

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

**C.W.P. No.5393 of 2016
Date of decision:21.03.2016**

Vijay Kumar Chopra

... Petitioner

VS.

Panjab University & others

... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

* * *

To be referred to Reporters or not ?

Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

* * *

Present : Mr. Amar Vivek, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Suvir Sidhu, Advocate
for respondent No.1.

Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Pratham Sethi, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J.(ORAL)

After having attained the age of superannuation the petitioner was re-employed as Professor in English for a term of five years. Such re-employment was approved both by the Syndicate and Senate of the respondent-University.

Through the present petition the primary challenge of the petitioner is to the order dated 16.03.2016 through which the Vice Chancellor of the respondent-University has not recommended his extension beyond the third year of re-employment.

Upon notice, Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Sr. Advocate has appeared on behalf of respondent No.2 and has submitted that since the impugned order is merely a recommendation by the Vice Chancellor and the matter is yet to be finally considered by both the Syndicate and Senate of

the respondent-University, the present petition is premature.

Learned counsel for the University has also raised the same objection.

Though learned counsel for the petitioner does not dispute the fact that the impugned order is merely a recommendation by the Vice Chancellor and that the final decision thereupon, under the applicable rules, is yet to be taken by the Senate of the respondent-University, he expresses his apprehension that the final decision would be taken against the petitioner.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusal of the record with their able assistance, I am of the considered opinion that at this stage the present petition is clearly pre-mature as no final decision with regard to the continuance of the petitioner on re-employment basis beyond the third year of his re-employment has been taken as it is the admitted case between the parties that the meetings for taking a final decision by the Syndicate and Senate of the respondent-University are scheduled for 22.03.2016 and 27.03.2016, respectively.

Disposed of as premature.

Obviously, since the petition is being disposed of as premature, the petitioner would be at liberty to approach the Court again on the same cause of action in case the final decision is taken to his prejudice.

(Deepak Sibal)
Judge

March 21, 2016
rimpal