

[226] IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCN No.772 of 2020

Date of Decision : 05.07.2022

Preeti d/o Sh. Gyan Prakash r/o village
Matanhail, Distt. Jhajjar, Haryana.

...Petitioner

versus

Ajit Balaji Joshi, Director, Higher Education,
SikshaSadan, Sector 5, Panchkula and another

....Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S. Walia

Present : None for the petitioner.
Mr. Manish Dadwal, Asstt. AG, Haryana.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] Prayer in the instant petition is for initiation of proceedings against the respondents for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P-1, dated 03.05.2019, in CWP No.11571 of 2019 in case titled as '**Amit Kumar and another**versus**State of Haryana and others.**'

[2] A perusal of order (Annexure P-1), reveals that while issuing notice in CWP No.11571 of 2019 for 28.05.2019 and ordering it to be heard along with CWP No.19583 of 2018, interim orders were passed in the same terms as in CWP No.19583 of 2018. A perusal of order dated 07.08.2018 in CWP No.19583 of 2018 reveals that the same was ordered to be listed for hearing along with CWP No.18235 of 2018 and further that if work was available in the respondent-College or nearby college, the authorities were required to take a decision at an early stage of the academic session, preferably within 10 days; whether to re-engage or continue with the service of the petitioners as Extension Lecturer / Asstt.

Professor (s) though regular appointments had been made.

[3] Grievance of the petitioner is that no order has been passed by the respondents regarding the engagement of the petitioners as Extension Lecturer in terms of order dated 07.08.2018 in CWP No.19583 of 2018.

[4] Learned Asstt. AG, Haryana, has referred to order (Annexure R-2) dated 02.07.2020, rejecting the claim of the petitioner on account of her not possessing requisite qualifications i.e. NET/Ph.d at the time of her initial engagement as Extension Lecturar, as also of her claim for engagement as Extension Lecturer not being covered by Policy dated 20.07.2017.

[5] Despite intimation having been given to counsel for the petitioner by the Reader of this Court during lunch break that the matter had been passed over and would be taken up for hearing in the post-lunch session, none is present on behalf of the petitioner. In the circumstances, it appears that the petitioner is not interested in pursuing the instant petition.

[6] In view of the position noted above, the instant petition is *disposed of* as not calling for any action against the respondents under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to challenge order (Annexure R-2) dated 02.07.2020 by way of appropriate proceedings in accordance with law, if so advised.

[7] *Rule discharged.*

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

05.07.2022

'Rajneesh'