

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

CM No. 8658 and 8659 of 2020 in/and
CWP No. 30872 of 2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 17.9.2020
(Heard through VC)

Raj Rani

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Mazlish Khan, Advocate
for the applicant/petitioner.

Mr. S.S. Pannu, DAG, Haryana.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J.

CM No. 8658 of 2020

Heard.

CM is allowed. The documents are taken on record.

CM stands disposed of.

**CM No. 8659 of 2020 and
CWP No. 30872 of 2019**

1. The petitioner herein is seeking adjustment to the post of Assistant Professor/Extension Lecturer (Commerce) under the Policy dated 13.07.2018, 28.01.2019 and 16.09.2019.

2. In brief, the facts as stated are, that the petitioner was engaged as Extension Lecturer (Commerce) in Government College For Women, Jind on 6.8.2012 on contract basis after having faced due selection process. As she was pregnant, she asked for maternity leave which was declined on the ground that there was no provision for maternity leave for an Extension

Lecturer. She was relieved from services on 24.11.2012. Thereafter, the State of Haryana issued various guidelines for engaging of Extension Lecturers and the petitioner approached the respondents for adjustment as an Extension Lecturer being eligible as per UGC/State guidelines. However, no action was taken on her representation, which has led to the filing of the instant petition.

3. Mr. Mazlish Khan, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is eligible as per norms of UGC/State Government issued from time to time to be appointed as Extension Lecturer (Commerce). She had worked in the said college in Jind to the entire satisfaction of her superiors till the time she was relieved as maternity leave was not allowed. It is contended that many persons have been allowed to join and continue as Extension Lecturer by the respondents in the various colleges and that the petitioner is entitled to the same relief.

4. Apart from this, counsel for the petitioner would rely upon a judgement rendered in **Civil Writ Petition No. 20767 of 2017 Anita Versus State of Haryana and others** decided on 25.1.2018 which pertained to allowing Extension Lecturers to continue to work in Government Colleges even though they did not possess any NET qualifications. Such lecturers would be allowed to continue in service till such time as a regular advertisement was issued and persons with NET qualifications were appointed. It is argued that recently **Civil Writ Petition No. 2715 of 2020 Ritika Versus State of Haryana and others** along with 66 other connected matters has also been disposed of by this Court wherein the learned Single Judge has disposed of the batch of writ petitions with a direction to consider the case of the candidates in the light of the new Policy

of the Government of Haryana Dated 4.3.2020. It was further directed “that in case any of the petitioners is found *“to be not covered by the above policy, details with regard to the clause which renders the petitioner ineligible be specified detailing therein as to what/which qualification is not possessed by the said candidate rendering him/her ineligible for appointment.”*

5. Whereas Mr. S.S. Pannu, learned State counsel has argued that the petitioner herein was relieved from service as far back as November 2012 and has no right to seek adjustment as an Extension Lecturer after a gap of almost 8 years. It is submitted that a new policy has come into effect dated 4th of March 2020 which clearly specifies that Extension Lecturers shall be engaged purely on work requirement basis and that they are required to be NET qualified. It is also argued that as per the condition of this policy, the eligible Extension Lecturers shall be engaged for one academic session, which will be subject to availability of workload in the subject concerned.

6. I have heard the counsel for the parties and with their resistance have gone through the pleadings of the case and the judgements as referred to by the counsel for the petitioner.

7. Admittedly, the petitioner had worked as an Extension Lecturer for a short duration in the year 2012 and thereafter was relieved in the month of November 2012 itself. By way of the instant writ petition, she is seeking a direction to be issued to the respondents to appoint her as an Extension Lecturer. A large number of writ petitions stand disposed of by this Court, the lead petition being **Ritika versus State of Haryana and others (supra)**, wherein the State Government has been given a direction to consider the case of various petitioners for adjustment and re-engaging as

Extension Lecturers. Let case of the petitioner be also considered in the light of the direction issued in **Civil Writ Petition No. 2715 of 2020 (Ritika Versus State of Haryana and others)**. The petitioner will approach the respondents by filing a detailed representation within a period of two weeks, and the same shall be considered within a period of one month thereafter in terms of direction given in **Civil Writ Petition No. 2715 of 2020 (Supra)**.

8. The writ petition along with all miscellaneous applications stands disposed of with the above directions.

17.9.2020
prem

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No