

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH
Sr. No.: 110

Civil Writ Petition No.28947 of 2023
Date of Decision: *January 09, 2024*

Dr. Priyanka Singh

..... PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

Guru Jambheshwar University of Science and Technology, Hisar, Haryana,
through its Vice Chancellor

..... RESPONDENT(S)

. . .

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA**

. . .

PRESENT: - Mr. Gursher Singh Bhandal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Puneet Gupta, Advocate, for the respondent-
University.

. . .

Tribhuvan Dahiya, J (Oral)

This petition has been filed *inter alia* seeking a writ of *certiorari*, quashing the advertisement No.12/2023, Annexure P-1, and for issuing a writ of *mandamus*, directing the respondent-University to re-advertise the post of Assistant Professor in the Department of Environmental Science and Engineering, and conduct the selection process in accordance with law.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the University is conducting a written test to shortlist candidates for interview for the advertised post. This is against the standards and norms notified by the University Grants Commission (UGC) vide notification dated 18.07.2018, Annexure P-2, and unsustainable.

3. Learned counsel for the University, appearing on advance notice, contends that the petitioner has no *locus-standi* to file the petition as she is not an applicant for the post in question. He also contends that in an earlier round of litigation, the petitioner filed Civil Writ Petition No.14066 of 2019, *Priyanka Singh vs. Guru Jambheshwar University of Science and Technology Hissar*, challenging selection for the post of Assistant Professor in the Department of Environmental Science and Engineering itself which was earlier advertised. And, vide interim order dated 07.01.2021, she was allowed to participate in the interview also subject to further orders. Still, she did not appear for the same and the selection was finalised, though the petition is pending for final adjudication before this Court.

4. Heard.

5. Undisputedly, the petitioner is not an applicant for the advertised post. The plea of learned counsel for the petitioner that had she applied for the post in question, she would have been precluded from filing the instant petition, is bereft of any merit and is hereby rejected. Merely by applying for the post the petitioner cannot be prevented from challenging any illegality that is being committed in the process of selection. Not being an applicant for the advertised post, she has no concern either with the process of selection or its outcome and has, accordingly, disentitled herself from challenging the selection. Besides, in the earlier round of litigation challenging selection for another post of Assistant Professor in the Department, she did not appear for the interview despite having been provisionally permitted by this Court. It is, therefore, apparent that she is acting like a busybody more interested in challenging the selection process than participating in it. This also disentitles her to file the instant petition.

6. In view thereof, there is no ground to entertain the petition.
7. Dismissed.

January 09, 2024

avin

(Tribhuvan Dahiya)
Judge

Whether Speaking/ Reasoned:

Whether Reportable:

Yes/ No

Yes/ No