

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 6055 of 2021

- Nitesh Chandra Sahu S/o Firat Ram Sahu Aged About 25 Years Working As A Guest Faculty (English) At Govenment College Barpali, District - Korba (C.G.)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department, Of Higher Education Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District - Raipur (C.G.)
2. Additional Director Directorate Of Higher Education Department, Atal Nagar New Raipur, District - Raipur (C.G.)
3. Principle, Government College Barpali, District - Korba (C.G.)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Shri Sanjay Yadav, Advocate

For Respondent/ State : Shri Anmol Sharma, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order on Board

01.11.2021

Heard

1. The grievance of petitioner in the present writ petition is that since the petitioner was working as Guest Lecturer under respondent No.3 for the academic year 2020-21, the respondents should not be permitted to replace the petitioner by another set of contractual Guest Lecturer.
2. Contention of learned counsel for petitioner is that the petitioner has undergone a due process of selection for being appointed as a Guest Lecturer and that the service of petitioner also was satisfactory as there is no complaint whatsoever, so far as the competency of petitioner is concerned. It

is further contention of the petitioner that now that the academic session is over, the respondents should not be permitted to go in for a fresh recruitment process for filling up of the posts of Guest Lecturers under respondent No.3 for the subject in which the petitioner was taking classes.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner relies upon the judgment of this Court passed in the case of “**Manju Gupta & others v. State of Chhattisgarh & others**” **WPS No. 4406/2016**, decided on 27.02.2017, whereby the similarly placed Guest Lecturers under the Director (Industrial Training Institute) have been granted protection from being replaced by another set of Guest Lecturers.
4. Learned State counsel opposing the petition submits that it is a case where no cause of action has till date arisen, inasmuch as the petitioner has filed the writ petition only on apprehension and since there is no cause of action, the matter is premature and deserves to be rejected.
5. Having heard the contentions put forth on either side and on perusal of record, what is admitted is that the petitioner was appointed vide Annexure P/1. The order of appointment specifically had a clause mentioning that the appointment so made is till an alternative arrangement is made by way of recruitment through regular/contractual/ transfer.
6. Further from the records, it also does not appear that the performance of petitioner, at any point of time, was found to be unsatisfactory. In the case of “Manju Gupta” (supra), this Court in paragraphs No. 8 to 11 has held as under:-

“8. True it is, that the Petitioners' status is that of a Guest Lecturer but that does not mean that they do not have any right. There is always a legitimate expectation of the Petitioners that since the filling up of the posts has not been initiated by way of a regular appointment or by contractual appointments, the Petitioners would be permitted to continue.

9. The undisputed fact is that the Petitioners were given

appointment only on undertaking given by them pursuant to an advertisement by the Respondents. In the undertaking which was made to be furnished by the Petitioners, they were made to undertake that their appointment would be till the posts are filled up by regular/contractual appointment. This by itself clearly gives an indication that unless the Respondents fill up the sanctioned vacant posts by either regular recruitment or by way of contractual appointment, the Petitioners would continue as Guest Lecturers. On the practical aspect also the fact that the Petitioners are discharging the duties of Guest Lecturers for last more than 1-2 years, itself is a good ground for permitting the Petitioners to continue on the said posts as Guest Lecturers, simply for the reason of their experience on the said post, as fresh recruitment would mean that persons with no or less experience would be participating in the recruitment process, which also would not be in the interest of the students who are under taking training in the respective institutions.

10. Taking into consideration the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Piara Singh (supra) and which has been further reiterated in the case of Dr. Chanchal Goyal (supra), this Court has no hesitation in reaching to the conclusion that the advertisement (Annexure P-1) so issued by the Respondents is definitely not in the interest of the students undertaking training at Industrial Training Institute, Ambikapur, and the same would amount to violation of Article 21 of the Constitution of India and the same therefore deserves to be and is accordingly quashed. The advertisement would be deemed to be quashed only to the extent of the recruitment against the posts at which the Petitioners are discharging. That is to say, the Respondents would be entitled to fill up the posts which are lying vacant by way of Guest Lecturers where there are no Guest Lecturers available.

11. It is directed that the Respondents would not be entitled for filling up the posts of Guest Lecturer by replacing the Petitioners unless the Respondents come up with a stand that the services of the Petitioners were dis-satisfactory. The quashing of the advertisement issued by the Respondents would also not come in

the way of the Respondents for filling up of the sanctioned vacant posts by regular recruitment or by way of contractual appointment for which the Respondents shall be free.”

7. This Court, under the given circumstances, is inclined to accept the same analogy in the present case also and accordingly it is ordered that unless there is any complaint received against the performance of petitioner, the respondents are restrained from going in for any fresh recruitment of a Guest Lecturer for the said subject under the respondent No.3-College, against which the petitioner was engaged.

8. It is however made clear that the protection to petitioner would be only to the extent of not being replaced by another set of Guest Lecturer. This would not preclude the State Government from going in for filling up of the post by way of a regular appointment or by way of engaging contractual Lecturers under the rules for contractual employment.

9. So far as the claim of remuneration as per the guidelines of UGC is concerned, it would be open for petitioner to make a suitable representation before respondent No.1 in this regard, who in turn would take a policy decision as regards the remuneration part payable to the Guest Lecturers, keeping in view the guidelines that have been laid down by the UGC.

10. With the aforesaid observations, the present writ petition stands disposed off.

Sd/-
(Goutam Bhaduri)
Judge

Jyoti