

**108 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CWP-30194-2022

Date of Decision: 21.09.2023

Ar. Avinash Singh

. . . . Petitioner

Vs.

I.K. Gujral Punjab Technical University and another

. . . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA

Present Mr. Sardavinder Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.

SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J.(Oral)

1. The petitioner had been granted benefit of joining in another university and his lien was directed to be continued for three years vide order dated 23.08.2017.

2. The petitioner, however, did not rejoin his duties, after completion of three years period despite the respondents gave further chance to the petitioner to join within fifteen days vide order dated 16.05.2022. However, the petitioner did not join and continued to perform his duties in another university namely Shaheed Bhagat Singh State University. Vide letter dated 28.05.2022, the petitioner submitted request to grant him extension upto 31.07.2022. The same was considered by the respondents and the petitioner was granted extension to join upto 30.06.2022 and it was informed that if he does not join back, the university on 01.07.2022, shall declare his post to be vacant. However, the petitioner did not join upto 01.07.2022 and sent another letter on 29.06.2022, giving others reasons with

regard to not being granted CAS promotion in the said university, for which

he was waiting. The said request letter was rejected by the university and accordingly his lien was terminated by declaring his post to be vacant, against which, the petitioner has filed the present petition.

3. Learned counsel submits that the lien of the petitioner has wrongly been terminated and he should have been given extension. Learned counsel for the petitioner does not press other relief in the present case and the same are, therefore, not being adjudicated.

4. I have considered the submission and carefully perused the record. Question of granting extension is exclusively an administrative decision. The petitioner has been given more than one chances to join back on his duties. In fact after 2020 i.e. on completion of three years, the respondents could have taken a decision. However, this Court finds that further more than two years time was granted to the petitioner but he did not join back his duties.

5. In view thereof, no interference is warranted to the decision taken by the university. The writ petition is bereft of merit and accordingly dismissed.

(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)
JUDGE

21.09.2023.

rajesh

1. Whether speaking/reasoned?	:	Yes/No
2. Whether reportable?	:	Yes/No