



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 09.02.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE R.VIJAYAKUMAR

W.P.(MD)No.3243 of 2026

and

W.M.P(MD)Nos.2671 & 2674 of 2026

R.Thennarasi

...Petitioner

Vs

1.The Principal Secretary to the Government,
Higher Education Department,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.

2. The Syndicate,
Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Abishekapatti,
Tirunelveli - 627 012.
Represented through its Vice Chancellor.

3. The Internal Complaints Committee (POSH),
Manonmaniam Sundaranar University,
Abishekapatti,
Tirunelveli - 627 012.

4. The Registrar,
Manonmaniam Sundaranar University,
Abishekapatti,
Tirunelveli - 627 012.

5. Vinod Vincent Rajesh,
Professor,
University,
Abishekapatti,
Tirunelveli - 627 012.

Assistant
Manonmaniamsundaranar

...Respondents



PRAYER: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records relating to the impugned final report dated 12.01.2016 submitted by the 3rd Respondent, minutes dated 01.02.2016 of Syndicate i.e., 2nd Respondent and order dated 25.02.2016 passed by the 4th Respondent and quash the same as being illegal, arbitrary, violative of and vitiated the purpose and object of the provisions of the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 and principles of natural justice, and further to direct the Respondents 1 to 4 to initiating appropriate disciplinary proceedings against the 5th respondent in the light of preliminary report dated 14.08.2015 and other evidences/statements given by the students from the 1st year M.A., 2nd years M.A., M.Phil students and research scholars before the 3rd respondent.

For Petitioner	: M/s.V.Rajiv Rufus
For Respondents	: Mr.N.Satheesh Kumar Additional Government Pleader for R1 M/s.H.Jasima Yashmin for M/s.Ajmal Associates for R2 to R4

* * * * *

ORDER

The present writ petition has been filed challenging the final report dated 12.01.2016 submitted by the third respondent herein with regard to the allegations raised as against the 5th respondent.



2. As far as the furnishing a final report is concerned, the petitioner had approached this Court in W.P(MD)No.21194 of 2017, seeking a mandamus directing the respondents 2 and 3 to provide information sought for by the writ petitioner with regard to the action initiated as against the 5th respondent. The writ petition came to be disposed of on 17.11.2017 directing the Public Information Officer of the respondent University to provide all the details relating to the action initiated as against the 5th respondent. Alleging violation of the orders of this Court dated 17.11.2017, the petitioner has preferred Cont.P(MD)No.1801 of 2018. The Contempt Petition came to be disposed of on 05.08.2019 with an observation that the petitioner has been provided with the copy of the orders dated 12.01.2016 and 25.02.2016. Therefore, it is clear that the petitioner was having access to these two orders, which are now impugned in the writ petition after a period of 7 years.

3. As could be seen from the records that the petitioner if at all so aggrieved with the orders, she has got a statutory appeal remedy under Section 18 of the Central Act 14 of 2013.

4. The learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the delay has occurred only due to the fact that the supporting records were furnished to him only in the year 2025.



5. The petitioner has also filed W.P(MD)Nos.5415 and 5426 of 2017 before this Court seeking a mandamus for initiating departmental action as against the 5th respondent for committing offences under the Central Act 14 of 2013. This writ petition came to be disposed of on 11.03.2021. Paragraph Nos. 3 to 5 are hereby extracted as follows:-

“3. With regard to the initiation of departmental proceedings against the erred Professor, already the Syndicate passed a resolution that (i) his period of suspension to be treated as punishment and he is to be reinstated immediately, (ii) stoppage of two increments without cumulative effect and (iii) severely warned not to repeat.

4. If the petitioner not being satisfied with the punishment imposed by the Syndicate, liberty is granted to the petitioner to file an appeal before the appellate authority for major punishment, on the ground that the offence committed by the second respondent is not tolerable one .

5. With the above observation and direction, these writ petitions are disposed of. No costs. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.”

6. In view of the above said facts, it is clear that if the petitioner wishes to challenge the final report dated 12.01.2016, she has to prefer an appeal under Section 18 of Act 14 of 2013. In case if the petitioner is aggrieved over the quantum of punishment imposed by the 5th respondent, it is for her to approach the appellate authority as directed by this Court on 11.03.2021 in W.P(MD)Nos. 5415 and 5426 of 2017. The petitioner cannot consolidate these two prayers to



file another writ petition.

WEB COPY

7. With the above said observations, this writ petition stands disposed of.

No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are also closed.

09.02.2026

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
RJR

To

The Principal Secretary to the Government,
Higher Education Department,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.



WEB COPY



R.VIJAYAKUMAR, J.

RJR

W.P.(MD)No.3243 of 2026

09.02.2026