

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH
Civil Writ Petition No.1500 of 2017
Decided on : 29.08.2017**

Savita Rani and others

... Petitioners

Versus

The State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE G.S. SANDHAWALIA

Present : Mr. Rohit Chaudhary, Advocate for
Mr. Vijay Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Harish Rathee, Senior DAG, Haryana.

G.S. Sandhawalia, J. (Oral)

The petitioners seek directions to the respondents to allow them to work on the post of Assistant Professor/Extension Lecturers till the time the said posts are not filled up through regular selected candidates on the basis of work in interview.

Further a writ in the nature of prohibition has been sought to restraining the respondents from replacing the petitioners during the vacation as well as in the end of the academic sessions.

It is the case of the petitioners that they are working from the last 4-5 years and some of them have joined in the academic session 2015-2016 and in Annexure P-1 the details have been mentioned, wherein some of them are working from 2012, whereas the others have joined in the year 2015. It is submitted that the petitioners are fulfilling all the conditions as decided by the Government as well as by the UGC, having paid ₹250/- per lecture, the maximum to ₹18,000/- per month.

The stand of the respondents on the other hand is that respondent No.3 has no intention to replace them with the another similarly

situated persons and has not advertised the same post till date. Respondent-college has not issued any new advertisement to replace them with the same set of persons. A circular dated 17.11.2016 (Annexure R-1) has already been issued that extension lecturers are not to be relieved till further orders. It has further been mentioned that petitioners No.3 and 4 have been engaged in the academic session from 2016-2017, whereas petitioners No.1 and 2 purely on extension basis for the first time in the academic session 2012-2013. Remuneration of ₹200/- per lecture would be given to extension lecturers. The remuneration was admissible upto 50 periods in a month and enhanced to a maximum payment of ₹18,000/- per month ensuring not more than 90 lectures. It has further been averred that they have not been engaged as part time lectures but are engaged on panel to deliver the lectures on period basis remuneration and they are not salaried class employees.

Keeping in view the above stand taken by the State and that the petitioners are continuing in service to deliver the lecturers on period basis remuneration, this Court is of the opinion that the present writ petition has been rendered infructuous, since the grouse of the petitioners was that they should not be replaced by similarly set of persons, which in principle the respondents are agreed to. Accordingly, no further orders are called for.

Petition stands disposed of as infructuous.

AUGUST 29, 2017

Naveen

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Whether Reportable:

**(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE**

Yes/No

Yes/No