



CWP-5541-2025

-1-

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

116

CWP-5541-2025

Date of Decision: 02.04.2025

Sunita Punia

...Petitioner(s)

**Versus**

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA**

Present:- Mr. Rajat Mor, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Rohit Arya, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana

**TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (Oral)**

The petition has been filed *inter alia* seeking a writ of *mandamus* directing the respondents to consider the petitioner as eligible Extension Lecturer from the date she qualified National Eligibility Test (NET), i.e., 13.04.2023, which entitles her to salary at the minimum pay scale meant for the post of Assistant Professor.

2. On the last date of hearing, the following order was passed:

Learned State counsel, on instructions, contends that the petitioner along with Preeti Sangwan earlier approached this Court by filing Civil Writ Petition No.6773 of 2020, and on account of *status quo* as regards her services granted, vide interim order dated 22.09.2020, she has continued in service. Accordingly, the instant petition may be heard along with pending petition.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, contends that the issue arising in the pending petition is different. He further

**CWP-5541-2025****-2-**

contends that the first petitioner/Preeti Sangwan in the earlier petition, who acquired eligibility by clearing NET on 16.11.2022, has already been given higher remuneration of ₹57,700, meant for eligible Extension Lecturers, from the date of issuance of Policy dated 14.12.2023. Principal of M.N.S. Government College, where both the petitioners are teaching, recommended their cases for grant of higher remuneration vide memo dated 25.09.2024, Annexure P-7. However, vide impugned memo dated 18.11.2024, Annexure P-8, the case of Preeti Sangwan was accepted, whereas that of the petitioner was rejected. Although both are similarly situated, as both have acquired eligibility by clearing NET prior to 30.06.2023, the petitioner's case has not been considered in the same manner as that of Preeti which is discriminatory on the face of it.

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions received from the second respondent vide memo dated 02.04.2025, submits that despite clearing NET on 13.04.2023, the petitioner has not been considered eligible Extension Lecturer due to a stipulation in clause 20 of the Policy regarding Engagement of Extension Lecturers in Government Colleges, dated 14.12.2023.

4. The objection taken by the respondents is not sustainable as clause 20 of the Policy defines 'displaced Extension Lecturers' whereas the petitioner has been continuously working since 2019, and is not a displaced Extension Lecturer.

5. In view thereof, the petition is disposed of with a direction to the second respondent/Director General, Higher Education, to review the impugned order dated 18.11.2024, and pass a fresh one considering the petitioner's entitlement to remuneration as eligible Extension Lecturer in the light of having qualified NET on 13.04.2023. The direction shall be carried out



**CWP-5541-2025**

**-3-**

within a period of six weeks of receiving a certified copy of this order, and the benefits, if due, shall be released to the petitioner within three weeks therefrom.

**(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)  
JUDGE**

**02.04.2025**

*Payal*

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No