

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

**CWP No.15271 of 2018
Date of decision: 07.08.2018**

Parveen Ranga

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present: Mr. Neeraj Yadav, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ritu Bahri, J.

This petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus direction the respondents to consider the case of petitioner for appointment as Extension Lecturer in Government College, Bawal.

Pursuant to the advertisement (Annexure P-1), petitioner participated in the interview for the post of Extension Lecturer in the subject of Economics on 22.07.2015. Grievance of the petitioner is that despite clarification dated 03.08.2015 (Annexure P-2) given by the Director, Higher Education, Haryana, one Neetu Singh, who is not NET qualified, has been selected as Extension Lecturer. As per information received under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (Annexure P-3), aforesaid Neetu Singh is not NET qualified. This information further states that she was working in the college in the year 2014-15 as well pursuant to the orders passed by this Court. Thereafter, the petitioner made a representation dated 23.04.2018 to the respondents almost after two years, stating therein that she being NET

qualified, was entitled to get the aforesaid post.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, this petition deserves to be dismissed. As per information dated 27.09.2015 & 25.07.2016 (Annexures P-3 & P-4), aforesaid Neetu Singh was working in the respondent-college in the year 2014-15 i.e. even prior to advertisement (Annexure P-1) and she continued working in the next session as well. Even though, she was not NET qualified, she could not be replaced by another set of contractual employees as per walk in interview. Moreover, the petitioner has approached this Court in the year 2018, whereas the selection process was over in the year 2015. It is not the case of petitioner that Neetu Singh had been appointed afresh pursuant to advertisement (Annexure P-1).

In view of the forgoing discussion, no case for issuance of direction, as prayed for, is made out.

No merits.

Dismissed.

07.08.2018
ajp

(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No