

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO

W.P.Nos.11661, 11668 & 11674 of 2017

COMMON ORDER

Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and learned Government Pleader for Higher Education appearing for the 2nd respondent.

Since the issue involved in all these writ petitions is one and the same, they are being disposed of by this common order.

The petitioners earlier filed WP Nos.9519, 9520 and 9542 of 2017 challenging the show cause notice issued on 8.3.2017 and those writ petitions were disposed of on 17.3.2017 after hearing the learned counsel for petitioners and the learned counsel for the respondents and more or less on a consensus arrived at by both the counsel. The relevant portion of the order reads as under:

“A reading of the show cause notice shows that in paragraph 6 of the notice the deficiencies noticed by the Scrutiny Committee were pointed out. Those deficiencies relate to non-submission of certain documents indicated therein. Paragraph 7 of the show cause notice asked the petitioners to submit an explanation pursuant to the action of the petitioners in submitting deficient information and fake documents. In that connection, the petitioners asked for copy of the Scrutiny

Committee report, but the same was negatived as stated above on the ground that what was asked is only submission of the documents pointed out by the Scrutiny Committee. The show cause notice does not confine to the submission of the documents, but since it requires an explanation from the petitioners, the request of the petitioners cannot be found fault with.

In the circumstances, after arguments, learned counsel for the first respondent fairly accepted for supply of the report of the Scrutiny Committee to the petitioners and the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners accepted to appear before the Standing Hearing Committee (SHC) on a particular day after going through the committee report along with the documents pointed out as deficient in the report of the Scrutiny Committee.

In view of the above, the first respondent is directed to submit the report of the Scrutiny Committee to the petitioners as sought for by them on or before 24th March 2017 and on receipt of the same, the petitioners shall appear before the Standing Hearing Committee (SHC) on 3.4.2017 along with their explanations and the documents in their possession, if any.

All the three writ petitions are, accordingly, disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.”

A reading of the penultimate paragraph of the above order clearly shows that the petitioners agreed to appear before the Standing Hearing Committee on 3.4.2017 for submission of their explanations and the documents in their possession.

Now the petitioners seek further time on the ground that all the original documents are not available. It is also brought to the notice of this Court that in fact, the petitioners have addressed a letter to the respondents on 30.3.2017, but the same

was rejected *vide* order dated 30.3.2017 itself and directed the petitioners to appear before the Standing Hearing Committee on 3.4.2017 at 9.30 A.M and present their case pursuant to the order passed by this Court on 17.3.2017 in W.P.Nos.9519, 9520 and 9542 of 2017.

No indulgence can be shown in the present cases. Accordingly, all the writ petitions are dismissed at the admission stage. It is needless to observe that as per the order dated 17.3.2017 passed by this Court in the earlier batch of writ petitions, it is open to the petitioners to submit their explanation and the documents in their possession.



JUSTICE A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO

31st March, 2017

rkk