



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

Sr. No.128

CWP-439-2025

Date of Decision: 13.01.2025

Gaurav Sorot

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Vijay Pal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG, Haryana.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)

The petition has been filed *inter alia* seeking a writ of *certiorari* quashing the show cause notice dated 17.12.2024, Annexure P-13, whereby the petitioner, who is working since 01.10.2012, has been afforded an opportunity to explain as to why his services as ineligible Extension Lecturer (English) may not be dispensed with.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the show cause notice is only a formality, as the wording of the notice itself makes it clear that the second respondent has already made up his mind to terminate the petitioner's services as Extension Lecturer on account of being ineligible. He also contends that the petitioner was awarded degree of M.Phil in English in June 2009 by Vinayaka Mission's Research Foundation (deemed to be University); a certificate to that effect has been appended to the petition as Annexure P-3. And in terms of the decision taken by the University Grants Commission (UGC) in its 472nd meeting held on 27.09.2010, Annexure P-8, the candidates having M.Phil degree on or before 10.07.2009 remain exempted from the requirement of National Eligibility Test (NET) for the



purpose of appointment as Lecturer/Assistant Professor. Accordingly, the petitioner cannot be considered ineligible for appointment as Extension Lecturer as he has cleared M.Phil before 10.07.2009, and the condition of clearing the NET would not be applicable on him.

3. Learned State counsel does not dispute that the matter is still under consideration and final decision on the petitioner's response to the show cause notice has not been taken as yet. She submits that the second respondent will consider his response in the light of UGC decision dated 27.09.2010, as well as the laid down qualifications for the post of Extension Lecturer in English.

4. In view of the statement made, learned counsel for the petitioner has no objection to the petition being disposed of in terms thereof.

5. Ordered accordingly.

6. In case the second respondent finally takes a decision against the petitioner, he shall not be relieved for a period of two weeks therefrom.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

13.01.2025
Maninder

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No