



WEB COPY



W.P.No.15762 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Delivered On: 07.07.2025

Reserved On: 02.07.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

W.P.No.15762 of 2025

And

W.M.P.No.23822 of 2025

- 1.M.Tamilselvan
- 2.V.S.Vaishnav
- 3.S.Karthikeyan
- 4.P.Divakar
- 5.E.Madhumetha
- 6.B.Thatchaini
- 7.N.Kavya
- 8.S.Sai kirupa
- 9.R.Rajeshwari

... Petitioners

Vs.

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Higher Education Department
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The Anna University,
Rep. by its Registrar,
Sardar Patel Road,
Chennai – 600 025.
- 3.The Dean
Anna University Regional Campus Coimbatore,
Coimbatore.

- 4.Dr.M.Saravanakumar

... Respondents



W.P.No.15762 of 2025

WEB COPY

Prayer:

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents 1 and 2 to constitute an enquiry committee consisting of independent members not directly connected to the third respondent campus to enquire into the complaints made by the petitioners against the fourth respondent and take action accordingly within a time frame fixed by this Hon'ble Court.

For Petitioners : M/s.N.Kavitha Rameshwar

For Respondents : Mr.C.Jayaprakash for R1
Government Advocate
Mr.U.Bharanidharan for R2 to R4
Standing Counsel for Anna University

ORDER

The petitioners have filed this petition seeking issuance of Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents 1 and 2 to constitute an enquiry committee consisting of independent members not directly connected to the third respondent campus to enquire into the complaints made by the petitioners against the fourth respondent and take action accordingly within a time frame.

2.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit



W.P.No.15762 of 2025

that the petitioners are the students studying MBA second year at Anna University Regional Campus, Coimbatore and they are now pursuing final semester. It is the further submission of the petitioners that for the project work, one Dr.J.Venkatesh was chosen as the guide as per the University Circular dated 21.11.2024, and he has been discharging his duty as a guide effectively. The learned counsel would further submit that Dr.J.Venkatesh is having issue with the fourth respondent who is the Dean of the College, and that Dr.J.Venkatesh has made various allegations against the fourth respondent. The learned counsel would further submit that the fourth respondent had intimidated the petitioners on account of personal animacy with their guide Dr.J.Venkatesh and that they are now in the last phase of their education and they have to complete the final project work. If the final project work is conducted at Coimbatore Campus, the fourth respondent being the Dean, would wreck vengeance against them and the same would cause serious prejudice to them, and that their complaint has to be enquired by the Officers from Anna University at Chennai.

3.Per contra, the learned Standing Counsel would contend that the present petition is the proxy litigation of Dr.J.Venkatesh. Taking



W.P.No.15762 of 2025

advantage of the fact that he being the guide to these petitioners, he has instigated the petitioners to file the present writ petition. It is the further submission of the learned Standing Counsel that Dr.J.Venkatesh has been continuously making baseless and defamatory allegation and that the petitioners being soft prey to him, had made use of them to file the instant frivolous petition. Hence prayed to dismiss the writ petition.

4.I have given my anxious consideration to either side submissions.

5.Though it was initially argued for the main prayer, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners has restricted their prayer to the extent to conduct project review to the petitioners at Chennai instead of Coimbatore. It is their submission that since the petitioners being in the last phase of their education, they have to submit the final project review and if the project review is conducted at Coimbatore Campus, it would seriously prejudice their interest as the Dean would prevail upon the members of the Review Committee and see to it they would not pass in the review which would cause dent in their educational trajectory. Hence would content that their project review



W.P.No.15762 of 2025

may ordered to be conducted at Chennai.

WEB COPY

6.This contention was stoutly objected by the learned Standing Counsel appearing for the Anna University and he would contend that the fourth respondent is not a member of the Project Review Committee and he is only an appropriate person being the Head of the Institution to select the Committee members for review. He would also rely upon the Anna University Regulations, 2021 Clause 6.1. For ready reference, the same is extracted hereunder:

"There shall be three assessments (each 100 marks) during the Semester by a review committee. The student shall make presentation on the progress made before the Committee. The Head of the Institution shall constitute the review committee for each programme. The review committee consists of Supervisor, Expert from the Department and a Project Coordinator from the Department. If the Project Coordinator / Expert Member happens to be the Supervisor then an alternate member shall be nominated."

7.According to the above Regulation, the fourth respondent has to select the members as he being the Head of the Institution.



W.P.No.15762 of 2025

Therefore, the question of prejudice cannot be prosecuted against him, as he has no role in reviewing their project, except simply nominating the members for Review Committee. The learned Standing Counsel has also invited the attention of this Court that the petitioners guide Dr.J.Venkatesh was also made as Supervisor to the Review Committee. Hence, as contended by the learned Standing Counsel all the apprehensions of the petitioners become insignificant in view of the presence of Dr.J.Venkatesh, against whom the petitioners have high regard and no complaints. Apart from that to further the interest of the students qua the petitioners, the respondents have also agreed to observe the proceedings of the Review Committee meeting from Chennai by the Director of Academics, Chennai, through video conferencing.

8.The submissions of the learned Standing Counsel appears to be fair. Though this Court does not find any merit in the petition, keeping the interest of petitioners' academics, would like to direct them to appear before the re-constituted Review Committee which includes Dr.J.Venkatesh as Supervisor, to submit their final project reviews. As agreed by the University, they are directed to make arrangement to observe the proceedings of the Review Committee by



W.P.No.15762 of 2025

Director of Academics, Chennai, through video conferencing. The respondents are directed to fix review meeting schedule well in advance, preferably giving not less than one week time to the petitioners for preparation, and such exercise has to be commenced forthwith after receipt of the copy of this order.

9. With the above direction, the writ petition is disposed of. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

07.07.2025

pri

Index: Yes/ No
Speaking Order/ Non Speaking Order
NCC: Yes/ No

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
Higher Education Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai – 600 009.
2. The Anna University,
Rep. by its Registrar,
Sardar Patel Road,
Chennai – 600 025.
3. The Dean
Anna University Regional Campus Coimbatore,
Coimbatore.

7/8



WEB COPY



W.P.No.15762 of 2025

C.KUMARAPPAN,J.
pri

**Pre-delivery Order in
W.P.No.15762 of 2025
And
W.M.P.No.23822 of 2025**

07.07.2025



WEB COPY



W.P.No.15762 of 2025