



208

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

**CWP-12705-2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 12.01.2026**

Kanika Verma and Others

...Petitioners

Versus

Punjab University and Others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JAGMOHAN BANSAL.

Present:- None for petitioner

Mr. Rajdeep Singh Cheema, Advocate for respondents No.2 & 3

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. On 01.06.2017, while issuing notice of motion, the respondent was directed not to replace petitioner by another set of Adhoc Employees/Contractual Employees/Guest Faculty. The order dated 01.06.2017 reads as:

“ *Notice of motion.*

Mr. Indresh Goyal, Advocate has entered appearance on behalf of the respondent No.1.

Learned counsel undertakes to supply a copy of the paper book to the learned counsel for respondent No.1 during the course of the day.

Learned counsel further undertakes to serve the respondent Nos.2 and 3 by way of dasti process. May do so. Dasti only.

Adjourned to 11.12.2017.

In the meantime, it is directed that the petitioners will not be replaced by another set of Adhoc Employees/Contractual Employees/Guest Faculty.”



3. The aforesaid order was followed by order dated 14.05.2018 which reads as:

“ The claim of the petitioners is that they were appointed on adhoc basis from Session to Session. After the end of every academic session their services came to an end automatically and they were given fresh appointments at the start of the new academic session. Neither any letter of appointment was issued nor any termination order was issued. Only a certificate of experience was issued in which till the year 2015-16 their status was mentioned as 'Adhoc Assistant Professor' but in the year 2016-17 their designation was changed to 'Guest Faculty'. This was done with the aim of denying certain benefits which were available to adhoc appointees. Thus, an apprehension was created in their mind that their services were brought to an end and another set of adhoc employees/guest faculty/contractual employees would be employed in their place. In these circumstances, the present writ petition was filed.

Vide order dated 01.06.2017, this Court restrained respondent No. 2 from replacing the petitioners by another set of Adhoc Employees/Contractual Employees/Guest Faculty.

Thus, in all fairness the petitioners should have been re-appointed on the commencement of the new academic session in July 2017 but the same did not happen. Thus, there was a violation of the order dated 01.06.2017. That apart, learned counsel appearing for respondents No.2 and 3 have not been able to justify their action.

No written statement has been filed till date. Only an application for vacation of stay has been filed.

Learned counsel for respondents No. 2 and 3 seek time to file a written statement but the same is denied in view of the fact that the petition has been pending since 01.06.2017 and the respondents have not thought it fit to file any reply till date.

Adjourned to 16.05.2018.



Principal of respondent No. 2 and Chairman of respondent No. 3 are directed to be present in the Court in person on the next date of hearing.

To be taken up immediately after urgent cases.

A copy of this order be given to learned counsel for the petitioner under the signatures of the Bench Secretary.

A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected matter.”

4. Mr. Rajdeep Singh Cheema, learned counsel for respondents No.2 & 3 submits that as per affidavit dated 20.09.2023 of the officiating Principal, none of the petitioners is working with the college. Seven petitioners have already withdrawn their petition and repeated letters were sent to three petitioners to join, however, they did not come forward.

5. In the wake of statement of Mr. Rajdeep Singh Cheema, Advocate, the petition stands disposed of with liberty to petitioners to move an application within three months from today, if cause survives.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

12.01.2026
SDK

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