

**2023 LiveLaw (SC) 544**

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA**

**SURYA KANT; J., DIPANKAR DATTA; J.**

**WRIT PETITION (CIVIL)..... Diary No(s).5235/2023; 10-07-2023**

**DR. SACHCHIDA NAND PANDEY versus UNION OF INDIA & ORS.**

**Reservation - The Supreme Court dismissed a Public Interest Litigation (PIL) seeking to cancel faculty appointments in Indian Institutes of Technology (IIT) from 2008 to present for allegedly violating reservation norms. The petitioner admits that the matter regarding implementation of reservation policy in the Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs) is already pending before the Supreme Court as well the Madras High Court. Hence, no separate writ petition on the same issue is required to be entertained. Petitioner's prayer to cancel appointments from June 2008 onwards cannot be entertained at this belated stage, more so, when none of the appointees is a party respondent. (Para 4)**

**Discrimination - Allegation of alleged discriminatory treatment to the candidates belonging to north and Hindi speaking States, in the matter of appointment as faculty members in IITs, is totally vague, evasive and without any supporting material. The petitioner has made sweeping allegations that several IIT students have committed suicide due to harassment caused by the professors in IITs. Such an absurd plea appears to have been taken on the basis of some news reports. The writ petition is wholly misconceived and misdirected. (Para 4, 5)**

*For Petitioner(s) Petitioner-in-person*

**ORDER**

1. Permission to appear and argue in-person is allowed.
2. Delay in refiling is condoned.
3. The instant writ petition, purportedly in public interest, has been filed against the Union of India and 23 Indian Institutes of Technology seeking following directions: -
  - (i) to cancel faculty appointments from June 2008 to the present date due to violation of the reservation norms;
  - (ii) to provide equal opportunity to north and Hindi speaking States' candidates in faculty positions; and
  - (iii) pass any other appropriate order as this Court may deem just and proper.
4. The petitioner, who has appeared in-person, candidly admits that the matter regarding implementation of reservation policy in the Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs) is already pending before this Court as well the Madras High Court. Hence, no separate writ petition on the same issue is required to be entertained. Petitioner's prayer to cancel appointments from June 2008 onwards cannot be entertained at this belated stage, more so, when none of the appointees is a party respondent. His allegation of alleged discriminatory treatment to the candidates belonging to north and Hindi speaking States, in the matter of appointment as faculty members in IITs, is totally vague, evasive and without any supporting material. The petitioner has made sweeping allegations that several IIT students have committed suicide due to harassment caused by the professors in IITs. Such an absurd plea appears to have been taken on the basis of some news reports.
5. In our considered view, the writ petition is wholly misconceived and misdirected. The same is, accordingly, dismissed.