



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 05-02-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY

W.P.No.6106 of 2025

1. Rosinamol Roy,
(Student Representative - Central
University of Kerala)
Moongamackal (h),
Thankamany (po),
Idukki, Kerala- 685 609.

2.Thasnim S. Nizar
(Theatre Trainer Representative - Alumni
Central University of Kerala)
Shanthibhavan,
Near SMAUP School Panayal Kasaragod,
Kerala - 671 318.

...Petitioners

Vs

1. Association of Indian Universities (AIU)
(Represented by its President/Organizing Secretary)
AIU House, New Delhi.

2.SRM University, Chennai
(Represented by Organizing Committee of the
38th South Zone Inter- University Youth Festival)

...Respondents

PRAYER:

Writ Petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the 2nd respondent to review the event again using the video recording available to the committee.



For Petitioners

No appearance

For Respondents

Mr.B.Ramasamy for R1
M/s.B.Saraswathi and
K.R.Anandavalli for R2

ORDER

This writ petition is filed for Mandamus directing the second respondent to review the event again using the video recording available to the Committee and to pass such further or other orders.

2. Upon perusal of the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition and the material records of the case, it can be seen that the petitioners are aggrieved by the fact that after participating in the cultural competition for selection of One Act Play to be performed at the National Level and when the South Zone selection took place at the second respondent-University, in spite of the petitioners performing extraordinary well, they were not selected. It is alleged that since repeatedly they were garnering glories, out of professional jealousy, the Committee had wilfully not selected them. If the video recording that is available is reconsidered, the same will come to light and hence, the prayer.

3. As far as the second respondent-University is concerned, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the second respondent-University would submit that except for



providing the venue, it is not the second respondent-University or its authorities, what considered or selected the play.

WEB COPY

4. It can be seen that the prayer is made wrongly against the second respondent-University. In any event, the Court would have granted the prayer as against the first respondent also to review the matter, but it can be seen that the main grievance was that the petitioners can take part at the National level which was to be conducted at Amity University, New Delhi in the month of March 2025. It can be seen that the same is also now over, and therefore, at this belated point of time, no useful purpose will be served in further keeping the matter pending or in going through the video recording, if any, available also.

5. In view of efflux of time, the Writ Petition does not require further adjudication. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is disposed of. No costs.

05-02-2026

Neutral Citation:No
ari



WEB COPY



D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

ari

W.P.No.6106 of 2025

05.02.2026



WEB COPY

