



\$~10

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 1534/2026, CM APPL. 7490-7491/2026**

DR JUGENDRA SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Suyash Srivastava, Mr. Gunjeet Singh and Mr. Manish Pandey,
Advocates.

versus

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY AND ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Vasanth Rajasekaran, SSC with
Mr. Karan Prakash, Advocate for
JNU.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

26.02.2026

%

1. The Petitioner, who was appointed as a Senior Technical Assistant in the School of Life Sciences ('SLS') at Jawaharlal Nehru University ('JNU'), is aggrieved by the recommendations dated 09th December, 2025 made by the Work and Cadre Review Committee of JNU, insofar as they propose the introduction of a common inter-departmental/University-wide seniority for the Technical Cadre.
2. The Petitioner contends that the said proposal is contrary to the Executive Council Resolution Minutes of April, 1999, and accordingly seeks issuance of a writ of mandamus restraining the Respondents from placing, considering, approving, or acting upon the aforesaid recommendations of the Cadre Review Committee.



3. Counsel for the Respondents submits that the present petition is premature. He explains that the Work and Cadre Review Committee has merely made recommendations, which are yet to be placed before the Finance Committee and thereafter before the Executive Council of the University for consideration. A final decision has not yet been taken.

4. It is further submitted that even if the Executive Council were to take a final view, the same would be amenable to review under Section 11(2) of the Jawaharlal Nehru University Act, 1966 before the JNU Court, which is presided over by the Chancellor of the University.

5. Having considered the submissions, this Court finds that the matter is presently at the stage of recommendations and no final decision has been taken. Additionally, the statute provides an internal mechanism for redressal in the event any decision adverse to the Petitioner is ultimately taken.

6. In the above circumstances, this Court is of the view that the Petitioner ought to exhaust the remedies available under the statutory framework before invoking the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

7. Counsel for the Respondents further states that the grievances raised by the Petitioner in the present writ petition may also be placed before the Finance Committee for its consideration.

8. In light of the above, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction that the contentions raised by the Petitioner be placed before the Finance Committee and, if necessary, before the Executive Council for due consideration.

9. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open. In the event the Petitioner exhausts the statutory remedies available to him and his



grievances remain unaddressed, he shall be at liberty to avail appropriate remedies in accordance with law.

10. Disposed of. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

FEBRUARY 26, 2026

nk