

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.RAMASUBRAMANIAN
AND
HON'BLE SMT JUSTICE ANIS

Writ Petition No.27064 of 2016

ORDER: (per V. Ramasubramanian, J.)

The petitioners have come up with this writ petition, challenging the second order of rejection for the grant of affiliation for 4 Undergraduate Courses in Engineering and one Post Graduate course in Business Administration.

2. Heard Sri P. Panduranga Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri A. Abhishek Reddy, learned standing counsel for the 1st respondent.

3. On the basis of an inspection report dated 4.4.2016, a deficiency report was prepared on 19.5.2016. The petitioners came up with a writ petition in W.P.No.24492 of 2016. In the said writ petition, an order was passed by a learned Judge, on 22.7.2016, directing the University to see whether there was a curable defect and reconsider their case, after conducting verification once again.

4. On the basis of the said order, the University appears to have conducted a reverification and passed a fresh order of rejection dated 2.8.2016. The tabular form furnished in the said order, is self-explanatory and hence, it is extracted as follows:

Course Name	N o . of faculty uploaded for FFC (T)	Absent on FFC visit (A)	N o . of Selection Committee Minutes uploaded (B)	Not qualified as per AICTE norms (C)	Black listed faculty (D)	Ph.D under-taking not submitted (E)	Required Faculty (Z)	Available faculty W + {T-(A+B+C +D+E)}	Shortage (Z-W)
B.Tech. (Civil Engg.)	22	11	03	--	01	--	12	07	05

B . Tech (ECE)	28	07	--	06	--	--	24	15	09
B. Tech (EEE)	32	05	01	05	--	--	24	21	03
B. Tech (Mech)	26	10	08	--	--	01	24	07	17
MBA	08	01	--	--	--	01	08	06	02

5. In the light of the above, we do not think that any relief can be granted to the petitioners. If deficiencies are found even after reverification and even after a claim with regard to the compliance is made, then the other questions

become disputed questions of fact, which cannot be gone into in a writ petition.

6. Drawing our attention to the report of the fact finding committee, it was contended by Mr. P. Panduranga Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioners that the finding with regard to the deficiency in faculty was arrived at, on flimsy grounds such as PAN card was not produced etc. Therefore, the learned counsel contends that there are actually no deficiencies.

7. But, we did not agree. The fact finding Committee's report relied upon by the petitioner, is dated 16.07.2016. The inspection was conducted in the presence of the petitioners.

8. As a matter of fact, the petitioners should have all the faculties in place even in April, 2016. Having failed to put in place the faculties at that time, the petitioners cannot now raise a factual dispute and invite a finding, for the benefit of securing affiliation for the current year. This dispute, is beyond the realm of this Court.

9. Therefore, the writ petition is dismissed. The miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in the writ petition shall stand closed. No costs.

V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN, J

ANIS, J

Date: 22.08.2016

Ksn