

**Sr. No.229
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CWP No.24364 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 26.11.2018

Dilbagh Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

Kurukshetra University and others

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present:- None for the petitioner.

Mr. A.S.Virk, Advocate,
for respondents.

ARUN MONGA, J.(ORAL)

Present petition has been filed seeking continuation of the petitioner as 'Assistant Professor' on contract basis who was originally appointed as such only for one academic session i.e. 2014-2015. However, the petitioner's appointment as 'Assistant Professor' on contract basis was discontinued vide Annexure P-3 on the ground that he was since engaged on contract basis for the academic session 2014-2015 till the classes are over or regular arrangement is made, whichever is earlier.

Petitioner challenged the said dis-continuation from service by way of a Writ Petition No.4865 of 2015 wherein this Court passed an order dated 01.05.2015 (Annexure P-4) that services of the petitioner shall not be replaced by any other contractual employee. Pursuant thereto petitioner was once again engaged/appointed as 'Assistant Professor' by respondent No.1 purely on contract basis for the academic session 2015-2016 vide

order dated 06.08.2015 (Annexure P-5). However, the said order of appointment was subsequently revoked as per terms and conditions given in the letter/order dated 06.08.2015 vide order dated 02.11.2015 (Annexure P-6) passed by respondent No.3.

Learned counsel for the respondents points out that in para 4 of the written statement which has not been controverted by way of any replication, it is the clear stand of the University that in view of the fact that there was no work load warranting the continuation of the petitioner as 'Assistant Professor', his services were discontinued as per Clause 5 of the letter of appointment/engagement by giving 15 days notice to him.

Order sheet reflects that the said written statement was filed on 26.05.2016 and the case has been pending ever since and the petitioner has not controverted the contents of the said written statement.

In view thereof there is no infirmity in the impugned order (Annexure P-6).

Writ petition is disposed of, accordingly, with liberty to the petitioner to move an appropriate application if there is any discrepancy in the facts as narrated in the written statement.

Petition stands disposed of.

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

26.11.2018

vandana

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No