

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

Judgment delivered on: October 12, 2017

+ W.P. (C) 7913/2016, CM No. 32748/2016

KOMAL MOHITE

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms Malavika Rajkotia,
Mr. Vaibhav Vats and Ms.
Soumya Maheshwari, Advs.

Versus

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY

..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Ginny J. Rautray and
Ms. Anushka Ashok, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

J U D G M E N T

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

1. The present petition has been filed with the following prayers:-

“In view of the facts & circumstances stated above, it is prayed that this Hon’ble Court in public interest may be pleased to:

1. issue a writ of certiorari or any other writ, order or direction thereby quashing and setting aside the report of the High Level Enquiry Committee set up by the respondent vide Office Order No. 201/CP/2016 dated

22.8.2016 of the Vice Chancellor punishing the petitioner, and all other proceedings consequential to and arising out of the report of the High Level Enquiry Committee of the respondent University;

- 2. award the petitioner the costs of these proceedings;*
- 3. Pass such further order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit."*

FACTS:-

2. The facts as averred by the petitioner in the writ petition are, on February 09, 2016 a poetry reading event was organized. The poster said "*A Country Without a Post Office*". As per Statute 32(2), the University has a proctorial system where administration of students related matters pertaining to acts of indiscipline are delegated to the Chief Proctor. He/she is assisted by two additional proctors; one of the proctors is a woman. On February 11, 2016, a proctorial inquiry was set up and an appeal was made to all concerned, especially students to submit all audio/video evidences regarding the incident by February 26, 2016. On February 11, 2016, the Vice Chancellor set up a High Level Enquiry Committee superseding the Proctorial Enquiry Committee. The HLEC was given the deadline of February 22, 2016 for submitting the report. The HLEC submitted a preliminary report, which was accepted by the Vice Chancellor and the Chief Proctor was asked to implement the recommendations. On February 16, 2016, HLEC sent a letter directing the petitioner to appear before the HLEC on February 18, 2016. On February 18, 2016, the HLEC sent second

notice to the petitioner directing her to appear before the HLEC on February 19, 2016. On February 19, 2016, the HLEC sent third notice to the petitioner directing her to appear before the HLEC on February 26, 2016. On February 23, 2016 the Vice Chancellor had approved appointment of two more Members in HLEC. On March 11, 2016, the HLEC submitted its report. On March 15, 2016, a show cause notice was issued to the students wherein they were directed to file reply by 4 pm on March 16, 2016. Deadline to file reply was increased by few days till March 18, 2016. On March 18, 2016, reply was filed by the students, wherein they had sought that the copy of the complaint, details of the witnesses and their depositions, list of documents, proof/evidence/findings, if any relied on and all documents, statements, and material, if any, relied upon by, during the course of the enquiry, be provided, in order to enable them to file a detailed written response. Thereafter, sufficient time may be granted to make an effective response to the findings. On April 25, 2016, the Chief Proctor after obtaining the approval of the Vice Chancellor issued order holding the petitioner guilty under Clause 3, of category-II sub-category (xxv), whereby the VC imposed a fine of Rs.20,000/- on the petitioner. A writ petition is filed by the petitioner being W.P.(C) No. 4394/2016 wherein this Court passed an order holding that the office order dated April 25, 2016 shall not be given effect to until the appeal filed by the petitioner is decided. On August 22, 2016, order is passed in the appeal upholding the fine of Rs.20,000/- that has been imposed by HLEC on the petitioner.

SUBMISSION:-

3. It is the submission of Ms. Malavika Rajkotia, post the events of February 09, 2016, the Respondent set up a 'proctorial enquiry' to enquire into the allegedly seditious slogans raised during this event. However, this enquiry was superseded by the Vice Chancellor, who set up a "High Level Enquiry Committee". The students identified by the HLEC sent a representation to the Committee, challenging its constitution and also requested that the findings, charges, and the purported evidence be shared with them. The HLEC failed to respond to any of these requests. As per the HLEC recommendations, the Petitioner was found guilty of "lending her name in the poster titled "Against the Brahminical collective conscience! Against the judicial killing of Afzal Guru and Maqbool Bhatt..." in the name of cultural evening thus arousing communal and caste feelings." In addition to this the VC withdrew the hostel facility of the Petitioner till July 21st 2016 and also imposed a fine of Rs.20,000/-, upon the Petitioner. In order to protest the unfair manner in which the Petitioner, among other students, was punished by the Respondent, some students of the University went on an indefinite hunger strike, followed by a mass hunger strike by some teachers of the University. The Petitioner subsequently, approached this Court for quashing the aforementioned office order. This Court held that the Office Order will not be given effect until disposal of the appeal filed by the Petitioner before the Vice Chancellor. The decision of the Chief Proctor was upheld and the

Petitioner was directed to deposit a sum of Rs.20,000/- as fine and hostel facilities were withdrawn from her for a period of two semesters for violation of disciplinary rules by the Appellate Authority. The Petitioner has been subjected to an enquiry which has violated the principles of natural justice, even though any administrative inquiry devoid of the adherence to these principles does not stand. Reference is made to the judgments of the Supreme Court in *AK Kraipak v. Union of India AIR 1970 SC 150* and *State of Orissa v. Dr. (Miss) Binapani Dei and Ors. AIR 1967 SC 1269*.

4. It is the submission of Ms. Malavika Rajkotias, that the impugned action of the respondent is bad for the following reasons:-

A. Violation of Principles of Natural Justice

The principles of natural justice have been violated at every step of the enquiry undertaken by the Respondent. The enquiry process suffered from the following lacunae:

a. Biased Enquiry

5. The appellate authority is the Vice Chancellor whose approval had been granted for imposing the punishment under Office Order 147/CP/2016 dated April 25, 2016. The Vice Chancellor was already prejudiced against the Petitioner and was consequently incapable of appreciating evidence from an unbiased perspective. The principle of "Nemo debet esse iudex in propria causa" means that no one should be a judge in his own cause is applicable in this case. She referred to the

judgment of the Supreme Court in the case reported as *(1978) AIR 597 Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India*.

b. Confrontation of Evidence

6. The Respondent failed to provide the Petitioner with copies of all statements and evidence collected by the High Level Enquiry Committee and consequently used by the Appellate Authority. The Respondent provided the Petitioner with a series of haphazardly compiled documents which were completely irrelevant and did not prove any of the charges made against the Petitioner. The Respondent has however, used these statements to level serious and false charges against the Petitioner. She referred to the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case reported as *(1955) AIR 65 Dhakeshwari Cotton Mills v. Commissioner of Income Tax*. In denying the Petitioner the opportunity to examine the statements and documents collected by the HLEC, the Respondent has denied the Petitioner of a fair opportunity making the enquiry process arbitrary and therefore illegal.

c. Cross examination

7. The Petitioner has also not been given the opportunity to cross examine persons or test the veracity of the persons examined by the committee and to lead evidence in her defence. This clearly vitiates the process adopted by the Respondent. Clause (5) of Section 35(2) of the Statutes of the University clearly states that a cross examination of the accused and the complainant is to be conducted in the proceedings conducted as part of a proctorial enquiry. This opportunity has not

been given to the petitioner in the instant scenario.

d. Notice

8. In addition to all of the lapses in the decision making process the Petitioner was not given notice about the proceedings which the Respondent undertook to punish the Petitioner. She referred to the judgment of the Supreme Court in *Nagarjuna Construction Company Ltd. v. Government of Andhra Pradesh and Ors. 2008 (14) SCR 859*.

B. Non-Application of Mind

9. The order passed is itself flawed in many respects. The imposition of the same penalty on all concerned students barring two, in spite of huge differences in the acts that they have been held guilty of, reflects a lack of application of mind as well as a complete ignorance of the principles of sentencing that an administrative body entrusted with holding an enquiry must be aware of. Moreover, while the Appellate Authority has limited itself to the question of quantum of punishment, it has failed to provide any reasons for the punishment imposed. The fact that the orders passed against all the students were in boilerplate language furthers the factum of lack of application of mind by the Appellate Authority. She referred to the judgments in the case of *Commissioner of Police v. Ghordandas 1952 SC 16* and *D'Souza v. State of Bombay 1956 SCR 382*.

C. Application of Patently Illegal University Rules

10. The Respondent has punished the Petitioner under rules which

are illegal and void. The Petitioner's alleged acts have been classified as a Category II misconduct falling under clause (xxv), which reads, "*Any other act which may be considered by the V.C. or any other competent authority to be an act of violation of discipline and conduct.*" This provision is too vague and wide. It can encompass any act of a student, and should therefore be considered void. Clause (10) of Statute 32(5) of the Statutes of the University state that the Vice Chancellor shall make the final decisions in any enquiry and shall approve the punishment imposed by the enquiry committee. Clause (12) of Statute 32(5) of the Statutes of the University state that the Vice Chancellor shall also be the appellate authority. Under these provisions, the Vice Chancellor is required to be involved in the process of enquiry at the first instance. However, he is also required to sit in appeal over the same matter. This is in violation of the basic principle that a person cannot sit in appeal against their own order.

D. Violation of the Fundamental Right to Freedom of Speech and Expression

11. The order passed by the HLEC and later confirmed by the Appellate Authority is not only violative of the Principles of Natural Justice but also deprives the Petitioner of her right to protest an activity to raise political issues which is her constitutional right under Article 19 (1) of the Constitution of India, 1950. She relied on the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of *Anita Thakur & Ors. v. Govt of Jammu and Kashmir & Ors AIR 2016 SC 3808*, wherein it was held that the right to peacefully protest is a fundamental right

guaranteed by the Constitution. The involvement of the Petitioner in the event held at the Sabarmati Dhaba on 9th February 2016 was peaceful the role played by her in the said event cannot be construed to be disruptive or giving rise to caste and communal feelings. She referred to the judgment of this Court in *Amritshava Kamal v. Jawaharlal Nehru University 2007 (99) DRJ 528*.

12. The past conduct of the Respondent is reflective of the fact that there exists a tendency in the Respondent to hold inquiries in a mala fide manner, sidelining the interests of the students. In the abovementioned case, it was found that the Respondent had not provided the Petitioner with opportunity or notice before the inquiry against the Petitioner. In support of this submission, Ms. Rajkotia referred to the judgment of *Flora Gupta v. Jawaharlal Nehru University Manu/DE/3042/2012*.

13. On the other hand, Ms. Ginny Routray, learned counsel for the respondent would submit, the Petitioner was given ample opportunities to appear and depose before the Enquiry Committee along with the liberty to carry materials and evidences in her defense at the stage of Enquiry, Show Cause Notice and Appeal. The Petitioner failed to respond to the first notice dated February 16, 2016 wherein she was asked to appear before the Committee on February 18, 2016. Subsequently, a second notice was issued on February 18, 2016 asking her to appear before the Committee on February 19, 2016. A third notice was served to the Petitioner on February 19, 2016 asking her to appear before the committee on February 26, 2016,

however, the Petitioner abstained herself from appearing before the committee and clearing her stand.

14. The Petitioner on February 26, 2016, the day on which she was to appear before the HLEC, addressed a letter to the HLEC wherein she stated that-

I have received three email communications from the High Level Enquiry Committee Nos.HLEC/JNU/2016/2085 (dated February 16, 2016), HLEC/JNU/2016/2111, 12-13 (dated February 18, 2016) and HLEC/JNU/2016/2116, 17 (dated February 19, 2016) asking me to appear on 18th February, 19th February and 26th February, respectively, before a High Level Enquiry Committee to explain my position on 'an incident that took place on 9th February, 2016 near Sabarmati and Ganga Hostel.

In the circumstances following the 9th of February an extremely volatile situation has been created both inside and outside the campus which has resulted in extreme mental and physical stress for me..... I feel insecure because the prevailing atmosphere in JNU, and city and indeed the country is not conducive to appear and fair investigation, making depositions and statements without fear impossible.....

I solicit your attention to the concerns I have raised here and I hope you would take necessary steps to address my

concerns first before going ahead with this enquiry, a sentiment which JNU community shares at large.

Ms. Routray submitted, the Petitioner feeling unsafe within the campus is not a viable excuse since the Respondent had taken steps to ensure the safety and tight security for all the students within the campus, in fact even morning walkers were prohibited to enter the campus. Further, the Respondent was residing within the campus and had hand delivered all her letters/communications to the Administrative Building. It is thus, evident that the Petitioner deliberately avoided appearing before the committee and made baseless excuses not to be so.

15. The Respondent on February 26, 2016 addressed a letter to the Petitioner wherein it was stated that-

This is in continuation with our earlier notices sent to you. The expanded Committee would like to meet you on 29th February, 2016 at 3.00 pm in Room No.108, Administrative Block and get your statement. Please note that the temporary suspension from academic activity is only during pendency of the enquiry which will be over on 3rd March, 2016 and the Committee does not presume anyone guilty. This is the last opportunity for you to meet with the Committee and please do so without any apprehension.

The above mentioned letter is therefore the fourth notice that was issued to the Petitioner. However, the Petitioner still failed to appear

before the Committee. On February 27, 2016 the Petitioner again wrote to the HLEC wherein she reiterated the contents of her previous letter and further stated that-

I also note with concern that in your letter that the HLEC has only afforded me a final chance for deposition but no opportunity to have witnesses examined in my defence or to cross-examine the person(s) who have complained against me and the witnesses he/she/they have represented. This is against my natural rights for justice. Any fair and free Enquiry can only take place when the university comes to normalcy.

16. She submitted that the Petitioner was served 4 notices asking her to appear before the Committee on 4 different dates i.e. February 18, 2016, February 19, 2016, February 26, 2016 and finally February 29, 2016. The Petitioner still however failed to appear on all four dates and did not provide any valid reason of not doing so. She submitted that the Petitioner never intended to appear before the Committee to begin with and therefore, sought excuses after excuses to avoid the same. Further, the Petitioner would have been given an opportunity to cross examine had she come forward to record her statement. A Show Cause Notice dated March 14, 2016 was issued to the Petitioner which stated that-

As per the High Level Enquiry Committee findings, you (Ms. Komal Mohite, Registration Number: 24581, Enrolment No:

15/62/MS/025, Year of Admission: 2015, M.Phil/Ph.D. Student, Centre for Political Studies, School of Social Sciences, JNU, New Delhi) have been found guilty on the following account under the Clause 3, Category II of Rules and discipline and proper conduct of students of JNU.

(iii) Furnishing false certificates of false information in any manner to the University

(xxv) Any other act which may be considered by the VC or any other competent authority to be an act of violation of discipline and conduct

The Show Cause Notice further asked the Petitioner to explain why **disciplinary action** should not be initiated against her for indulging in the above mentioned acts. The Petitioner was asked to submit her reply to the Chief Proctor's Office latest by 16.03.2016, 17:00 hrs later extended till 18.03.2016 failing which it would be presumed that the Petitioner has nothing to say in her defense and the office would proceed further in the matter. A copy of HLEC report was also conveyed to the Petitioner which clearly outlined the act and conduct of the Petitioner based on the depositions which led to issuance of the Show Cause Notice.

17. The Petitioner responded to the Show Cause Notice on 18.03.2016 wherein she stated that-

The composition of the committee itself has been questioned

by both JNUTA and JNUSU, for being non-representative and biased. Despite the inclusion of two additional members at a later stage, there are no SC/ST representatives on the committee.

This is apart from the fact that the unseemly haste and total disregard of any rules of natural justice, that vitiate the constitution of the HLEC, its proceedings and its “report”.....

I am deeply disturbed by such a non-specific, vague and general show cause notice that seems to have been issued for no reason other than a plan to rope me along with other students into an orchestrated controversy to deter us from taking vocal positions on any issues that arise in the university.

Ms. Routray submitted that no Rule or Statute of the Respondent University requires the composition of the committee to have SC/ST representation. Further, the Petitioner cannot claim that there was a disregard of the Principles of Natural Justice since the Petitioner was served with 4 notices to appear on 4 different dates yet the Petitioner chose to ignore them and not appear before the Committee. She submitted that the Petitioner without having appeared before the Committee cannot claim that the principles of natural justice have not been followed by the Respondents. The Petitioner herself failed to avail the opportunity given to her and thus, there was **no violation of**

Principles of Natural Justice and Fair Play.

18. She further submitted that at the stage of appeal the decision is to be taken only from record before the deciding Appellate Authority. Rules under the Statute 32(5) state that the *punished student has the right to appeal against the punishment and Vice Chancellor is the empowered authority to deal with Appeal*. The Petitioner chose not to avail opportunities given to her, at the stage of enquiry, by admittedly not appearing before the Committee despite being in the campus, hence the Writ Petition on this ground alone is not maintainable.

19. According to Ms. Routray, the Petitioner is a student studying in JNU and resident of Hostel in JNU. The Respondent No.1 is Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU) established and incorporated by an Act of Parliament in the year 1966.

20. That at 12 pm on 09.02.2016 the Respondent got to know that some students were planning to host an “anti-national event” in the evening at Sabarmati Dhaba. A meeting was called in the Vice Chancellor’s Office, wherein it was discovered that permission was sought from the Additional Dean of Students on the false pretext of holding a poetry reading competition at Sabarmati Dhaba. Despite the alleged “permission” immediately being withdrawn by the DOS, the event was carried on which led to an enormous law and order situation.

21. On 11.02.2016 forthwith a High Level Enquiry Committee (HLEC) was constituted by the Vice Chancellor to enquire into the

incident that took place on 09.02.2016 in the Respondent's campus. By virtue of Section 5(10) of the JNU Act read with Statute 32(1) of the Statutes of the University-

“The Vice Chancellor has been vested with all the powers relating to discipline and disciplinary action in relation to students.”

It is pertinent to mention that the **HLEC superseded the Proctorial Enquiry** vide letter dated 11.02.2016 wherein it is stated that-

This Committee and the earlier notice dated 11th February, 2016 of the Chief Proctor stands withdrawn.

22. According to Ms. Routray, the HLEC followed **SOP** being norms in view of the nature and the need of the enquiry. The terms of reference of the Enquiry entailed formulation of **SOP**. The SOP norms are essentially analogous to the Norms recommended for a Proctorial enquiry. She submitted, the 3 member Committee later expanded to 5 by the Vice Chancellor mainly consisted of University Professors and since it was an internal enquiry of JNU, no third party was allowed to be present during hearing. Further, no one was allowed to be represented by a third party. The terms of Reference for the Committee was:

- (i) *To enquire into the incident and ascertain sequence of events.*
- (ii) *Identify any lapses that may have taken place, and*

(iii) *On the basis of **the findings**, recommended **action** to be initiated by the University as per its statutes and guidelines.*

23. That the Petitioner was given ample opportunities to appear and depose before the committee along with the liberty to carry materials and evidences. That the Committee issued their **First Notice** on 16.02.2016 and subsequently **Second Notice** on 18.02.2016 and **Third Notice** on 19.02.2016 along with a communication dated 26.02.2016 to the Petitioner, directing her to appear before the committee and explain her position about the incident that took place on 09.02.2016 near Sabarmati and Ganga Hostel. Despite this the Petitioner failed to appear before the committee. The above mentioned notices were dispatched via the Central Dispatch of the University which is an independent department within the University. She submitted that the notices were served to all her known addresses including her Hostel room and email-id. Further, as per the Hostel Manual of the University concerning Norms governing Hostel Life Chapter 2, Clause 2.5.3, states that- *“A resident who wishes to stay out late or remain absent overnight shall inform the warden concerned in the prescribed form.”* However, there was no intimation on behalf of the Petitioner that she would not be available in the hostel. She also submitted that despite notices being served, the Petitioner still failed to appear before the Enquiry Committee. Thus, the Petitioner herself lost the opportunity to appear before the committee and clear her stand.

Meanwhile, one week extension i.e. upto 03.03.2016 to submit the recommendations was granted to HLEC. Thereafter the terms of the

Enquiry Committee was further extended till 11.03.2016.

24. The HLEC followed Standard Operating Procedure devised by the HLEC specifically for the said enquiry during the course of enquiry. The HLEC spent considerable time in examining all the evidences pertaining to the event which included taking written depositions of eye witnesses and security officials, posters, SMS withdrawing consent to hold Anti-National event, form for seeking permission examining the video clips submitted by JNU Security Office and scrutinizing various documents/posters related to this incident. The video submitted to the Committee by the CSO was duly authenticated by a Government approved agency: Truth Labs, Bangalore. Subsequent to enquiry procedure, the HLEC **recommended** that the Petitioner be charged under Category II of (Rules of Discipline and Proper Conduct of Students of JNU) of the Statutes of the University and be fined Rs.20,000 and hostel facility be withdrawn till 21.03.2016. The HLEC submitted its report along with recommendations to the Vice Chancellor on 11.03.2016.

25. It is submitted that the HLEC gave ample opportunities to the Petitioner and after repetitive reminders and notices the Petitioner choose not to appear. According to Ms. Routray, the recommendation for disciplinary action was based on the findings of the HLEC. The HLEC recommended charges as well as punishment as per the Statutes and guidelines of JNU. The Chief Proctor, after perusing the report of the HLEC, issued a Show Cause Notice on 14.03.2016 and along with an extension dated 16.03.2016 along with a copy of HLEC report to

the Petitioner.

26. The Respondent subsequently on 25.04.2016, after more than a month, passed an office order wherein it was stated that-

With reference to the 9 February 2016 incident of JNU campus, the High Level Enquiry Committee (HLEC) had found Ms. Komal Mohite (Registration Number: 24581, Enrolment No: 15/62/MS/025, Year of Admission: 2015, M. Phil./PhD. Student, Central for Political Studies, School of Social Science and a r/o. Room No.12, Koyna Hostel) guilty on the following counts.

*The university ‘**Rules and discipline and proper conduct of students of JNU**’, Clause3- ‘Categories of misconduct and indiscipline’, Category-II, Sub-Category (vi) prohibits ‘Furnishing false certificates or false information in my manner to the University.’*

As per the HLEC recommendation, Ms. Komal Mohite has been found guilty of

- a. giving undertaking in the false pretext to hold a “Poetry Reading- A country without a Post Office” at Sabarmati Dhaba on 9 February 2016 from 5.00 pm to 7.30 pm*
- b. Misleading Chairperson, CPS/SSS, Prof. Anupama Ray for asking permission for holding an event “Poetry Reading- A country without a post Office” at Sabarmati*

Dhaba on 9 February 2016 from 5.00 pm to 7.30 pm.

c. Misrepresenting her hostel address in the undertaking form.

*The university ‘**Rules and discipline and proper conduct of students of JNU**’, Clause 3- ‘Categories of misconduct and indiscipline’, Category-II, Sub- Category (xxv) prohibits ‘Any other act which may be considered by the VC or any other competent authority to be an act of violation of discipline and conduct’.*

As per the HLEC recommendation, Ms. Komal Mohite has been found guilty of

(a) lending her name in the poster titled “Against the Brahminical collective conscience! Against the judicial killing of Afzal Guru and Maqbool Bhatt.....” in the name of Cultural Evening thus arousing communal and caste feelings

These act on the part of Ms. Komal Mohite is very serious in nature, unbecoming of a student of JNU and calls for stringent disciplinary action against her. However, keeping her career prospects in mind, the Vice-Chancellor has taken a somewhat lenient view in the matter.

The Vice-Chancellor, in exercise of his powers vested in him under Statute 32(5) of the Statutes of the University, has ordered that the hostel facility of Ms. Komal Mohite be

withdrawn with immediate effect till 21 July 2016 and has also imposed a fine of Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand Only). She is directed to deposit the fine by 13 May 2016 and show the proof thereof to this office, failing which the Hostel facility will be withdrawn with immediate effect and further registration will not be allowed.

All the Hostels of the University will remain out of bounds of Ms. Komal Mohite during this period. Anyone giving shelter to Ms. Komal Mohite in any premises of the University will invite strict disciplinary action against the person(s) concerned.

27. The Petitioner appealed against the above mentioned Office Order vide letter dated 02.05.2016 wherein she stated that-

In my responses to the HLEC, I had categorically stated that I was willing to cooperate with its proceedings provided that I was informed of the charges against me so that I could furnish my explanation. This was never done, in fact my letters were not responded to at all. Nor was I furnished with any of the following documents that I asked for.....

She submitted that the Petitioner was not provided with copies of documents as the University in its wisdom and in view of the atmosphere, considering the sensitivity of the manner and in the interest of witnesses' safety only provided for the same to be inspected before the Committee.

Further, the Norms and Procedures along with SOP state that-

8. *Members of the committee will sign a confidentiality/non-Disclosure Statement.*

9. *Any information shared confidentially to the Committee to the Committee members will not be shared by them after the terms of the Enquiry Committee is over.*

10. *No cell phone will be brought into the committee room when any persons come to depose before it.*

11. *No statement will be issued to the press during the enquiry period and also after the enquiry period.*

12. *All communication from the University to the Committee and vice a versa will be in writing.*

28. She also submitted that even though the Petitioner and other students were not provided the copies of the documents at the stage of show cause, the same was available to them to access had they appeared before the committee to depose. Thus, they themselves failed to avail the opportunity provided to them. It is further submitted that the Petitioner would have been given an opportunity to cross examine had she come forward to record her statement. Ms. Routray referred to the judgment of the Supreme Court in the matter of ***K.L. Tripathi V. State Bank of India & Ors. (1984) 1 SCC 43*** wherein, it was held that-

The concept of fair play in action, which is basis of natural justice, must depend upon the particular lis between the parties. Where there was no lis regarding the facts, no real prejudice would be caused to a party by absence of any formal opportunity of cross examination and that per se would not invalidate or vitiate the decision arrived at fairly.

29. Further, the Petitioner's communications were acknowledged however they were not replied to as all her contentions and doubts would have been addressed if she chose to appear before the Committee. Four notices were sent to her, yet she chose to ignore them, it is thus evident that the Petitioner colluded and conspired with the other students/ Petitioners and therefore did not appear before the Committee. Had the Petitioner been truly willing to cooperate with the Enquiry, she would have appeared on the first date itself and 3 other notices would not have to be sent to her. This Court vide Order dated 13.05.2016 directed that the Order shall not be given effect till the appeals of the Petitioners are heard and disposed of. Subsequently, the Petitioner was given provisional admission to continue in the present semester keeping in view the Order dated 13.05.2016 by this Court.

30. The Respondent vide letter dated 13.06.2016 to the Petitioner stated that –

With reference to your appeal against the Report/recommendations of the High Level Enquiry

Committee (HLEC), regarding 9 February incident JNU campus, you are requested to appear before the Vice Chancellor, Appellate Authority of the University, and depose on 16 June 2016 at 4.00 p.m. at Vice-Chancellor's Office.

She would submit despite the Petitioner did not appear on the said dated and subsequently a notice was issued to her on 24.06.2016 asking her to appear on 4th July, 2016.

31. That the Respondent finally issued the Office Order No. 201/CP/2016 dated 22.08.2016 wherein it was stated that-

On being asked by the Appellate Authority "Were you present at the Sabarmati Dhaba to attend the event on 9th February, 2016?" In response to the above question she said that "she will not speak anything until and unless she is provided with a photocopy of all the documents requested by her in her earlier representations to the University Authorities". It is important to note that Ms. Komal Mohite was provided a complete set of files (Security depositions, copies of all relevant videos, copies of statements given by witnesses, copies of all correspondence, copies of the report of the HLEC, all other documentary proof) used by the HLEC to arrive at the punishment in respect of Ms. Mohite....

32. Further, the Petitioner was asked other questions however, she

did not cooperate.

Ms Komal Mohite was given ample time by the committee to examine all the files before she could write her appeal and she read through these files and wrote her appeal.

Evidence-

- 1. The requisitions form to book the venue was filled by Umar Khalid and the undertaking was signed by four students, out of them one student was Ms. Komal Mohite. Hence it was clear that Ms. Mohite was one of the organizers of the event.*
- 2. She misrepresented her hostel address on the requisition form submitted for the event.*
- 3. She mislead the Chairperson CPS/SSS, Prof. Anupama Roy by citing in the requisition form that the permission was being taken for a cultural event whereas the event which was held was of a different nature altogether.*
- 4. She lent her name to be printed in an objectionable poster titled "Against the Brahmanical Collective Conscience Against the Judicial Killing of Afzal Guru and Maqbool Bhatt..... In the name of cultural evening thus arousing communal and caste feelings.*

Recommendations

Ms. Mohite did not make any specific appeal to absolve

herself from the charges made by the HLEC. On the contrary she questioned the formation of HLEC itself, and asked for documents and evidence related to her involvement in the event. The committee thereupon considers the recommendations of the HLEC on the aforesaid student highly justifiable. Therefore, the punishment recommended by the HLEC i.e. “No Hostel Facility till 21st July, 2016 and fine of rs.20,000” stands as it is. In this case, the Appellate Authority has decided to withdraw hostel facility for a period of two semesters from the date of receipt of the office order. In addition to this, she has to submit an undertaking in a prescribed format to the Chief Proctor.

33. Ms. Routray would submit that the Respondent’s intention was not to increase the punishment of the Petitioner. The punishment by the Appellate Committee was to be in consonance with the recommendation of the HLEC and was hence calculated on the basis of months. She would submit, once the punishment is given effect to, it shall be followed as per the HLEC recommendations as mentioned in the Order dated 22.08.2016. Further it was her submission the Petitioner did in fact intend to mislead the Respondents, firstly, the purpose of the event in the proforma and the poster are entirely different. Secondly, regarding the misrepresentation of her hostel address, she was not in between transitioning hostels as stated by her Counsel as all her communications were addressed from Room No.12,

Koyna Hostel and she received all the letters from the HLEC at the same address. However, in the Undertaking her Hostel name was written as Ganga Hostel. Furthermore, the Petitioner had signed the undertaking on her own as mentioned in her reply to the Show Cause Notice dated 18.03.2016 and the same can be matched from her letters/representations. She would submit, that in her Affidavit dated 05.09.2016 she stated that the signature was not hers; however she admitted to the same under duress. According to Ms. Routray the Petitioner on one hand claims that she was aggressively interrogated and admitted it being her signature under duress and on the other hand claims that she refused to answer questions, thus, this shows that the Petitioner's statement cannot be relied upon and she has been trying to mislead the court from day one. She would submit the Affidavit dated 05.09.2016 is an afterthought after the Order dated 22.08.2016 was passed. Had the Petitioner genuinely been aggrieved with the procedure followed by the Appellate Committee, she could have come forward and stated the same after 04.07.2016, thus, the Affidavit cannot be given any credence to.

34. That the University's autonomy means its right of self-government particularly, it's right to carry on its legitimate activities without interference from any outside authority. That the petitioner against whom charges were framed was given adequate opportunities to defend herself, and the committee followed the rules of natural justice while holding this enquiry. She would submit, it is a settled law that matters falling within the jurisdiction of educational

authorities should normally be left to their decision and this Court would not interfere unless it thinks it must do so in the interest of justice. She referred to the judgment of this Court in ***Jawaharlal Nehru University V. Flora Gupta, LPA 570/2012 & CM No.14010/2012*** wherein, it was held that-

The grounds on which administrative action is subject to control by judicial review are, “illegality”, “irrationality” and “procedural impropriety”. The Court will be entitled to interfere in such matters if the decision is tainted by any vulnerability like illegality, irrationality and procedural impropriety. To be “irrational” it has to be in total defiance of logic or moral standards. If the power is exercise on the basis of facts which do not exist having which are patently erroneous, such exercise of power shall be vitiated. Exercise of power will be set aside if there is manifest error in the exercise or such power is manifestly arbitrary. To arrive at a decision on “reasonableness” the court has to find out if the respondents have left out a relevant factor or taken into account irrelevant factors.

35. That the Respondent has acted within their authority, exercised their judgment in good faith, and followed the applicable laws. The constitutional provisions, the provisions of the Act, the Statute and the Ordinances and the Principles of Natural Justice have been complied with by the Respondent. The Petitioner was served with notices at her hostel, at her various addresses and was asked to show cause and was also given opportunity to defend herself before the enquiry committee. The Petitioner however deliberately avoided proceedings. She submitted that only certain documents relied upon by the HLEC were filed before this Court and the entire evidence, documents, notices and

proceedings are maintained by the Respondent in its official files. The same are available for any other scrutiny as and when the same may be requisitioned before this Court. The Legal Submissions made and judgments relied upon in *Umar Khalid V. JNU, W.P. (C) 7826/2016* and *Anirban Bhattacharya V. JNU, W.P. (C) 7828/2016* may be read as part and parcel of the present submissions. The judgments are:-

- (i) *K.L. Tripathi v. State Bank of India and Ors 1984 (12) SCC 43;*
- (ii) *State of Gujarat v. Pagi Bhura Bhai Rumal Bhai AIR 1969 Gujarat 260;*
- (iii) *Ajeet Seeds Ltd. V. K. Gopal Krishnaiah 2014 (1) SCC 685;*
- (iv) *Chief Commissioner of Income Tax (Administration) Bangalore v. V.K. Gururaj and Ors. 1996 (7) SCC 275;*
- (v) *State of Punjab v. Bakhshish Singh 1997 (6) SCC 381;*
- (vi) *Suresh Koshy George v. University of Kerala AIR 1969 SC 198;*
- (vii) *State Bank of Patiala v. S.K. Sharma 1996 (3) SCC 36;*
- (viii) *Ram Chander Roy v. Allahabad University AIR 1956 ALL 40;*
- (ix) *V. Ramana v. APSRTC & Ors 2005 (7) SCC 335;*
- (x) *M. V. Bijlani v. UOI and Ors 2006 (5) SCC 88.*

In view of the above facts and circumstances, she prayed for the

dismissal of the writ petition

36. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the written arguments/submissions submitted by the counsels, it is noted that the subject matter of this petition is, the orders passed by the Competent Authority whereby a penalty of withdrawing hostel facility with immediate effect till July 21, 2016 and a fine of Rs.20,000/- was imposed on the petitioner, which order was upheld by the Appellate Authority whereby the Appellate Authority has held that the punishment recommended by the HLEC i.e no hostel facility till July 21, 2016 and a fine of Rs.20,000/- stands as it is. It was also decided by the Appellate Authority to withdraw hostel facility for a period of two semesters from the date of receipt of the office order with a direction to prescribe an undertaking. The grounds of challenge are that the same has been conducted in violation of the Statutes, which inter alia states that no punishment shall be imposed on a student unless he/she has been found guilty of the offence for which he/she has been charged by a proctorial or any other enquiry after following the normal procedure and providing due opportunity. The petitioner's alleged acts have been classified as Category (II) misconduct falling under Clause (xxv), which is too wide and can encompass any act of a student and therefore void. Clause (x) of Statute 32(5) stipulates Vice Chancellor to approve the punishment imposed by the Enquiry Committee whereas the Vice Chancellor shall also be the Appellate Authority, which has the effect of a person sitting in appeal against his own order, which is impermissible. The action of the respondent is

actuated by malafides and in violation of the judgment of this Court in *Jawaharlal Nehru University V. Flora Gupta (supra)* and *Amritshava Kamal v. Jawaharlal Nehru University (supra)*. The findings of HLEC are perverse. The punishment has been imposed without giving to the petitioner the relevant material on which the HLEC has based its recommendation. The appellate order is also in violation of principles of natural justice; the material on which the Appellate Authority relied upon has not been given to the petitioner nor any opportunity was given to cross examine persons/test the veracity of the persons examined by the Committee and to enable the petitioner to lead defence evidence. The Appellate Authority denied the petitioner enough time to peruse the depositions against her effectively denying her the opportunity to submit her response to the same.

37. The respondent has justified its action by contending that the Enquiry Proceedings were held by following the principles of natural justice and the Rules/Statutes. It is the petitioner, who failed to come forward and depose before the Committee. That apart, the respondent has also highlighted the seriousness of the charges for which the petitioner was held guilty. That apart, the appellate proceedings were held after giving due opportunity to the petitioner to inspect the documents and after inspection of the documents and upon hearing and inability of the petitioner to answer the queries put by the Appellate Authority, the appellate order was passed.

38. There is no dispute that the petitioner had filed an Appeal dated May 02, 2016. It is a conceded fact that the Vice Chancellor-Appellate Authority had held its meeting on July 04, 2016. There is also no dispute that the petitioner was shown the record of the enquiry. The parties are at variance about the duration for which the record was shown. It is a conceded fact that a hearing was given to the petitioner on the same day, which resulted in the passing of the appellate order on August 22, 2016.

39. Clause 12 of the Norms and Procedure followed during enquiry stipulates that every punished student has a right to appeal. In the case in hand, after this Court had passed the order on May 13, 2016 in the earlier writ petition filed by the petitioner being W.P.(C) No. 4394/2016, the respondent University issued a communication dated June 13, 2016 asking the petitioner to appeal to the Vice Chancellor and depose on June 16, 2016, on which date she did not appear. On 24.06.2016 a notice was issued for her appearance on 4th July, 2016. The communication does not refer to the fact that the petitioner shall be given the relevant record/documents for inspection. Be that as it may, the learned counsel for the parties agree that the files/records/documents before the HLEC were given to the petitioner on July 04, 2016 to enable her to peruse the same and make submissions on the same day. Even assuming, three hours were granted to the petitioner to inspect the documents on July 04, 2016, some time need to have been granted to the petitioner to apply her mind on the evidence so noted by her during the inspection, which

was against her and to make an effective appeal. Surely, for such purposes, she may have required reasonable time to prepare her case, which may include seeking legal advice. The procedure evolved by the Appellate Committee to allow inspection of the documents/records and hearing her could not be in conformity with the principles of natural justice and the law laid down by the Supreme Court in the case of *Associated Cement Company Ltd. v. Workmen and another (1964) 3 SCR 652*, wherein the Supreme Court was considering an appeal arising out of an industrial dispute between the appellant and the respondent workman with regard to dismissal of five workmen employed by the appellant company. One of the issue was that before the enquiry was actually held on June 11, 1952, notice was not given to Malak Ram, one of the workmen telling him about the specific date of the enquiry. The Supreme Court held that failure to intimate to the workman concerned about the date of the enquiry may, by itself, not constitute an infirmity in the enquiry, but, on the other hand, it is necessary to bear in mind that it would be fair if the workman is told as to when the enquiry is going to be held so that he has an opportunity to prepare himself to make his defence at the said enquiry and to collect such evidence as he may wish to lead in support of his defence. The Supreme Court held, on the whole, it would not be right that the workman should be called on any day without previous intimation and the enquiry should begin straightaway. The Supreme Court held, such a course should ordinarily be avoided in holding domestic enquiries. In other words, the Supreme Court has held that an incumbent should be given sufficient opportunity/time to consider

the evidence, which has come against him and to collect evidence in support of his defence. In the case in hand, no such time was given to the petitioner. That apart, if the material is being shown to the petitioner, on July 04, 2016, surely, some time should have been given to the petitioner to enable her to supplement her appeal already filed by her on May 02, 2016. This would be in conformity with the concept of fair play in action, which is the basis of natural justice. That apart, even in these proceedings, the respondent has not filed complete record of the HLEC. In fact, a stand has been taken in the written submissions filed by learned counsel for the respondent in this case that only certain documents relied upon by the HLEC were filed before this Court and the entire evidence, documents, notices and proceedings are maintained by the respondent in its official files. The same are available for any other scrutiny as and when the same is requisitioned before the Court. Even if some depositions were filed along with the written arguments in some connected cases, the same are in Hindi. Even otherwise the HLEC report refers to deposition of some eye witnesses, which are in the deposition files. It is not clear, who these witnesses are, who are being referred to. All the evidence, documents, notices and proceedings being in the official files, there was no occasion for this Court/counsel for the petitioner to look into the same for proper appreciation/justification of the impugned orders.

40. That apart, I note, the petitioner in her appeal dated May 02, 2016 has raised several grounds. A perusal of order dated August 22, 2016, it is seen that the Appellate Authority has not dealt with the said

grounds. The Supreme Court in the case reported as **(2013) 6 SCC 530 Chairman, Life Insurance Corporation of India and others v. A. Masilamani**, in para 19 held as under:-

“19. The word “consider”, is of great significance. The dictionary meaning of the same is, “to think over”, “to regard as”, or “deem to be”. Hence, there is a clear connotation to the effect that, there must be active application of mind. In other words, the term “consider” postulates consideration of all relevant aspects of a matter. Thus, formation of opinion by the statutory authority, should reflect intense application of mind with reference to the material available on record. The order of the authority itself, should reveal such application of mind. The appellate authority cannot simply adopt the language employed by the disciplinary authority, and proceed to affirm its order. (Vide: Indian Oil Corpn. Ltd. & Anr. v. Santosh Kumar, (2006) 11 SCC 147; and Bhikhubhai Vithlabhai Patel & Ors. v. State of Gujarat & Anr., AIR 2008 SC 1771).

In view of the aforesaid judgment of the Supreme Court, it is expected that the Appellate Authority should have disposed off the appeal by a reasoned and speaking order. This I say so, there is nothing in the Rule, relating to appeal which says otherwise i.e it is not necessary for the Appellate Authority to pass a reasoned order.

41. Insofar as the plea of Ms. Malavika Rajkotia that the Vice Chancellor having involved in the process of enquiry at the first instance, cannot sit in appeal against his own order is concerned, the same is without any merit for more than one reason. Firstly, the petitioner by appearing before the Appellate Authority on July 04, 2016 has submitted herself to the jurisdiction of the Appellate Authority i.e. the Vice Chancellor. Secondly, the vires of Rule 12 contemplating an appeal to the Vice Chancellor is not under challenge.

42. Insofar as the judgments relied upon by Ms. Routray are concerned, in *K.L. Tripathi (supra)*, the issue, which fell for consideration was with regard to a challenge to the departmental enquiry by an employee on the ground that he was not provided opportunity to cross examine. The Supreme Court held that in the absence of any lis as to the facts, allegations having been not disputed by the delinquent officer, no prejudice has been caused.

43. The issue, which has been considered by me in the aforementioned paras is only with regard to, whether sufficient opportunity was given to the petitioner to inspect the documents at the appellate stage and then submit an appropriate appeal after the inspection, so as to make the appellate proceedings meaningful and purposeful. Hence, the judgment would have no relevance.

44. Insofar as the judgment in the case of *State of Gujarat v. Pagi Bhurabhai Rumalbai (supra)*, is concerned, in the said case the Gujarat High Court held that the delinquent has no right to seek a personal hearing at the appellate stage. In the case in hand, the personal hearing having been agreed to and granted by the University, it cannot be contended by Ms. Routray that the personal hearing was not required.

45. In *Ajeet Seeds Limited (supra)*, para 10 on which the reliance was placed, relates to a conclusion with regard to Section 114 of the Evidence Act, which enables the Court to presume that in common course of natural events, a communication made would have been delivered at the address of the addressee. A reference was made to

Section 27 of the General Clauses Act, which gives rise to presumption that service of notice has been effected when it is sent to the correct address by registered post. The said judgment has no applicability on the limited issue being considered and decided by this Court.

46. In *Hira Nath Mishra and others v. The Principal, Rajendra Medical College, Ranchi and another* (1973) 1 SCC 805, the Supreme Court was concerned with a case where the appellants, the male students of a Medical College lived in the College hostel. A confidential complaint was received by the Principal from thirty six girl students residing in the Girls Hostel of the College alleging that the appellants with some others at late night had entered into the compound of the Girls Hostel and walked without clothes on them. The Principal constituted an Enquiry Committee consisting three Members of the staff. The identification through photographs was carried out and the Girls by and large could identify the appellants from the photographs. The appellants were called before the Committee one after the other. They were explained the contents of the complaint. Due care was taken not to disclose the names of the Girls, who made the complaint. The appellants denied the charges and said they were in the Hostel at that time. The Supreme Court held as under:-

(i) The complaint made to the Principal related to an extremely serious matter as it involved not merely internal discipline but the safety of the girl students

living in the Hostel under the guardianship of the college authorities. These authorities were in loco parentis to all the students-male and female who were living in the Hostels and the responsibility towards the young girl students was greater because their guardians had entrusted them to their care by putting them in the Hostels attached to the college. The authorities could not possibly dismiss the matter as of small consequence because if they did, they would have encouraged the male student rowdies to increase their questionable activities which would, not only, have brought a bad name to the college but would have compelled the parents of the girl students to withdraw them from the Hostel and, perhaps, even stop their further education. The Principal was, therefore, under an obligation to make a suitable enquiry and punish the miscreants.

(ii) The Police could not be called in because if an investigation was started the female students out of sheer fright and harm to their reputation would not have cooperated with the police. Nor was an enquiry, as before a regular tribunal, feasible because the girls would not have ventured to make their statements in the presence of the miscreants because if they did, they would have most certainly exposed themselves to

retaliation and harassment thereafter. The very reasons for which the girls were not examined in the presence of the appellants, prevailed on the authorities not to give a copy of the report to them. It would have been unwise to do so.

(iii) Therefore, the authorities had to devise a just and reasonable plan of enquiry which, on the one hand, would not expose the individual girls to harassment by the male students and, on the other, secure reasonable opportunity to the accused to state their case. The course followed by the Principal was a wise one.

(iv) Under the circumstances of the case, the requirements of natural justice were fulfilled, because principles of natural justice are not inflexible and may differ in different circumstances.”

From the above, it is noted that, keeping in view the nature of allegations against the male students; to protect the identity of the complainants, the girl students, the Supreme Court had upheld, the nature of enquiry conducted by the University as being in compliance with the principles of natural justice. The aforesaid judgment of the Supreme Court has no applicability in the facts of this case and also on the limited issue that is being decided by this Court.

47. Insofar as the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of **Suresh Koshy George** (*supra*) is concerned, in para 7 on which

reliance was placed by Ms. Routray, the Supreme Court was considering a submission that the Vice Chancellor had not made available to the appellant a copy of the report submitted by the Inquiry Officer before asking him to make a representation. The Supreme Court rejected the contention by holding that the enquiry was held after due notice to him and in his presence. He was allowed to cross examine the witnesses examined in the case and he was permitted to adduce evidence in rebuttal of the charge. The Supreme Court also held, no Rule was brought to its notice, which stipulated the supply of report. The Supreme Court also observed that it was not the case of the appellant that he had asked for the copy of the report, which was denied to him. The judgment relied upon by Ms. Routray is distinguishable, inasmuch as the petitioner did not participate in the proceedings/the proceedings were held in her absence. Further, the Appellate Authority itself has offered to allow inspection of the documents/record of HLEC. The petitioner had asked for the documents/record/material in her appeal dated May 02, 2016. The Appellate Authority having allowed the inspection, reasonable time should have been given to the petitioner to supplement the appeal already filed by her on May 02, 2016. The judgment has no applicability, at least on the limited issue that is being decided by this Court.

48. Insofar as the judgment of the Allahabad High Court in the case of *Ram Chander Roy (supra)* wherein reliance was placed on paras 24 and 25, relates to the power of the Vice Chancellor to impose any

punishment in maintaining the discipline of the University. There is no dispute on the said proposition of law. Insofar as the plea that the right of cross examination was denied is concerned, the High Court held that it was not convinced that in a case where Head of an Educational Institution takes disciplinary proceedings, it is necessary that he must give an opportunity to the student to cross examine the witnesses, who may be examined by him in order to satisfy himself that an occasion has arisen for taking disciplinary action against him. In matter of discipline, the Head of Educational Institution does not act as a judicial or a quasi judicial Tribunal. The Disciplinary power vested in any Officer or the Head of an Institution is a power which is absolutely necessary for and ancillary to the exercise of administrative functions in that capacity. Suffice to state, 32(5) of the Statutes of the University lays down the procedure. In any case, as stated above, on a limited issue, which is being decided, this judgment would not have any applicability.

49. In *State Bank of Patiala and Others v. S.K. Sharma (supra)*, Ms. Routray who relied upon para 35 to contend that no prejudice has resulted to the petitioner on account of non furnishing her the copy of the statements of witnesses as it cannot be said that she did not have a fair hearing is concerned, there is no dispute on the proposition, in view of the position of law noted above, but the limited time given by the Appellate Authority to the petitioner to inspect the documents/material/record and to give a hearing on the same day would not be in conformity with the principles of natural justice.

Surely, the Authority empowered under the Statute is required to give a reasonable opportunity to make the very purpose of the power being exercised by such Authority meaningful.

50. Insofar as *State Bank of Punjab and others v. Bakhshish Singh (supra)* is concerned, there is no dispute that the Court cannot sit as an Appellate Authority over and above the conclusion of the Disciplinary Authority that a particular act was a gravest act of misconduct warranting dismissal. As stated above, on the limited issue that is being decided by this Court, this judgment would have no relevance.

51. Insofar as *Chief Commissioner of Income Tax (Administration), Bangalore v. V.K. Gururaj and others (supra)* is concerned, the said judgment is on the proposition of deemed service, which in any case has no applicability for the reasons already stated.

52. Insofar as the judgment in the case of *V. Ramana v. APSRTC and Ors (supra)* is concerned, the same relates to the issue of judicial review with regard to punishment. The same has no applicability in view of limited issue that is being decided by this Court.

53. Insofar as the reliance placed by Ms. Routray on the judgment of *M.V. Bijlani (supra)* is concerned, in view of the limited issue that is being decided by this Court, this judgment would have no relevance.

54. In view of my above discussion, the writ petition is allowed to the extent that the Appellate Order dated August 22, 2016 is set aside

and the matter is remanded back to the Appellate Authority with a direction to grant an opportunity of inspection to the petitioner, the record of the HLEC for continuous two days during office hours only by notifying the date and time to the petitioner for the same and upon such inspection, the petitioner shall have one week time to file a Supplementary Appeal, upon which the Appellate Authority shall give a hearing to the petitioner on a date and time fixed by the Appellate Authority, who thereafter shall, by considering the appeal(s) already filed by the petitioner and the Supplementary Appeal, if any, pass a reasoned order as expeditiously as possible preferably within six weeks thereafter. Till such time, the order dated April 25, 2016 shall not be given effect to. It is also made clear in view of the undertaking given by the petitioner in W.P.(C) No. 4394/2016 the petitioner shall not indulge in any strike or dharna or agitation or coercive action in future in connection with the issue, till such time the proceedings between the parties attain finality. No costs.

CM No. 32748/2016 (for stay)

Dismissed as infructuous.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

OCTOBER 12, 2017/ak