



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

210

Date of Decision: 21.04.2026

1. CWP-8566-2011

SUSHMA AND OTHERS

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondent(s)

2. CWP-7309-2009

MEENA RANI AND OTHERS

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondent(s)

3. CWP-7291-2009

RAJESH KUMAR AND OTHERS

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present:- Mr. Shilak Ram Hooda, Advocate with
Mr. R. K. Chauhan, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Aakash Singla, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (Oral)

These petitions have been filed seeking a writ of *quo warranto* directing the respondents to explain why they have not followed the mandate of Article 335 of the Constitution of India in making appointment of Guest Faculty teaching staff in schools all over the State of Haryana, since Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Backward Class reserved category candidates have not been given their due share. Further, a writ of *mandamus* has been sought directing the respondents to appoint the petitioners, who

belong to the reserved category, as Guest Faculty Teachers as they have been illegally ignored.

2. Learned State counsel submitted that the appointment of Guest Faculty teaching staff was made in the Government Schools as a stop-gap arrangement in terms of criteria and procedure laid down vide letter dated 18/27.09.2006, Annexure P-5, which is not under challenge. Besides, as mentioned in the written statement filed in CWP-7291-2009, the Department sent requisition to the recruiting agency/Commission for filling up of 1503 posts of Lecturers (School cadre), 2976 posts of Masters and 9647 posts of JBT Teachers on regular basis. The Commission issued advertisements for the purpose, and regular appointments were made by giving due reservation to reserved category candidates in terms of the Government Policy.

3. Considering the submissions, this Court is not inclined to entertain the petition; firstly, because the writ of *quo warranto* cannot be issued to call for an explanation from the respondents, as has been sought by the petitioners; secondly, because it is not in dispute that the said Guest Faculty Teachers were appointed as a stop-gap arrangement, and the respondents duly initiated the process to fill regular vacancies through the Commission by following the reservation Policy.

4. Accordingly, the petitions stand dismissed.

5. A photocopy of this order be placed on the connected files.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

21.04.2026
Ad