



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

**CWP No.547 of 2025
Date of Decision:16.09.2025**

Dr. Akanksha Qayum

....Petitioner

VS.

Union Territory of Chandigarh and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. Vivek Sheoran, Advocate
for the petitioner (through VC)

Mr. Sanjiv Ghai, Advocate
for respondents No. 1 and 2

Mr. Anosh Samson, Advocate for
Mr. Gagneshwar Walia, Advocate
for respondents No. 3 and 4

Mr. Akshay Kumar Goel, Advocate (Through VC)
for respondent No. 5

Mr. Hemen Aggarwal, Advocate
Mr. Ashim Garg, Advocate
for respondent No. 6-UGC

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. On 13.01.2025, the following order was passed by this Court:-

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that petitioner is working with respondent as Assistant Professor for last 4 years. She is UGC NET



qualified and possessing degree of M.Phil and Ph.D besides 8 years teaching experience.

2. *The respondent vide advertisement dated 14.07.2023 advertised post of Assistant Professor for different streams including History. She applied pursuant to said advertisement but her application was rejected. She preferred Civil Writ Petition No.451 of 2024 before this Court seeking direction to respondents to consider her claim.*

3. *By order dated 10.01.2024, this Court directed the respondents to permit the petitioner to join the process of interview. The selection process initiated by aforesaid advertisement was cancelled. The respondent has re-advertised said post. She has again applied, however, has come to know that her candidature has been rejected by the University. The college as per SOP found her eligible and referred her case to the University but Committee constituted by University has rejected her candidature for the purpose of interview.*

4. *Notice of motion returnable for 11.03.2025.*

5. *Mr. Parminder S. Kaul, Advocate, Mr. Gagneshwar Walia, advocate and Mr. Akshay Kumar Goel, Advocate accept notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 6.*

6. *This Court vide order dated 10.01.2024 with respect to advertisement dated 14.07.2023 directed the respondents to permit the petitioner to join process of interview. The relevant extracts of order dated 10.01.2024 are reproduced as below:*

“12. Taking note of all the facts and circumstances which have been submitted before this Court, it is directed that name of the petitioner be considered as having been included in the list already published, by the College (respondent No.3) or the Panjab University (Respondent No. 5) for the



purpose of starting the process of interview. However, concerned respondent would be at liberty to publish a separate/afresh list before starting of the interview, by including the name of petitioner, provisionally.

13. Accordingly, petitioner herein would be allowed to join the process of interview and any such interview would be considered as a provisional interview which would be subject to the final decision of the present writ petition.

14. It is further directed that in case, petitioner is found suitable for the post, result be produced in a sealed cover before this Court on the next date of hearing.

15. It is further clarified that in case, petitioner is not found to be suitable for the post, though interviewed provisionally under the order of this Court, the suitable candidate can be offered the appointment.

16. Adjourned to 09.02.2024.”

7. The aforesaid advertisement was cancelled and same posts are advertised afresh. The college has recommended name of petitioner, however, respondent-University has rejected her candidature.

8. In the light of interim order dated 10.01.2024 passed by this Court, I find it appropriate to direct the respondents to permit the petitioner to join the process of interview and consider her claim provisionally. If she is found suitable for the post, the result would be produced in a sealed cover before this Court on the adjourned date.

9. It is further clarified that in case petitioner is not found to be suitable for the post though interviewed provisionally under the order of this Court, a suitable candidate can be offered the appointment.”



2. Mr. Akshay Kumar Goel, Advocate submits that pursuant to aforesaid order, the petitioner was permitted to participate in the interview. She was not found suitable for the post and another candidate namely Dr. Bhajan Singh came to be selected. The University has granted approval and appointment letter would be issued by college concerned in due course.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner expressed his inability to controvert aforesaid statement.
4. In the wake of statement of Mr. Akshay Kumar Goel, Advocate the instant petition is hereby dismissed.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

16.09.2025
paramjit

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes	
Whether reportable:	Yes	