



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.138

CWP No.18299 of 2025

Date of Decision: 04.07.2025

Arun Hasanpuri and others

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Sajjan Singh, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Mr. Harish Rathi, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Ms. Harpriya Khaneka, Advocate,
for respondent no.4/Commission.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)

The petition has been filed *inter alia* seeking a writ of *certiorari* quashing the respondents' action in illegally considering candidates having qualification in the subjects of Bio-Science, Human Biology, Bio-Science (Animal Science), Fisheries, Aquaculture, Environmental Science, Bio-Chemistry, Limnology, Entomology, Bio-Technology, Genetics, Bio-informatics Science, and Genetics Engineering for the posts of Assistant Professor in the subject of Zoology; and the candidates having qualifications in the subjects of Bio-Science, M.Sc. Bio-Science (Plant Streams), M.Sc. Bio-Science (Plant Science), M.Sc. Genetics, Bio-technology, Microbiology, Molecular Biology, Biochemistry, Bioinformatics, Environmental Science, Physiology (Plant), Genetics Engineering, Soil Science, Plant Pathology, M.Sc. Agriculture, Horticulture, Floriculture, Life Science, and Forestry for the posts of Assistant Professor in the subject of Botany. Further, quashing of proceedings of the committee to decide the matter of allied subjects and



equivalency of concerned subjects, dated 12/13.02.2025, Annexure P-10, has also been sought.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that out of the seven petitioners, three applied for the posts of Assistant Professor in the subject of Zoology and the remaining four in Botany pursuant to advertisement 42 to 67 of 2024. Only petitioners no.2 and 6 could qualify the screening test and have been shortlisted for Subject Knowledge Test. He contends that as per essential qualifications laid down for the posts, the requirement is, *'Good academic record with a Master's degree with 55% marks (or an equivalent grade in a point-scale wherever the grading system is followed) in a concerned/relevant/allied subject from an Indian University, or an equivalent degree from an accredited foreign university'*. The relevance/allied nature of all the aforementioned subjects has been decided by the committee, though it did not consist of experts of all the fields regarding which opinion has been given. Details of committee's members have been mentioned who are experts only from Civil Engineering, Mass Communication, Finance, Management Economics and Financial Services, Mathematics, Management, and Political Science; however, they opined about the relevance of thirty-seven subjects in a single day's meeting, which was beyond their competence. He further contends that subjects of Environmental Science and Biotechnology have been considered allied/relevant subjects for Zoology, but Zoology has not been considered allied/relevant for these subjects. Similarly, subjects of Biotechnology, Environmental Science and Microbiology have been considered as allied/relevant subjects for Botany, but not *vice versa*. Accordingly, a large number of candidates might have been shortlisted for Subject Knowledge Test by considering them eligible based on recommendations of the committee, which could not have been done.



3. Learned counsel for the Commission contends that based upon the recommendations of the committee and other relevant material, the Government has notified the Haryana Education (College Cadre) Group-B Service (Amendment) Rules, 2024. She further submits that the equivalence, relevance and allied nature of the subjects is being decided as per recommendations of the committee. The list of allied/relevant subjects has been provided by them which is not exhaustive in nature. She also submits that relevance/equivalence of the subjects is decided by the Government, which has rightly been done.

4. Be that as it may, this Court is not inclined to entertain the petition since none of the petitioners has been affected by the recommendations of the committee. Two of the petitioners, who cleared the Screening Test, have already been allowed to participate in the selection process; rest five could not make the grade being lower in merit. They have not been declared ineligible at any stage or excluded from the process of selection on account of the qualification they possess; relevance of their degrees is not in issue. Further, details or particulars of the candidates or their degrees who might have been considered eligible on the basis of their qualification being allied/relevant, have not been given in the petition. And in its absence, there is no basis for this Court to even *prima facie* find that any irregularity has been committed in the process of selection; nor can the committee’s report be questioned in these circumstances.

5. In view thereof, there is no ground to entertain the petition and it stands dismissed.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

04.07.2025

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