

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.VINOD CHANDRAN

MONDAY, THE 23RD DAY OF FEBRUARY 2015/4TH PHALGUNA, 1936

WP(C).No.11504 of 2009 (G)

PETITIONER:

**KISHAN SEBASTIAN,S/O.SEBASTIAN,
AUSEPHPARAMBIL HOUSE,PRAVITHANAM.P.O,
KOTTAYAM DISTRICT-686 651.**

BY ADV.SRI.SUNIL JACOB JOSE

RESPONDENT'S:

- 1. MAHATMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY,KOTTAYAM,
REPRESENTED BY THE REGISTRAR.**
- 2. THE CONTROLLER OF EXAMINATIONS,
MAHATHMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY,KOTTAYAM.**

**R1,R2 BY SRI.VARGHESE M.EASO, SC, M.G. UNIVERSITY
BY SRI.T.A.SHAJI, SC, M.G.UNIVERSITY**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD
ON 23-02-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

pk

K. Vinod Chandran, J.

W.P(C) No.11504 of 2009-G

Dated this the 23rd day of February, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioner was a diploma holder in Plastic Mould Technology from the Central Institute of Plastics Engineering & Technology, Chennai. The petitioner sought for admission to B.Tech Course in Mechanical Engineering. However, his eligibility was rejected by the Academic Council, against which the petitioner approached this Court.

2. This Court, by interim order dated 05.05.2009, permitted the petitioner to provisionally appear for the examination, subject to decision being taken by the Syndicate on the eligibility. The interim order was passed only since the learned Standing Counsel for the University had submitted before Court that the issue whether the petitioner is eligible to be admitted to the course as per the prospectus is one to be considered by the Syndicate.

3. The learned Standing Counsel for the University has now produced an order of the Assistant Registrar, communicating that the Syndicate had considered the same at its meeting held on

19.01.2010 vide Item No.67/10.1/6998 and resolved to accept the decision of the Academic Council.

In the above circumstances, the interim order being one passed subject to the result of the decision being passed by the Syndicate, nothing survives in the writ petition. The writ petition would stand dismissed as infructuous.

Sd/-
K. Vinod Chandran,
Judge

vku/

[true copy]