



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

Sr. No.119

CWP-8753-2026

Date of Decision: 27.03.2026

Rampal Singh

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Sajjan Singh, 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 continue the petitioner's services up to sixty years of age.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner was appointed as eligible Extension Lecturer in a Government College under the respondent Department, and has been given the benefit of Haryana Extension Lecturers and Guest Lecturers (Security of Service) Act, 2024 (for short, 'the 2024 Act'). In terms of Sections 2(h) and 3 of the 2024 Act, he is entitled to continue in service till attaining the age of superannuation, i.e., fifty-eight years, which will be on 30.04.2026. A reference has been made to the memo dated 11.11.2022, Annexure P-15, issued by Government of Haryana, Higher Education Department, regarding "Revised minimum qualifications for appointment of teachers and other academic staff including Librarians and Directors of Physical Education and Sports in Universities and Colleges and measures for the maintenance of standards in Higher Education, 2022 based on University Grants Commission Regulations



2018". On the basis of para 2.1 of the memo, it has been submitted that in the event of acute shortage of manpower in the Higher Education Department, teachers such as Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, Senior Professor and Principal may be re-employed in a college beyond the age of superannuation. And there is shortage of teachers in the Department, as apparent from the interim order dated 20.09.2023, passed by the Division Bench in CWP No.22168 of 2021 titled *Veena Rani v. State of Haryana and others*, and connected matters; the order makes a reference to a letter by the Government to the effect, '*... at present 4738 sanctioned posts of Assistant Professor in various subjects in Government Colleges in the State of Haryana are lying vacant in the department*'. Accordingly, the petitioner has a right to continue and/or be re-employed up to sixty years of age.

3. Learned State counsel has received instructions from the second respondent vide memo dated 27.03.2026, a copy whereof is retained on the case file along with its enclosure as Annexure 'A'. Referring to the same, he contends that in terms of the amended policy guidelines regarding engagement of eligible extension lecturers, issued vide memo dated 13.05.2023, Annexure R-1, the petitioner has no right to claim extension. It stipulates under clause 27, '*No eligible extension lecturer shall be retained beyond the age of 58 years. The instructions issued vide letter/Memo No.DHE-020016/7/2020 dated 17.12.2020 are hereby withdrawn*'.

4. Heard.

5. Considering the submissions, this Court finds that the revised minimum qualifications for appointment of teachers, notified by the Government vide memo dated 11.11.2022, have no application to the petitioner's case. Paragraph 2.1 of the memo, which has been relied upon by



the petitioner to claim re-employment after fifty-eight years of age, reads as under:

2.1. Keeping in view the acute shortage of teachers in higher education, specially experts who can contribute towards creation of knowledge, teachers such as Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, Senior Professor and Principal may be re-employed in University/College beyond the age of superannuation, by the Universities concerned in the Universities, by the State Government in the Government Colleges and by the Managing Committee with permission of the State Government in the Government Aided private Colleges subject to availability of vacant posts, workload and fitness, up to the age of sixty five years or till the regular appointment or promotion is made against such vacant positions whichever is earlier.

Provided further that all such re-employment shall be strictly in accordance with the guidelines prescribed by the State Government from time to time.

Apparently, this para is applicable to teachers such as Assistant Professors and other academic staff in universities and colleges, whereas the petitioner has been appointed as Extension Lecturer. He has never been appointed as a regular Assistant Professor and cannot be considered as such. Besides, para 2.1 has already been considered by this Court in CWP No.28019 of 2023 titled *Dr. Mangat Singh and another v. State of Haryana and others*, holding that it does not contain any mandate to re-employ retired teachers. The observations of the Court read as under:

7. A perusal of paragraph 2.1 of the notification dated 11.11.2022 makes it apparent that it does not contain any mandate to re-employ retired teachers in the universities or colleges up to sixty-five years of age, or till regular appointment or promotion is made against vacant posts. It is only an enabling provision for the universities or colleges to engage the services of re-employed teachers up to sixty-five years of age subject to



availability of vacant posts, workload, fitness or promotion, etc. Further, it specifically provides that such re-employment can only be in accordance with the guidelines prescribed by the government from time to time. Once the government vide memo dated 09/11.10.2024 has laid down the guidelines and prescribed maximum age limit for re-employing extension lecturers as sixty years, no exception can be taken to it, and the petitioners cannot claim any right to continue in service beyond the maximum prescribed age even on the basis of availability of workload.

5.1. Further, being an Extension Lecturer, he has been given protection of tenure up to the age of superannuation, i.e., fifty-eight years, in terms of the 2024 Act. Also, in terms of clause 27 of the amended policy guidelines issued vide memo dated 13.05.2023, an Extension Lecturer cannot be retained in service beyond fifty-eight years. And validity of clause 27 has already been upheld by this Court in CWP No.25413 of 2025 titled *Dr. Rita Tandon v. State of Haryana and others*, holding as under:

5. Undisputedly, the Policy guidelines of May, 2023, prescribe maximum age for eligible Extension Lecturer to be fifty-eight years, which is the same as provided for regular teachers and Assistant Professors in the Department. Therefore, there is nothing arbitrary or illegal about it. The UGC Regulations referred to by learned counsel for the petitioner only prescribe that regular Assistant Professors, Assistant Professors and Professors may be reemployed on contract appointment beyond the age of superannuation, as applicable to the concerned University or college, upto the age of seventy years. The provision enabling the institution to re-employ regular teachers after superannuation cannot give a right to the petitioner to challenge the maximum age of superannuation prescribed under clause 27 of the Policy guidelines, or claim entitlement to remain in service beyond the age stipulated therein. The Regulations are for a distinct purpose, and have no



concern with the policy of employing Extension Lecturers on contract or their age of superannuation.

6. Additionally, the petitioner cannot draw benefit from the observations of *Veena Rani* case (*supra*) regarding vacancy of sanctioned posts in Government colleges since it shows the status as on 20.09.2023. And it has not been contested at the Bar that thereafter further recruitment process for appointment of Assistant Professors in the Department has been carried out. The petition itself mentions that the Department has already advertised 2424 posts of Assistant Professor in different subjects, and the process is going on.

7. Accordingly, finding no merit in the petition, it stands dismissed *in limine*.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

27.03.2026
Maninder

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