



\$~117

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 16947/2022 and C.M. APPL. 1551/2024**

REENA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abhik Chimni, Mr. Gurupal Singh, Ms. Pranjal Abrol and Mr. Maarooof, Advocates.

versus

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY & ANR.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Ginny J. Rautray, Senior Advocate with Ms. Devika Thakur and Mr. Ranvijay Singh, Advocates along with Mr. Sumer Singh and Mr. Lalit Chandra Kullu, JNU Officials, for Respondent/JNU.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

10.12.2024

%

1. This writ petition has been preferred by the Petitioner laying a challenge to his APARs for the period 01.09.2019 to 05.09.2019; 06.09.2019 to 31.12.2019; and from 01.01.2020 to 31.01.2020. A direction is sought to the Respondent University to appoint a new Reporting Officer and Reviewing Officer for the future APARs for the period between 01.05.2021 to 30.04.2023 on account of alleged bias of Respondent No. 2.
2. Ms. Ginny J. Rautray, learned Senior Counsel, at the outset, on instructions, submits that all the 03 APARs under challenge in this writ petition have been rectified with respect to the endorsement of the



Reviewing Officer and upgraded and therefore, grievance of the Petitioner stands redressed. She also hands over the APAR dossier to support the said submission.

3. I have perused the APAR dossier of the Petitioner and heard learned counsel for the Petitioner and learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the University.

4. Ms. Rautray is correct in her submission that grievance of the Petitioner stands redressed. Insofar as APAR for the period 01.01.2019 to 05.09.2019 is concerned, Professor Syed Ainul Hasan, Dean has reviewed the APAR and upgraded the same to 8.66. APAR for the period 06.09.2019 to 31.12.2019 has also been reviewed by Professor Syed Ainul Hasan and upgraded to 8.08. In the APAR for the year 2020, Professor Mazhar Asif is the Reporting Officer while Professor Syed Ainul Hasan is the Reviewing Officer and the latter has upgraded the earlier numerical grading to 6.44. This takes care of the contention of the Petitioner that the 03 APARs were reviewed by an incompetent Authority as also that the erstwhile Reviewing Officer had downgraded the APARs.

5. Insofar as the relief that Respondent No. 2 be restrained from reporting or reviewing the APARs covering the period 01.05.2021 to 30.04.2023 is concerned, it is not known at this stage as to which officer has initiated or reviewed the APARs for this period as this writ petition was filed in the year 2022. Therefore, this aspect is left open to be agitated by the Petitioner at the appropriate time, if so required.

6. In view of the aforesaid, this writ petition is disposed of giving liberty to the Petitioner to take recourse to legal remedies with respect to the gradings now endorsed by the new Reviewing Officer in the 03 impugned



APARs, if so aggrieved. Liberty is also granted to lay a challenge to the APARs for the period 01.05.2021 to 30.04.2023, in case the Petitioner has any grievance. Needless to state that as and when the case of the Petitioner comes up for any promotion or financial upgradation under the MACP Scheme, the rectified APARs will be taken into consideration.

7. Pending application also stands disposed of.

JYOTI SINGH, J

DECEMBER 10, 2024

B.S. Rohella/shivam