



217

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

**CWP-3657-2020(O&M)
Date of decision : 16.03.2026**

Rohit Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State Project Director, Samagra Shiksha, U.T. Chandigarh

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPINDER SINGH
NALWA**

Present: Mr. S.K. Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Maheshinder Singh Sidhu, Additional Standing
Counsel, U.T. Chandigarh for the respondent.

DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA, J. (Oral)

In the present writ petition, the petitioner is praying for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the declaration/information (Annexure P-8) downloaded from the website of the respondent, whereby the petitioner has been held to be not eligible to be considered for appointment on the post of TGT Science (non medical). It was also prayed that direction should be given to the respondent to consider the case of petitioner for appointment on the post of TGT Science (non medical).

2. The brief facts of the case are that the respondent issued an advertisement dated 26.02.2019 (Annexure P-1) for the purpose of recruitment for various TGT posts including 47 posts for TGT Science (non medical). The petitioner applied under OBC category for the post of TGT Science (non-medical) in pursuance to the abovesaid



advertisement dated 26.02.2019 (Annexure P-1). The petitioner duly appeared in the written examination and qualified the same. The result was declared by the respondent in the month of August, 2019 on the website. The petitioner was called by the respondent for the purpose of scrutiny of documents on 17.09.2019. The documents of the petitioner were considered at the time of scrutiny of documents, however, it transpired that under the column of remarks, it was mentioned that the verification for recognition of Central University, Rajasthan for integrated M.Sc. B.Ed. Physics is pending.

3. Taking into consideration the qualification of the petitioner, a meeting of Departmental Officers and Subject Experts from Colleges was convened on 30.09.2019. In the meeting, it was discussed that as the petitioner has passed integrated M.Sc. B.Ed. with teaching subject of Physics instead of Science, it was observed that the matter may be recommended for clarification from the Central University, Rajasthan, from where the petitioner had acquired the qualification. Accordingly, a letter dated 03.12.2019 was sent to the Vice Chancellor, Central University, Rajasthan, for clarification. Accordingly, Central University, Rajasthan, gave its clarification vide letter dated 23.12.2019 (Annexure R-1) whereby, it was clarified that the case of the petitioner can be considered to teach Science (non-medical) at secondary level. In light of the letter/clarification dated 23.12.2019 (Annexure R-1), a Committee was constituted by the respondent to go into the eligibility of the petitioner. The Committee submitted its report dated 13.01.2020 (Annexure R-2) and as per the



said report, it was held that the case of the petitioner cannot be considered as eligible for the post of TGT Science (non medical).

Relevant extract of the abovesaid report is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“After discussion, it was recommended by the committee that a clarification may be sought from Central University, Rajasthan whether the candidate who have passed **Integrated M.Sc. B.Ed with teaching subject of Physics instead of Science** can be considered eligible for the post of TGT Sc. Non Medical or not. Accordingly, a letter vide No. PD/SSA/EA1/2019/13181 dated 03.12.2019 was sent to the Vice Chancellor, Central University, Rajasthan for clarification on the above issue. In response to that the Controller of Examination, Central University, Rajasthan has clarified as under:

"With reference to your L.No. PD/SS/EA1/2019/13181 dated 03.12.2019, it is informed that Mr. Rohit Kumar (Enroll No. 2015IMSBPH015), a student of Integrated M.Sc. B.Ed. (Physics) has completed this programme in the year 2018. The programme taught at Central University of Rajasthan is approved by NCTE (recognition order vide letter-NRC/NCTE/M.Sc. B.Ed/238th meeting (Part-IV/2015/1/0405-406)) issued on 31st May, 2015 in which under point no. 3, it is clearly mentioned that the student whoever so will take up this programme is equivalent to teach at secondary level.

As per the NCTE regulation 2014 (part-III, Section-IV, No. 366, F. No.62-01/2012/NCTE), the qualification to be recruited as education teacher in secondary level is graduation/post-graduation from recognized university with atleast 50% marks in either graduation or post graduation (or its



equivalent) and B.Ed. from NCTE recognized institution.

The candidate is graduate in science at Bachelor level and hence he can be considered to teach science (Non Medical) at secondary level.

From the above letter, it can be observed that the University has clarified that he can be considered to teach Sc. Non-Medical at Secondary level but has not mentioned that teaching of Physics is equivalent to teaching of Science. At the time of appointment, eligibility of the candidate is to be checked in reference to provision of RR and details as mentioned in Advertisement.

Dr. J.P. Singh, Associate Professor in Physics, PGGC-11 and other committee members perused the detailed mark sheet of the candidate and observed that the candidate has passed following subjects, which are related to Bachelor of Education in Integrated M.Sc. B.Ed.

ED 101	Basics Education
ED 102	Senior Secondary Education in India: Status, Challenges and Strategies
ED- 201	Philosophy of Physics
ED-202	Learner and Learning
ED 301	Teaching Approaches and Strategies
ED 302	Pedagogy of Physics-I
ED 401	Learning Assessment
ED 402	Pedagogy of Physics-II
ED 501	Internship
ED 502	Internship and Teaching Practice
ED 503	Project/ Dissertation
ED 601	Classroom Organization and Management

From the above details, it is clear that the candidate has studied Pedagogy of Physics and Philosophy of



Physics, which cannot be considered as equivalent to teaching of Science.

Accordingly, the committee is of the opinion that the candidate has not studied teaching of Science at B.Ed level, as such, he cannot be considered as Eligible for the post of TGT Sc. Non Medical.”

4. Aggrieved against the action of the respondent in not considering the case of the petitioner for appointment on the post of TGT Science (non medical), the petitioner has filed the present writ petition.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that in light of letter dated 23.12.2019 (Annexure R-1) i.e. clarification issued by the Central University, Rajasthan, wherein it was held that the case of the petitioner can be considered to teach Science (non-medical) and as such, the petitioner is eligible to be considered for appointment to the post of TGT Science (non medical).

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that the letter/clarification dated 23.12.2019 (Annexure R-1) issued by the Central University, Rajasthan, was duly considered by the Committee of Experts and taking into consideration the subjects which the petitioner had in integrated M.Sc. B.Ed. course, it was held by the Committee that the petitioner is not eligible to be considered for appointment on the post of TGT Science (non medical).

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at length and perused the paper-book along with records.



8. The only issue involved in the present writ petition is whether the petitioner has the requisite qualification in terms of the advertisement dated 26.02.2019 (Annexure P-1) for the purpose of appointment on the post of TGT Science (non medical).

9. A perusal of the facts of the case would show that the case of the petitioner was duly considered by the Committee of Experts constituted by the respondent and taking into consideration the relevant subjects which the petitioner had in integrated M.Sc. B.Ed. Course, the Committee opined that the petitioner is not eligible for the purpose of appointment on the post of TGT Science (non medical).

10. It is well settled law that the High Court is not an expert and should not ordinarily interfere in the decision of experts. Reference can be made to various judgments of Hon'ble the Supreme Court.

11. In ***The Chancellor, Utkal University v. Dr. Bijayananda Kar (1994) 1 SCC 169***, Hon'ble the Supreme Court observed thus:

“9. This Court has repeatedly held that the decisions of the academic authorities should not ordinarily be interfered with by the courts. Whether a candidate fulfils the requisite qualifications or not is a matter which should be entirely left to be decided by the academic bodies and the concerned selection committees which invariably consist of experts on the subjects relevant to the selection....”

12. In ***Chairman, J&K State Board of Education v. Feyaz Ahmed Malik & Others (2000) 3 SCC 59***, Hon'ble the Supreme Court highlighted the significance of expert bodies in the field of education.



It was further observed that such bodies comprise individuals from diverse backgrounds possessing substantial experience and expertise, are entrusted with the responsibility of maintaining high academic standards. The Court held that the decisions of such expert bodies deserve due deference and weightage from the Courts.

13. In ***Dental Council of India v. Subharti K.K.B. Charitable Trust & Another (2001) 5 SCC 486***, Hon'ble the Supreme Court held that the High Court's jurisdiction is extremely limited to interfere with the discretion exercised by the expert bodies.

14. In ***Medical Council of India v. Sarang & Others (2001) 8 SCC 427***, Hon'ble the Supreme Court held that the Courts should ordinarily refrain from interpreting technical rules and regulations and instead defer such matters to domain experts.

15. In ***Dr. Rajbir Singh Dalal v. Chaudhari Devi Lal University, Sirsa & Another (2008) 9 SCC 284***, Hon'ble the Supreme Court observed that it is not appropriate for the Court to sit in appeal over the opinions rendered by experts, reaffirming judicial restraint in such matters.

16. In ***B.C. Mylarappa alias Dr. Chikkamylarappa v. Dr. R. Venkatasubbaiah & Others (2008) 14 SCC 306***, Hon'ble the Supreme Court affirmed the established legal position regarding importance and relevance of the recommendations made by the expert committees.

17. In ***All India Council for Technical Education v. Surinder Kumar Dhawan & Others (2009) 11 SCC 726***, again the legal position



has been reiterated that it is a rule of prudence that courts should hesitate to dislodge decisions of academic bodies.

18. Taking into consideration the law laid down by Hon’ble the Supreme Court referred above, the report submitted by the Committee dated 13.01.2020 (Annexure R-2) that the petitioner is not eligible for consideration for appointment on the post of TGT Science (non medical) and as there is no allegation of *mala fide* alleged against the Committee, as such, no relief can be granted to the petitioner.

19. Accordingly, the present writ petition is dismissed.

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

16.03.2026	(DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA)	
<i>d.gulati</i>	JUDGE	
Whether speaking / reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No