



CNR: KAHC010486892026

NC: 2026:KHC:40627
WP No. 22114 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 3RD DAY OF AUGUST, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO. 22114 OF 2026 (GM-RES)

BETWEEN:

DR. T.G.SITHARAM,
SON OF LATE T.S GUNDURAO,
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.28,
I MAIN, VHCS LAYOUT,
BASAVESHWARANAGAR
III STAGE, IV BLOCK,
BENGALURU - 560 079.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VENKATESH S ARABATTI, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. K.S.HARISH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE (IISC),
C.V RAMAN AVENUE,
BENGALURU - 560 012.
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN.
2. MR. KRIS GOPALKRISHNAN,
CHAIRMAN,
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE,
C.V RAMAN AVENUE,
BENGALURU - 560 012.

Digitally signed
by SHWETHA
RAGHAVENDRA
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



CNR: KAHC010486892026

3. DR. G. RANGARAJAN,
DIRECTOR INDIAN INSTITUTE
OF SCIENCE,
C.V RAMAN AVENUE,
BENGALURU - 560 012.
4. DR. NAGESH KUMAR,
REGISTRAR INDIAN
INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE,
C.V RAMAN AVENUE,
BENGALURU - 560 012.
5. COMMITTEE FOR ACADEMIC INTEGRITY IN
RESEARCH (CAIR) AND
THE ETHICS COMMITTEE
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE,
C.V RAMAN AVENUE,
BENGALURU - 560 012.
REPRESENTED BY THE CHAIRMAN
PROF. S RAMAKRISHNAN.
6. PROF. S RAMAKRISHNAN,
CHAIRMAN,
CAIR AND ETHICS COMMITTEE,
DEPARTMENT OF INORGANIC AND
PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY,
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE,
C.V RAMAN AVENUE,
BENGALURU - 560 012.
7. PROF. T.A.ABHINANDANAN,
DEPARTMENT OF MATERIALS ENGINEERING,
MEMBER,
CAIR AND ETHICS COMMITTEE



CNR: KAHC010486892026

NC: 2026:KHC:40627
WP No. 22114 of 2026

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE,
C.V RAMAN AVENUE,
BENGALURU - 560 012.

8. PROF. ANJULA GURTOO,
DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES,
MEMBER,
CAIR AND ETHICS COMMITTEE
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE,
C.V RAMAN AVENUE,
BENGALURU - 560 012.
9. PROF. VIJAY B. SHENOY,
DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS,
MEMBER, CAIR AND ETHICS COMMITTEE,
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE,
C.V RAMAN AVENUE,
BENGALURU - 560 012.
10. PROF. DIPANKAR NANDI,
DEPARTMENT OF BIOCHEMISTRY,
MEMBER, CAIR AND ETHICS COMMITTEE,
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE,
C.V RAMAN AVENUE,
BENGALURU - 560 012.
11. PROF. MADHAVI LATHA G.,
DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING,
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE,
C.V RAMAN AVENUE,
BENGALURU - 560 012.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.SYED KASHIF ALI AND SRI. PRADEEP S SAWKAR,
ADVOCATES FOR R1 AND R4)



CNR: KAHC010486892026

NC: 2026:KHC:40627
WP No. 22114 of 2026

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO A. QUASH BY WRIT OF CERTIORARI OR ANY OTHER APPROPRIATE WRIT OR ORDER DIRECTION IN THE NATURE OF WRIT, THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE RESPONDENT NO.5 COMMITTEE DATED 18.06.2026 AS PER ANNEXURE - A AND ETC.,

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

ORAL ORDER

1. Sri. Syed Kashif Ali and Sri. Pradeep S Sawkar, learned advocates accept notice for respondent Nos.1 to 4.
2. Notice to respondent Nos.5 to 11 is dispensed with in view of the proposed order to be passed.
3. Petitioner is before this Court seeking for the following reliefs:

" a. Quash by writ of Certiorari or any other appropriate writ or order direction in the nature of writ, the "Report and Recommendation" of the Respondent No.5



CNR: KAHC010486892026

NC: 2026:KHC:40627
WP No. 22114 of 2026

Committee dated 18.06.2026 as per ANNEXURE-'A'.

b. Declare that the procedure adopted by the Respondent No.5 Committee in withholding of the Reply filed by the Respondent No.11 to the Complaint as per ANNEXURE-'E' dated 19.11.2025 filed by the petitioner citing confidentiality is illegal and opposed to principles of Natural Justice;

c. Issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ or order directing the Respondents No.1 to 4 to constitute a CAIR & Ethics Committee with persons of competence and expertise to deal with the Complaint of the petitioner.

d. Award the costs of this petition; and

e. Such other and further relief as may be just and necessary in the interest of justice."

4. The petitioner, is a Senior Professor in respondent No.1- institute namely, Indian Institute of Science (hereinafter for brevity, 'IISc'). The petitioner had lodged a complaint as regards respondent No.11 being a Post-Doctoral Researcher, for Plagiarism and Ethical Violation of the IISc Policy for Academic Integrity in Research, Misrepresentation of the Role of respondent No.11 in '*Chenab Railway Bridge*



CNR: KAHC010486892026

Project', Misattribution of Contribution within IISc and Disregard of Primary Contributors and Ethical Misrepresentation by respondent No.11.

5. A preliminary inquiry having been done by the Committee of Academy Integrity in Research (hereinafter, for brevity, '*CAIR*') and a report having been submitted, the petitioner is before this Court seeking for a certiorari to quash the said report.
6. The submission of Sri Venkatesh S Arabatti, learned counsel for the petitioner is that the CAIR has not conducted inquiry in a proper manner and the principles of natural justice have not been applied to the petitioner inasmuch as, the petitioner has not been provided an opportunity of being heard in the matter before the CAIR submitted its report and on that ground, he submits that the report is required to be set aside.



CNR: KAHC010486892026

7. Though the submission of learned counsel for respondent No.1 is that an appeal is available under Rule 8.1 of the said Policy, this Court cannot accede to the said submission made, inasmuch as, the Scheme of the Policy provides for a complaint to be filed in respect of the aspects which have been adverted to in the complaint and in terms of Clause (e) of Rule 3, a Preliminary Investigation is to be conducted, which is also known as a fact finding inquiry by the CAIR. The CAIR in terms of Clause (b) of Rule 3, is a Committee formed by the Director consisting of such members as deemed fit by the Director to preliminarily inquire into the veracity of a complaint as per Rule 5 of the Policy.
8. In terms of Rule 5, on receipt of a complaint, the Director shall forward the same to the CAIR for preliminary investigation. The inquiry is to be conducted in terms of Rule 6.



CNR: KAHC010486892026

**NC: 2026:KHC:40627
WP No. 22114 of 2026**

9. Clause (a) of Rule 6 provides for preliminary inquiry by the CAIR, who is required to gather the preliminary information and fact find, so as to assess whether such complaint has substance and if so, whether an inquiry is warranted. The preliminary inquiry is to be conducted as expeditiously as possible and should normally be concluded within 45 days from the date of receipt of the complaint along with all details by the CAIR in terms of Clause (b) of Rule 6. It is this report of the CAIR which has been furnished as of now.
10. In terms of Clause (b) of Rule 6, the phase of inquiry would start when the Inquiry Authority receives the report of the preliminary inquiry conducted by CAIR along with recommendations from the Director and then, as per the procedure as provided at Annexure-I, appended to the Policy is applied and thereafter in terms of Clause (c) of Rule 6, corrective action is to be taken on the basis of the Inquiry Report.



CNR: KAHC010486892026

11. At present, what has been conducted is a preliminary inquiry by CAIR and not an inquiry by the Inquiry Authority. The preliminary inquiry report is required to be placed before the Director and the Director along with his recommendation, is to forward it to the inquiry authority. The preliminary inquiry by the CAIR is not the final report, but, it is only a preliminary report. It is but required for the Director on receipt of the preliminary inquiry report to make his recommendations to the Inquiry Authority. It is only on the Inquiry Authority completing the inquiry that the question of taking any decision or corrective action would arise.
12. At present, the appellate remedy provided under Rule 8.1 is for any person aggrieved by the Report-cum-Findings and the consequent action taken by a Disciplinary Authority, such aggrieved person may file an appeal to the Competent Authority as per Byelaw 22 of the Scheme Regulations Byelaws, if the



CNR: KAHC010486892026

NC: 2026:KHC:40627
WP No. 22114 of 2026

aggrieved party is an employee and to the Director if the aggrieved party is a student.

13. The question of an aggrieved party would arise only after the Report-cum-Findings are placed and consequent action is taken by a disciplinary authority and not before that.
14. As indicated *supra*, the stage at which the matter is now is of preliminary inquiry conducted by the CAIR and report submitted to the Director.
15. It is only after the Director makes a recommendation to the Inquiry Committee, that the Inquiry Authority would conduct a inquiry. At that stage, there would be two options:- (i) for the Inquiry Committee to drop the proceedings or (ii) to go ahead with the inquiry. It is only when such a decision is taken by the Inquiry Committee, can the petitioner be said to be an aggrieved party, inasmuch as, dropping of the proceedings would also be a consequent action. As



CNR: KAHC010486892026

NC: 2026:KHC:40627
WP No. 22114 of 2026

indicated, a preliminary inquiry report having been submitted by CAIR, the petitioner cannot be said to be aggrieved as of now.

16. Reserving liberty to the petitioner to challenge the Report-cum-Findings and the consequent action taken by Disciplinary Authority, if so advised, the petition stands ***disposed of***.

Sd/-
(SURAJ GOVINDARAJ)
JUDGE

BSV
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 21