



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH  
AT GWALIOR**

BEFORE

**HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE ANAND SINGH BAHRAWAT**

**ON THE 22<sup>nd</sup> OF SEPTEMBER, 2025**

**WRIT PETITION No. 4454 of 2020**

***DR. JAYDEEP PARASHAR***

*Versus*

***THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS***

---

**Appearance:**

*Shri Jitendra Kumar Sharma- Senior Advocate with Shri Kashif Hussain- Advocate for petitioner.*

*Shri B.M. Patel – Government Advocate for respondent/State.*

*Shri Anand Vinod Bhardwaj- Advocate for respondent No.4.*

---

**ORDER**

This petition, under Article 226 of Constitution of India, has been filed seeking the following relief (s):

- “i) That the respondents no.1 to 3 may kindly be directed to consider the case of the petitioner for regularizing on the post of Assistant Professor (Law) as par with the incumbents mentioned in Annexure -P/15 and grant all the benefits of regular employees as per the recommendations of University Grant Commission alongwith all consequential benefits, in the interest of justice.
- ii) Cost of the petition be awarded or any other order or direction deemed fit in the circumstances of the case be issued in the favour of the petitioner.”



2. Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner submits that respondent No.2 framed a policy for appointment of Teachers, Librarians and Sports Officer in case of availability of vacancies in the colleges laying down the procedure for such appointments and accordingly issued directions to all the Principals of Government Colleges. In pursuance of the above instructions, respondent No.3 invited applications of the eligible candidates for appointment against the post of Assistant Professor (Law). As the petitioner was fulfilling all the eligibility criteria, he duly submitted his candidature form in the said recruitment and vide order dated 07.09.2000, petitioner was initially appointed as Law Teacher against the vacant post of Assistant Professor (Law), however, the said appointment was made on contract basis. Initially, appointment was made for 89 days and thereafter the contract period was extended from time to time and petitioner is still working against the vacant post of Assistant Professor (Law) in Government Nehru College, Ashok Nagar. Thereafter, vide order dated 24.07.2006 petitioner was further appointed for the academic session 2006-07 in temporary capacity till the appointment of Law Teacher by the State Government. At present, petitioner is still continuing on the said post.

3. Learned Senior Counsel further submits that since 2000 petitioner has been working on vacant post and in view of judgment dated 20.12.2024 passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Jaggo Vs. Union of India & Ors in C.A. No.-014831-014831 - 2024 [Arising out of SLP (C) No.5580 of 2024]** and order dated 22.08.2024 passed in the case of **The State of Chhattisgarh & Anr. Vs. Gopi Sao & Ors. in Civil Appeal No.(s).8097-8122/2024**, petitioner is entitled for regularization. Learned Senior Counsel further submits that every year respondent No.3 has forwarded the information to respondent No.4 from time to



time in which it is clearly mentioned that the petitioner is working as a law Teacher against the vacant post of Assistant Professor and on the basis of the said information respondent No.4 has renewed the recognition of the Law College run by respondent No.1 to 3. Learned Senior Counsel submits that since 2000 petitioner has been working on the vacant post, therefore he is entitled for regularization on the basis of aforesaid judgments passed by Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Jaggo (supra)** and **Gopi Sao (supra)** and the communication dated 18.05.2011/23.05.2011 and therefore present petition may be disposed of with a direction to consider the case of petitioner for regularization.

4. Learned counsel for respondents have not objected to the limited prayer made by learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner.

5. Considering the same, present petition is *disposed of* with a direction to petitioner to submit a fresh and detailed representation before the competent authority/respondent No.2 within a period of three weeks from today and respondent No.2/competent authority is directed to decide such representation in the light of the aforesaid judgments passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Jaggo (supra)** and **Gopi Sao (supra)**, communication dated 18.05.2011/23.05.2011 and other relevant circulars pertaining to regularization, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

6. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.

(Anand Singh Bahrawat)  
Judge