



W.A.(MD) No.96 of 2026

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 27.01.2026

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE G.JAYACHANDRAN
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN**

W.A.(MD) No.96 of 2026

and

C.M.P.(MD) No.1024 of 2026

- 1.The Vice-Chancellor
Prist University
Trichy – Thanjavur Highway Vallam
Thanjavur-613 403, Thanjavur District
- 2.The Registrar
Prist University
Trichy-Thanjavur Highway Vallam
Thanjavur-613 403
Thanjavur District
- 3.The Director cum Dean
Prist University
Madurai Campus
Madurai – Sivagangai Road
Arasanoor, Sivagangai District

... Appellants

-VS-

- 1.A.Jenifer Parvin



W.A.(MD) No.96 of 2026

WEB COPY

2.The University Grand Commissioner (UGC)
Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg
New Delhi-110 002

3.Dr.Srinivasan
Former Director cum Dean
Prist University
Madurai – Sivagangai Road
Arasanoor, Sivagangai District

4.Kalpana
In-Charge LL.M. 2021 – 2022 Batch
Prist University
Madurai Campus
Madurai – Sivagangai Road
Arasanoor, Sivagangai District
Now residing at
No.10-2-26, Kumaran Street
Oormatchikulam, Samayanallur Post
Madurai District

... Respondents

Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of Letters Patent to set aside the order, dated 18.11.2024, passed in W.P.(MD) No.16608 of 2024, on the file of this Court.

For Appellants : Mr.O.S.Thilak Pasumbadiyar

For Respondents : Mr.C.Jeyaprakash for R1



WEB COPY

W.A.(MD) No.96 of 2026

J U D G M E N T

[Judgment of the Court was made by DR.G.JAYACHANDRAN, J.]

Challenging the order dated 18.11.2024, passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.(MD) No.16608 of 2024, the appellant – University has preferred this writ appeal.

2. According to the first respondent / writ petitioner, the appellant – University, which offered two year LL.M. course, has extended the course period beyond the two years' period and in consequence there of, as a practicing lawyer, she is not able to continue the course and hence, she filed the writ petition seeking refund of the course fee paid by her.

3. The learned Single Judge, *vide* order dated 18.11.2024, considering the limited scope of the relief sought, without going into the merits of the case, directed the appellant – University to consider the representation of the writ petitioner dated 07.06.2024 and pass appropriate orders in the matter of refund of course fee to the writ petitioner, within a period of one week, from the date of receipt of a copy of the order and further directed the



W.A.(MD) No.96 of 2026

appellant – University to forthwith return the original academic certificates of the writ petitioner to her. Challenging the same, the University has preferred the present writ appeal.

4. It is brought to the notice of this Court by the learned counsel appearing for the first respondent / writ petitioner that in spite of the specific direction issued by the learned Single Judge, the appellant – University has neither refunded the course fee nor returned the original academic certificates to the writ petitioner.

5. This Court, on considering the nature of the dispute between the appellant – University and the first respondent / writ petitioner, is of the view that the University cannot withhold the original academic certificates produced by the students at the time of joining the course and at the same time, the student can also not seek refund of the course fee for the period which he / she had already undergone. Hence, on the last hearing i.e., 21.01.2026, when the matter came up for condonation of the delay in filing the appeal, this Court directed the appellant – University to produce the original academic certificates of the writ petitioner and handover the same to her by the next date of hearing. Pursuant to the said direction, today, when



W.A.(MD) No.96 of 2026

WEB COPY

the matter is taken up for hearing, learned counsel appearing for the appellant – University submitted that the appellant – University has produced all the original academic certificates of the writ petitioner to her.

6. Learned counsel appearing for the first respondent / writ petition has not disputed the above submission of the learned counsel appearing for the appellant – University.

7. Recording the above submission, this writ appeal is disposed of. It is needless to state that there shall not be any further claim from the first respondent / writ petitioner insofar as refund of course fee is concerned, since course fee is being collected by the University for the service already rendered by them. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

[G.J., J.]

[K.K.R.K., J.]

27.01.2026

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

krk



WEB COPY



W.A.(MD) No.96 of 2026

DR.G.JAYACHANDRAN, J.
AND
K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN, J.

krk

W.A.(MD) No.96 of 2026
and
C.M.P.(MD) No.1024 of 2026

27.01.2026