



CWP- 4098-2025 (O&M)

-1-

120

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

**CWP- 4098-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 20.02.2025**

POONAM RANI

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

... RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Ankur Jain, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Shreenath A. Khemka, Advocate
for the respondents-University.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)

The petition has been filed seeking a writ of *mandamus* directing the official respondents no. 2, 5 and 6 to take necessary action on the petitioner's representations dated 14.12.2024 and 28.11.2024, Annexure P-4, P-7 and P-6, respectively, regarding cancellation of EWS certificate issued to the seventh respondent/Anu and registering a case against her for fraud and misrepresentation.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the seventh respondent has wrongly been selected by the University as Assistant Professor in Human Development and Family Studies/HDFS on the basis of recommendations of selection committee dated 13.08.2024, though she does



CWP- 4098-2025 (O&M)

-2-

not fulfill the laid down criteria to be considered under EWS category. The petitioner has made several complaints against her and also submitted the representations mentioned above, but no action in the matter has been taken. In case the appointment given to the seventh respondent is set aside on account of her not belonging to EWS category, the petitioner being next in merit, would be entitled to get appointment.

3. Heard.

4. It is apparent on record that the appointment of seventh respondent as Assistant Professor in HDFS has not been challenged. Also, learned counsel has not referred to any document which could even *prima facie* establish that the seventh respondent does not belong to EWS category. No vested right of the petitioner has been infringed only because the representations submitted by her against the seventh respondent have not been decided as yet. In these circumstances, a writ of *mandamus* cannot be sought only to get the representations decided.

5. In view thereof, finding no merit in the petition, it stands dismissed.

6. Pending application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

20.02.2025

Seema

**(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No