

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:002200-DB



LPA-3684-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 12.01.2026

Dr. Sushila Bishnoi

...Appellant

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI**

Present: Mr. Sardavinder Goyal, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Rajesh Gaur, Addl. AG, Haryana.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (Oral)

1. This appeal arises out of an order passed by the learned Single Judge dated 28.10.2025, whereby the claim of the appellant of re-engagement as Extension Lecturer, has been declined.

2. It is not in dispute that the appellant was displaced as Extension Lecturer by the Principal Government College, Hansi, due to lack of workload. The learned Single Judge has taken note of Annexure P/9 i.e. remuneration statement, as per which, the appellant worked as Extension Lecturer in the subject of Environment Study in the college and got remuneration during the month of November, 2010 and December, 2010. She was, thereafter, displaced due to lack of workload. Relying upon the policy contained in memo dated 13.09.2019, the appellant came up with a case of re-engagement as Extension Lecturer.

3. The learned Single Judge has taken note of the fact that the appellant had worked as not eligible Extension Lecturer only for thirteen days i.e. from 22.11.2010 to 04.12.2010. She has not worked thereafter. The claim of the appellant has consequently been rejected by the learned Single Judge holding that the policy for re-engagement of Extension Lecturer required the essential qualification prescribed for the post of Assistant Professor under the Service Rules, which is not possessed by the present appellant.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant has subsequently acquired the requisite qualification for appointment to the post of Assistant Professor.

5. Having gone through the facts of the case, learned Single Judge has dismissed the writ petition by observing as under:-

“5. The facts mentioned in the written statement have not been disputed by filing any counter-affidavit. It also remains uncontested that the petitioner was engaged as ineligible Extension Lecturer only for thirteen days as aforementioned. There is no provision in the Policy, dated 04.03.2020, for re-engagement of such Extension Lecturers or considering them as displaced, nor has any been pointed out. Besides, the memo dated 13.09.2019, relied upon by the learned counsel cannot entitle the petitioner to seek re-engagement, as appointment of Extension Lecturers is regulated in terms of Policy dated 04.03.2020, as amended from time to time.”

6. It is undisputed that during the appellant's working of thirteen days as Extension Lecturer, she was not eligible, inasmuch as the qualification possessed by the appellant was not equivalent to that of Assistant Professor. The entitlement of the appellant flows from the date of

her initial engagement in the year 2010 and admittedly the appellant did not possess the essential qualification for the post of Assistant Professor at that point of time. After such long lapse of time and also considering the short period of thirteen days of engagement, we do not find that the rejection of the appellant's claim for re-engagement suffers from any illegality. The argument that the subsequent policy would not be applicable is a misconceived argument inasmuch as the policy applicable on the date of re-engagement would govern the re-engagement and the principle that the rules of the game cannot be changed after the process of recruitment has begun, is applicable only to appointments and has no applicability in the case of re-engagement. The argument that the limited work carried out for thirteen days is not a relevant factor for consideration, has rightly been taken note of and rejected.

7. In that view of the matter, we do not find any illegality or perversity in the judgment passed by the learned Single Judge. The appeal fails and is consequently dismissed.

8. All pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA)
JUDGE

(RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI)
JUDGE

12.01.2026
rajesh

1. Whether speaking/reasoned?	:	Yes/No
2. Whether reportable?	:	Yes/No