



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 9TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE K.S. HEMALEKHA

WRIT APPEAL NO. 1820 OF 2025 (EDN-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. DR. ANUBHA MAHAJAN
D/O SH. SUBHASH CHANDRA MAHAJAN
AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS
RESIDENT OF HOUSE NO.1234
SECTOR 16, FARIDABAD
HARYANA - 121 002

...APPELLANT

(BY MS. USHA L., ADVOCATE FOR
SRI NADUVINAMANI VIVEKANAND, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE DENTAL COUNCIL OF INDIA
(A STATUTORY BODY CONSTITUTED
UNDER THE DENTIST ACT, 1948)
THROUGH ITS PRESIDENT
AIWAN-E-GHALIB MARG
KOTLA ROAD, TEMPLE LANE
OPP. MATA SUNDRI COLLEGE FOR WOMEN
NEW DELHI - 110 002
2. THE VICE CHANCELLOR
RAJIV GANDHI UNIVERSITY OF
HEALTH SCIENCES



4TH 'T' BLOCK, JAYANAGAR
BENGALURU - 560 041
KARNATAKA

3. THE PRINCIPAL
OXFORD COLLEGE FOR DENTAL
PHARMACY, NURSING
AND PHYSIOTHERAPY
10TH MILESTONE
BOMMANAHALLI
HOSUR ROAD
BENGALURU - 560 068
KARNATAKA

...RESPONDENTS

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED UNDER SECTION 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 10.06.2025 IN W.P.No.14966/2022 &
PASS AN ORDER DIRECTING RESPONDENT NO.3 TO COMPLY
WITH THE DIRECTIONS OF RESPONDENT NO.1 ISSUED VIDE
LETTER DT. 07.10.2020 & ETC.

THIS APPEAL, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING,
THIS DAY, JUDGMENT WAS DELIVERED THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE K.S. HEMALEKHA



ORAL JUDGMENT

(PER: HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE)

1. For the reasons stated in the application, I.A. No. 1/2025 is allowed. The delay of 126 days in filing the appeal is condoned.
2. The appellant has filed a present appeal impugning an order dated 10.06.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge of this Court in Writ Petition No.14966/2022 (EDN-RES).
3. The appellant had filed the said petition, *inter alia*, praying that directions be issued to respondent No.3-Management to take strict action/implement the recommendations made by the Dental Council of India [**DCI**] vide letter dated 07.10.2020.
4. The appellant was a student who enrolled in a postgraduate course in Dental Science with the Department of Paedodontics and Preventive Dentistry at respondent No.3 (Oxford College for Dental, Pharmacy, Nursing and Physiotherapy) in the year 2016. She made various allegations against certain professors and heads of departments regarding her being bullied and harassed.
5. She had absented herself from classes. She states that she had suffered injuries and therefore she could not attend the



college. She alleged that when she attempted to resume attending classes, the concerned Professor did not allow her to do so and punished her by making her stand outside the classroom continuously. She also alleged that the respondent-College had withheld her academic credentials and necessary certificate; resultantly, denying her an opportunity to pursue her post-graduation in dental science with another institution.

6. The learned Single Judge, after examining the statement of objections and the materials placed by respondent No.3-College, found that a committee had been constituted and that the allegations made by the appellant were duly enquired into. After examining the same, the Court found that there are no grounds for issuing any directions for constituting a fresh inquiry.

7. The learned counsel referred to a letter dated 07.10.2020, whereby the Executive Committee of the DCI had directed the Management of respondent No.3-College to issue a warning to Dr.A.R. Pradeep, Dean and Director of the College, for failing to provide a conducive environment for the appellant, and to have the matter enquired into by Senior Professors and HODs for the timely settlement of her grievance.



8. The learned counsel submits that in compliance with the said letter, it is necessary for respondent No.3 to institute a fresh inquiry. Paragraph 2 of the said letter indicates that said directions were issued keeping in view the inquiry committee report dated 07.07.2020. The said report indicates that on receiving the appellant's complaint, DCI issued a show cause notice for conducting enquiry with regard to the grievances. Respondent No.3, in response to the said notice, informed DCI that a committee had been constituted comprising of various senior members under the Chairmanship of the former Dean and Director, Government Dental College and Research Institute, Bangalore. The said committee consisted of 10 members, with Dr. Jayaprasad N Shetty, former Dean and Director, Government Dental College and Research Institute, Bengaluru as the Chairman. The said committee commenced the inquiry and examined various documents and complaints. Thereafter, it submitted a report stating as under:

"III. REPORT

1. The Committee found out that the Student seat was a management seat. There is no evidence that she brought to the notice of the management of the Institution about her alleged grievances.



2. The Committee found out that the Institution is conducting various programs with lectures on depression, stress management, pain, yoga and anti ragging. The said programs were also conducted during the Student's tenure in the college.

3. The Committee also found out that the Student addressed her grievances through media. The Committee has gone through the videos and found that the Student did not produce any evidence regarding the alleged bullying and harassment. It was found that the Student failed to answer the questions post by the expert panelist.

4. The Committee found out that the first and second Respondent had put forth all the facts before the media.

5. The Committee found out that the Student's attendance was 6.3% in 2nd year and NIL in 3rd year. The required attendance is one of the prerequisites to give exams and participate in any other activity of the course. The lack of attendance also proves that the Student is not eligible to give exams or attend seminars during the said period.

6. The Committee found out that the Student has made all kinds of attempts to tarnish the image of department and defame faculty on social media.

7. The Committee found out that fifty PG students have successfully passed out from this department and are well placed all over the globe. The batch mates of the Student and other PGs who were present during her tenure have given their written statements to the Respondents regarding their interactions with the Student. These letters give facts about various instances, amount of help they gave her and her response to them.

8. The Committee found out that on 16th November 2019, The DCI 3-member inquiry committee did a thorough inquiry into the allegations raised by the Student. Written statements and interrogation of Dean, HOD, Department faculty, non-teaching and PG students were taken. They have inspected the preclinical record book, log book of the



Student and attendance registers of the department. It was found that there was no clinical record of the Student.

9. The Committee found out that the student has attended her clinical posting at Jayadeva hospital only once on 20th April 2017. Normally the PGs are posted 8-10 times in their 2nd year.

10. The Committee found out that the Student did not pursue and complete her PG as per the norms set out by the DCI/RGUHS Institution.

11. The Committee found out that the Student's decision to quit the PG course was due to her chronic medical syndrome that was diagnosed in 2014, well before joining PG.

12. The Committee found out that the allegations made were only afterthought and for not wanting to take responsibility for her physical incapability to cope up with PG. Thus her complaint of bullying and harassment arose only in April 2019, which is 2 years after her prolonged absence. The Student did not give any reason for the delay in complaining against the alleged bullying and harassment."

9. In view of the findings, the Committee concluded that the appellant had failed to establish that she was subjected to any harassment or bullying during her course period at the institution, either by fellow students or by the Professors, as complained. The Committee also found no merit in the contention that Respondent No.3 had not created a conducive environment for students to pursue their course of study and graduation.



10. In view of the clear and unequivocal findings of the said Committee, we are unable to accept that there is any fault in the decision of the learned Single Judge in rejecting the writ petition.

11. The present appeal is unmerited and accordingly dismissed.

12. All pending applications stand disposed of.

**Sd/-
(VIBHU BAKHRU)
CHIEF JUSTICE**

**Sd/-
(K.S. HEMALEKHA)
JUDGE**

KMV
List No.: 2 Sl No.: 18