



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 06.04.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE HEMANT CHANDANGOUDAR

W.P.(MD)No.2456 of 2026
and W.M.P(MD)Nos.1989 and 1998 of 2026

Naresh Ashok Menon

.. Petitioner

- Vs. -

1. Indian Institute of Management Tiruchirappalli,
(An Institute of National Importance Under the Ministry of Education,
Government of India),
Rep. by its Director,
Tiruchirappalli- 620 024.

2. The Director,
Indian Institute of Management Tiruchirappalli,
Tiruchirappalli - 620 024.

3. The Dean (Academics),
Indian Institute of Management Tiruchirappalli,
Tiruchirappalli - 620 024.

4. The Chairperson – PGPM,
Indian Institute of Management Tiruchirappalli,
Tiruchirappalli - 620 024.

.. Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this court to issue a WRIT OF CERTIORARIFIED MANDAMUS calling for the records relating to the impugned proceedings passed by the 4th Respondent dated 04.01.2026 whereby the Petitioner has been declared



ineligible to register for Semester III of the Post Graduate Programme in Management (PGPM) and has been directed to undergo a year back for the course Operations Research for Managers (ORM), and quash the same as illegal, arbitrary and unconstitutional, and consequently direct the Respondents to declare that the Petitioner has successfully completed and passed the said course and permit him to continue his studies along with his batch 2025-2027.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.S.Ramakrishnan

For Respondents : Mr.Raghuvaran Gopalan
Standing Counsel

ORDER

The petitioner is before this Court assailing the proceedings dated 04.01.2026 issued by the fourth respondent, whereby the petitioner's request for registration in Term-III of the PGPM course conducted by the respondent institution was rejected. The rejection was on the ground that the petitioner did not meet the minimum attendance requirement for the Term-II course, namely "Operations Research for Managers (ORM)," for the academic year 2025–2026.

2. The petitioner admittedly fell short of the prescribed minimum attendance for appearing in the Term-II ORM examination. However, the petitioner was permitted to appear for both the mid-term and end-term examinations. On that basis, the petitioner contends that the denial of



registration for Term-III is arbitrary and discriminatory.

WEB COPY

3. The learned counsel for the respondents, referring to the Student Manual applicable to the PGM 2024–2026 and PGPM 2025–2027 batches, submitted that Clause 2.8.2 clearly stipulates that if a student misses more than 25% of classes in a core course, for whatever reason, he/she is required to repeat the course in the next academic year. Consequently, the petitioner, having fallen short of the attendance requirement, is not eligible for registration in Term-III.

4. Heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials available on record.

5. It is not in dispute that the petitioner had only 65% attendance in the Term-II ORM course. Though the petitioner was permitted to appear for the mid-term and end-term examinations, such permission does not confer any right to claim automatic progression to the next term.

6. Clause 2.8.2 of the Student Manual mandates that if a student misses more than 25% of classes in a core course, he/she must repeat the course in the next academic year, and consequently, would not be permitted to register for



subsequent terms unless all requirements, including minimum attendance, are fulfilled. The clause also provides a limited relaxation where attendance falls between 50% and 75%, but only in exceptional circumstances such as medical emergencies, bereavement, or placement-related commitments.

7. In the present case, the reasons for shortage of attendance are partly attributable to the petitioner's suspension for consumption of psychotropic substances in the hostel premises and partly due to late attendance. These reasons do not fall within the exceptional categories contemplated under Clause 2.8.2 for grant of relaxation.

8. Merely because the petitioner was permitted to write the examinations does not give him a right to seek registration in Term-III. Such permission cannot be treated as a relaxation of the mandatory attendance requirement.

9. The PGPM course is a professional programme, and the respondent institution is entitled to enforce its academic rules, including minimum attendance. Since the petitioner has not satisfied the attendance requirement, he cannot claim registration as a matter of right.



10. Further, it is noted that Term-III of the PGPM course commenced on 05.01.2026 and concluded on 20.03.2026. In such circumstances, no relief can be granted at this stage.

11. In the absence of any arbitrariness or discrimination in the impugned proceedings, this Court finds no merit in the writ petition.

12. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

06.04.2026

Index :Yes/No
NCC :Yes/No
PJL

To

1. Indian Institute of Management Tiruchirappalli,
(An Institute of National Importance Under the Ministry of Education,
Government of India),Rep. by its Director,
Tiruchirappalli- 620 024.

2. The Director, Indian Institute of Management Tiruchirappalli,
Tiruchirappalli - 620 024.

3. The Dean (Academics),Indian Institute of Management Tiruchirappalli,
Tiruchirappalli - 620 024.

4. The Chairperson – PGPM,
Indian Institute of Management Tiruchirappalli,
Tiruchirappalli - 620 024.



WEB COPY



HEMANT CHANDANGOUDAR, J.

PJL

W.P.(MD)No.2456 of 2026

06.04.2026