



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

232

CWP-4216-2020

Date of Decision: 28.10.2025

DR. SUSHILA BISHNOI**...Petitioner(s)****Versus****STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS****...Respondent(s)****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA**

Present:- Mr. Sardavinder Goyal, Advocate with
Mr. Nishant Sindhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Aakash Singla, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (Oral)

The petition has been filed, *inter alia*, seeking a writ of *mandamus* directing the respondents to allow the petitioner to join and work as Extension Lecturer Environment Science/Study till regular selections are made against the post.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was displaced as Extension Lecturer by the Principal, Government College, Hansi, due to lack of workload. The assertion has been made on the basis of 'Remuneration Statement' of the same date, Annexure P-9, which is to the effect that the petitioner has worked as Extension Lecturer in the subject of Environment Study in the College and got remuneration of ₹3200 in November, 2010 and ₹2000 in December, 2010. It also records that she has been displaced due to lack of workload. A reference has been made by the learned counsel to guidelines issued by the Principal Secretary to Government of Haryana, Higher Education Department, vide memo dated 13.09.2019, Annexure P-12, stipulating that the workload of Environment Science will be allotted to displaced Extension Lecturers who are qualified in the subject as



per the UGC Regulations. Therefore, the petitioner has a right to join as displaced Extension Lecturer, as she is now eligible.

3. Learned State counsel, on the contrary, has submitted that the petitioner has worked as ineligible Extension Lecturer in the College only for thirteen days, i.e., from 22.11.2010 to 04.12.2010, and has no right to seek re-engagement on that basis. As per the Policy for engagement of Extension Lecturer, dated 04.03.2020, only those persons who fulfill the essential qualifications prescribed for the post of Assistant Professor under the Service Rules can be engaged as Extension Lecturer, and the ineligible ones are required to be disengaged.

4. Heard.

5. The facts mentioned in the written statement have not been disputed by filing any counter-affidavit. It also remains uncontested that the petitioner was engaged as ineligible Extension Lecturer only for thirteen days as aforementioned. There is no provision in the Policy, dated 04.03.2020, for re-engagement of such Extension Lecturers or considering them as displaced, nor has any been pointed out. Besides, the memo dated 13.09.2019, relied upon by the learned counsel cannot entitle the petitioner to seek re-engagement, as appointment of Extension Lecturers is regulated in terms of Policy dated 04.03.2020, as amended from time to time.

6. In view thereof, there is no merit in the petition and it stands dismissed.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

28.10.2025
Ad

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No