



Amrut

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

MISC.CIVIL APPLICATION NO.265 OF 2024

IN

WRIT PETITION NO.128 OF 2021

SNIGDHA MAYENKAR

... APPLICANT

Versus

**STATE OF GOA, THR. CHIEF SECRETARY
AND 2 ORS**

... RESPONDENTS

Mr S. D. Lotlikar, Senior Advocate with Ms S. Kenny, Advocate for the applicant.

Mr Prashil Arolkar, Additional Government Advocate for respondent No.1.

Ms. A. A. Agni, Senior Advocate with Ms A. Harihar, Advocate for respondent No.2.

**CORAM:- BHARATI DANGRE &
NIVEDITA P. MEHTA, JJ.**

DATED :- 10th June, 2025

P.C.:

1. Mr Lotlikar, learned Senior Advocate for the applicant has pressed into service the selection process for the post of Assistant Professor in Biotechnology and Biochemistry as according to him the petitioner qualified for the said post and faced interview for both these two posts and found herself non selected as far as Biotechnology is concerned and was declared unsuitable as far as the post of Biochemistry is concerned. The justification offered is to be found in the affidavit in reply filed by respondent No.2 i.e. Registrar of Goa University affirmed on 20.01.2025 whereby a categorical statement is

made to the effect that as per the Statute under VIth Pay Commission regarding the promotion of teachers under CAS, the minimum passing marks is 50% as per the weightage under Explanatory Note under Table II and the 50% marks requirement in direct recruitment of teachers in the absence of any specific provision of minimum percentage for the direct recruitment. A categorical statement is made that this decision was uniformly applied to all the recruitment under VIth Pay and VIIth Pay Commission for direct recruitment of teachers on the regular and also on the contract basis.

2. Mr Lotlikar would invite our attention to the additional affidavit filed by the petitioner on 10.01.2024 where he has pointed out the instances where the candidates who were secured less than 50% marks have been selected on contract/by way of stop gap arrangement and the affidavit has pleaded hostile discrimination and arbitrariness attributing it to the University.

3. The learned Senior Advocate Ms Agni representing the University would raise a technical objection that this is not pleaded in the petition but according to us since this allegation is levelled in the additional affidavit filed by the petitioner in the writ petition itself, we expect the University to respond to the same as it had adopted a fair stand when it hold us through its affidavit filed by the Registrar on 20.01.2025 that they had applied uniform standard of fixing the threshold of 50% while recruiting the regular teachers as well as on

contract basis.

We expect a response at the end of the University within a period of one week.

Renotify to 19.06.2025 at 4.00 p.m.

NIVEDITA P. MEHTA, J.

BHARATI DANGRE, J.