

PETITIONER:
SUNEETA AGGRWAL

Vs.

RESPONDENT:
STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 11/02/2000

BENCH:
V.N.Khare, N.S.Hegde,

JUDGMENT:

Leave granted.

There is a government aided institution known as 'Hindu Girls College, in the town of 'Jagadhari', Haryana. The management of the institution advertised a post of Hindi Lecturer. In response to the said advertisement, the appellant and other persons applied for selection to the said post. The Selection Committee on 15th July 1996 interviewed the candidates. The nominee of the Vice Chancellor and the Director of High Education approved the name of the appellant to be placed at Sr. No. 2 whereas, one Kiran Bala was placed at Sr. No. 1. However, the Selection Committee recommended the name of the appellant for the said post. This was not

approved by the Vice Chancellor who, by order dated 5.8.96, directed the said post to be re-advertised.

Accordingly, on 13th November 1996, the post was again advertised and in response thereto, the appellant again applied for being considered for the post of Hindi Lecturer. The date of interview was fixed as 10th January, 1997. On the said date the appellant appeared before the Selection Committee without any kind of protest and simultaneously filed a writ petition challenging the order of the Vice Chancellor dated 5.8.96 whereby the Vice Chancellor disapproved the recommendation of the Selection Committee and issued a direction for a fresh advertisement. On 10.1.97, an interim order was passed in the writ petition filed by the appellant to the effect that the selection process may go on, but the result of the same be not declared. However, this interim order was not brought to the notice of the Vice Chancellor. The Vice Chancellor, being ignorant of the said order, approved the name of Mrs. Kamlesh Kumari Bhatia whose name was recommended by the subsequent Selection Committee for appointment to the post of Hindi Lecturer. Consequent upon the said order of approval, Mrs. Kamlesh Kumari Bhatia joined the said post. Subsequently, when the interim order was brought to the notice of the Vice Chancellor, he withdrew the order of approval. Mrs. Kamlesh Kumari Bhatia challenged the said withdrawal order passed by the Vice Chancellor by means of a separate writ petition. The writ petitions filed by Suneeta Aggarwal (appellant) and Mrs. Kamlesh Kumari Bhatia were

heard together. The writ petition tiled by the appellant was dismissed whereas the writ petition filed by Mrs. Kamlesh Kumari Bhatia was allowed.

We have heard learned counsel for the parties. Narration of aforesaid facts would show that the appellant had disintitiled herself to seek relief in the writ petition filed by her before the High Court. The appellant did not challenge the order of the Vice Chancellor declining to accord approval to her selection and, on

2

tile contrary, she allied afresh to the said post in response to re-advertisement of the post without any kind of protest. Not only did she apply for the post, but also she appeared before the Selection Committee constituted consequent upon re-advertisement of the post and that too without any kind of protest, and on the same day she filed a writ petition against the order of the Vice Chancellor declining to accord his approval and obtained an ad-interim order. In the writ petition she also did not disclose that she has applied for die post consequent upon second advertisement. The appellant having appeared before die Selection Committee without any protest and having taken a chance, we are of the view that the appellant is estopped by her conduct from challenging the earlier order of the Vice Chancellor. The High Court was justified in refusing to accord any discretionary relief in favour of the appellant. The writ petition was rightly dismissed.

Accordingly, the appeal fails and is dismissed. No order as to costs.