

Company: Sol Infotech Pvt. Ltd.

Website: www.courtkutchehry.com

Printed For:

Date: 24/08/2025

Dr. Lal Singh Vs State of U.P. and Others

Court: Allahabad High Court

Date of Decision: May 20, 2011

Acts Referred: Uttar Pradesh Higher Education Services Commission Act, 1980 â€" Section 13, 13(3), 3

Hon'ble Judges: Sunil Ambwani, J; Dilip Gupta, J

Bench: Division Bench
Final Decision: Dismissed

Judgement

1. The Petitioner has sought the quashing of the order dated 6th August, 2005 passed by the Director of Education (Higher Education), Allahabad

(hereinafter referred to as the "Director") by which, pursuant to the order dated 29th July, 2005 issued by the State Government, the Manager of

Kisan Degree College, Simbhaoli, District Ghaziabad has been directed to cancel the appointment of the Petitioner as Principal of the said College

consequent to the cancellation of the placement of the Petitioner in the said College by the Director.

2. The Director, after having received the list of selected candidates from the Higher Services Commission (hereinafter referred to as the

"Commission") established u/s 3 of the Uttar Pradesh Higher Education Services Commission Act, 1980 (hereinafter referred to as the "Act"),

issued the order dated 6th October, 2003 for placement of the Petitioner as Principal in Kisan Degree College, Simbhaoli, District Ghaziabad u/s

13(3) of the Act. The management of the College consequently issued appointment order in favour of the Petitioner. This placement order was

cancelled by the Director.

3. We have considered the issues raised in this petition in the judgment delivered by us today in Writ Petition No. 60844 of 2005 (Dr. Satya

Pandey v. Director of Education (Higher), U.P. Allahabad and Ors.). We, therefore, propose to state only the essential facts relating to the

issuance of the placement order of the Petitioner by the Director as other facts have been stated in detail in the aforesaid judgment.

4. Advertisement No. 25 of 1998 was issued by the Commission on 13th August, 1998 for filling up posts of Principals for male and female Post

Graduate Colleges and Degree Colleges. The Petitioner applied pursuant to the aforesaid Advertisement. The Petitioner was placed at Serial No.

25 in the list dated 18th April, 2001 of general category candidates sent by the Commission to the Director containing names of Principals of

Degree Colleges.

5. The Director issued the placement order dated 6th October, 2003 for appointment of the Petitioner on the post of Principal in Kisan Degree

College, Simbhaoli, District Ghaziabad. The Committee of Management of this College issued the appointment letter dated 7th October, 2003 to

the Petitioner who joined the College on 7th October, 2003.

6. In the meantime, as complaints about large scale irregularities in the placement/appointments of Principals by the Director were received, the

State Government conducted an enquiry through the District Magistrate, Allahabad. It was found in the enquiry that many persons were appointed

as Principals of the Degree Colleges/Post Graduate Colleges against the provisions of the Act as well as against the decision of the Supreme Court

in Kamlesh Kumar Sharma Vs. Yogesh Kumar Gupta and others, The State Government, therefore, by the order dated 29th July, 2005 issued

directions to the Director to cancel such placement orders. Accordingly, the Director by the order dated 6th August, 2005 cancelled the placement

order dated 6th October, 2003 of the Petitioner and also issued directions to the Committee of Management of Kisan Degree College, Simbhaoli,

District Ghaziabad to cancel the appointment of the Petitioner. It is this order that has been impugned in the present petition.

7. On 16th September, 2005, while entertaining the writ petition, the Court ordered that till further orders of the Court, the impugned order dated

6th August, 2005 shall be kept in abeyance.

8. It is stated in the counter affidavit filed by the State that the post of Principal in Kisan Degree College, Simbhaoli, District Ghaziabad was not

advertised in Advertisement No. 25 of 1998. It is, therefore, stated that the appointment of the Petitioner was void, being against the provision of

Section 13 of the Act and also against the decision of the Supreme Court in Kamlesh Kumar Sharma (supra). Even according to the Petitioner, the

post of Principal in the said College fell vacant on 30th June, 2002 and was subsequently advertised in Advertisement No. 35.

- 9. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner has raised the same submissions as were raised in Dr. Satya Pandey (supra).
- 10. We have examined the issues raised by learned Counsel for the Petitioner in detail in the judgment and order of date rendered in Dr. Satya

Pandey (supra) and have rejected them.

11. Thus, for the reasons stated in the judgment delivered by us today in Dr. Satya Pandey (supra), the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief and

the writ petition deserves to be dismissed.

12. The writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed.			