

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

124

CWP-12626-2026

Date of Decision: 24.04.2026

Dr. Sonika Malik

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present:- Mr. S.S. Patter, Advocate, and
Ms. Pragya Malik, 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 re-engage the petitioner as Extension Lecturer (English) since she has acquired the requisite eligibility by qualifying University Grants Commission-National Eligibility Test (UGC-NET) in English on 22.02.2025.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner was initially engaged in the Department in 2015 as ineligible Extension Lecturer, and was relieved from service in January, 2025, in terms of Policy guidelines dated 04.03.2020, as amended from time to time. Thereafter, she became eligible to be appointed as Extension Lecturer, but her claim has been wrongly declined, vide impugned order dated 18.06.2025, only on the ground that she was not covered in the amended Policy dated 14.12.2023, which requires the candidates to acquire eligibility on or before 30.06.2023, to be considered as displaced eligible extension lecturer. There is no justification for the cut-off date, and a reference has been made to an interim order dated 26.05.2023, Annexure P-6, passed by

others v. State of Haryana and others, whereby operation of similar requirements specified in amendment to the Policy guidelines issued vide memo, dated 13.05.2023, has been stayed.

3. Learned State counsel, however, submits that the Policy guidelines dated 04.03.2020, have been further amended vide memo dated 14.12.2023. In terms of amended Clause 20, *a displaced eligible extension lecturer is one who has acquired eligibility on or before 30.06.2023 (end of the academic year)*. The petitioner does not fulfil the requirement, and cannot be considered a displaced eligible extension lecturer for adjustment under the Policy.

4. Considering the submissions, this Court finds no ground to entertain the petition since the Policy guidelines dated 04.03.2020, as amended vide memo dated 14.12.2023, unequivocally require that displaced eligible extension lecturer is the one who acquired eligibility on or before 30.06.2023. The petitioner concededly does not meet this requirement. Besides, no benefit can be taken by her by referring to the interim order, dated 26.05.2023, passed by the Division Bench since it was with reference to a memo dated 13.05.2023, which stands superseded by the subsequent amendment vide memo dated 14.12.2023, based upon which the petitioner’s case has been rejected. It is also not disputed that the said amendment was challenged before a Division Bench of this Court in CWP-2038-2024 titled *Neha Rani v. State of Haryana and others*, and was upheld vide order dated 08.02.2024.

5. Dismissed *in limine*.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

24.04.2026
Payal

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