dayanand University Rohtak
and others

... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Ravinder Singh Dhull, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

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 petitioner is an rank outsider for the relief claimed. He is a meddlesome interloper who has no personal stake in the case set up either against respondent No.1 or respondent No.2. He appears to want a job in the 2nd respondent on the strength of being a Law Graduate and a practicing lawyer but he has not produced any advertisement issued by the institution calling applications from the public to fill posts. He depends on a litigation filed by the three private respondents herein in CWP No.9412 of 2006 which was disposed of as infructuous on January 10, 2014 by the Division Bench. Counsel for the Maharishi Dayanand University, Rohtak made a statement before the Bench that Mr. Chauhan etc. would not be replaced by contractual employees and they would continue so long as the New Self Financing Scheme is in vogue. In the disposed of petition, CM No.4636 of 2016 has been filed by which a request was made for replacement of counsel and accordingly the matter posted for September 20, 2016.

2. Against the order passed by the Division Bench, an SLP was filed in the SCI which is stated to be pending.

3. The prayer in this petition is to quash a notice dated June 13, 2016 (P-7) informing persons concerned [and not the petitioner] that the Vice Chancellor of the University has constituted a Committee to examine the cases of four faculty members working on contract basis under Self Financing Scheme in view of the orders of this Court to consider and report as to whether the services of these teachers [the three respondents] may be considered for regularization/co-terminus with the course/programme. No prayer personal to the petitioner has been made in the petition and, therefore, not only that the petitioner is not an aggrieved person but he has absolutely no locus standi to question the Notice which does not pertain to him nor affects his life or career.

4. The petition is wholly misconceived and misdirected and actually deserved to be dismissed costs when the petitioner asserts he is a practising lawyer but I restrain my hands from imposing them so as not to harm him on bad advice tendered and initiative taken by someone who wears a veil and hides himself from court to question by proxy the impugned Notice. There is not even a final decision taken by the Committee which in the hands of aggrieved person would have made the writ open to dismissal as premature. The petition is devoid of meaning or grief and is accordingly dismissed in limine.

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

28.07.2016
manju