

**104+244 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CWP No.6580 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 30.05.2016**

Dinesh Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

Panjab University, Chandigarh and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. Chetan Mittal, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Kunal Mulwani, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Subhash Ahuja, Advocate and
Ms. Balpreet Sidhu, Advocate
for respondents No.1, 2, 4 and 5.

Mr. Karan Nehra, Advocate
for respondent No.6.

DEEPAK SIBAL J. (ORAL)
CM No.6821-CWP of 2016

Through the present application, replication to the written statement filed on behalf of respondents No.1, 2, 4 and 5 is sought to be placed on record.

Allowed as prayed for.

CM stands disposed of.

CWP No.6580 of 2016

Through advertisement No.4/2014 (Annexure P-2), the respondent-Panjab University, Chandigarh (hereinafter referred to as the “University”) sought applications for appointment to the two posts of Associate Professors in the Department of Laws, Panjab University, Chandigarh. One of the posts was reserved for the Scheduled Caste category and the other one was for General category.

The present petition was filed by the petitioner primarily on the ground that the respondent-University was considering the candidature of respondent No.6 even though he was not having the requisite experience of guiding candidates for research at doctoral level as on the last date of submission of the applications. It was the case of the petitioner that he was identically placed as respondent No.6 and if the candidature of respondent No.6 was to be considered then on the ground of parity even he should be considered.

Upon notice having been issued, the respondent-University has filed a short reply by way of affidavit of the Registrar of the University in which it has been stated that one post of Associate Professor (SC category) has been withdrawn and it was that post against which respondent No.6's candidature was being considered.

Learned counsel for the respondent-University further submits that candidature of respondent No.6, in pursuance to the advertisement in question, would not be considered for either of the posts of Associate Professor in the Department of Laws, Panjab University, Chandigarh as advertised through the advertisement in question.

In view of the afore-referred stand taken on behalf of the respondent-University as also the statement made by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the University, learned counsel for the petitioner does not press the present petition.

Dismissed as not pressed.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

May 30, 2016
rittu