



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

**COCP-2431-2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 20.08.2025**

SEEMA AHLAWAT

.... Petitioner

VERSUS

ANAND MOHAN SHARAN, IAS AND ORS

.... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present : Mr. Dalbir Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Addl. AG Haryana for the respondents.

ALKA SARIN, J. (ORAL)

1. The present contempt petition has been filed for non-compliance of the order dated 07.03.2019 passed by this Court in CWP-6192-2019. The operative part of the order dated 07.03.2019 *ibid* reads as under :

'In the meantime, petitioners shall continue to work as per directions given by this Court in CWP-26077-2018 Mamta Rani V/s State of Haryana'.

The operative part of the order dated 09.10.2018 passed by this Court in CWP-26077-2018 titled as Mamta Rani & Ors. V/s State of Haryana & Ors. reads as under :

'Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, instant writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to allow the petitioners to work till regular appoints are made and the petitioners shall not be

replaced on the basis of transfer of regular employee. However, it is further made clear that if some new regular candidate joins, the petitioners can be relieved, as per Menka and others v. State of Haryana and others, decided on 05.05.2016 and further the respondents will consider the retention of the petitioner as per the guidelines issued on 13.07.2018 (Annexure P-4). This exercise shall be completed within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order'.

2. The grievance of the petitioner is that her workload has been reduced and therefore commensurately her salary has been reduced.
3. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents has pointed out that the direction in the writ petition being CWP-26077-2018 was to the effect that the petitioner would not be replaced on the basis of any transfer of regular employee. In the present case, admittedly, the petitioner is still working at the same position as she was earlier and she has not been replaced on the basis of transfer of any regular employee. Learned counsel has further referred to the policy guidelines dated 04.03.2020 regarding engaging Eligible Extension Lecturers in Government Colleges purely on work requirement basis, which reads as under :

'B. Remuneration

8. The eligible extension lecturers shall be paid @ Rs.57700/- per month w.e.f. 27-6-19 (on the principle of equal work equal pay) and no allowances are to be paid.

They shall be given teaching workload as per State Govt. norms. Further, they shall also perform all additional duties (at par with regular Assistant/Associate Professor), However, duties involving financial responsibilities shall not be allotted to them.

9. However, all those incumbents who are not eligible as per UGC/State Government norms but are still working as being protected by the orders of Hon'ble High Court, will be paid a remuneration of Rs.35,400/- per month and will be meeting complete workload and all other duties as well till the final outcome in Civil Writ Petitions.

10. Wherever, an Extension Lecturer is engaged and still working as being protected by the orders of Hon'ble High Court and there is less workload as per stipulated norms they will be paid Rs.35,400/- per month'.

It has further been pointed out that as on today the petitioner is getting the same salary as her workload is complete.

4. In view thereof, no further orders are required to be passed in the present contempt petition and the same is disposed off as such. Rule stands discharged. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

20.08.2025

Aman Jain

NOTE:

(ALKA SARIN)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking

Whether reportable: Yes/No