



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

LPA-1641-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 25.09.2025

JAI PARKASH MALIK

...APPELLANT

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

...RESPONDENTS

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR**

Present:- Mr. Rahul Deswal, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Pankaj Middha, Addl. AG, Haryana.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (ORAL)

1. This appeal is directed against the judgment of learned Single Judge dated 06.05.2025 passed in Civil Writ Petition No.6665-2025 whereby the claim of appellant for appointment to the post of School Principal has been rejected.

2. Learned Single Judge has noticed the qualification laid down for appointment to the post of School Principal in the Haryana School Education Rules, 2003 to observe that the requisite qualification is not possessed by the appellant. The observations of the learned Single Judge contained in paragraph No.4 of the judgment reads as under:-

“A perusal of the impugned order shows that the petitioner’s request has been declined on the ground that he did not fulfill the essential qualifications for the post of Principal as laid down in the Haryana School Education Rules, 2003, which are as under:

(i) *M.A./M.Sc./M.Com Second Division*

(ii) *B.T./B.Ed. or its equivalent Eight years teaching experience after B.T./B.Ed. Out of which two years' experience should be in an administrative capacity as Head of High/Middle School. In case of Lecturer, eight years teaching experience.*

Apparently, a candidate for the post in question is required to have minimum eight years teaching experience after B.T./B.Ed., out of which two years' experience should be in an administrative capacity as Head of High/Middle School. The petitioner does not possess the requisite administrative experience as he has never worked as Head of High/Middle School. Being shift incharge under two shifts system, is not akin to having two years experience as administrative head of High/Middle School. This essential requirement of administrative experience has been done away only in the case of Lecturer with eight years teaching experience. There is no material on record to establish that the petitioner was ever appointed as Lecturer. Merely because he was assigned secondary and senior secondary classes for some time, would not make him Lecturer. Accordingly, no exception can be taken to the impugned order dated 10.01.2025.

3. The only defence set-up by the appellant is that though his substantive appointment was on the post of S. S. Master but he was authorized to teach Classes at the Secondary level.

4. It is undisputed that appellant was not appointed substantively to the post of Lecturer. Merely on the strength of a Certificate issued by an Educational Authority, it cannot be said that the

requirement of eight years' experience as Lecturer is met by the appellant. We are, otherwise, informed that the appellant has attained the age of superannuation around 2010.

5. For the reasons set-out in the judgment of learned Single Judge, as also the period which has elapsed since then, we do not find any occasion to interfere in this appeal which consequently fails and is accordingly dismissed.

6. Pending application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

[ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA]
JUDGE

[ROHIT KAPOOR]
JUDGE

SEPTEMBER 25, 2025
Rahul Joshi

- | | |
|------------------------------|--------|
| 1. Whether Speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether Reportable | Yes/No |