

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

1. CWP No. :23738 of 2011(O&M)
Reserved on :26.07.2023
Pronounced on : 14th September, 2023

Garima and othersPetitioners

VERSUS

State of Punjab and othersRespondents

2. CWP NO. :22673 of 2011(O&M)

Didar SinghPetitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab and othersRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA

Present: Mr.Rajvinder Singh Bains, Sr. Advocate
with Ms. Arushi Garg, Advocate, for the petitioners
in both the cases.

Mr. D.K.Singal, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Gurminder Singh, Sr. Advocate,
with Mr. Sameer Sachdeva and Mr.J.S.Gill,
Advocates, for the added respondents-employees.

Ms. Bhagyashri, Advocate,
for respondents no.5 to 10 in CWP-22673-2011.

SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J

1. Both the above titled Writ Petitions are being decided together as the questions of law and facts are almost similar. Facts of the case are, however, being noticed from the Civil Writ Petition No. 23738 of 2011 filed by Garima Sood and others.

2. The petitioners Garima Sood, Ramandeep Kumar and Preeti have preferred this writ petition stating that they are fully eligible for appointment on the post of Lecturers and Asstt. Professors as all of them have successfully passed Junior Research Fellow Test from CSIR and UGC. The grievances raised in both the present petitions are with regard to the appointment and continuation of part time Lecturers against the large number of regular sanctioned posts. It is their contention that the respondents have appointed the part time Lecturers and have continued them for long and now they are in the process of regularizing their services in violation of the law laid down by the Apex Court in Secretary, State of Karnataka and others vs. Uma Devi and others, (2006) 4 SCC 1 and also by this Court in Kulbhushan Singh v. State of Punjab reported in (2001) 4 SCT 852.

3. It is contended that in the connected writ petition i.e CWP No. 22673 of 2011, petitioner Didar Singh has cleared his UGC NET qualification and also completed his Ph.D in 2013 and he also prays for restraining the Government from taking a decision to regularize the part time adhoc Lecturers working in the Govt. Colleges.

4. The facts which need to be noticed are that on 11.08.2001, an advertisement was issued by the Punjab Public Service Commission for filling up 274 posts of Lecturers in the College Cadre. The selection process was completed and so far as the petitioner Didar Singh is concerned, he was also

selected under the said selection process. However, before appointments could be made, the recruitment and selection process was challenged before this Court. The said selections were challenged in CWP No.6615 of 2002 titled Common Cause Forum, Punjab v. State of Punjab and others and in this regard vide order dated 29.04.2002 directed the Govt. not to appoint any candidate who is awaiting appointments without prior permission of the Court and accordingly, the Government issued an order on 12.05.2002 restraining appointments on regular basis. The Punjab Public Service Commission (hereinafter referred to as 'PPSC' for short) accordingly instructed to hold interviews in abeyance during the pendency of this writ petition for the posts of Lecturers in various subjects vide order dated 16.01.2003. In **Amrit Pal Singh and others v. State of Punjab and others** and in Civil Writ Petition No.1166 of 2004 titled Navleet Kaur and others v. State of Punjab and others, similar order was passed in relation to other subjects also on 10.02.2004. In several other subjects, similar orders were passed by High Court and therefore, petitioners could not be appointed.

5. In order to overcome the paucity of teachers, the State Government had appointed part time Lecturers and Guest Faculty Lecturers who allegedly did not fulfill the minimum requisite eligibility criteria laid down by the UGC. The Guest Faculty Lecturers were being paid Rs.175/- per hours, subject to maximum of Rs.7000/- per month. The part time Lecturers were allegedly appointed by the Principals without following a fair selection process. It is alleged that out of 260 Lecturers appointed in the aforesaid manner, only 100 candidates possessed minimum requisite eligible criteria of having possessed UGC NET examination or possessing Ph.D as per 2009 notification. It is further stated that an advertisement was again published by

the PPSC on 04.04.2008. Against the same, COCP No.117 of 2009 was filed and it was stated that there were 293 part time Lecturers working in the different Government Colleges. In another COCP No.1830 of 2009, affidavit was filed by the Department of Higher Education stating that PPSC has been advised not to proceed further as there was an interim order passed by this Court restraining from filling up the posts of Lecturers.

Thereafter, the State Govt. informed of filling up the posts of Lecturers by recruiting through a Higher Level Committee where-after it was informed that a policy for regularization of adhoc Lecturers had been approved and they were going to regularize it.

6. It has been submitted by the petitioners that earlier in **Kulbhushan Singh's case (supra)**, the Division Bench of this Court made observations while deciding bunch of writ petitions filed by adhoc Lecturers seeking regularization on 09.08.2001, whereby, this Court refused to regularize the services of the adhoc part time Lecturers and also further held that the concerned petitioners-part time Lecturers would not be permitted to continue in employment till regular incumbents are appointed. The said judgment passed in **Kulbhushan Singh's case (supra)** was challenged before Supreme Court and in **Civil Appeal No. 8745 of 2003** titled **Hargunpratap Singh & Ors. v. State of Punjab and Ors.**, the Apex Court while deciding the case on 07.11.2003 directed as under:-

“We have carefully looked into the judgment of the High Court and other pleadings that have been put forth before this court. It is clear that though the appellants may not be entitled to regular appointment as such it cannot be said that they will not be entitled to the minimum of the pay scale nor that they should not be continued till regular incumbents are appointed. The course adopted by the High Court is to displace one ad hoc

arrangement by another ad hoc arrangement which is not at all appropriate for these persons who have gained experience which will be more beneficial and useful to the colleges concerned rather than to appoint persons afresh on ad hoc basis. Therefore, we set aside the orders made by the High Court to the extent the same deny the claim of the appellants of minimum pay scale and continuation in service till regular incumbents are appointed we direct that they shall be continued in service till regular appointments are made on minimum of the pay scale. The appeals shall stand allowed in part accordingly.”

7. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that after the order has been passed by the Supreme Court in dis-allowing the respondents from being regularized, the petitioners had preferred this writ petition to challenge the decision of the State for regularizing the services of those part time Lecturers.

8. Upon notice, the State Govt. gave an undertaking before this Court that before any move is made to implement the decision to regularize the part time adhoc Lecturers, State would clarify its stand to this Court. The undertaking was continued. In the reply, respondents/State have taken a stand to regularize the Lecturers who were already working in the various colleges with the State of Punjab as a one time measure. A committee was constituted on 22.01.2020 for the said purpose and the services of eligible candidates were to be regularized on 01.04.2020 provided they fulfill the conditions laid down therein.

9. An application for stay was moved by the petitioners on 28.01.2020 vide CM-1810-CWP-2020 praying for restraining the respondents / State from acting upon the order dated 21.01.2020. The said stay application came up before the Court on 10.06.2020 and following order was passed:-

*“In the meanwhile, no regularization of any part-time/ad hoc/guest lecturers, or other persons recruited to the post of Lecturers other than by way of the process of regular selection as prescribed in the rules, shall be made by the respondents, with it also made clear that any statute allowing for such regularization, shall not be resorted to at this stage at least by the Government, as a shelter to issue letters of regularization (till further orders by this court), in Y 1 view of the ratio of the judgment of the Supreme Court in **Secretary, State of Karnataka and others vs. Uma Devi and others, (2006) 4 SCC 1.***

Since hearing is being done by video conferencing and it may take a little while for uploading the order passed today, learned State counsel is directed to orally convey this order to the concerned authorities immediately, telephonically, and any non-compliance thereof shall be viewed as contemptuous, on the next date of hearing.”

10. An application was moved for impleadment by the adhoc Lecturers and also application for vacating the stay was moved. It was stated that a COCP No.1040 of 2017 had been moved earlier by the petitioners assailing the action of the respondents / State in invoking the powers under the Punjab Adhoc, Contractual, Daily Wage, Temporary Work Charged and Outsourced Employees' Welfare Act, 2016 for regularizing the services of the part time employees. The said Contempt Petition was withdrawn. It was further stated that applicants have been working on the post of Asstt. Professors in various Colleges since 2000 and 2001 and more than 20 years have elapsed. They also possess the minimum qualification as required under the **UGC Regulations for Appointment of Teachers and other Academic Staff in University and Colleges and Measures for the Maintenance of Standards in Higher Education 2010 (hereinafter referred to as UGC Regulations of 2010)** and are fully eligible for regular appointment and have cleared the National

Eligibility Test also. However, on account of the interim order, they are still working on contract basis and are getting minimum the pay scale.

11. Both the writ petitions, therefore, were heard together at this stage finally.

12. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the newly impleaded respondents do not have any right to be regularized on the posts as they have been appointed by a back door method without following due procedure of law and without following the procedure as laid down by the UGC for selection and appointment of Lecturers. Learned counsel submits that the appointment of Asstt. Lecturers now known as Asstt. Professors has to be in strict compliance with the qualifications and procedure laid down by the UGC under UGC Regulations of 2010. Due to their wrongful continuation of service, regular selections to the posts of Lecturers is being delayed and the State Govt. is trying to regularize the Lecturers as Asstt. Professors although after the UGC regulations of 2010 have come into force, appointment on the post of Asstt. Professors can only be made to those persons who have passed the NET qualification or have done Ph.D as per the UGC Regulations of 2010.

13. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the adhoc / part time Lecturers submits that the writ petition is liable to be dismissed due to non joinder and mis joinder of parties and the persons who are going to be affected or are beneficiary of the principles approved for regularization were not impleaded as respondents and an interim order was passed restraining the State Govt. from regularizing respondents who have been impleaded later on. It is submitted that the respondents have been working as Asstt. Professors in various subjects and a chart had been prepared along with the reply wherein it is shown that the respondents were appointed in 2000 and 2001 and have been

continuously working since then. Most of them possess the qualification of having passed UGC NET examination while few of them have also done Ph.D and others are M.Phil apart from possessing Post Graduation degree of the subject concerned. The respondents are all working on full time basis and performing all the functions and work of regular Lecturers / Asstt. Professors for nearly 20 years although they are designated as part time Lecturers on contract basis. It is stated that they were appointed and selected against regular permanent sanctioned and vacant posts of Lecturers in various subjects available with the State of Punjab. The posts were advertised and requisition was invited from open public and selections were done by duly constituted selection committee in the order on merit. The appointment orders reflect them to be appointed on temporary basis whereas in some, the appointment has been made on adhoc basis. However, they have been continuing and being paid pay scale as equivalent to regular Lecturers and annual increments are also being given to them regularly. Their work and conduct during the period has been satisfactory and have also fair results in academic and therefore, they should be regularized as per the parameters laid down by the Apex Court in **Uma Devi's case (supra).**

14. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that at present there are 1873 posts of Lecturers in various Govt. Colleges in State of Punjab and 300 posts are being occupied by regular appointees while 250 candidates like respondents are those, who have been appointed as part time Lecturers on contract basis and they fulfill the minimum qualification for appointment. Even if the respondents are regularized, still 1300 posts of Lecturers would remain vacant which can be filled by following due procedure. The petitioners can compete for such selection in accordance with law. It is also pointed out

that the petitioners have not been able to get selected either on regular basis or on adhoc contractual basis and the present petition which has been filed by only four persons cannot come in the way of regularization of the respondents.

15. The State Govt. has taken a decision to regularize the services of the aforesaid Lecturers who are working in the various colleges. The committee has taken a decision on 22.01.2020 making recommendations regarding regularization of temporary teachers working in various Govt. Colleges under the Department of Higher Education (Edu.-I Branch), Chandigarh and has made following conclusions and recommendations:-

“(v) The Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No. 8745 of 2003, filed by some part time lecturers, has ordered vide dated 07.11.2003 that these part time lecturers should be allowed to continue till regular incumbents come i.e. these temporary teachers should not be replaced with similar set of other temporary persons. Thus, this command was just to protect the rights of temporary teachers on temporary appointments only and had no relevance regarding regularization of services.

(vi) On this issue of regularization of part time lecturers, earlier in 2013, the then Add. A.G., Sh. B.S. Walia has given his legal opinion that the regularization could be done as a one-time measure of the irregularly appointed employees, who completed ten years of services in accordance with Uma Devi's case 2006(3) RSJ 572. However, he had also opined that applicability of the terms and conditions as laid down by UGC would depend on there being a cadre of Part-Time Lecturers, there being terms and conditions stipulated by the UGC for appointment of Part Time Lecturers on regular basis as also of the same having been adopted by the Government of Punjab. Accordingly, terms and conditions stipulated by the UGC in respect of Part-Time Lecturers as one date when regularization is sought to be done and as have been adopted by the Government of Punjab would be applicable.

(vii) The present Advocate General Punjab has also given his legal opinion, vide dated 17.12.2018 on the issue of regularization of part time lecturers that "Part-time lecturers having requisite qualifications / being duly qualified and who have been recruited through Selection Committees following due procedure can be

regularised as a one-time measure, assuming that the Selection Committee adopted a procedure for selecting appointees and the Part-time lecturers who are duly qualified have completed ten or more years of service. However, this benefit of Umadevi's case would be available to appointments made prior to 2006 i.e. before the date of judgment in Umadevi's case. Therefore, on a case to case basis, the Department must examine if each of the claim for regularisation fulfils the above test laid down by the judgment in Umadevi's case and after such an examination the Department may decide accordingly (i.e. whether to regularise or not)."

(viii) The Govt. of Punjab, Department of School Education vide Notification No. 1/62/12-3Edu.7/1330634/1 dated 09.10.2018 had issued a policy, as per the decision dated 03.10.2018 taken by the Council of Ministers, to merge and regularize the services of various categories of teachers, including A & B group services w.e.f. 01.04.2018, in the Education Department. However, the said benefit was extended with the condition the beneficiary would get initial Basic Pay + Grade Pay for the first three years from 01.04.2018. Thus, these beneficiary teachers were taken into the Department as new entrants in the cadre.

5. Conclusion/ Recommendation: *The Committee resolves to make the following recommendations:*

(i) Since, the one-time measure of regularization could not be undertaken earlier due to the said stay on the regular recruitments, therefore, the Department may take this measure now.

(ii) The services of the eligible candidates could be regularized w.e.f. 01.04.2020, provided they fulfil all the following conditions:

(a) The initial appointment of the candidate must have been made by the Department directly or through State Govt. Employment Exchange against sanctioned vacant post.

(b) The initial appointment of the candidate must have been made on the basis of merit through a transparent and competitive process.

(c) The candidate was duly qualified as per State Govt. Rules/U.G.C. norms at the time of his/her initial appointment.

(d) The candidate must have completed a service period of 10 years or more as on 31.03.2020, without intervention or cover of the Court order.”

16. This Court finds that while disposing off the Civil Appeal No. 8745 of 2003, titled **Hargunpartap Singh and others v. State of Punjab**, the Supreme Court has rejected the contention of the respondents to be entitled to the regular appointment and have only granted them benefit of minimum pay scale and continuation in service.

17. In a recent judgment reported in **2021(12) Scale 66** titled **Union of India v. Ilmo Devi and others**, the Apex Court was examining the judgment passed by this Court whereby this Court modified the order of the Central Administrative Tribunal and directed to re-visit the whole issue, complete the exercise to reformulate their regularization/absorption policy and take a decision to sanction the posts in a phased manner. The Supreme Court after considering the law laid down in **Uma Devi’s case (supra)** and also in **Dr.Ashwani Kumar v. Union of India and Anr. (2020) 13 SCC 581**, **State of Karnataka and anr. v. Dr.Praveen Bhai Thogadia, (2004) 4 SCC 684**, **Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India and ors., (2020) 3 SCC 637**, **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation v. Krishan Gopal and others (2020) SCC Online SC 150**, **State of Maharashtra and anr. v. R.S.Bhonde & Ors. (2005) 6 SCC 751** held as under:-

8.4 xxxx

The High Court cannot, in exercise of the power under Article 226, issue a Mandamus to direct the Department to sanction and create the posts. The High Court, in exercise of the powers under Article 226 of the Constitution, also cannot direct the Government and/or the Department to formulate a particular regularization policy. Framing of any scheme is no function of the Court and is the sole prerogative of the Government. Even the creation and/or sanction of the posts is

also the sole prerogative of the Government and the High Court, in exercise of the power under Article 226 of the Constitution, cannot issue Mandamus and/or direct to create and sanction the posts.

8.5 *Even the regularization policy to regularize the services of the employees working on temporary status and/or casual labourers is a policy decision and in judicial review the Court cannot issue Mandamus and/or issue mandatory directions to do so. In the case of R.S. Bhonde and Ors. (supra), it is observed and held by this Court that the status of permanency cannot be granted when there is no post. It is further observed that mere continuance every year of seasonal work during the period when work was available does not constitute a permanent status unless there exists a post and regularization is done.*

8.6 *In the case of Daya Lal & Ors. (supra) in paragraph 12, it is observed and held as under:-*

“12. We may at the outset refer to the following well-settled principles relating to regularisation and parity in pay, relevant in the context of these appeals:

(i) The High Courts, in exercising power under Article 226 of the Constitution will not issue directions for regularisation, absorption or permanent continuance, unless the employees claiming regularisation had been appointed in pursuance of a regular recruitment in accordance with relevant rules in an open competitive process, against sanctioned vacant posts. The equality clause contained in Articles 14 and 16 should be scrupulously followed and Courts should not issue a direction for regularisation of services of an employee which would be violative of the constitutional scheme. While something that is irregular for want of compliance with one of the elements in the process of selection which does not go to the root of the process, can be regularised, back door entries, appointments contrary to the constitutional scheme and/or appointment of ineligible candidates cannot be regularised.

(ii) Mere continuation of service by a temporary or ad hoc or daily-wage employee, under cover of some interim orders of the court, would not confer upon him any right to be absorbed into service, as such service would be “litigious employment”. Even temporary, ad hoc or daily-wage service for a long number of years, let alone service for one or two years, will not entitle such employee to claim regularisation, if he is not working against a sanctioned post. Sympathy and sentiment cannot be grounds for passing any order of regularisation in the absence of a legal right.

(iii) Even where a scheme is formulated for regularisation with a cut-off date (that is a scheme providing that persons who had put in a specified number of years of service and continuing in employment as on the cut-off date), it is not possible to others who were appointed subsequent to the cut-off date, to claim or contend that the scheme should be applied to them by extending the cut-off date or seek a direction for framing of fresh schemes providing for successive cut-off dates.

(iv) Part-time employees are not entitled to seek regularisation as they are not working against any sanctioned posts. There cannot be a direction for absorption, regularisation or permanent continuance of part-time temporary employees.

(v) Part-time temporary employees in government-run institutions cannot claim parity in salary with regular employees of the Government on the principle of equal pay for equal work. Nor can employees in private employment, even if serving full time, seek parity in salary with government employees. The right to claim a particular salary against the State must arise under a contract or under a statute.

[See State of Karnataka v. Umadevi (3) [(2006) 4 SCC 1], M. Raja v. CEERI Educational Society [(2006) 12 SCC 636], S.C. Chandra v. State of Jharkhand [(2007) 8 SCC 279], Kurukshetra Central Coop. Bank Ltd. v. Mehar Chand [(2007) 15 SCC 680] and Official Liquidator v. Dayanand [(2008) 10 SCC 1.]

8.7 Thus, as per the law laid down by this Court in the aforesaid decisions part-time employees are not entitled to seek regularization as they are not working against any sanctioned post and there cannot be any permanent continuance of part-time temporary employees as held. Part-time temporary employees in a Government run institution cannot claim parity in salary with regular employees of the Government on the principle of equal pay for equal work.”

18. Having noticed the aforesaid facts and the protracted litigations, this Court finds that regular selection for post of Asstt. Professor / Associate Professors has not been conducted since almost 20 years. Therefore, the respondent / State must take immediate steps to conduct selections for regular appointment of Asstt. Professors, Associate Professors and Professors in the various universities in the State of Punjab. The selection process should be done by a transparent method and in terms of the **UGC Regulations of 2010**. The qualifications laid down by the UGC cannot be ignored or sidelined for making regular appointments or regularizing services of otherwise ineligible candidates. Even if the Lecturers have been working continuously for years together, they cannot be regularized if they do not possess the requisite qualifications under the aforesaid regulations of 2010. As against the State Govt., the grievance of the petitioners of not conducting the selections is found to be genuine. The contention of the respondents, therefore of the petitioners having no locus to challenge the action of the State, deserves to be rejected.

19. Any appointment made *de hors* the rules is anathema to the concept of equality of employment and equality before law as envisaged under Articles 14, 15 and 16 of the Constitution of India. All persons should be given an equal opportunity to compete and participate in the selection process and

appointments should be made by a transparent method based on merit and eligibility criteria.

20. However, the aforesaid principle is rarely adhered to for the reasons that the regular selection process is cumbersome or for the reasons that the selecting bodies failed to perform their constitutional duty of conducting selections in a fair and impartial manner. This results in the general public being deprived of the regularly selected persons in order to meet out with the immediate requirement of teachers. The concerned Colleges, Universities and the State authorities resort to making adhoc / urgent / temporary / part time appointments on the post which are meant to be filled by regular method. It cannot be left unnoticed that once a person obtains appointment by such methods which are not in accordance with rules, they continue to work on the said post in the garb that regularly selected persons are not available.

21. Time and again the Courts including the Apex Court has been observing that selection should be done by following the procedure as laid down under the Rules. Infact, for the purpose of academics, the UGC conditions of appointment of Asstt. Professor's Regulations of 2010 are required to be followed strictly but as the regular selections are not made for years together and such adhoc urgent temporary Lecturers continued to perform their duties against the permanent posts for years together, the need arises for granting them same benefit.

22. In view of the above, this Court does not find any reason to allow the State Govt. to regularize the respondents by adopting a course alien to the UGC Regulations of 2010. The respondents and similarly placed Asstt. Professors would, therefore, have to participate in the regular selection. It is, however, left open to the State to grant certain bonus marks for teaching

experience gained by such adhoc Lecturers. It is always good to have experienced teachers. However, the level of education cannot be reduced in such a way as to lower down the overall standard of higher education. This Court has also perused the criteria which was adopted by the committee formed for regularizing the adhoc Lecturers and finds that such criteria will open a precedent to encourage backdoor appointments. The method and manner of selection of the adhoc Lecturers cannot be said to be absolutely fair and transparent and, therefore, the same cannot be approved. Even though, the respondents may have been allotted the minimum of the pay scale and may also be receiving increments, then too they cannot be equated to Asstt. Professors appointed after undergoing regular selection in terms of UGC Regulations of 2010.

23. As has come on record, there are about 2000 posts lying vacant in various Govt. colleges in the State of Punjab. Absence of teachers has a direct effect on the development of the society. Students need to be taught and on account of paucity of teachers, there is heavy burden on the existing Asstt. Professors. Therefore, respondents/State is required to come out of its inertia and take immediate steps for filling up the posts by issuing advertisement and inviting applications from all over India basis. UGC has already laid down the regulations for the criteria and method of selection.

24. Since 2002, there have been no Selections in State of Punjab and, therefore, this Court is prompted to pass appropriate orders and it is directed that:-

- i) the Punjab State Govt. shall within four weeks' from today issue an advertisement for filling up the vacant posts of Asstt. Professors in various subjects and shall include the posts

which are also meant for the adhoc Lecturers who were appointed on urgent temporary basis or part time basis initially. The said existing adhoc Lecturers would be entitled to participate in the selection process if they possess the minimum eligibility as laid down under the Regulations of 2010. Such adhoc Lecturers would be eligible for being given the benefit of their experience if they achieve a particular bench mark in the written examination which may be fixed by the concerned examining body;

It is made clear that the existing adhoc Lecturers if selected would fill their respective category of posts;

ii) The reservation of posts shall be made on the total number of posts for each subject;

iii) The reservation policy as followed by the Govt. shall be maintained and the reservation of posts shall be made on the total number of available posts for each subject in all the colleges of the State or Universities;

iv) Keeping in view the protracted litigation pending in the Court since long, it is directed that the candidates participating for open selection should be given appropriate age relaxation. So far as the adhoc Lecturers are concerned, they would be allowed to participate in the selection process without putting embargo of their age criteria.

25. The aforesaid directions are being given so that the selection process may be concluded as soon as possible and concluded preferably within a period of eight months.

26. Accordingly, both writ petitions are allowed to the aforesaid extent.
27. All pending applications shall stand disposed of.

14th September, 2023
mamta

(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No