

209

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CWP No.18727 of 2014

Date of decision: 07.01.2016

Nishant

....Petitioner

versus

Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology and others
....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. Narender Kaajla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Arvind Seth, Advocate
for respondents No.1 and 2.

None for respondents No.3 to 7.

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

In pursuance of an advertisement issued by the respondent-Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, vide appointment letter dated 16.08.2012 the petitioner was appointed as a Teaching Associate in the Department of Printing and Technology on contract basis.

As per the terms of his appointment, the petitioner was to continue upto 31.05.2013 or till regular appointment was made, whichever was earlier. Vide order dated 19.08.2013, the petitioner's appointment on contract basis was extended for another one year on the same terms and conditions. He was, thus appointed on contract basis upto 31.05.2014.

Through the impugned advertisement, the respondent-University invited applications for filling up on contract basis, several posts including the post held by the petitioner.

According to the petitioner, he cannot be replaced by another set of employees on contract basis.

It is the admitted case between the parties that in pursuance to the impugned advertisement, the petitioner made an application for consideration of his candidature for being appointed as a Teaching Associate. However, after considering his candidature, the same was rejected and in his place, the private respondent was appointed. It is only after the petitioner was denied appointment that he filed the present in September, 2014.

Having taken part in the process of selection and after rejection of his candidature, the petitioner would be estopped from laying to challenge that very process.

Still further, the appointments under challenge were made in May 2014 and were to be for a period of one year, which period also has come to an end by efflux of time. Neither of the counsel were able to apprise the Court whether any extensions in service were granted to any of the private respondents.

In view of the above, there is no merit in the present petition.

Dismissed.

No costs.

(Deepak Sibal)
Judge

07.01.2016

anju rani