



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1794 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Reserved on : 25.10.2025

Delivered on : 30.10.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.MURALI SHANKAR

W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1794 of 2025

and

W.M.P.Crl.(MD)Nos.422 and 423 of 2025

Dr.K.Jeganathan

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Higher Education Department,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The Additional Chief Secretary/Vigilance Commissioner
and Commissioner for Administrative Reforms,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
- 3.The Director,
Directorate of Vigilance and Anti-Corruption (DVAC)
Chennai – 600 016.
- 4.Bharathidasan University,
through its Syndicate Chairman/Vice Chancellor,
Thiruchirappalli.



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1794 of 2025

5.The Registrar,
Bharathidasan University,
Thiruchirappalli – 620 024.

6.The State Project Director,
RUSA (Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan)
DOTE Campus, Guindy, Chennai – 600 025.

7.The Principal Accountant General,
O/o.The Accountant General (A& E)
361, Annal Salai Teynampet.
Chennai – 600 018, Tamil Nadu.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records relating to the impugned 256th Syndicate meeting of BDU held on 22.09.2025 vide resolution Item No.2025.39 of the respondents 4 and 5 and quash the same and consequently, direct the respondents not to proceed with any detailed enquiry, investigation, or proceedings against the petitioner based on the DVAC report or the impugned Syndicate resolution, in any manner whatsoever.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Prabhu Rajadurai,
for Mr.J.Anand Kumar.

For Respondents : Mr.T.Amjad Khan,
Government Advocate (Civil Side)
for R1, R2 and R6

: Mr.S.Ravi,
Additional Public Prosecutor, for R3.

: Mr.V.R.Shanmuganathan, for R4 and R5.



WEB COPY



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1794 of 2025

: Mr.G.Karthick, for R7.

ORDER

This Writ Petition is directed against the resolution passed in impugned 256th Syndicate meeting of Bharathidasan University held on 22.09.2025 vide Item No.2025.39 of the respondents 4 and 5 and for consequential direction to the respondents not to proceed with any enquiry, investigation, or proceedings against the petitioner based on the DVAC report or the impugned Syndicate resolution.

2.The writ petitioner, a Professor of Physics at Bharathidasan University, Trichy, boasts an unblemished 17-year service record. He has held various esteemed positions, including Director, Centre for Nano Science & Nano Technology, Chair, School of Physics, and Member of the Syndicate nominated by the Governor-Chancellor. Appointed as Coordinator, Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA) on January 31, 2017, with a purely liaising role and no independent financial or administrative powers, the petitioner successfully utilized RUSA Phase-I funds of Rs. 25 crores for infrastructure development. This earned the



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1794 of 2025

University the RUSA Star award from the Government of Tamil Nadu for efficient implementation. Subsequently, Rs. 50 crores was sanctioned for RUSA Phase-II in 2018 for research and innovation projects. Despite financial decisions being taken by competent authorities and ratified by the Syndicate, certain audit observations by the Accountant General in September 2023 were misrepresented, leading to false allegations and media reports. The Vice-Chancellor and Public Works Department provided clarifications, and an internal enquiry found no irregularities. However, respondents 4 and 5 relied on an unverified DVAC report dated 18.02.2024, to initiate proceedings, wrongly implicating the petitioner. The fourth respondent granted permission for further enquiry against the petitioner and another professor, prompting the petitioner to file this Writ Petition.

3.The fifth respondent filed a counter affidavit, specifically in support of the writ petitioner.

4. Heard Mr.G.Prabhu Rajadurai, learned counsel appearing for the writ petitioner ; Mr.T.Amjad Khan, learned Government Advocate (Civil Side) appearing for the first respondent; Mr.S.Ravi, learned Additional



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1794 of 2025

Public Prosecutor appearing for the third respondent ;

Mr.V.R.Shanmuganathan, learned counsel appearing for the respondents 4 and 5 and Mr. G.Karthick, learned counsel appearing for the seventh respondent.

5.It is not in dispute that the State project Director, RUSA and the Principal Secretary, Government of Tamil Nadu, Higher Education Department, constituted an Enquiry Committee vide proceedings in R.C.No.1253/RUSA/2023, dated 12.01.2024 to find out whether any irregularities were committed in the RUSA activities at Bharathidasan University and to submit a report. It is also not in dispute that the said Committee has yet to submit its report.

6.The learned counsel for the writ petitioner would submit that the fifth respondent, without awaiting the report from the Enquiry Committee constituted specifically to investigate the veracity of the complaint, dated 20.11.2023 and determine in any irregularities occurred in RUSA activities, but by only taking note of the report of DVAC and the letter sent by the first respondent, has passed the impugned resolution, demonstrating a complete lack of application of mind.



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1794 of 2025

WEB COPY

7.The allegations were levelled against the two professors and since the second suspected officer Dr.N.Prasanna, died in a road accident, the sanction was granted against the other suspected officer, the writ petitioner herein.

8.The fifth respondent in the counter affidavit has specifically stated that there was no misappropriation nor mishandling of RUSA funds occurred in Bharathidasan University and that in compliance of the directions given by the first respondent vide his letter, dated 29.06.2024, the University has passed a Syndicate Resolution No.2025.39, dated 22.09.2025 granting permission to DVAC to conduct further enquiry under Section 17 A (1) of Prevention of Corruption (Amendment) Act 2018 with regard to the allegation in the report submitted by the DVAC.

9.The learned counsel appearing for the respondents 4 and 5 would submit that in pursuance of the directions of the Secretary to Government, Higher Education Department, the fifth respondent was constrained to pass the impugned resolution and that the University has already clarified that there was no misappropriation of RUSA funds nor any irregularities in RUSA activities at their campus.



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1794 of 2025

WEB COPY

10. The learned Government Advocate (Civil Side) appearing for the first respondent would submit that the Additional Chief Secretary/Vigilance Commissioner requested the Principal Secretary to Government, Higher Education Department, Chennai for considering DVAC report and to take appropriate decisions regarding grant of prior approval at Government level as per Section 17 A (1) of Prevention of Corruption (Amendment) Act 2018 for conducting a detailed enquiry against the two suspect officers in respect of the allegation as detailed in the vigilance report and that in pursuance of the said communication, the first respondent sent a D.O.Letter No.930/H2/2024-I, dated 29.06.2024 to the Registrar, Bharathidasan University/fifth respondent requesting him to place the report of the Directorate of Vigilance and Anti Corruption before the Syndicate and take appropriate action and inform the decision taken to DVAC as requested therein within time frame and also sent action taken report to the Government immediately and that the Government has not compelled the University to pass the impugned resolution and only directed them to consider the DVAC report and take a decision with regard to the granting of permission for detailed enquiry.



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1794 of 2025

11.As rightly pointed out by the learned Government Advocate (Civil Side) appearing for the first respondent, in the D.O letter, dated 29.06.2024, the first respondent has only requested the fifth respondent to place the DVAC report before the Syndicate and to take appropriate action.

12. Notably, the Government cannot dictate a University Syndicate to pass a resolution or make decisions. As a Statutory body, the Syndicate is the highest executive body for University management and decision making and it is expected to independently decide issues brought before it, free from the directions by the Government or any other authority.

13. In the present case, as aptly pointed out by the learned counsel for the writ petitioner, the fifth respondent prematurely passed the impugned resolution, relying solely on the DVAC report without awaiting the enquiry committee's report, which was specifically constituted for this purpose.

14. This Court concurs with the learned counsel for the writ petitioner's contention that the impugned resolution was passed without application of mind, warranting its quashment.



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1794 of 2025

WEB COPY

15.The learned Government Advocate (Civil Side) appearing for the first respondent would submit that they are expecting the report of the enquiry committee shortly.

16. In light of the above, the fourth respondent is directed to consider the requisition of respondents 1 and 2 afresh, based on the DVAC report, the enquiry committee's report, and other relevant materials. The first respondent shall forward the enquiry committee's report to the fifth respondent immediately upon receipt. The fifth respondent shall then place the matter before the fourth respondent, who shall consider it afresh and decide whether to grant permission for a detailed enquiry.

17. The first respondent is directed to expedite the enquiry committee's report within two weeks from the date of receipt of this order and forward it to the fifth respondent within a week. The fifth respondent shall place the matter before the fourth respondent within a week of receiving the report. The fourth respondent shall consider and decide within two weeks thereafter.

9/12



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1794 of 2025

WEB COPY

18. With these directions, the Writ Petition is disposed of. No costs. The connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

30.10.2025

NCC :Yes/No
Index :Yes/No
Internet : Yes/ No
das

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Higher Education Department,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The Additional Chief Secretary/Vigilance Commissioner
and Commissioner for Administrative Reforms,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.
- 3.The Director,
Directorate of Vigilance and Anti-Corruption (DVAC)
Chennai – 600 016.
- 4.Bharathidasan University,
through its Syndicate Chairman/Vice Chancellor,
Thiruchirappalli.



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1794 of 2025

WEB COPY

- 5.The Registrar,
Bharathidasan University,
Thiruchirappalli – 620 024.
- 6.The State Project Director,
RUSA (Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan)
DOTE Campus, Guindy, Chennai – 600 025.
- 7.The Principal Accountant General,
O/o.The Accountant General (A& E)
361, Annal Salai Teynampet.
Chennai – 600 018, Tamil Nadu.



WEB COPY



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1794 of 2025

K.MURALI SHANKAR, J

das

Pre-delivery order made in
W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1794 of 2025
and
W.P.M.P.Crl.(MD)Nos.422 and 423 of 2025

Dated : 30.10.2025