

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

*Date of Order: May 02, 2018*

+ **W.P.(C) 4640/2018 & CMs 17907-08/2018**

DR. JITENDRA KUMAR VERMA ..... Petitioner  
Through: Mr. Shrey Yadav, Mr. Anshuman  
Sahni and Mr. Apurv Chandola, Advocates

versus

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF FOREIGN TRADE ..... Respondent  
Through: Nemo

**CORAM:**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR**

**ORDER**  
**(ORAL)**

1. On 23<sup>rd</sup> January, 2018, petitioner had received interview call for the post of Assistant Professor Level-1 to be held on 8<sup>th</sup> February, 2018. It is the case of petitioner that on 8<sup>th</sup> February, 2018, he had gone to the venue of interview and he was abruptly told by the staff of respondent-Institute that the panel members have stated that petitioner is not eligible to attend the interview.

2. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that on the same very day, petitioner had sent an Email (*Annexure P-2*) to the Registrar of respondent-Institute to find out as to why petitioner was not allowed to appear in the said interview and on the next day, i.e. on 9<sup>th</sup> February, 2018, petitioner had received an Email response to the effect that petitioner was not eligible to attend the said interview. Attention of this

court is drawn to a document (*Annexure P-1 colly.*), which indicates that online applications were invited for the post in question, i.e. Assistant Professor in Information and Technology, and as per this document (*Annexure P-1 colly.*), the essential qualification for the post in question is NET/SET/SLET and M.Phil/Ph.D. is desirable.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that petitioner had got the Ph.D. degree in December, 2017 and on the day of the interview, he was holding Ph.D. degree and so, there is no reason as to why petitioner was not interviewed. It is submitted that in any case, Ph.D. degree was not an essential qualification, but was desirable. Thus, it is submitted that respondent be directed to call petitioner for the interview as the result of the selection to the post of Assistant Professor in Information and Technology has not yet been declared.

4. Despite service of advance notice, none appears on behalf of respondent-Institute.

5. In the facts and circumstances of this case, it is deemed appropriate to permit petitioner to send an Email to the Registrar of respondent-Institute to specifically elicit as to how petitioner was not eligible to attend the interview in question. Respondent-Institute shall give an Email response to petitioner within 24 hours of receiving the said query from petitioner.

6. Respondent-Institute be apprised of this order forthwith to ensure its compliance. If petitioner is not satisfied with response so received from respondent-Institute, then petitioner would be at liberty to avail of the remedies as available in law, if need be.

7. With aforesaid directions, this petition and the applications are disposed of.

Copy of this order be given *dasti* under signatures of the Court Master to counsel for petitioner.

**(SUNIL GAUR)**  
**JUDGE**

**MAY 02, 2018**

s

