

\$~A-5

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P. (C) 3661/2020

DR. PRASANNANSHU Petitioner
Through Mr. Karan Suneja, Advocate.

versus

THE SELECTION COMMITTEE FOR VICE-CHANCELLOR
NATIONAL LAW UNIVERSITY DELHI & ANR. Respondents

Through Mr. S.D. Sharma, Advocate for NLU.
Mr. Sanjay Vashishtha, Advocate for
R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

% **22.06.2020**

C.M. No. 13076/2020 (Exemption from filing certified/true copies)

In view of the reasons stated in the application, the same is disposed of with a direction to the applicant to file the certified/true copies within a period of one week of lifting of the lockdown.

Application stands disposed of.

C.M. No. 13077/2020 (Exemption from filing affirmed affidavits and court fee)

In view of the reasons stated in the application, the same is disposed of with a direction to the applicant to file the duly affirmed affidavits and to pay the requisite court fee within a period of one week of lifting of the lockdown.

Application stands disposed of.

W.P. (C) 3661/2020 and CM No. 13078/2020 (Stay)

Hearing has been conducted through Video Conferencing.

The Petitioner joined NLUD in 2009 as an Associate Professor and was promoted as a Professor on 01.07.2015. On 11.10.2019, a Notification was issued by the Convener of the Selection Committee of the National Law University (NLU), inviting nominations for the post of Vice-Chancellor. The eligibility terms and conditions for the post were described in the Notification.

Mr. Suneja, learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that on 11.11.2019, the Petitioner had applied for the post of Vice-Chancellor, NLU in the prescribed format and within the time prescribed for applying.

The application was conforming to the terms and conditions of the advertisement, which were verified before making the application. He further submits that on 05.02.2020, the Selection Committee decided to call the other applicants for interaction, on 25.02.2020. Meeting of the Selection Committee was held on 25.02.2020, however the Petitioner was not invited for the interaction.

Mr. Suneja submits that the applicant has a glorious record and academic profile, including his professional qualifications and was eligible for the post as per the terms and conditions of the advertisement. He further submits that a representation has been made on 03.06.2020 to the Chancellor to look into the matter and provide a hearing, which is still pending.

Mr. Suneja further submits that the present petition has been triggered by the fact that the Petitioner has recently learnt that the Selection Committee is in the process of declaring the result of the interview, in which case, serious prejudice would be caused to the Petitioner.

Issue notice.

Mr. Sanjay Vashishtha accepts notice on behalf of Respondent No. 2 and submits that Respondent No. 2 has no role in calling the candidates for interview/interaction and the role of NLU was only limited to advertising and receiving hard copies of the applications.

I have heard learned counsels for the parties.

Since the representation made by the Petitioner dated 03.06.2020 is pending consideration with the Chancellor, at this stage, the present petition is premature.

Let the Registrar of Respondent No.2 place the representation before the Chancellor for consideration.

Needless to state that the order passed will be communicated to the Petitioner within a period of 3 days from the date of the decision.

In case the Petitioner is aggrieved by the decision, he is at liberty to take recourse to the remedies available to him in accordance with law.

Petition is disposed of along with the stay application, in the aforesaid terms.

JYOTI SINGH, J

JUNE 22, 2020
yo