

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
BANGALORE BENCH**

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. No.170/00390/2017

DATED THIS THE 5th DAY OF MARCH 2020

HON'BLE DR. K.B. SURESH, MEMBER (J)

HON'BLE SHRI CV. SANKAR, MEMBER (A)

Praveen Kumar PV
S/o Narayanan V,
Aged about 33 years,
Working as Senior Technical
Assistant 'B' (now under the order
of reposition to the lower
post of Technician 'A') ADE
MMD Division, Bangalore. 560075
and R/at, C 29/2 Phase I
DRDO Township, CV Raman Nagar,
Bangalore. 560093.Applicant

(By Advocate Shri Subrahmanyam Bhat)

vs.

1.Union of India,
Ministry of Defence,
Government of India,
DRDO Bhavan,
'A' Block, DRDO Bhavan,
Rajaji Marg,
New Delhi-110 011.

2.The Director General
(Aero), Defence Research and
Development Organization,
Ministry of Defence,
ADE Campus, New Thippasandra
New Delhi-110 075.

3.Director
Aeronautical Development
Establishment, Defence Research
Development Organization,

Ministry of Defence,
Government of India,
New Thippasandra
Bengaluru 75.

...Respondents.

(By Shri Vishnu Bhat... Senior Panel Counsel)

ORDER

HON'BLE DR. K.B. SURESH, MEMBER(J)

1. The matter seems to be covered by the judgement of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala at Ernakulam in WP.(C) No.9779/2014 (S) dated 20.12.2014 produced as R-17 by the respondents which we quote:-

"IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

*THE HONOURABLE THE AG.CHIEF JUSTICE MR.ASHOK BHUSHAN
&
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.M.SHAFFIQUE*

SATURDAY, THE 20TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2014/29TH AGRAHAYANA, 1936

WP(C).NO. 9779 OF 2014 (S)

*ASHOK BHUSHAN, Ag. C.J.
And
A.M. SHAFFIQUE, J.*

W.P(C) No.9779 of 2014

=====

Dated this the 20th day of December, 2014

J U D G M E N T

Ashok Bhushan, Ag. C.J.

This Writ Petition has been filed as a public interest litigation. The first petitioner, an Associate Professor, is the member of Senate of the University of Calicut and the second petitioner is a prominent social activist in Malappuram District, where the Calicut University situates. Both the petitioners, by this public interest litigation, have highlighted the sordid state of affairs in the University and are complaining the extra jurisdictional acts of the respondents in operating beyond the territorial limits of the University by operating in various foreign countries.

2. The public interest litigation was entertained by this Court and notices were issued to respondents 8 to 31, which are study centres overseas permitted by the University of Calicut. Some of the respondents overseas have been served with notices and notices with regard to some of the centres had not been served. Learned Standing Counsel appearing for the University accepted notice for respondents 1 to 4 and 32. A counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of the fifth respondent Chancellor of the University of Calicut. The University Grants Commission (for short, "the UGC"), 7th respondent, is also represented by the counsel, who has filed a detailed statement.

3. The facts of the case, which emerged from pleadings of the parties are: The State Legislature enacted the Calicut University Act, 1975 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act') to reorganise the University of Calicut with a view to establishing a teaching, residential and affiliating University for the northern districts of the State of Kerala. Section 4 of the Act provides for territorial limits. According to Section 4(1) of the Act, the jurisdiction of the University shall extend to the revenue districts of Cannanore, Kozhikode, Malappuram, Palghat and Thrissur of the State. The petitioners in the Writ Petition have pleaded that the first respondent, who is functioning as the Vice-Chancellor, is not only mismanaging and misconducting the affairs of the University, but also conducting grave financial irregularities, flouting the University Act and the Statute. It is stated that contravening the provisions of Section 4 of the Act, respondents 1 to 4 colluded together in granting illegal approvals and affiliations to 24 private counseling centres overseas run by respondents 8 to 31. The UGC is vested with the authority to co-

ordinate and determine the standards of higher education in the country by an Act of Parliament. The UGC time and again has reiterated that no University should go beyond the territorial jurisdiction. Public notices and several notifications were issued by the UGC in that regard. It is stated that the University by distance mode of education cannot operate beyond its territorial limits of jurisdiction. It is pleaded that respondents 1 to 4 have granted permissions to respondents 8 to 31 to run study centres after entering into an MoU, which has been withheld by respondents 1 to 4 from this Court. The second respondent has visited UAE as a sales executive. Allegations have been made that vigilance enquiry is pending against the second respondent and respondents 1 and 2 are not fit persons to hold the post of Vice-Chancellor and Pro-Vice-Chancellor. In the Writ Petition the following reliefs have been claimed:

- "1) issue a writ of certiorari, or any other appropriate writ, order or direction to call for records relating to Exhibits P7, P8, P8(a), P8(b), P8(c), P8(d) and P8(e) and to quash the same.*
- 2) issue a writ of mandamus compelling the respondents 8 to 31 to close down their off- shore campuses operating on the basis of the illegal grant of approvals and affiliations given by the respondents 1 to 4.*
- 3) issue a writ of mandamus or other appropriate writ, order or direction to the 5th respondent to remove the respondents 1 to 4 from their respective posts in the University for their mismanagement, misbehaviour, maladministration, fraudulent acts and abuse of powers and to order appropriate legal action against the respondents 1 to 4."*
- 4. A counter affidavit has been filed by the University, where it has been pleaded that the University, through the School of Distance Education, is offering contact classes and distributing study material. Respondents 8 to 31 are not at all affiliated to the University, but they are only the selected centres, which are permitted to help the students in the matter of tuition, enrollment, examinations etc. The counter affidavit refers to the above centre as "purely as a private parallel institution, helping and guiding the student community in their effort to become a Graduate/Post*

Graduate". The students do not physically be present in the University for examination and the University of Calicut conducts examination in overseas. In the counter affidavit the list of approved counselling/programme centres issued by the University of Calicut (School of Distance Education) has been filed giving list of its various centres in the State and details of 25 centres overseas.

5. A statement has been filed by the UGC stating that provisional recognition to the University for offering programmes through distance mode was granted by erstwhile Distance Education Council of the Indira Gandhi National Open University, New Delhi. The erstwhile Distance Education Council, from time to time, issued directions that the University can offer programmes within the State. Reference of letter dated 17.10.2009 has been made by the UGC. Notification of the UGC dated 16.04.2009 has also been referred and quoted, which clearly directed to all the Universities in the State from not operating beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the State in any manner either in the form of off campus/study centre at the affiliated College or through franchisees. The decision has been taken by the UGC and communicated to all concerned that the State University shall operate only within the territorial jurisdiction allotted to it under its Act and in no case beyond the territory of the State of its location. Details of various notifications have been referred to in the Statute, which have been brought on record, including notification dated 23.08.2013 that no University can offer its programmes through franchising arrangement with private coaching institutions even for the purpose of conducting courses through distance mode.

6. We have heard Sri.P.K.Muhammed, learned counsel for the petitioners, Sri.S.Krishnamoorthy, Standing Counsel for the UGC, Sri.Santosh Mathew, Standing Counsel for the Calicut University and the learned Senior Government Pleader.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that respondents 1 to 4 and 32 are acting in breach of provisions of the Act and Statute as well as the directions issued by the UGC by operating several study centres overseas through which various courses and

degrees are awarded. It is submitted that as per Section 4 of the Act, the University cannot operate beyond the territorial jurisdiction even by Distance Education Programme. It is submitted that in essence, the University has permitted such centres/franchisees out of the country and given them every authority to conduct admission, give tuition, hold examination for various degrees and programmes of the Calicut University. In spite of various notifications and directions issued by the Distance Education Council and the UGC, asking all Universities to desist from opening a study centre even for distance education beyond the territorial jurisdiction, the Calicut University has not only defied such direction, but undauntedly proceeding with its study centre violating all statutory provisions, norms and guidelines. The University authorities are acting in most

arbitrary and fanciful manner in carrying out the above design. It is further submitted that various misdeeds and misconducts have been committed by the Vice-Chancellor and Pro-Vice-Chancellor with regard to which Members of the Senate have submitted a detailed memorandum to His Excellency the Government of Kerala, who is the Chancellor of the University, regarding mismanagement of funds in the University, arbitrary conducting the business of the University and violating the Acts and Statutes and Rules. Learned counsel for the petitioners has placed reliance on various judgments of the Apex Court in support of his submissions, which shall be referred to while considering the submissions in detail.

8. Learned counsel for the University does not deny opening of study centres overseas. It is, however, submitted that those centres, which are running overseas, are not at all affiliated to the University. It is submitted that those overseas centres are functioning "purely as a private parallel institution, helping and guiding the student community in their effort to become a Graduate/Post Graduate". It is further admitted that examinations are conducted in its overseas centres of the Calicut University, though under the supervision of the officers of the University. Allegations against respondents 1 and 2 that they are facing criminal cases have been denied. It is submitted that all the private students are to be registered through the School of Distance Education of the University. It

has been pleaded that in order to cater the educational needs of the students of Malabar area beyond the territorial jurisdiction, the Syndicate resolved to take action for conducting courses through the School of Distance Education.

9. Sri.S.Krishnamoorthy, learned counsel for the UGC has submitted that the Calicut University has no jurisdiction to conduct its distance education course through any study centre outside the territorial jurisdiction of the University. It is submitted that both Distance Education Council and the UGC have issued several directions, notifications and public notices asking the Universities to carry their operation within their territorial jurisdiction alone. The Distance Education Council does not accord recommendation to study centres of any University. Referring to various notifications issued by the UGC and the directions issued by the Distance Education Council, it has been submitted that action of the Calicut University is wholly illegal and despite the directions of the University Council, the UGC is continuing with its overseas centres.

10. Before we proceed to consider the respective submission of learned counsel for the parties, it is necessary to notice the relevant statutory provisions governing the issue. The Act was enacted to provide for reorganisation of the Calicut University. It is useful to note the preamble of the Act, which is to the following effect:

"Preamble.- WHEREAS it is expedient to reorganise the University of Calicut with a view to establishing a teaching, residential and affiliating University for the northern districts of the State of Kerala."

11. Section 2 of the Act contains definition clause. Section 2(2) defines "affiliated college". Section 4 of the Act deals with territorial limits, which is to the following effect:

"4. Territorial limits.- (1) The jurisdiction of the University shall extend to the revenue districts of Cannanore, Kozhikode, Malappuram, Palghat and Trichur of the State;

(2) No educational institution situated beyond the territorial limits of the University shall, save with the sanction of the Chancellor and the

Government, be affiliated to the University and no education institution within the territorial limits of the University shall, save with the sanction of the Chancellor and the Government, seek or continue affiliation to any other University established by law."

12. Section 34 of the Act provides for Statutes Section 36 relates to Ordinances. The Calicut University First Statutes, 1977 was framed by the Government of Kerala. Chapter 43 was inserted by amendment approved by the Senate on 29.3.99, which was published in Kerala Gazette dated 22.8.2000. Chapter

43 relates to School of Distance Education. The Director of Distance Education is the convener of the Advisory Board of School of Distance Education. Statute 2 of Chapter 43 defines the academic powers and executive powers of the Director. As per Statute 2, there shall be an Advisory Board which shall make recommendations to the Academic Council/Syndicate in all matters relating to the course of studies offered by the school of Distance Education. Chapter 43 of the Statutes does not contain any provision empowering the Advisory Board, Academic Council/Syndicate and Director of Distance Education to open any study centre outside the territorial jurisdiction of the Calicut University.

13. The Indira Gandhi National Open University Act, 1985 was enacted by the Parliament for the promotion of open and distance education system. The Indira Gandhi National Open University established the Distance Education Council under Statute 28 of the Act, 1985. The Distance Education Council was contemplated as Council to regulate and co-ordinate the distance education. Various directions were issued by the Distance Education Council, which shall be referred to hereinafter. Statute 28 was repealed by the President of India by notification dated 04.05.2013. The Central Government in exercise of its power under Section 20(1) of the University Grants Commission Act, 1956 has directed that the UGC shall act as the regulator for higher education through open and distance learning and the Universities offering any programme/course in open and distance learning mode shall require recognition from the Commission. Thus, distance education was regulated by

Parliamentary Act, 1985 and thereafter by the UGC, which is invested with the power and duty to co-ordinate higher education in the country.

14. The Calicut University Act is a State enactment, which is referable to Entry 32 of List II of the Constitution of India, which is to the following effect:

"32. Incorporation, regulation and winding up of corporation, other than those specified in List I, and universities; unincorporated trading, literary, scientific, religious and other societies and associations; co-operative societies."

15. The University Grants Commission Act, 1956 as well as the Indira Gandhi National Open University Act, 1985 were Parliamentary enactment referable to Entry 66 of List-I, which is to the following effect:

"66. Co-ordination and determination of standards in institutions for higher education or research and scientific and technical institutions."

16. As per the Parliamentary enactment, the University Grants Commission Act, 1956 was enacted for co-ordination and determination of the students in institutions for higher education. It is useful to quote first paragraph 1 of the statement of objects and reasons, which is to the following effect:

"The Constitution of India vests Parliament with exclusive authority in regard to 'co-ordination and determination of standards in institutions for higher education or research and scientific and technical institutions'. It is obvious that neither co-ordination nor determination of standards is possible unless the Central Government has some voice in the determination of standards of teaching and examination in Universities, both old and new. It is also necessary to ensure that the available resources are utilised to the best possible effect. The problem has become more acute recently on account of the tendency to multiply Universities. The need for a properly constituted Commission for determining and

allocating to Universities funds made available by the Central Government has also become more urgent on this account."

17. *The issue regarding territorial jurisdiction of State University and the Parliamentary legislation enacted under Entry No.66 of List I fell for consideration before the Apex Court in Prof.Yaspal v. State of Chattisgarh ([2005] SCC 420). A public interest litigation was filed in the Supreme Court under Article 32 of the Constitution challenging an enactment, viz., Chattisgarh Niji Kshetra Viswavidhyalaya (Stapana Aur Viniyaman) Adhiniyam, 2002. Some of the Universities were functioning even outside the State of Chattisgarh under the State enactment enacted by the State of Chhattisgarh. In paragraph 4 of the judgment the Apex Court has noted the following advertisement issued by the University:*

".....The universities had issued advertisements for opening up study centres in different parts of the country for award of any number of degrees and diplomas. By way of illustration, copies of advertisements issued by some of the universities have been filed. One of such universities, namely, Indian University, issued an advertisement inviting applications for Nodal Service Centres/University Centres for awarding the following kind of degrees and diplomas.....".

The Apex Court took note of University Grant Commission Act, 1956 and Entry 32 of List II and as well as Entry 66 of List I of the VII Schedule of the Constitution. The Apex Court after noticing various earlier judgments of the Supreme Court laid down the following in paragraphs 33 and 34:

"33. The consistent and settled view of this Court, therefore, is that in spite of incorporation of universities as a legislative head being in the State List, the whole gamut of the university which will include teaching, quality of education being imparted, curriculum, standard of examination and evaluation and also research activity being carried on will not come within the purview of the State Legislature on account of a specific entry on coordination and determination of standards in institutions for higher

education or research and scientific and technical education being in the Union List for which Parliament alone is competent. It is the responsibility of Parliament to ensure that proper standards are maintained in institutions for higher education or research throughout the country and also uniformity in standards is maintained.

34. In order to achieve the aforesaid purpose, Parliament has enacted the University Grants Commission Act. First para of the Statement of Objects and Reasons of the University Grants Commission Act, 1956 (for short "the UGC Act") is illustrative and consequently it is being reproduced below:

"The Constitution of India vests Parliament with exclusive authority in regard to 'coordination and determination of standards in institutions for higher education or research and scientific and technical institutions'. It is obvious that neither coordination nor determination of standards is possible unless the Central Government has some voice in the determination of standards of teaching and examination in universities, both old and new. It is also necessary to ensure that the available resources are utilised to the best possible effect. The problem has become more acute recently on account of the tendency to multiply universities. The need for a properly constituted Commission for determining and allocating to universities funds made available by the Central Government has also become more urgent on this account."

18. The Apex Court further laid down that any State Legislature which stultifies or sets at naught an enactment validly made by Parliament would be wholly ultra vires. The following was laid down in paragraph

*"48. Any State legislation which stultifies or sets at naught an enactment validly made by Parliament would be wholly ultra vires. We are fortified in our view by a Constitution Bench decision in *R. Chitralekha v. State of Mysore* (1964 (6) SCR 368 : AIR 1964 SC 1823) where power of the State under Entry 11 List II (as it then existed), and Entry 25 List III qua Entry 66 List I came up for consideration. Subba Rao, J. after quoting the following passage from *Gujarat University v. Krishna Ranganath**

Mudholkar (1963 Supp (1) SCR 112 : AIR 1963 SC 703) : (R. Chitralekha case (1964 (6) SCR368 : AIR 1964 SC 1823).

"The State has the power to prescribe the syllabi and courses of study in the institutions named in Entry 66 (but not falling within Entries 63 to 65) and as an incident thereof it has the power to indicate the medium in which instruction should be imparted. But the Union Parliament has an overriding legislative power to ensure that the syllabi and courses of study prescribed and the medium selected do not impair standards of education or render the coordination of such standards either on an all India or other basis impossible or even difficult." enunciated the following principle defining the contours of the legislative powers of States vis a vis Union so as to steer clear of any overlap or collision:

"This and similar other passages indicate that if the law made by the State by virtue of Entry 11 of List II of the Seventh Schedule to the Constitution makes impossible or difficult the exercise of the legislative power of Parliament under the entry 'Coordination and determination of standards in institutions for higher education or research and scientific and technical institutions' reserved to the Union, the State law may be bad. This cannot obviously be decided on speculative and hypothetical reasoning. If the impact of the State law providing for such standards on Entry 66 of List I is so heavy or devastating as to wipe out or appreciably abridge the Central field, it may be struck down. But that is a question of fact to be ascertained in each case."

As noted above, the Act provides for territorial jurisdiction of the University in Sec.4. The Act thus enjoins the University to function within the territorial limits as prescribed under Sec.4. In the State of Kerala there are other Universities with territorial jurisdiction. The enactment thus confines the jurisdiction of the Calicut University to 5 Districts of the State, namely, Kannur, Kozhikode, Malappuram, Palakkad and Thrissur. Section 4(2) states that no educational institution situated beyond the territorial limits of the University shall save with the sanction of the Chancellor and the Government be affiliated to the University. Thus even if the University wanted to affiliate an institution situated in any other District of the Kerala State, sanction of (i) the Chancellor and (2) the Government was the pre-condition. The

enactment thus clearly prohibits the University to operate beyond its territorial limits.

19. We have already noted that the Calicut University First Statutes, 1977 Chapter 43 dealt with "school of distance education". One more provision of the Statutes, Chapter 44 which is relevant to note was introduced by amendment dated 07.03.2003 gazetted on 06.05.2003. Details of different Study Centres/Institute of Engineering and Technology one established under the Statute for running cost based courses and under the direct control of the University. Study Centres which were included in Chapter 44 are the Study Centres within the territorial jurisdiction of the University. Chapter 44 is quoted for ready reference:

"1. University Study Centres/Institute of Engineering and Technology. Study Centres/Institute of Engineering and Technology is one established under statute for running cost based courses and under the direct control of the University.

2. Name of Study Centres/Institute of Engineering and Technology.

(i) Study Centre, Calicut.

(ii) Study Centre, Vatakara

(iii) Computer Centre, Calicut University Campus.

(iv) Centre for Printing and Technology,

Calicut University Campus.

(v) Teacher Education Centres at Vadakara

Calicut, Wayanad, Manjeri, Palakkad and Thrissur.

(vii) Institute of Engineering and Technology, Calicut University Campus".

20. Now we refer to the facts of the present case to find out about the Programme Centres approved by the Calicut University. A counter affidavit has been filed by the University on behalf of respondents 1, 3 and 4 and 32 where Ext.R1 has been filed containing a list (Approved Counselling/Programme Centres in Kerala) and (Approved Counselling/Programme Centres Overseas). In the list pertaining

to Counselling Centres at Kerala there are 235 institutions. In the list which is filed at page 34 to 38 (Approved Counselling Centres Overseas), there are 25 institutions. Study Centres which have been permitted by the University are in different countries including UAE, Sultanate of Oman, Kuwait, Qatar and Saudi Arabia. The petitioners in the Writ Petition has produced certain orders issued by the University of Calicut conferring status of School of Distance Education to different Counselling Centres/Programmes Overseas. One of the orders dated 12.10.2012, Ext.P8, is relevant to be extracted which is to the following effect:

"UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT

(Abstract)

School of Distance Education- Counselling/Programme Centre-MoU Executed- Regional Institute of Management and Information Technology, Riyadh-Status conferred-Final order issued.

SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION (D'SECTION)

No.SDE/D3/6118/RIMIT/CC/12 Dated, Calicut

University.P.O., 12.10.12

*Read: 1. U.O. No. SDE/D3/6118/RIMIT/CC/12
dated 19.09.2012.*

2. MoU dated 12.09.2012 received from

*Mr.Abdul Bari.C, Director, Regional Institute
Management and Information Technology, Riyadh.*

3. MoU executed on 09.10.2012.

ORDER

As per the paper read (1) above, the Counselling/Programme Center status of School of Distance Education had been conferred to Regional Institute of Management and Information Technology, Riyadh and directed to submit the properly executed MoU along with a Demand Draft for USD 1750 (One Thousand Seven Hundred and Fifty only) drawn in favour of the Finance Officer, University of Calicut, as inspection fee before the commencement of courses granted to them. Accordingly, the Institution has submitted the MoU and a chalan for '96,145 paid at SBT, Calicut University dated 12.09.2012 equivalent amount to USD 1750 toward inspection fee vide paper read (2). As per paper read (3) MoU was executed by the Registrar. Therefore, the status of the Counselling/Programme Centre of School of Distance Education is hereby conferred to Regional Institute of Management and Information Technology, Riyadh to conduct UG Programme with an intake of 350 students in each course PG with an intake 290 (two hundred and ninety) students in each course, MBA Programme with an intake of 30 (thirty) students, Diploma in Hotel Management (DHM) with an intake of 80 (eighty) students and PG Diploma in Foreign Trade (PGDFT) with an intake of 60 (sixty) students, Bachelor of Multimedia and Communication (BMMC) and Bachelor of Interior Design (BID) with an intake of 40 (forty) students in each courses in their institution from this academic year onwards.

Orders are issued accordingly.

Sd/-
Director
To
Mr. Abdul Bari.C,
Director,
Regional Institute of Management
and Information Technology,
Riyadh

Copy to : PS to V.C/ PA to
PVC/PA to Registrar/
Finance/Budget/ JULFA/
DR/AR I/II/SF/FC.

Forwarded/ by order
SECTION OFFICER"

Another order dated 12.12.2012 filed as Ext.P8(a) is also quoted:

"UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT

(Abstract)

School of Distance Education-City College International, Ajman- MoU Executed- Status Counselling/Programme Centre conferred- Final order issued.

SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION (D'SECTION)

No.SDE/D3/1077/CCI/CC/12 Dated, Calicut

University.P.O., 12.12.12

Read:

1. *U.O. of even No. dated 09.10.2012.*
2. *MoU dated 17.11.2012 received from Mr.Abdul Hameed.N.K, Managing Director, City College International, Ajman.*
3. *MoU executed on 10.12.2014 O R D E R As per the paper read (1) above, sanction has been accorded to rename and relocate Al Hilal Education Centre, Sharjah to City College International, Ajman along with the courses granted and directed to submit the properly executed MoU along with a Demand Draft for USD 1750 (One Thousand Seven Hundred and Fifty only) drawn in favour of the Finance Officer, University of Calicut, as inspection fee before the commencement of courses granted to them. Accordingly, the institution has submitted the MoU and forwarded the DD vide paper read (2) above. As per paper read (3) MoU was executed by the Registrar. Therefore, the status of the Counselling/Programme Centre of School of Distance Education is hereby conferred to City College International, Ajman to conduct BA, B.Sc. Mathematics, B Com, BBA, MA, M com, M Sc. Mathematics, MBA, BMMC (for MBA and BMMC course intake is limited 30 (thirty) students each and for DHM course with an intake of 40 (forty) students in their institution subject to the terms and conditions specified in the MoU.*

Orders are issued accordingly.

*Sd/-
Director*

*To Mr. Abdul Hammed.N.K,
Managing Director,
City College International, P.B.No.6463, Ajman, UAE.*

*Copy to : PS to V.C/
PA to PVC/PA to Registrar/
Finance/Budget/
JULFA/DR/AR I/II/SF/FC.*

*Forwarded/ by order
SECTION OFFICER"*

A perusal of the said orders clearly indicate that the Status of Counselling Centres/Programme have been authorised to conduct UG Programme with an intake of students. The said orders also contain a statement that a MoU has been entered between the Institution and the University. No copy of MoU entered with the Centres has been brought on record. It was incumbent on the University to bring the MoU on record to indicate the real nature of function which it has entrusted in the MoU to programme courses. But deliberately the said MoU has been withheld from the court to conceal the real nature of the transaction between the University and Overseas Centres.

21. The University in the counter affidavit has, to some extent admitted some of the functions which it has entrusted to the Overseas Centres. The University in paragraph 4 while stating that the Centres are not affiliated to the University has quoted thus:

".... These centers are not at all affiliated to the university but only the selected centres which are permitted to help the students in matters of tuition, enrollment, exams etc., but all these are permitted strictly in adherence to the rules and guidelines framed by the university...."

Further in paragraph 5 the following has again been stated:"..They work purely as a private parallel institution, helping and guiding the student community in their effort to become a Graduate/Post Graduate".There is a clear statement on behalf of the University that the Centres are conducting tuition, enrollment, exams etc., The University however states that when exams are conducted under the supervision of

the officials of the University. With regard to conduct of examination the following has been stated in paragraph 6.

"...Only constraint here is his/her physical presence in the examination hall for attending the examination and for the same, the University of Calicut conducts its examination in overseas centres under the strict supervision and vigilance of the officials of Calicut University". The examinations are thus actually conducted at the Study Centres which have been approved Overseas. Teaching is also carried by the Study Centres. The order granting sanction to the Centres filed as Ext.P8 clearly provides that Centres have been authorised to conduct UG Programme with an intake of specified number of students in different courses.

22. From the above it is clear that even though affiliation has not been granted, Centres for all purposes have been recognized for conducting study and for holding examination though as per the University under its permission. We have noted above that the University is to function in its territorial limits as prescribed in Sec.4. Even for conduct of examination by distance Education, University cannot cross its territorial limits. The Apex Court in Prof. Yaspal v. State of Chattisgarh (supra) has noted that the University of Chattisgarh where opening an off-campus situated in other States of the country. The Apex Court in paragraph 60 held that provision enabling a University to have an off-campus centre outside the State was beyond the competence of the State. The following was laid down in paragraph 60:

"60. Dr. Dhavan has also drawn the attention of the Court to certain other provisions of the Act which have effect outside the State of Chhattisgarh and thereby give the State enactment an extraterritorial operation. S.2(f) of the amended Act defines "off campus centre" which means a centre of the university established by it outside the main campus (within or outside the State) operated and maintained as its constituent unit having the university's complement of facilities, faculty and staff. S.2(g) defines "off shore campus" and it means a campus of the university established by it outside the country, operated and maintained as its constituent unit, having the university's complement of facilities, faculty and staff. S.3(7) says that the object of the university shall be to establish the main campus in Chhattisgarh and to have study centres at different places in India and other countries. In view of Art.245(1) of the Constitution, Parliament alone is competent to make laws for the whole or any part of the territory of India and the legislature of a State may make laws for the whole or any part of the

State. The impugned Act which specifically makes a provision enabling a university to have an off campus centre outside the State is clearly beyond the legislative competence of the Chhattisgarh Legislature".

The law is thus clear on the subject that as University functioning under a State cannot have extra territorial jurisdiction.

23. Petitioners as well as the UGC have also referred to various Orders, Notifications, guidelines in this context which are relevant to be noted. As noted above, the University Grant Commission has filed a statement bringing on record various guidelines issued by the University Grant Commission and Distance Education Council. In paragraph 5 of the statement it was stated that even as per the University Grant Commission Regulation, 2003 if the Study Centres are to be opened beyond the territorial limits concerned, the same can be done only with the permission of the UGC and the State Government where the study centre is opened. It is to be noted hereinafter that subsequently by further directions complete prohibition was imposed by the University Grants Commission from opening Study Centres outside the territorial limits of the University. In paragraph 7 of the statement the UGC has quoted letter dated 16.4.2009 issued by the UGC to all Universities after the pronouncement of the Supreme Court in Prof. Yaspal v. State of Chhattisgarh (supra). It is useful to quote the said letter which is to the following effect:

"All the State Governments (As per list attached) Subject: Territorial jurisdiction of State Universities/State Pvt. Universities - regarding Dear Madam, There is a growing trend of establishment of Private Universities by the State Governments. As on now, 37 Private Universities established by the State Governments are in existence as per the information available with the UGC. It is understood that there are some more Private Universities about which the State Government have not sent any information to the UGC. In addition there are a large number of traditionally established State Universities. It is brought to your kind notice that the UGC has received information through RTI applications or through various students visiting UGC office that the State Universities/State Private Universities established by the State Govt. have opened off campuses, study centers and have created franchise in the name of distance education programmes outside the State. This action on the part of the State Universities or Private Universities established by the State Governments beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the respective State Govt. is not

permissible in the light of the observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in favour Yeshpal's case. The Honourable Supreme Court in Annamali University's matter has held the view that Parliament alone is competent to enact laws for any part or for the whole country and the State Legislature can enact law only in respect of its territorial jurisdiction confined to the concerned State. However, notwithstanding the above position in law and the judgment of the Honourable Supreme Court, the State Governments have enacted laws establishing State Universities and Private Universities which allow them to operate beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the concerned State in the form of OFF Campus/Study Centres, affiliated colleges and the centres operating through franchises etc., this has resulted into an anomalous situation and it is also causing hardship to the student community at large. Keeping in view the above, I shall be grateful if you kindly use your good offices and take immediate action on the following: To take suitable steps for amending the existing Acts made so as to bring the same in conformity with the observations made by the Honourable Supreme Court of India in the case of Prof. Yaspal and State of Chhattisgarh. This Should be adhered in all future cases. To stop all the State/State Private Universities in the State from operating beyond the territorial jurisdiction of your State in any manner either in the form of off campus/study centre/affiliated college and the centre operating through franchises.

Yours faithfully,

P.K.Chauhan)

Secretary".

As noted above, under the Indira Gandhi National Open University Distance Education Council started to supervise, control and co-ordinate Distance Education Centres. Proceedings of the District Education Council are brought on record as Ext.R7(d). In the proceedings various decision were taken. It is useful to abstract decision Nos.9 and 10 which are to the following effect:

"9. Regarding territorial jurisdiction for offering programmes through distance mode it has been decided that the latest UGC notifications will prevail over all previous notifications and circulars.

As per the UGC notifications dated June, 2009, State University can offer (i) programmes only within the State; and (ii) Deemed to be University can offer

programmes from Head Quarters. However, Deemed Universities may seek the permission from UGC to open off campus centers in other States, and offer Distance Education Programmes through the approved off campus only after approval of UGC and DEC. (iii) Central Universities will adhere to jurisdiction as per their Act. (iv) The territorial jurisdiction of the institutions other than Universities shall be their Head Quarters, and in no case outside the State concerned. The letter of recognition will clearly state the territorial jurisdiction of the University/Institution.

10. The Distance Education Council prohibits franchising of Study Centres and this should be clearly stated in the recognition letter issued by the DEC. Each Universities will clearly state the territorial jurisdiction of the University/Institution". On 17.12.2009, Distance Education Council of Indira Gandhi Open University has issued a letter to the Vice Chancellor of the University of Calicut. The letter clearly directed the University that territorial limits for offering distance education programmes would be as per Acts and Statutes of the University. Along with the said letter the Distance Education Council guidelines were annexed. It is useful to quote letter dated 17.12.2009 along with Distance Education Council direction No.6:

"INDIRA GAHDI NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY MAIDAN GARHI,

NEW DELHI - 110 0689,

INDIA DISTANCE EDUCATION COUNCIL.

Prof. Manjulika Srivastava

Director

F.No.DEC/2009/17.12.2009

Sub: Continuation of Recognition till the Committee visits – reg.

Dear Sir/Madam,

This has reference to your application requesting the Distance Educational Council for recognition of your programmes offered through distance mode from the year 2008-09 onwards. In this connection we would like to inform you that your proposal for granting regular recognition to your University is under process. Meanwhile, your university has been granted continuation of provisional recognition till such time the Committee visits your University and submits its recommendations and a decision is

taken by the Joint Committee on the same. However, we maintain that it is the responsibility of the Institution/University to follow the norms prescribed by the concerned regulatory bodies and seek their recognition for professional/technical programme/s as per the requirements. Getting approval of concerned statutory apex body for relevant programme/s will be the sole responsibility of the Institution. The DEC does not allow franchising of study centres. Further, we would also like to mention that the territorial jurisdiction for offering distance education programmes would be as per Acts and Statutes of your University and in accordance with the UGC guidelines. Your institutions shall also follow all norms/guidelines issued by the DEC for offering programmes through distance mode a copy of which is enclosed.

With regards,

Yours sincerely,
 Sd/-
 (Manjulika Srivastava)
 To
 The Vice Chancellor,
 University of Calicut,
 Thenjipalam, Kozhikode,
 Calicut".

"6. Regarding territorial jurisdiction for offering programmes through distance mode the latest UGC notifications will prevail over all previous notifications and circulars. As per the UGC notification, State Universities (both private as well as Govt. funded) can offer programmes only within the State and Deemed Universities from the Headquarters and in no case outside the state. However, Deemed Universities may seek the permission to open off campus centers in other States and offer distance education programmes through the approved off campuses only after approval of UGC and DEC. Central Universities will also adhere to the UGC norms. The territorial jurisdiction for the institutions (both private as well as Govt. funded) shall be the Headquarters, and in so case outside the State. Thus the territorial jurisdiction of your Institution shall be governed by these UGC guidelines".

Further in the meeting dated 10.03.2010 of the Distance Education Council, the Council again reiterated its decision regarding territorial jurisdiction in offering programmes through distance mode. Item No.35.3 is quoted below:

"35.3: Territorial jurisdiction in offering programmes through distance mode The Council in its 28th meeting held on 23rd March, 2007, had decided that jurisdiction for offering programmes through distance mode will be as per the Acts and Statutes of the concerned university. However, in the ninth Joint Committee of UGC-AICTE & DEC held on 17.08.2009 regarding territorial jurisdiction for offering programmes through distance mode, it was decided that the latest UGC notifications will prevail over all previous notifications and circulars of the DEC. The Council considered the roles and responsibility and the authority of the Joint Committee and decided that the Joint Committee cannot supersede the Statutory Authority of the Distance Education Council. The Council noted that the distance education and online education cannot have the Territorial jurisdiction and it was decided that in case of Central Universities and the State Universities, the Territorial Jurisdiction will be as per their Acts and Statutes for offering programmes through distance mode. The Territorial Jurisdiction in case of Deemed Universities will be as per UGC which mandates the prior approval of the UGC for opening Centres outside the Headquarters. The Territorial Jurisdiction in case of Private Institutions (other than Universities) will be as decided by the Joint Committee".

The Distance Education Council of the Indira Gandhi National Open University has issued a Notification dated 01.11.2012 which has been filed as Ext.R7(f). Notification in respect of open and distance education contained directions. One of the directions was that in case of State (both government funded and private) the territorial jurisdiction will be as per their Acts and Statutes but not beyond the boundaries of their respective States. As noted above, provision for Distance Education Council was replaced and the Central Government entrusted the Co-ordination, control and management of distance education to the University Grants Commission. The UGC had issued a public notice on 27.6.2013 which has been filed by the petitioner as Ext.R7(g).

24. The University in its counter affidavit has also brought on record the said public notice. It is useful to extract the following portion of the letter:"Public Notice on Course/Study Centres/Off campuses & Territorial Jurisdiction of Universities No.F.27-1/2012(CPP-II) 27th June, 2013 The Commission has come across many advertisements published in National Dailies offering opportunities for the award of University degrees through various franchise

programmes conducted by certain private institutions. These private establishments claiming themselves as study centres or learning centres of different universities enroll students for various degree programmes and also claim to be responsible for teaching and conduct of examinations. The faculty and the infrastructure belong to these private agencies. The concerned university except providing syllabus and teaching materials, has no mechanism to monitor and maintain the academic standards of teaching being imparted at these centres. This blatant compromise with the standards of education has led to widespread criticism. The Commission has taken a serious view of these misleading advertisements appearing in various newspapers.

It is therefore, clarified or the information of all concerned including students and parents that:

- a) a Central or State Government University can conduct courses through its own departments, its constituent colleges and/or through its affiliated Colleges;*
- b) a university established or incorporated by or under a State act shall operate only within the territorial jurisdiction allotted to it under its Act and in no case beyond the territory of the state of its location.*
- c) the private universities and deemed universities cannot affiliate any college or institution for conducting courses leading to award of its diplomas, degrees or other qualifications.*
- d) no University, whether central, state, private or deemed can offer its programmes through franchising arrangement with private coaching institutions even for the purpose of conducting courses through distance mode.*
- e) all universities shall award only such degrees as are specified by the UGC and published in the official gazette.*
- f) the Universities shall conduct their first degree and Master's degree programmes in accordance with the regulations notified by the Commission in this regard". The UGC thereafter by letter dated 28.3.2013 has written to all the Vice Chancellors of Universities/Institutions and Directors of Distance Education Council on the subject of territorial jurisdiction and offering of programmes through off- campus/study centres, etc., by Institutions/Universities. It is useful to quote the following extract of the letter".*

"ii) A University established or incorporated by or under a State Act shall operate only within the territorial jurisdiction allotted to it under its Act and in no case beyond the territory of the State of its location.

iv) no university, whether central, state, private or deemed, can offer its programmes through franchising arrangement with private coaching institutions even for the purpose of conducting courses through distance mode".

25. On 04.06.2014 the UGC has written to the Calicut University which letter has been produced as Ext.R7(c). By the said letter the UGC informed the Vice Chancellors of the Calicut University that decision has been taken to maintain status quo for 2014-15 and accordingly approval was granted to the University. The University was directed to offer programmes through distance mode which are approved by the statutory bodies of the country. Paragraph 2 of the letter however, states that the above recognition is subject to terms and conditions contained therein. Condition Nos.xi and xii are quoted as follows:

"xi) The territorial jurisdiction in respect of Universities for offering programmes through distance mode will be as per the policy of UGC on territorial jurisdiction and opening of off campuses/centres/study centres as mentioned in the UGC notification No.F.27-1/2012(CP-II), dated 27th June, a copy of which is also posted in the UGC website www.ugc.ac.in/deb. In respect of standalone Institutions (other than the Universities), the territorial jurisdiction will be headquarters.

xii) Franchising arrangement for offering programmes in distance mode in any form is not allowed".

Petitioner has brought on record a letter dated 21.04.2014 issued by the UGC addressed to the Director of the Mahatma Gandhi University filed as per Ext.P16. The School of Distance Education, M.G.University was directed to close down conducting of off-campus programmes. It is useful to quote Ext.P16.

"UNIVERSITY GRANT COMMISSION Distance Education Bureau DEC Building, IGNOU, Campus, Maidan garbi, New Delhi - 110 068 Tel No.011-29571828, Fax No.011 29536668 F.No.UGC/DEB/MGU/KTM/KRL/09-11) 21.04.2014 To The Director Mahatma Gandhi University School of Distance Education Priyadarshini Hills P.O., Kottayam - 686 560 Kerala Sub: Conducting Off Campus programmes - reg.

Sir/Madam, This has reference to your letter dated 08.01.2014 which was received in Distance Education Bureau (DEB). University Grants Commission (UGC) on 31.01.2014 with respect to conducting of Off Campus programmes by Mahatma Gandhi University, Kovalam, Kerala. In this connection, I am directed to inform that the DEB, UGC vide its letter dated 28.11.2013 had requested the University to close down all study centres for offering programmes through distance mode opened in violation of UGC policies. But it seems that the University has continued admitting students through these centres and thus jeopardizing the careers of students. Hence the University is again requested to immediately close down the study centres (7 International and 6 National Centres) opened by the University in violation of UGC guidelines on territorial jurisdiction with immediate effect, failing which steps would be initiated to withdraw the recognition accorded for offering programmes through distance mode. An action taken report in this regard may be submitted by the University at the earliest.

Thanking you,

*Yours faithfully,
Sd/-
Dev Kant Rao
Dy.Director".*

26. From the above materials on record it is evidently clear that both erstwhile Distance Education Council and University Grant Commission repeatedly directed all Universities not to run any Study Centre beyond its territorial jurisdiction. Universities were directed to close down its Study Centres which were opened beyond territorial limits as well as Overseas under the Distance Education Programme. Thus there is clear direction by the University Grant Commission for directing all Universities to operate under the territorial jurisdiction. Directions issued by the University Grant Commission are in exercise of its powers under the UGC Act, 1956 and are binding on the State Universities. The UGC in its letter dated 21.4.2014 has directed the Mahatma Gandhi University to close down all off-shore study centres offering programmes through Distance mode.

27. From the above it is clear that the Calicut University is running its off-campus Centres overseas against the statutory provisions of the Act as well as against the express directions issued by the Distance Education Council and the UGC as noted above. That apart, as per the letter addressed to the Vice Chancellor of the Calicut

University dated 04.06.2014 (Annexure 7(c) the recognition of the Calicut University for functioning, through opening a Distance Education Centre is subject to the conditions mentioned which we have already extracted.

28. Respondents 1 to 4 are clearly acting beyond their powers in permitting and running of Study Centres Overseas for Distance Education which are referred as programme centres as noted above against the provisions of the Act as well as against the direction of the University Grant Commission and the Distance Education Council. The said action is beyond their jurisdiction and has to be condemned. The University has to close the Centre Overseas immediately failing which the UGC may take action for withdrawing recognition of their distance education course.

29. Petitioners in the Writ Petition have also made a prayer to remove respondent Nos.1 to 4 from the respective posts.

30. We are of the view that under the Act it is the Chancellor who is empowered to take such action. We thus have not examined the allegations made in the Writ Petition nor are expressing any opinion in that regard. It is for the Chancellor under the Act to take appropriate action, if any.

In the result:

The Writ Petition is allowed to the following extent:

(i) A writ of mandamus is issued to respondents 1 to 4 and 32 to close all their off-shore Centres situate Overseas operating on the basis of the permission/approval granted by the University.

(ii) Respondents 1 to 4 and 32 shall take immediate action for closing off-shore Centres failing which the UGC shall initiate proceedings for withdrawal of the recognition of the

University for running course by Distance Education as per conditions regarding territorial jurisdiction mentioned in the letter dated 04.06.2014 already issued to the Vice Chancellor of the Calicut University. Parties shall bear their own costs.

ASHOK BHUSHAN, AG. C.J.

A.M. SHAFFIQUE, JUDGE.

2. But then the issue was whether this is available prospectively or retrospectively, since there is no retrospective operation possible unless significant reason stated. After discussing at the Bar, we decided to appoint a Commission to find out the factual matrix. We quote from the Commissioners Report:-

"COMMISSIONERS REPORT"

1. In the Honorable Central Administrative Tribunal OA.No.390/2017 was pending between Praveen Kumar vs. Union of India. In the said case K.Dilip Kumar, Advocate was appointed as a one man commission related to the Study Centre situated in Kasaragod Dist, Kerala State. The Honorable court was fixed a fee of Rs.25,000/- as commissioner fee and that is already paid by the party.

2. As per the directions of the Honorable Tribunal, the commissioner was issued notice to the petitioner and respondent counsel related to visiting the sopt on 08/12/2018.

3. In this matter, the commissioner was visited the institution named Scholar college and computer academy Nileshwar, Kasargod Dist, Kerala State on 08/12/2018 at 10 AM. At the time of inspection of the sopt, the petitioner Praveen Kumar was present in the institution and also from the side of the respondent (Defence Department) two persons named Umesh, Admin Officer and Ravi Admin Officer was present. From the presence of the parties, the commissioner enquired about the institution and the background and other related academicals backgrounds of the Annamalai University and also related to the examinations and other educational matters.

4. The commissioner was visited the institution, Principal of the Institution Shri Muraleedharan and Shri Vijayan, MD are present at that time. They described about the functioning of the Annamalai University and other related academical matters. The Principal told me that Annamalai University is conducting classes in the institution and taking classes by good teachers who have well experience in the subject. Lab facilities and all other facilities are provided by the

college as per the directions and guidance by the University. There are different courses in the college named Bsc Computer Science, Msc Computer Science, Bachelor of Computer Application, Master of Computer Application and other IT courses. The principal told me that lots of students are participated in the coaching classes and they have good academic background.

5. The commissioner enquired above the person named Praveen Kumar. The principal stated that one Praveen Kumar was a student in the institution in the academic year 2012-15. He was studies BSc Computer science. At the time of his academical year he was attended the classes and we are provided good lab facilities and other facilities to him. At the time of the academical year 2012-15 there are more than 100 students in the particular course. The principal stated that the examination was conducted by the Annamalai University and Annamalai University is preparing question papers. At the time of examination the squad of Annamalai University will campaign the college and conduct the examination.

6. The commissioner enquired the details above the papers related to the Annamalai University, the college authorities provided some papers related to attendance, attendance sheet etc and also give the details of Annamalai University examination centre.

7. The commissioner has taken the statement of the two persons in the college in the presence of the witnesses one Shri Vijayan, MD and Principal Shri Muraleedharan. Both of the statements are enclosed herewith. In the statements, they stated that, they have permission to conduct classes of Annamalai University and they are conducting the classes well and they are following the guidelines of the Annamalai University. The college authorities given one cover sent by the Annamalai University related to the examination. That also I am producing before the Hon. Tribunal.

8. The commissioner was visited the college. The college was situated in the city called Nileshwaram near National Highway in Kasargod Dist. The college was in eace face bounded by private properties and road. The college is triple story building and different classes are conducting in the same building. The classes are

measuring 22x17 feet with black board, furniture's, ceiling fans and other amenities. The principal and MD have separate chambers and also separate chambers for teaches. And there is a separate library in the same building and toilet facilities are also available in the back side of the building.

9. The Hon. Tribunal directed to verify the study centre and requested to enquire about the resources and other related academical matters.

10. As per the directions of the Hon. Tribunal, the commissioner has deeply enquired and came to know that there was a study centre existed that place and conducted classes of Annamalai University with adequate facilities with experienced teachers. The commissioner came to know that in the year 2012-15 one Praveen Kumar was studies in the said college and completed his course BSc Computer Science in Annamalai University. The Principal was identified the said Praveen Kumar. The commissioner was visited the whole building and other related amenities. There was a good computer lab facility in the college. There are more than 24 computers and other related infrastructure in the said lab. The commissioner was taken the photos of the computer lab. I am enclosing the photos of the computer Lab of the college. The commissioner was taken the complete photos of the institution and the photos are produced before the Hon. Tribunal. The college was conducting Distance Education classes of Annamalai University in the institution completely under the guidance of Annamalai University.

11. The commissioner was discussed with the college principal and MD in the presence of petitioner and Defence personals Ravi and Umesh. The college principal and MD stated that we are strictly conducting examination under the guidance of principal and MD and said course is valid whole India. They stated that the institution was running more than 30 years and they are conducting courses of Annamalai University more than 16 years and stated that they have good reputations in academicals careers in Kasaragod Dist, Kerala State.

12. I, K.Dilip Kumar, the commissioner appointed by this court submitting the report after verification of the facts and circumstances

and also other related subjects. I visited the spot as per the instructions of the Hon. Tribunal and submitting this report.

Yours faithfully,

sd/-..

*Commissioner
K.Dilip Kumar*

*Bangalore
17/12/2018.*

*Copy to:
Vishnu Bhat,
Central Govt. Standing Counsel*

*Subramanya Bhat
Advocate for the petitioner”*

3. The Commissioner is a Senior Panel Counsel for the Union Government of India and a very experienced counsel. He had noted that in fact, a Study Centre of the Annamalai University which is admittedly a premier educational facility of great vintage. An objection has been raised by the respondents to the Commission's Report to the effect that the Study Centre is also running a Distance Educational Programme of Kannur University. But, then it is pointed out that after the UGC intervention as directed by the Hon'ble Court the Annamalai University had to close down the facility and invited the Scholar Centre operated another Distance Educational Programme of Kannur University. Therefore, the applicant claims that it will not detract or retract from his rights.

4. On a careful examination of the matter as above, we feel that the benefit which was granted to the applicant cannot be retrospectively taken away, particularly so as in Annexure A-13 judgement of the Hon'ble High Court adjudicated at Madras filed by the same Annamalai University with University Grants Commission and the Distance Education Bureau as

respondents have also found merit in the right of the students as the degree awarded to them as valid. We quote from this judgement:-

“IN HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Monday, the Thirty First Day of August Two thousand fifteen

WP No. 27185 of 2015

and MP. No.1 of 2015

Annamalai University

....Petitioner

vs

The University Grants Commission,

*Writ Petitions under Article 226 of the Constitution of India
praying that in these circumstances stated therein and in the respective
affidavits filed therewith the High Court will be pleased to*

*“i) Issue a writ of Certiorari or any other appropriate Writ, Order or
Direction in the nature of a Writ, calling for the records in respect of the
impugned order passed by the 2nd respondent under the aegis of the 1st
respondent vide his proceedings No.F-1-2/2015(DEB-III) dated
14.8.2015 (also mentioned as dated 28.7.2015) and quash the same in
WP.27185/2015 and*

*ii) To grant an interim order of stay of the impugned order issued by the
2nd respondent under the aegis of the 1st respondent vide his
proceedings No.F-1-2/2015(DEB-III) dated 14.8.2015 (also mentioned
as dated 28.7.2015) pending disposal of (MP.1/2015 in
WP.27185/2015) respectively*

ORDER: *These petitions coming on for orders upon perusing the
petitions and the affidavits filed in support thereof and upon hearing the
arguments of Mr.R.MUTHU KUMARASAMY, Senior Counsel for M/s*

R.SURESH KUMAR, Advocate for the petitioner in both the petitions the court made the following order:-

2. *The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the condition imposed qua territorial limit has been found to be illegal by the order passed by this court in WP.No.30039 of 2012 dated 12.3.2013, the Writ Appeal was filed by the respondents in WA.No.606 of 2015 against the said order and there is no interim order. The order passed in MP.No.1 of 2015 is to the effect that all admissions made by the petitioner in respect of the Distance Education Programme for the centres situated outside the territorial jurisdiction shall be subject to the final decision of the pending Appeal.*

3. *The learned Senior Counsel also submits that the admissions are made in the University and only study centers are located outside the territorial limit. Even assuming the condition is upheld, the students can be put forth into the petitioner's University.*

4. *Taking note of the fact that there is no interim order of stay of the order passed by the Single Judge on the earlier occasion and in the light of the order passed by the Hon'ble Division Bench, there shall be an order of interim stay.*

5. *Registry is directed to post this Writ Petition along with WA.No.606 of 2015.*

6. *However it is made clear that the admissions made are subject to the result of further orders that can be passed by the Hon'ble Division Bench. The petitioner shall make this position clear to the students who are to be admitted."*

5. Therefore, OA is allowed. A declaration is made that the Degree obtained by the applicant from the Annamalai University will be treated as valid for all purposes and will be eligible for all the consequences. OA allowed as above. No order as to costs.

(CV. SANKAR)
MEMBER (A)

(DR. K.B. SURESH)
MEMBER (J)

bk

