

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

239

**RSA-3377-2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 7.12.2017**

**GURU NANAK DEV UNIVERSITY AMRITSAR THROUGH ITS
REGISTRAR**

....APPELLANT

VS

RANJIT SINGH HUNDAL AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present: Mr. G.B.S.Dhillon , Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Harbhajan Singh Sran, Advocate
for the respondents.

AJAY TEWARI, J.(Oral)

By this appeal the appellant has challenged the order of the Lower Appellate Court allowing the appeal of the respondents and setting aside the order dated 5.12.2008 by which the services of the respondent No.1 were terminated with all consequential benefits giving power to the appellant to hold a fresh enquiry in accordance with the law. The genres of the dispute was Ph.D thesis submitted by the respondent No.1. The committee was set up to evaluate the thesis and had come to the conclusion that it was a case of plagiarism and at one stage, the respondent No.1 had even resigned from service. His resignation was however not accepted but his services were terminated. After hearing both the learned counsel for the parties the following agreed order is passed.

The thesis submitted by the respondent No.1 shall be referred to fresh committee for evaluation strictly in terms of Rule 6 of the Ordinances For Doctor of Philosophy published in January 2008 by the Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar. In case, the fresh Committee finds that there was no plagiarism by the respondent No.1 he shall be forthwith reinstated into service with all consequential benefits. However, in case it is found that there is plagiarism and any disciplinary action also has to be taken against him then the appellant would be at liberty to take action only after holding a full fledged enquiry.

Let the thesis of the respondent No.1 be now submitted to the Committee in terms of Rule 6 (supra) within a period of one month from today. In the event of an enquiry being instituted against the respondent No.1 in terms of the above direction the disciplinary authority will also take a view on the manner in which the intervening period has to be treated.

The appeal stands disposed of

Since the main case has been decided, the pending C.M, if any, also stand disposed of.

7.12.2017
anuradha

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

-

Whether speaking/reasoned - Yes/No

Whether reportable - Yes/No