

Pradeep Kaul Vs. the Chairman (Acting) University Grants Commission

Pradeep Kaul Vs. the Chairman (Acting) University Grants Commission

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/956014

Court : Delhi

Decided On : Dec-06-2012

Judge : Suresh Kait

Appellant : Pradeep Kaul

Respondent : The Chairman (Acting) University Grants Commission

Judgement :

\$~41 * IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI % + Judgment delivered on:

6. h December, 2012 W.P.(C) 7441/2012 PRADEEP KAUL Petitioner Through: Mr. R.P. Sharma, Adv. versus THE CHAIRMAN (ACTING) UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION Respondent Through: Mr. Amitesh Kumar and Mr. Mayank Manish, Advs. for UGC. CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURESH KAIT SURESH KAIT, J.

(Oral) 1. The petitioner is aggrieved with the inaction of the respondents / CEC, a Society under the University Grants Commission for not considering the recommendation of Prof. Abdul Wahid, Vice-Chancellor, Central University of Kashmir for considering the candidature of the petitioner for the post of Director, Consortium for Education Communication (CEC), New Delhi and Inter-University Centre of UGC (Autonomous Organization).

2. The UGC sent a communication dated 27.09.2010² to the Vice- Chancellor / Director, Banasthali Vidyapeeth, Rajasthan, wherein it is stated that the Consortium for Education Communication (CEC), New Delhi is one of Inter-University Centre established under Section 12 (ccc) of the UGC Act no. 3 of 1956. The Consortium is headed by a Director, who is the executive Authority of CEC. The terms of the present Director expired on 14.11.2012 on the completion of 5 years tenure.

3. It is further stated that the UGC has to fill up the post of Director, Consortium of Education Communication (CEC), New Delhi and Inter-University Centre of UGC on a fixed salary of Rs.75,000/- along with a special allowance of Rs.5,000/- per month and other benefits as per the terms and conditions for the post. The term of appointment will be 4-5 years or till he / she attains the age of 65 years, whichever is earlier. It is further stated that the term can be renewed for a further period of 5 years.

4. Counsel for the UGC appearing on the advance notice stated that for the appointment of the Director, UGC had constituted a Search Committee. The Vice-Chancellor of the aforesaid Vidyapeeth was requested to suggest the name of suitable persons for appointment as Director of Consortium. As the Director is the executive authority of the Consortium, the person recommended must be of the sound administrative acumen besides having academic distinction. He or she should be a person with vision and foresight to provide necessary leadership to the Consortium. He / She may also have extensive knowledge of and experience in the field of Mass Communication and Journalism / Media Production / Multi-Media / EContent / Information Technology etc.

5. The Search Committee considered all the applications including the application of the petitioner and found 5 persons suitable for the interaction. After the interaction they recommended 2 names in order of merit and thereafter one person out of the two has been finally selected, who has joined on 29.11.2012.

6. Ld. Counsel for the respondent further submits that mere applying for the post does not give right to the petitioner to be selected.

7. The main grievance of the petitioner is that candidature of the petitioner has not been considered by the respondent. Whereas, as per the statement of Id. Counsel for the respondent on instruction, the name of the petitioner was fully considered, however not found suitable for the aforesaid post.

8. In view of the above, I find no merit in the instant petition. Same is dismissed in limini. CM. NO. 19015/2012 In view of the above, instant application has become infructuous and dismissed as such. SURESH KAIT, J DECEMBER 06 2012 jg

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com