



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

267

CWP-15358-2024(O&M)
Date of Decision: 15.01.2026

DR. NARESH KUMAR

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present:- Mr. Roopak Bansal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Mehta, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Puneet Gupta, Advocate with
Mr. Ravindra Singh, Advocate for respondent no.2.

Mr. Amit Kaith, Advocate
for the applicant. (in CM-13824-CWP-2025)

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (Oral)

The petition has been filed, *inter alia*, seeking a writ of *mandamus* directing respondents no.1 and 2 to consider the petitioner for appointment to the post of Associate Professor in the Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences in response to advertisement 19/2023.

2. The petitioner was not considered eligible for the post as his teaching experience was not in accordance with the UGC guidelines, as apparent from report of the screening committee, Annexure P-5.

3. Learned counsel for the University contended that the reason for not considering the petitioner's experience valid was that the gross emoluments drawn by him while serving as Assistant Professor on contract basis were less than the monthly salary of a regularly appointed Assistant Professor. Drawing full salary of a regularly appointed Assistant Professor is a

mandatory requirement under Regulation 10(f)(iii) of the University Grants



Commission (Minimum Qualifications for Appointment of Teachers and other Academic Staff in Universities and Colleges and other Measures for the Maintenance of Standards in Higher Education) Regulations, 2018. The law stands settled by the Supreme Court, vide judgment rendered in Civil Appeal nos.12411-12414 of 2024 titled *Allahabad University and others v. Geetanjali Tiwari (Pandey) and others*, that to be eligible for the post of Assistant Professor the requisite experience must be in terms of Regulation 10 of the 2018 Regulations.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, asserted since the petitioner was employed as contractual Assistant Professor in the respondent University itself, his experience deserves to be counted. At the same time, it could not be disputed that he was not drawing the emoluments meant for a regularly appointed Assistant Professor.

5. Accordingly, there is no escape from concluding that the petitioner does not meet the essential requirements of eligibility in terms of the law laid down in *Geetanjali Tiwari* case *ibid*. As a result, no exception can be taken to the University’s decision rejecting his candidature on that account.

6. Dismissed.

7. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

15.01.2026
Ad

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