
(2012) 06 P&H CK 0012
In the Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh
Case No : C.W.P. No.11361 of 2012

Dr. Manju

APPELLANT

Vs

Maharishi Dayanand University, Rohtak and others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 01-06-2012

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2012) 06 P&H CK 0012

Hon'ble Judges : K. Kannan, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : D.R. Bansal, for the Appellant;

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

K. Kannan, J.—The petitioner challenges the selection of the 3rd respondent for the post of Assistant Professor stating that the selection was not appropriate and biased. A wild allegation is made in the petition, which the learned counsel argues with vehemence in Court that the 3rd respondent has struck a deal with the Vice Chancellor and therefore, the choice was not objective. It is also the contention of the petitioner that he had 23 publications to his credit while the 3rd respondent had only a lesser number of publications and that too not of international or national eminence but in Journals which were not Peer Reviewed. I find no basis in any of the wild allegations that the petitioner is making. It may not be necessary at all times that the number of publications that are made will be relevant for relative appraisal but it will be quality that should be of relevance. Again for the petitioner to contend that the Journals in which the petitioner has caused the publication did not fulfill the necessary Peer Review Research Journal does not obtain any kind of authenticity since the list of publications which the 3rd respondent has given refers to the volume and year of publication as well, lending a colour of plausibility and it would be best left to the authority to decide what is appropriate and if the selection process is made through a validly constituted Committee, the petitioner cannot have a grievance that the selection process was in any way vitiated. There is no scope for rejection of such a process

when the process of selection is put in the hands of the persons who are competent in their respective fields. On an overall tally that has been taken for selection, I find that the 3rd respondent has secured 68 marks against the 48 marks which the petitioner has obtained. There is no reason to suspect the selection made of the 3rd respondent as vitiated in any way and the challenge made in the petition for the selection of the 3rd respondent ought to fail.

2. The writ petition deserves dismissal and it is accordingly dismissed.