

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

(Heard through VC)

CWP No.7955 of 2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision: June 10, 2020

Deepika

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Lalit Rishi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Moudgil, Asstt. AG Haryana.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

The petitioner herein is seeking appointment as a Visiting Faculty (Lecturer) at Govt. Polytechnic, Hisar.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner would submit that pursuant to the advertisement No.PRDH/47681 dated NIL, the petitioner herein joined the Govt. Polytechnic, Hisar as a Visiting Faculty (Lecturer) on hourly basis in the discipline of Fashion Design, Fashion Technology, Mechanical Engineering and Textile Technology. It is contended that she was subsequently relieved from her duties on 23.07.2019. She then was again engaged on 21.08.2019 as Visiting Faculty (Lecturer), as the regular Lecturer Ms. Teena Verma proceeded on maternity

leave and she continued to work in her place till such time Ms. Teena Verma rejoined her duties. It is argued that the petitioner herein is entitled to be considered for the post of Visiting Faculty (Lecturer) against the available teaching load in terms of the guidelines issued on 04.12.2019, available on record as Annexure P-5. However, the representation dated 11.12.2019 has not been considered as on date and subsequent thereto, several representations have been made to the respondents to consider her case for appointment. Counsel for the petitioner would also place reliance upon letter dated 10.02.2020 as written by respondent No.3 to respondent No.2. Apart from the above submissions, counsel for the petitioner also relies upon an order passed by this court in **CWP No.21471 of 2018** titled as **“Rakesh vs. State of Haryana and others”** wherein, the department had been directed to adjust the petitioner in the department in case, there is work available.

Notice of motion.

At this stage, on the asking of the court, Mr. Sandeep Moudgil, Asstt. AG Haryana accepts notice and states that the petitioner herein had been appointed under a particular scheme, which scheme is no longer in existence.

I have heard counsel for the parties and with their valuable assistance, have perused the pleadings of the case.

Admittedly, the petitioner had been working as Visiting Faculty (Lecturer) as is evident from Annexure P-3. There are also guidelines available on the record, which have been issued by the Principal Secretary to the Govt. of Haryana, Technical Education Department, which pertain to

the appointment of Guest Faculty. The petitioner herein admittedly has worked as Guest Faculty and is currently out of job. She has made several representations seeking appointment as Guest Faculty, in terms of the new guidelines issued by the Technical Education Department, however, her representation has not been considered nor has any speaking order been passed thereon.

In view of the fact that representations of the petitioner are still pending consideration, the respondent-State is directed to look into the same and decide the representations of the petitioner for appointment to the post of Visiting Faculty (Lecturer) in terms of the guidelines issued and in accordance with law by passing a speaking order, preferable within a period of two months, from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

Ordered accordingly.

June 10, 2020

vijay saini

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No