

Smt. Gargi Ghunta Vs Regional Joint Director Education and Others

Court: Uttarakhand High Court

Date of Decision: June 11, 2007

Citation: (2008) 1 UC 36

Hon'ble Judges: M.M.Ghildiyal, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Gopal Narayan and Munish Bharadwaj, for the Appellant; Paresh Tripathi, for Respondent Nos. 1, 2 and 3, Manoj Tiwari, for Committee of Management and C.K. Sharma, for the Respondent

Final Decision: Dismissed

Judgement

M.M. Ghildiyal, J.

Heard Sri Gopal Narayan, Advocate and Sri Munish Bharadwaj, learned Counsel for the Petitioner, Sri Paresh

Tripathi, learned Counsel for State of Uttarakhand, Sri Manoj Tiwari, learned Counsel for Committee of Management and Sri C.K. Sharma,

learned Counsel for Respondent No. 5.

2. In both the writ petitions, there involve identical set of facts and common legal question which are to be decided, therefore for the sake of

convenience, both the writ petition have been consolidated and are being decided by a common judgment. Writ petition No. 1236 (ss) 2006 will

be leading case.

3. By means of writ petition No. 1236(ss) 2006 the Petitioners has prayed for the

following reliefs:

a) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari quashing the order dated 5/6-09-2006 and 20-06-2006 (annexure No. 6 & 7 to the

writ petition),

b) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the Respondents not to interfere the work of the Petitioner as a Lecturer

(Home Science), M.K.P., Inter College, Dehradun.

c) Issue any other order or direction which this Hon"ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.

d) Award cost of the petition to the Petitioner.

4. Lateron, the Petitioner has filed amendment application and sought another prayer to be added in the prayer clause which reads as under:

bb). Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari quashing the impugned order dated 27-04-2007 (annexure-12) passed by District

Education Officer, Dehradun i.e. Respondent No. 2.

5. By means of writ petition No. 1392(ss) 2006 the Petitioners has prayed for the following reliefs:

i. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing and commanding the Respondents to promote the Petitioner on the post of

Lecturer Home Science in the Mahadevi Kanya Pathshala, Inter College, Dehradun,

ii. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the Respondents to decide the representations dated 10-07-2006 and 10-

09-2006 (annexure Nos. 9 & 10 to the writ petition),

iii. Issue any other writ, order or direction which this Hon"ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case,

iv. Award the cost of petition.

6. The Petitioner Smt. Gargi Ghunta is aggrieved with the order dated 20-06-2006, passed by the Joint Director of Education, Garhwal Division,

Pauri and the consequent order dated 5/6-09-2006 passed by Addl. District Education Officer, Dehradun.

7. Vide order dated 20-06-2006, the Joint Director of Education, has held that though Smt. Gargi Ghunta is senior to Smt. Rama Ghildiyal, but

she is not eligible to be promoted on the post of Lecturer (Home Science) as she does not possess requisite qualification as per the law. In

pursuance to this order, the Addl. District Education Officer, Dehradun vide order dated 06-09-2006 has cancelled the approved granted to the

Petitioner (Gargi Ghunta) for promotion on the post of Lecturer (Home Science) in the Institution.

8. Vide order dated 27-04-2007 which is also under challenge, the District Education Officer, Dehradun has directed the Committee of

Management of the Institution to sent proposal of Petitioner Smt. Rama Ghildiyal for promotion for the post of Lecturer (Home Science) and also

to decide the representation of Smt. Rama Ghildiyal.

9. The short question which is to be decided and involved in these writ petitions is as to whether a person who has passed graduation degree with

one subject as Home Science, is entitled to be promoted on the post of Lecturer (Home Science) or not ? As per the Regulations, the qualification

prescribed for the said post is as under:

4. ? ? ? (? 11, 12) ? | 1. ? ? ? . . . ? ? (? ?) ? ? (?) ?

2. ? ? ? ? ? (? ?) ? - ? ? ? (? ?) ? ? (?) ? ?

3. ? ? ? , 1950 - 54 ? ? ?

10. Learned Single Judge of this Court on 21-06-2004 in writ petition No. 737 of 2003 (ss) Smt. Neeta Lohani v. State of Uttaranchal and Ors.

has already decided the question involved in the instant writ petitions. The relevant portion is being quoted hereunder:

... The Rule is very clear. It provides the graduate in Home Arts or Home Science or Euthenics. If these candidates are available, then the selection

has to be made from only these candidates. Selection of those candidates, who have completed graduation with one subject of Home Science do

not fulfill the eligibility prescribed under the Rules.

Therefore, Joint Director of Education is directed to correct the mistake and republish the list of the selected candidates, who have their

graduation/degree either in Home Art or in Home Science or in Euthenics. If the candidates are not available, then the post shall be re-advertised

containing the same qualifications and shall be filled strictly in accordance with the eligibility provided under Clause 15 of Rule 8 of the Rules,

known as UP. Subordinate Education (Trained Graduate Grade) Service Rules 1983....

11. A review application was filed against the observations made in writ petition No. 737 (ss) 2003 on 21-06-2004, however the observation

made by the Court in respect of the qualifications of a Teacher (Home Science) remained unchanged in the said judgment. Against this judgment a

special appeal was filed and Hon"ble the Division Bench of this Court has upheld the judgment of the Single Judge.

12. It is not disputed that Smt. Gargi Ghunta is graduate with one subject as Home Science alongwith two other subjects, namely, Sanskrit and

Article Thus, as per the judgment of the Single Judge, findings of which have been upheld by Hon"ble the Division Bench of this Court Smt. Gargi

Ghunta is not entitled to be promoted on the post of Lecturer (Home Science).

13. In view of the aforesaid situation, I do not find any illegality or infirmity in the order passed by the Joint Director of Education on 20-06-2006

and the consequential order passed by the Addl. District Education Officer, Dehradun on 06-09-2006 as well as the order passed by District

Education Officer o 27-04-2007.

14. Learned Counsel for the parties drew attention of the Court towards the Rules pertaining to educational qualifications of the Teachers of

Private Colleges and that of the Govt. Colleges. Having hearing learned Counsel for the parties and going through these Rules, I am of the view

that the Rules regarding educational qualifications of the Teachers of Private Colleges and that of the Govt. Colleges are para-in-materia.

15. Learned Counsel for Smt. Gargi Ghunta has submitted that Smt. Rama Ghildiyal was appointed in the year 1987 in C.T. Grade against a short

time vacancy. Though her services were terminated in the year 1991, however she continued to work in the Institution without any order of

reappointment which is evident from the letter issued by the Addl. District Education Officer dated 24-04-2007 and she is also getting salary.

Submission of the Petitioner Smt. Rama Ghildiyal is that termination order was never given effect to and she was continuing on the post and

thereafter she was regularized in L.T. Grade w.e.f. 06-01-1993.

16. The Petitioner Smt. Gargi Ghunta did not challenge the regularization order of Smt. Rama Ghildiyal who was regularized w.e.f. 06-01-1993. In

the forgoing circumstances, I do not find any merit in writ petition No. 1236 (ss) 2006, therefore, the same is liable to be dismissed.

17. So far the writ petition No. 1392(ss)2006 is concerned, in view of the fact that the District Education Officer has already asked the Committee

of Management of the Institution to send proposal for promotion of Smt. Rama Ghildiyal, the grievances of Smt. Rama Ghildiyal have already

redressed, therefore the writ petition No. 1392(ss)2006 has rendered infructuous.

18. Accordingly, therefore the writ petition No. 1236(ss)2006 is hereby dismissed. The writ petition No. 1392(ss)2006 has rendered infructuous

and is being disposed of accordingly. No order as to costs.

19. All the pending applications stand disposed of.

20. Let a certified copy of this judgment be kept in the connection writ petition.