



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

223

CWP-21980-2023 (O&M)

Decided on :08.04.2026

ABHAY

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF UT CHANDIGARH AND OTHERS

. . . Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

PRESENT: Mr. Atul Arya, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Madhu Dayal, Advocate and
Ms. Sukhmani Patwalia, Advocate
for respondents No. 1 & 2-U.T. Chandigarh.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI , J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, the challenge is to the impugned order dated 21.08.2023 (Annexure P-1) passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh (hereinafter referred to as “the Tribunal”), whereby Original Application No. 204 of 2020 filed by the petitioner, seeking to quash the appointment of respondent No. 4- Aarti Bhatt to the post of Assistant Professor (Music-Vocal) on the ground that the same is contrary to the notification dated 18.07.2018 issued by the University Grants Commission (hereinafter referred to as “UGC”), has been dismissed.

2. At the very outset, learned counsel for the respondents submits that the issue as to whether the notification dated 18.07.2018 issued by the UGC is applicable within the State of Punjab as the same was applicable to

**CWP-21980-2023 (O&M)**

the Union Territory, Chandigarh at the relevant time in the year 2019, or whether the notification of the year 2010 would apply, stands settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India while passing order in **Civil Appeal No. (s) 9471 of 2025 titled as 'Mandeep Singh and others versus State of Punjab and others' decided on 14.07.2025**, wherein it has been held that in the State of Punjab, the notification dated 18.07.2018 issued by the UGC has not been adopted and, therefore, the earlier notification issued by the UGC dated 30.06.2010 continues to operate. Consequently, the arguments raised by learned counsel for the petitioner that the appointment of the private respondent is contrary to the notification dated 18.07.2018 issued by the UGC are liable to be rejected.

3. Faced with this situation, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that even under notification issued by the UGC dated 30.06.2010, the said appointment of the private respondent is bad in law.

4. On being asked whether any such ground on the basis of the instructions issued by the UGC in 2010 had ever been relied upon by the petitioner in the original application filed before the Tribunal, learned counsel for the petitioner fairly submits that no such ground had been taken.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present petition may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further with liberty to the petitioner to approach the Tribunal for raising such plea.

6. Keeping in view the above, ***the present petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to either file a fresh original application or to move an application for revival/review of the earlier original application,*** along with a prayer to amend the pleadings so as to raise the said claim based upon the notification dated 30.06.2010 issued by the UGC, in order to



CWP-21980-2023 (O&M)

challenge the appointment of respondent No. 4 -Aarti Bhatt to the post of Assistant Professor (Music-Vocal).

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

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

08.04.2026

Riya

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/~~No~~
Whether Reportable: ~~Yes~~/No