SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			WPSB/8/2026 Dr Dheerendra Singh Gangwar --Petitioner **Versus** State of Uttarakhand & Others --Respondents *With* **WPSB/6/2026** **WPSB/5/2026** **WPSB/7/2026** **WPSB/12/2026** **WPSB/13/2026** **WPSB/14/2026** **WPSB/15/2026** **WPSB/17/2026** **WPSB/18/2026** **Hon'ble Manoj Kumar Tiwari, A.C.J.** **Hon'ble Subhash Upadhyay, J.** Mr. M.C. Pant, Advocate (through VC), with Ms. Anupriya Kukreti, Advocate, for the petitioners. Mr. Gajendra Tripathi, Standing Counsel, for the State. Mr. Bhupesh Kandpal, Advocate, and Mr. Prashant Shukla, Advocate (through VC) for the respondent no. 2 and 3. (2) Since common questions of fact and law are involved in these writ petitions, therefore, these are being heard and decided together by this common judgment. However, for brevity, facts of Writ Petition (S/B) No. 8 of 2026 alone are being considered and discussed here. (3) Dr. Dheerendra Singh Gangwar has filed Writ Petition (S/B) No. 8 of 2026 seeking the following reliefs: *"I. Issue a writ, rule order or direction in the nature of Mandamus directing the Respondents to treat the appointment of the Petitioner as regular and permanent and to allow him all the service benefits at par to the regular faculty in respect of pay, increment and other benefits or in alternate to regularize the services of the Petitioner with all service benefits*

			keeping in view the facts highlighted in the body of the writ petition or to mould the relief appropriately by safeguarding the interest of the Petitioner keeping in view the facts highlighted in the body of the Petition; *II. Issue a writ, rule, order or direction directing the Respondents to not to fill up the posts occupied by the Petitioner from the open market before the grant of regular status to the Petitioner keeping in view the facts highlighted in the body of the writ petition or to mould the relief appropriately by safeguarding the interest of the Petitioner keeping in view the facts highlighted in the body of the Petition;"* (4) According to petitioner, he was appointed as Assistant Professor after regular selection in Seemant Institute of Technology, Pithoragarh, vide order dated 9.8.2012, and it was mentioned in the appointment order that he shall be entitled to salary in the scale of ₹15,600-39,100 with AGP of ₹6000, however he is not being paid salary in regular pay scale and he is being paid consolidated salary amounting to ₹48,963 per month. Thus petitioner contends that he be given salary and other benefits at par with regular faculty members serving on equivalent post, as per UGC Regulations. (5) Mr. Bhupesh Kandpal, appearing for Uttarakhand Technical University, however, submits that even though petitioner was appointed in Seemant Institute of Technology, Pithoragarh in 2012, but he later joined duties in Women Institute of Technology, Dehradun and he is serving at the said institute at Dehradun since 2012. He further points out that petitioner is presently serving in Faculty of Technology, Uttarakhand Technical University, Dehradun and as per the decision taken by the Finance Committee of the University, petitioner has been sanctioned consolidated salary/honorarium amounting to ₹60,000 per month, but petitioner is not willing to accept the said amount and he is insisting that he be paid salary as per UGC Scale. (6) Mr. M.C. Pant, learned Counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that University

authorities are insisting that concerned faculty members should give an undertaking that they will not stake claim for regularisation as a condition for grant of the revised salary amounting to ₹60,000 per month.

(7) Admittedly, petitioner has served as Assistant Professor in a campus college of Uttarakhand Technical University for more than a decade, therefore he has earned a right to be considered for regularisation under the existing scheme/rules. Since Finance Committee of the University has taken a decision to grant ₹60,000 a month as salary/honorarium to petitioner, therefore, the condition imposed by the University authorities of furnishing an undertaking appears to be unreasonable.

(8) Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, writ petitioners are disposed of with liberty to petitioners to approach the competent authority in the University by making their separate respective representation for regularisation as well as salary in terms of UGC Regulations. If petitioners make such representation within two weeks from today, the competent authority shall look into the matter and pass appropriate order, as per law, within six months thereafter. Meanwhile, petitioners shall be paid salary/honorarium in terms of the decision taken by the Finance Committee, without insisting upon any undertaking that they will not stake claim for regularisation in future. However, this order will not prejudice ongoing selection, if any, for the faculty positions.

(Subhash Upadhyay, J.) (Manoj Kumar Tiwari, A.C.J.)
17.11.2026

Pr

PRABODH KUMAR
