

CWP-15311-2026

2026:PHHC:090233



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

119

CWP-15311-2026

Date of decision:06.07.2026

BALINDER SINGH

.....Petitioner

VERSUS**KURUKSHETRA UNIVERSITY KURUKSHETRA AND OTHERS**

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present : Mr. Deepak Grover, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. A.S. Virk, Advocate
for respondents No.1 and 2.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (Oral)

1. The present writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature of *certiorari* for quashing the order/notification dated 17.03.2026 (Annexure P-3), whereby respondent No. 3 has been appointed as Chairperson of the Social Work Department. A further prayer has been made for the issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents to appoint the petitioner as the Chairperson of the Social Work Department.

CWP-15311-2026

2026:PHHC:090233



2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends the petitioner belongs to the Scheduled Caste category and has been serving as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Social Work under respondent Nos. 1 and 2 for the last 14 years. She possesses the requisite qualifications, experience and eligibility prescribed under the applicable statutory provisions for appointment as Chairperson of the Department. It is further contended that the post of Chairperson in the Department of Social Work fell vacant upon the retirement of Dr. Ramesh Bhardwaj, Senior Professor, on 15.03.2026 after attaining the age of superannuation. In terms of Statute 20(1)(d) of the Kurukshetra University Act and Statutes, 1986, the Vice-Chancellor is empowered, under special circumstances, to appoint the senior-most Assistant Professor drawing an Academic Grade Pay (AGP) of ₹8,000/- and having at least nine years' experience as Chairperson. The petitioner, being the senior-most eligible Assistant Professor, fulfilled all the prescribed conditions for such appointment.

2.1. He further contends that respondent No. 2, after duly considering her eligibility and seniority, recommended her name for appointment as Chairperson vide communications dated 02.03.2026 (Annexure P-1) and again on 12.03.2026 (Annexure P-2). However, despite the aforesaid recommendations and the petitioner's undisputed eligibility, respondent No. 1, vide the impugned order/notification dated 17.03.2026

CWP-15311-2026

2026:PHHC:090233



(Annexure P-3), appointed respondent No. 3, Dr. Vanita Dhingra, as Chairperson of the Department for a second tenure, without assigning any valid or justifiable reason for overlooking the petitioner's claim. It is also contended that the action of the respondents in appointing respondent No. 3 in preference to the petitioner is arbitrary, discriminatory and violative of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India, besides being contrary to the statutory provisions governing such appointment. The petitioner had a legitimate expectation of being considered and appointed to the said post in view of her seniority, eligibility and the recommendations made in her favour.

2.2. Aggrieved by the impugned action, the petitioner submitted a representation dated 17.03.2026 (Annexure P-4), requesting the respondents to reconsider the matter and appoint her as Chairperson in accordance with law. However, the said representation has neither been decided nor has any remedial action been taken by the respondents, thereby compelling the petitioner to invoke the extraordinary writ jurisdiction of this Court.

2.3. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he would be satisfied if the representation dated 17.03.2026 (Annexure P-4) of the petitioner is considered and decided by the respondent(s) by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.

3. Notice of motion.

CWP-15311-2026

2026:PHHC:090233



4. Mr. A.S. Virk, Advocate appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 and 2 and submits that he has no objection in case a direction is issued to respondent No.2/competent authority for time-bound consideration and decision of the representation of the petitioner by passing a speaking order.

5. Therefore, in view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the respondent No.2/competent authority is directed to consider the representation (Annexure P-4) of the petitioner and pass a speaking order, after affording him an opportunity to be heard, within a period of 03 months from the date of receiving a certified copy of this order. Further, the decision taken thereof shall be conveyed to the petitioner. Needless to say, if the petitioner is found entitled to the relief sought, the same shall be granted forthwith by the respondent.

6. Disposed of, accordingly.

7. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

06.07.2026*parul verma*

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