

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

AND

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE GUDISEVA SHYAM PRASAD

WRIT APPEAL No. 701 of 2015

JUDGMENT: (*Per Hon'ble Sri Justice Gudiseva Shyam Prasad*)

This writ appeal is arising out of the order passed in the W.P.No.14334 of 2010 by the learned single Judge dismissing the writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for a writ of mandamus declaring the selection of the unofficial respondents 2 to 5 as Assistant Professors in the first respondent-University, who are appointed in pursuance of the advertisement vide No.2/2009 dated 2/7/2009 as violative of Articles 14 and 19 of the Constitution of India.

2. Heard the arguments of the appellant who appeared in person, and the arguments of the learned counsel for respondent No.1, and respondents 2 to 4 .

3. The appellant advanced his arguments stating that the English and Foreign Languages University is a Central University. It was created by an Act of Parliament in the month of December 2006. The Act came into force on August 3, 2007. The University has issued a notification No. 2/2009, dated 2/7/2009 to fill up teaching posts of Assistant Professors. The qualifications prescribed for the said posts are as follows:

A. Assistant Professors:
Rs.15600-39100 (PB 3) + AGP Rs.6000/-

QUALIFICATIONS:
Essential (From 1 to 40 mentioned below)

Good academic record with at least 55% of the marks or, an equivalent grade of B in the seven point scale with latter grades O, A, B, C, D, E & F at the Master's degree level, in the relevant subject from an Indian University, or, an equivalent degree from a foreign University.

Besides fulfilling the above qualifications, candidates should have cleared the eligibility test (NET) for Lecturers conducted by the UGC, CSIR or similar test accredited by the UGC.

"NET/SLET shall remain the minimum eligibility condition for recruitment and appointment of lecturers in Universities / Colleges / Institutions.

Provided, however, that candidates, who are or have been awarded Ph.D. degree in compliance of the "University Grants Commission (minimum standards and procedure for award of Ph.D Degree) Regulation 2009, shall be exempt from the requirement of the minimum eligibility condition of NET/SLET for recruitment and appointment of Assistant Professor or equivalent positions in Universities / Colleges / Institutions" vide UGC notification No.F.1-1/2002 (PS) Exemp. Dated 1st June, 2009."

4. The appellant has applied for the post of Assistant Professor, and he was called for interview but was not selected. The unofficial respondents 2 to 4 have been selected along with the one Sri Abdullah C.K., the 5th respondent herein, whose services were later terminated on the ground of unauthorized absence. The appellant has not sought for any remedy against the 5th respondent.

5. The appellant's contention is that the unofficial respondents 2 to 4 are not having essential qualifications of 10th class and Intermediate which are the preceding qualifications to the minimum prescribed qualification. It is contended that the appellant is having good academic record but ignoring the same the respondents 2 to 4 who are not having good academic record have been selected, as such their selection is illegal.

6. The selection committee has also not maintained the Record of Marks obtained by each candidate in the interview, and the committee has arbitrarily acted and selected the respondents 2 to 4

who do not hold the prerequisite minimum qualifications of 10th class, intermediate and degree.

7. The appellant places reliance on the decision reported in *Rakesh Kumar Sharma v. State (NCT of Delhi) and Others*¹, wherein it was held that *“a person who does not possess the requisite qualification cannot even apply for recruitment for the reason that his appointment would be contrary to the statutory rules, and would therefore be void in law”*.

8. The appellant further contended that the learned single Judge while dismissing the writ petition held that the selected candidates are having Ph.D Degree which is higher qualification than the prescribed minimum qualification, cannot be accepted. It is contended that the learned single Judge ought to have seen that as per UGC Regulation, 2010 and as per the notification No.2/2009 dated 02.07.2009, the essential qualifications for the post of assistant professors are as referred above.

9. The appellant further contended that the unofficial respondents did not possess any academic record with regard to their pre-requisite qualifications of SSC and intermediate as such they did not comply with the minimum eligibility criteria prescribed in the good academic record. To prove the said facts, the appellant has submitted additional material which was obtained from the University under the Right to Information Act vide letter No.EFL-

¹ (2013) 11 SCC 58

U/PIO/RTI/08/42/2016/ 1651 dated 23rd December, 2016 issued by the Public Information Office of the University.

10. The appellant contends that even if a particular University regulation allows admission for B.A. and M.A. course, without a person possessing preceding academic qualification such as intermediate and B.A, however, for the purpose of employment as University Teachers, the UGC Regulation clearly prescribes “good academic record”. According to him, “good academic record” is an essential part of minimum educational qualification prescribed by the UGC and the respondent University. Therefore, it is contended that none of the unofficial respondents namely the respondents 2 to 5 possess good academic record, to make them eligible for the employment as Assistant Professors in the 1st respondent-University

11. In this regard, the appellant has placed reliance on the UGC regulation published in the Gazette of India (Part-III, Sec. 4) dated 18.09.2010 on the subject “Minimum qualifications for appointment of teachers and other academic staff in Universities and Colleges and measures for the maintenance of standards in higher education-2010”. It is contended that the respondent-University, in reply to the RTI query, has clarified the phrase “Good academic regard”, which means that the candidate must have obtained an average of 50% Marks in each of the two public examinations/degree (“two public examinations/degrees means Intermediate and Degree”) immediately preceding the Masters Degree.

12. The appellant has placed reliance on the judgment rendered by this High Court in W.P No.27619 of 2010 that a candidate must secure and average of 50% marks in intermediate and degree examination, which is a part of minimum eligibility criteria prescribed under UGC regulation for appointment to the post of Lecturers and Assistant Professors.

13. The appellant has also placed reliance for the said proposition by referring to the judgment of honorable Apex court rendered in State of Orissa and another v. Mamata Mohanty², wherein it was held as under:

“Education is the systematic instructions, schooling or training given to the young persons in preparation for the work of life. It also connotes the whole course of scholastic instructions which a person has received. Education connotes the process of training and developing the knowledge, skill, mind and character of students by formal schooling. The excellence of instructions provided by an educational institution mainly depends directly on the excellence of the teaching staff. Therefore, unless they themselves possess a good academic record/minimum qualifications prescribed as an eligibility, it is beyond imagination of any one that standard of education can be maintained/enhance.”

14. The 2nd respondent filed counter affidavit stating that he was awarded Ph.D in Modern Arabic Literature, in 2009, and was awarded M.Phil with Distinction in Arabic Literature. He also possesses Master’s Degree in Modern Arabic Literature, awarded in the year 2005, by the Centre for Arabic Studies of the 1st respondent-University. He further stated that he was qualified in the National

² (2011) 3 SCC 436

Eligibility Test conducted by the UGC in the year 2005, and that he worked as Guest Lecturer in the Department of Arabic during 2009-10, and as a Teaching Assistant (Part-Time) during 2006-2008 in the 1st respondent-University, and that he has fifteen published works and that he attended several international seminars and presented the papers, and that his selection was a legitimate selection.

15. The 3rd respondent filed counter stating that he studied Alimiyat and Fazeelat Courses at Darul-Uloom Sabeelaussalam, Hyderabad. He appeared for Urdu Fazil examination in January, 1993 conducted by Idara-E-Adbiyat-e-Urdu, Hyderabad, and that the certificate course is equivalent to Diploma in Oriental Examination in Urdu of Osmania University vide its letter No.L/977/72/Acad, dated 08.11.1973. He passed B.A. (Languages) Degree course, which is a 3-year degree course offered by the Osmania University, and thereafter he passed M.A. (Arabic) with 86% marks from Osmania University in April, 1998, and was awarded Gold Medal. He also passed NET examination conducted by the UGC in June, 2004. He was also awarded Ph.D in Arabic by the Osmania University. He worked as Senior Arabic Lecturer in Sri Chaitanya Junior College, from July 2002 to April, 2010. He also worked as Part-time Arabic Lecturer in the Department of Arabic in Osmania University from December, 2008 to April, 2010.

16. The 4th respondent filed counter stating that he studied Urdu Alim from Idara-E-Adabiyat-E-Urdu, Panjagutta, Hyderabad, in 1997. The Osmania University, Hyderabad, vide proceedings dated

01.03.2004 resolved that his qualification is eligible for admission to Pre-Degree Course in Urdu under the Faculty of Oriental Languages. Subsequently, the academic counsel at its meeting held on 29.11.1974 has recognised the entrance examination in oriental languages conducted by the Osmania University as equivalent to Matriculation i.e., SSC for the purpose of employment. He passed Urdu Fazil examination in the year 2000 from Idara-e-Adabayat-e-Urdu, and that the Academic Senate of the Osmania University has approved the Urdu Fazil Course as equivalent to Intermediate of A.P., for the purpose of admission to B.A/B.Com course from Academic Year 1999 and 2000 onwards. He passed B.A. from Osmania University with Arabic as main language in the year 2002 with First Division. He did M.A., in Modern Arabic Language and passed in A-Grade. He also qualified in the NET exam in the year 2004, and also did M.Phil in Arabic Language and Literature in the year 2005 and Ph.D in Arabic Language in the year 2008. He passed Diploma in Translation. He wrote a book on Linguistics published by India Logue Foundation, Hyderabad, in the year 2008 with title “A Linguistic Introduction to the Study of Arabic Language, and he also wrote a book on “Translation: The Basis a Technical Approach.

17. The appellant has placed reliance on the following precedents.

- (i) Judgment of the Hon’ble Apex Court in Rakesh Kumar Sharma (1 supra)
- (ii) Judgment of the Hon’ble Apex Court in (2006) 9 SCC 564
- (iii) Judgment of the Division Bench of the Rajasthan High Court in Division Bench Civil Special Appeal (Writ) Nos. 532/2002, 531/2002, 624/2002, 625/2002.

18. The Rajasthan High Court, by common judgment dated 08.04.2010, held as under:

“... besides the requirement of a post graduate degree with 55% Marks, ‘Good Academic Record’ has been another but integral part of the essential qualifications for the post of Lecturer and it can not be said, as assumed by the learned single judge, that merely the marks in the post graduation would have been decisive and the other aspects of academic record were totally redundant. Contrary to what has been assumed by the learned single judge, in view of the position emanating from the statutory rules and notifications as discussed supra and in view of the fact that the qualifications so laid down by the UGC and the amended rules were not even put to challenge in the writ petitions, the indisputable position had been that “good academic record” with at least 55% marks in post graduation as envisaged by the UGC was a part of essential qualifications for the post of Lecturer, and there was no reason that the requirement of “good academic record” could have been dispensed with merely for a person having the requisite marks in post graduation.”

19. In **Rakesh Kumar Sharma v. State (NCT of Delhi) and others** (1 supra), the Hon’ble Supreme Court held as under:

“20. This Court lately in *State of Gujarat v. Arvindkumar T. Tiwari*³, held:

14. A person who does not possess the requisite qualification cannot even apply for recruitment for the reason that his appointment would be contrary to the statutory rules, and would therefore, be void in law. Lacking eligibility for the post cannot be cured at any stage and appointing such a person would amount to serious illegality and not mere irregularity. Such a person cannot approach the court for any relief for the reason that he does not have a right which cannot be enforced through court.

³ (2012) 9 SCC 545

23. There is no obligation on the court to protect an illegal appointment. The extraordinary power of the court should be used only in an appropriate case to advance the cause of justice and not defeat the rights of others or create arbitrariness. Usurpation of a post by an ineligible candidate in any circumstance is impermissible. The process of verification and notice of termination in the instant case followed within a very short proximity of the appointment and was not delayed at all so as to even remotely give rise to an expectancy of continuance.”

20. In *State of Rajasthan and another v. Kulwant Kaur*⁴, the equity, maxims – *Actus curiae neminem gravabit* – has been explained in paragraph 15 of the judgment which is as under:

“15. *Actus curiae neminem gravabit* is a well known maxim. The orders passed by the appellant could not, thus, have been directed to be set aside by the High Court on the grounds stated therein. The High Court did not arrive at a finding that the respondent was possessed of basic essential qualification, both as regards general education as well as the training.”

21. In Civil Misc. Writ Petition No.26819 of 2008 and 46255 of 2006 (*Bharat Kumar Singh v. U.P. Public Service Commission, Allahabad, and others*), it was held as under:

“We also do not find any conflict between the minimum qualification prescribed and recommended by Government Order dated 6.1.2003, and those advertised by the Public Service Commission U.P., Allahabad and the U.P. Higher Education Service Commission for the post of lecturers. In all the cases, the candidates are required to possess good academic record i.e., 50% in both Graduate and in Post Graduation Degree Courses, for being eligible to apply. The respondents did not commit any error in interpreting

⁴ (2006) 9 SCC 564

the prescribed qualifications and in rejecting petitioner's application to consider him for appointment."

22. In Writ Petition No.27619 of 2010 of this High Court wherein the "good academic record" has been explained placing reliance on the decisions reported in *Madhya Pradesh Public Service Commission v. Navnit Kumar Potdar*⁵, and *Sanjay Kumar Manjul v. Chairman, UPSC*⁶, it was held as under:

"Hence, the writ petition is allowed, and the action of the respondents in not issuing call letter for the interview for the post of Lecturer in Urdu is declared as unconstitutional and arbitrary. It is declared that the petitioner holds 'good academic record' as defined under the relevant clauses of the advertisement. The respondents shall undertake necessary exercise, in view of the said declaration."

23. In *Yogendra Singh Rawat and Ors etc. v. Hemwati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University and Ors.*⁷, it was held as under:

"Shri Ajay Pal Singh was appointed as lecturer on 2.11.91. Earlier he had been appointed on 7.9.88 for a period of two months. In his affidavit filed in this Court he stated that he submitted his thesis for D.Phil in 1993 and was awarded D.Phil degree in 1993. In support of his claim that he had submitted his thesis he has not filed any certificate from the Registrar of the University. He obtained 48% marks in Intermediate and 52.8% in B.A. examination. No post in his subject was also available on 2.11.91. Since Sri Singh did not fulfil the criteria for substantive appointment his case was not recommended.

We are therefore of the view that the High Court was right in coming to the conclusion that the appellants did not satisfy the requisite qualifications or the criteria as laid for their appointment as lecturers in the University. We do

⁵ (1994) 6 SCC 293

⁶ (2006) 8 SCC 42

⁷ Appeal (Civil) 365-370 of 1994

not find any infirmity in the orders of the Executive Committee of the University not recommending the appellants for substantive appointment as lecturers in the University. These appeals, therefore, fail and are dismissed.”

24. On consideration of the arguments advanced by the appellant and the counsel for the respondents the following points arise for consideration in this writ appeal:

- (i) *Whether the academic qualifications of the appellant were not considered by the 1st respondent-University for the post of Assistant Professor against Notification No.2/2009 dated 02.07.2009; and whether the selection criteria in the notification mandates possession of “good academic record” as defined in UGC Regulations; and whether the appellant and respondents 2 to 4 possess “good academic record” prescribed under UGC rules?*
- (ii) *Whether the selection committee for selection to the post of Assistant Professor against Notification No.2/2009, was not validly constituted?*
- (iii) *Whether the appellant is entitled for the relief of a direction to the 1st respondent-University to consider him for appointment as Assistant Professor?*

Point No. (i)

25. It is the contention of the appellant that he possesses 3-year graduation degree, and also Intermediate which are the two public examinations preceding the Post Graduation degree for appointment to the post of Assistant Professor, and that he also possesses ‘good academic record’ as defined by the University and the UGC Regulations, and though he possessed necessary and sufficient academic qualifications as prescribed in the notification issued by the 1st respondent-University, he was not selected and the University

has selected respondents 2 to 4 who were not having 'good academic record'.

26. The learned single Judge while passing the impugned order has observed that the appellant possessed only M.A. with NET qualification whereas the respondents 2 to 4 possess Ph.D and also NET. In paragraph 12 of the impugned order, the learned single Judge has observed as under with regard to the qualifications of the candidates for the appointment to the post of Assistant Professors.

"12. The selection for the posts of Assistant Professors as it would appear in the Notification is obviously basing on the higher qualification but not basing on the performance in the X Class or Intermediate course. Basing on the particulars furnished by the respondents 2, 3 and 4, this Court is of the opinion that they do not possess the qualifications which were mentioned in the Notification. Further, the respondents 2 to 5 were selected for the respective posts in the year 2010 and they have been continuing in the said posts."

27. The observations of the learned single Judge would indicate that as per the notification issued by the University, the higher qualification is the criteria for selection to the posts of Assistant Professors. The performance in the X Class and Intermediate is not the criteria for the said selection and therefore basing on the particulars furnished by the respondents 2, 3 and 4, it was opined that they possessed the qualifications as mentioned in the notification. The respondents 2 to 4 were selected for respective posts in the year 2010 and they have been continuing in the said posts. As far as this observation is concerned, the findings of the learned single Judge with regard to the appointment of respondents

2, 3 and 4 considering their higher qualifications without considering their performance in the Graduation and Intermediate may be to some extent acceptable, but it does not appear that the object of the notification was so. It is also obvious that there is not much discussion on the qualifications of respondents 2 to 4 as to whether they have obtained their Graduation and Intermediate certificates from the recognised educational institutions. But however, it is a fact that respondents 2 to 4 have been selected in the respective posts in the year 2010 and they have been continuing in the said posts.

28. It is pertinent to note that as per University Grants Commission Regulations, and the notification issued by the 1st respondent-University certain qualifications were prescribed for appointment to the post of Assistant Professor. The appointment should be based on “good academic record”. The “good academic record” has been explained in a catena of decisions. Good academic record means the candidate should possess a Master’s Degree with 55% of marks along with possessing 50% of marks in the two preceding public examinations, i.e., Graduation and Intermediate from a recognised institution/University. A perusal of the candidature of the appellant would show that he has got the requisite qualification and he has got good academic record also as prescribed in the UGC Regulations and the notification issued by the University.

29. In contrast, the respondents 2 to 5, on account of studying in Madrasas, have directly joined Under Graduate or Post Graduate Courses. This can be seen from the educational qualifications of the

appellant as well as respondents 2 to 5 given in a tabular column in the Annexures to this order.

30. The respondents 2 to 5 have obtained Degrees and Post Graduate Degrees from recognised and leading Universities. But the same cannot wash out the requirement of a formal education. A person who has undergone ten years of schooling, two years of Pre-University (or as Secondary) before obtaining a Degree and Post Graduate Degree will be normally construed to have a much better academic record than those who directly did a Graduate and Post Graduate Course. Therefore, on point No.(i), we have to hold that the petitioner was possessing a better academic record than the respondents 2 to 5.

POINT No. (ii)

31. The appellant has also contended that the Selection Committee is not a validly constituted for the purpose of interviewing candidates for respective posts.

32. The learned single Judge has properly appreciated this aspect concluding that the appellant has not placed any material to show that the selection committee was not validly constituted and therefore the said finding does not need any interference.

POINT No. (iii)

33. The learned single Judge has observed that while exercising jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, he cannot substitute his opinion to that of the selection committee to differ with the selection of the respondents 2 to 4. However the appellant

is able to demonstrate that he possessed the prescribed qualifications and also good academic record for selection to the post of Assistant Professor, and respondents 2 to 4 does not appear to have good academic record in their qualifications of Graduation and Intermediate from recognised Universities in the light of material placed before this Court.

34. No doubt, it is the University which has to conduct proper scrutiny of qualifications and evaluate those certificates before considering whether they are obtained from recognised Universities or not and whether the candidates have good academic record. The 1st respondent University appears to have not shown concern about the qualifications of Graduation and Intermediate, and made the selection based on the subsequent qualifications of Masters Degree and Ph.D and experience of candidates.

35. However, we do not wish to interfere with the selection of respondents 2 to 5 already made by the University and upheld by the learned single Judge, for the simple reason that while admitting the respondents 2 to 5 to Graduate/Post Graduate Courses, the University had overlooked this aspect. But at the same time, we cannot be oblivious of the fact that a gross injustice has been done to the petitioner by not selecting him and by preferring the respondents 2 to 5 over and above the petitioner. Therefore, we are of the considered view that the order of the learned single Judge could be modified by directing the University to consider the case of the petitioner for appointment to any one of the vacancies, as admittedly a few vacancies were left unfilled by the University. As a matter of

fact, the services of the 5th respondent who was appointed in the very same selection have been terminated and hence there can be no impediment for considering the case of the appellant at least as against that vacancy.

36. IN THE RESULT, the writ appeal is disposed of modifying the impugned order passed in W.P.No.14334 of 2010, and directing the 1st respondent University to consider the candidature of the appellant for the post of Assistant Professor as against any of the existing vacancies, or against the vacancy that arose due to the termination of the services of the 5th respondent and pass orders within two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment. The appointments of respondents 2 to 4 are not interfered with.

Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed. No costs.

V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN, J

GUDISEVA SHYAM PRASAD, J

July, 2017

KSM

**INFORMATION EXTRACTED FROM THE AFFIDAVIT FILED BY THE APPELLANT-WRIT PETITIONER, AND THE COUNTER AFFIDAVITS FILED BY RESPONDENTS 2 TO 4
IN RESPECT OF THEIR EDUCATIONAL AND OTHER QUALIFICATIONS**

S.No	Name of the candidate	S.S.C / 10 th (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Intermediate / + 2 (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Degree (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Post Graduation (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Ph.D (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Other qualifications (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Other information
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
1.	Md. Batatullah Farooqui (Appellant – Writ Petitioner)	From Board of Secondary Education, Hyderabad (A.P.)	From Board of Intermediate Education, Hyderabad (A.P.)	B.A., from Islamic University of Madinah (Kingdom of Saudi Arabia)	M.A. (Arabic) (Gold Medalist)		i) Diploma in Translation ii) PG Diploma in Applied Linguistics iii) NET exam qualified iv) Working as Assistant Professor in Moulana Azad National Urdu University on Contract basis since 06.11.2008 v) Adib-E-Fazil, from University of Madras, Madras vi) Certificate of Participation in Data Entry Operator Course vii) Certificate of Proficiency in Information Systems from APTECH Computer Education, Guntur.	

Annexure-2

S.No	Name of the candidate	S.S.C / 10 th (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Intermediate / + 2 (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Degree (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Post Graduation (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Ph.D (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Other qualifications (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Other information
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
2.	Dr. Md. Ayyub Siddiqui (Respondent No.2)		NIL	NIL	M.A. in Modern Arabic Literature in 2005 (Grade A marks)	PhD in Modern Arabic Literature in 2009 (ii) M.Phil with Distinction in Modern Arabic Literature) in 2006	Alimiati Certificate from Darul-Uloom Nadvat-ul Ulama, Lucknow 2) Passed NET exam in December, 2005 3) Worked as Guest Lecturer, Department of Arabic during 2009-10 4) Worked as Teaching Assistant (Part-time) during 2006-2008	Equivalent to Bachelors Degree for admission to M.A. (Arabic) by Osmania University in the Committee Meeting held on 14.07.2003

Annexure-3

S.No	Name of the candidate	S.S.C / 10 th (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Intermediate / + 2 (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Degree (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Post Graduation (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Ph.D (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Other qualifications (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Other information
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
3.	Dr. Md. Shahabuddin (Respondent No.3)	NIL	NIL	B.A (Languages) (from Osmania University) (May 1996) (Regular) 71% marks	M.A. (Arabic) (from Osmania University) (April 1998) (Regular) 86% marks Awarded Gold Medal	Ph.D in Arabic from Osmania University November 2007	1) Urdu Alim & Urdu Fazil From Idara-e-Adabiyat-e-Urdu (Year – 1993) (Mode – not mentioned) (55% - 2 nd Div) 2) Passed NET Exam conducted by UGC in 2004 3) Teaching experience as Senior Arabic Lecturer in Sri Chaitanya Junior College from July 2002 to April 2010 4) Teaching experience as part-time Arabic lecturer in Deptt. of Arabic in Osmania Univ from Dec 2008 to April 2010	Urdu Alim and Fazil courses are recognised as equivalent to Entrance and Diploma in Oriental Language examinations in Urdu of Osmania University, vide Office of Registrar, Osmania University letter dated 08.11.1973

Annexure-4

S.No	Name of the candidate	S.S.C / 10 th (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Intermediate / + 2 (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Degree (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Post Graduation (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Ph.D (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Other qualifications (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Other information
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
4.	Dr. Syed Muhammed UI-Hashmi (Respondent No.4)	NIL	NIL	B.A. (Arabic) in 2002 First Division	M.A. (Modern Arabic Language) Passed with 'A' Grade marks	Ph.D in 2008 M.Phil in 2005	Urdu Alim & Urdu Fazil courses from Idara-e-Adabeyat-e-Urdu (Year 1997 and 2000, respectively) Diploma in Translation Worked as Lecturer in National Council for promotion of Urdu Language from September 2004 to July 2006. Worked as Part-time lecturer in Department of Arabic in Osmania University from 2006 to 2008 Worked as Guest lecturer in the Department of Arabic for one year in EFLU	

Annexure-5

S.No	Name of the candidate	S.S.C / 10 th (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Intermediate / + 2 (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Degree (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Post Graduation (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Ph.D (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Other qualifications (Year of study) (Mode of study) (% of marks)	Other information
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
5.	C.K. Abdullah (Respondent No.5)	Terminated from service w.e.f. 16.01.2012 for unauthorised absence (vide Order of the 1 st respondent, dated 13.02.2014)						



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAM
AND
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE GUDISEVA SHYAM PRASAD



WRIT APPEAL No. 701 of 2015

July, 2017

KSM

