

129

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

CWP-21863-2023

Date of Decision:02.11.2023

SUBHADER PAL

..... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present : Mr. Jasbir Mor, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raman Sharma, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Mr. Puneet Gupta, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. On 29.09.2023, the following order was passed:

“1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondent No.2 to grant marks with respect to teaching experience of the petitioner and consider him for interview to be held on 29.09.2023 & 30.09.2023.

2. The petitioner applied, pursuant to advertisement, for the post of Assistant Professor. The petitioner has applied under ‘General Category’ and ‘Other Backward Classes ategory’. The petitioner has not been called for the interview on the ground that he has not secured requisite marks. The petitioner has not been awarded marks with respect to his experience. The petitioner is working as PGT in Secondary Education and he had applied for the same post

pursuant to advertisement of Central University, Odisha and Central University, Kerala. The Central University, Odisha and Central University, Kerala awarded 9 marks to the petitioner with respect to his experience, however, respondent No.2 has not awarded marks with respect to his experience. The respondent-University as well as other Central Universities are following norms of N.C.T.E and guidelines of U.G.C. for the appointment of Assistant Professor.

3. Mr. Raman Sharma and Mr. Shivoy Dhir, Advocates who on advance notice are present in Court for respondent No.1 and respondent Nos.2 & 3, respectively, seek time to get instructions.

4. The interview is going to take place on 29.09.2023 and 30.09.2023. The petitioner, as claimed in the writ petition, had applied for the same post pursuant to advertisement by other Central Universities which are following the same set of rules and regulations. If the petitioner is not permitted to participate in the interview, it may seriously prejudice his interest, thus, respondents are directed to permit the petitioner to participate in the interview.

5. It is made clear that permission to participate in the interview would not create any right in favour of the petitioner against the advertized posts. It is further clarified that the interim arrangement made by this order would be subject to outcome of this writ petition.

*6. Adjourned to **02.11.2023**.*

7. The respondent shall accept print out of this order obtained from the website of this Court.”

2. Learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3, at the outset, submits that petitioner participated in the interview, however, he has not been selected by the Selection Committee. He further submits that result

of the interview would be communicated to the petitioner within 2 weeks from today.

3. Faced with this, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the present petition with liberty to avail remedies as permissible by law.
4. Dismissed as withdrawn with aforesaid liberty.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)

JUDGE

02.11.2023

Ali

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>