

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

**CWP No. 18175 of 2018
Date of Decision: 27.07.2018**

Tamanna

...Petitioner

Vs.

Guru Jambheshwar University of Science and Technology, Hisar and
others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Mr. Vivek Khatri, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J. (Oral)

1. The document produced in Court at the time of hearing is taken on record as Mark 'A'.

2. In the walk-in-interview on 29.06.2018, the petitioner appeared but one Vikram Singh was selected for appointment as Assistant Professor (English) against one advertised vacancy. A direct recruitment drive was conducted in the first half of the year 2017 in which the petitioner did not apply and one Ms. Rashmi-respondent No.4 was a candidate. For some reason, that selection process was scrapped. Respondent-University filled the post earlier advertised by way of recruitment process-2017 by a walk-in-interview process conducted on 06.12.2017 and appointed the 4th respondent as Assistant Professor (English) to teach in the Department of Communication and Technology.

3. This petition has been filed with the grievance that the 4th respondent could not have been appointed since she did not appear in the walk in interview held on 29.06.2018.

4. The petitioner was not a competitor in the second process and neither was the 4th respondent contender in the interview held on 29.06.2018. If the 4th respondent has been picked up for the merit list in the interview held on 12.12.2017 then no illegality can be attached to this action having regard to the documents produced by Mr. Khatri today in Court which discloses the high marks secured by the 4th respondent in selection process. Her marks are as high as 40; the break up of which is 15 for academic record; 24 for research performance as against 25 other candidates who were all below 19 marks and the 2nd best secured 23 marks. The huge gap between the merit of the 4th respondent and the next best candidate in that selection confirms that there is nothing remiss in the appointment of the 4th respondent as a contractual teacher, who is in any case remains subject to being replaced by regular recruit, when available.

5. I find no merit in this petition and dismiss it.

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

27.07.2018

kv

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