

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench
New Delhi**

OA No.4351/2014

(MA Nos.82/2017, 676/2017, 910/2017, 1670/2015,
1819/2017, 2257/2018, 2431/2018, 4009/2017,
4045/2014, 4046/2014 & 4647/2017)

Reserved on: 22.01.2020
Pronounced on: 29.01.2020



Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. A. K. Bishnoi, Member (A)

Anil Kumar Shukla, TGT (Maths)
S/o late Ram Kumar Shukla,
Aged about 47 years,
R/o P-9/2, Staff Quarters, KV No.3,
Delhi Cantonment-110010.

... Applicant

(In person)

Versus

1. Union of India through
Secretary Sh. Rajarshi Bhattacharya
(with official & personal capacities),
Department of School Education & Literacy,
MHRD, Government of India,
C Wing, Shastri Bhawan,
New Delhi-110001.
2. Chairman, Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan (KVS)
through Personal Secretary
Mrs. Binta Thakur
(with official & personal capacities),
MHRD, Government of India,
C Wing, Shastri Bhawan,
New Delhi-110001.
3. Ms. Vrinda Sarup (with official & personal capacities),
Vice-Chairman, Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan
(KVS) & Special Secretary (SE), MHRD,
Government of India,
C Wing, Shastri Bhawan,

New Delhi-110001.



4. Sh. Sukhbir Singh Sandhu (with official & personal capacities),
Joint Secretary (PG), MHRD,
Government of India,
C Wing Shastri Bhawan,
New Delhi-110001.
 5. Sh. Avinash Dikshit (with Official & personal capacities),
Commissioner, Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan (Hqrs.), 18 Institutional Area,
Shaheed Jeet Singh Marg,
New Delhi-110016.
 6. Sh. D. Manivannan (with official & personal capacities), Deputy Commissioner,
KVS Regional Office Ranchi,
KV Namkum Campus, Namkum,
Ranchi-834010 (Jharkhand).
 7. Smt. Veena Tirkey (with official & Personal capacities), Principal,
KV Ramgarh Cantt., PO - SRC,
Distt. Ramgarh-829131
(Jharkhand).
- ... Respondents

(By Mr. S. Rajappa, Advocate)

ORDER

Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman :

The applicant was appointed as a Primary Teacher in the Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan (KVS) on 01.11.1993. It is stated that he was posted in the States of Nagaland and Assam for a period of 12 years, and thereafter was posted in other places.

2. In this OA, the applicant has challenged Annexures A-1 to A-9. Annexure A-1 is a notice dated 16.09.2014, wherein certain observations were made about his functioning, and he was required to explain as to why disciplinary action be not initiated against him.



Annexure A-2 is an office order dated 24.09.2014, informing the applicant that a preliminary inquiry is constituted against him regarding his immoral behaviour towards girl students, and he was required to appear before the inquiry committee, scheduled to be held in the Principal's chamber, KV Ramgarh Cantt., on 24.09.2014.

Annexure A-3 is an order dated 26.09.2014, through which the Deputy Commissioner, KVS, Regional Office, Ranchi, placed the applicant under suspension in contemplation of proceedings under Article 81(B) of the Education Code.

Annexure A-4 is an office order dated 26.09.2014, through which the Deputy Commissioner has constituted a committee to conduct a summary inquiry into the complaints of the alleged immoral behaviour of the applicant towards girl students.

Annexure A-5 is a notice dated 08.10.2014, informing the applicant that he did not appear in the proceedings on 27.09.2014, and requiring him to appear before the committee on 09.10.2014.



Annexure A-6 is a letter dated 15.10.2014, addressed by the Deputy Commissioner to the Commissioner, summing up the conclusions of the summary inquiry, and forwarding a copy of the inquiry report, comprising of 27 pages, along with annexures.

Annexure A-7 is an order dated 27.10.2014, through which the suspension ordered against the applicant was revoked.

Annexure A-8 is a letter dated 14.11.2014, wherein the applicant was informed that he did not report to duty even after revocation of the suspension, and that the entire period of absence from 31.10.2014 would be treated as unauthorised absence.

Annexure A-9 is a show cause notice dated 12.11.2014, requiring the applicant to explain as to why his services be not terminated under Article 81(B) of the Education Code of KVS.

3. It is necessary to mention that during the pendency of the OA, the services of the applicant were terminated through an order dated 22.12.2014, and the same is challenged by filing MA No.2257/2018. An appeal preferred by the applicant was also rejected on 01.10.2015.



4. The applicant contends that the proceedings challenged in this OA are totally untenable and are vindictive in nature. He submits that on an earlier occasion, he was dismissed from service by making frivolous allegations, and since the order of dismissal was set aside by this Tribunal, the respondents have taken offence to it and instituted proceedings, one after the other, with a view to get rid of him. He submits that the allegations of immoral behaviour against the girl students are invented only to circumvent the disciplinary inquiry, and to summarily dismiss him from service. He has also raised the plea that once the present OA is pending before the Tribunal, passing of the order of dismissal is violative of Section 19(4) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985. He has also raised the plea that the KVS is not a registered Society, and various activities undertaken by it do not have the sanction of law. The applicant also filed quite a large number of MAs claiming one relief or the other.



5. On behalf of the respondents, counter affidavit is filed. Substantial part thereof is devoted to explain the circumstances under which Article 81(B) came to be incorporated in the Education Code. It is stated that the institutions established by them impart education for boys and girls, and with a view to prevent any acts of immoral or sexual behaviour towards the students, particularly by teachers, the provision was incorporated.

6. The respondents state that on 23.09.2014, four girl students of Class VIII-C, and one girl student of Class IX-C, submitted complaints alleging that the applicant exhibited immoral behaviour towards them during the school hours. It is stated that a preliminary inquiry was conducted, and the applicant was placed under suspension on 26.09.2014. It is also stated that a summary inquiry committee comprising of four members was constituted, and a report was also submitted by the committee. The respondents state that though the applicant was given opportunity at various stages, either he has avoided responding to them, or used to raise irrelevant issues, just with an intention to protract the proceedings. It is stated that the respondents had to paste notices or to publish them in newspapers to ensure that no procedural lapse takes place. It is

ultimately stated that the acts proved against the applicant are very serious in nature, and accordingly, the punishment was imposed by invoking Article 81(B) of the Education Code. Reference is made to the judgments of the Supreme Court in several cases, as regards the approach to be adopted in such cases.



7. The applicant argued the case in person. He has taken us through various proceedings which he has challenged in the OA. He contends that he has been subjected to serious hardship by being required to work in the North Eastern States for 12 years, and the respondents continued to harass him even after he was posted to a different place. He contends that the various orders of punishment that were passed against him were set aside by the Guwahati Bench of the Tribunal, and the respondents have invented the grounds of immoral behaviour to take vengeance against him. He has also raised the plea that the respondents were not entitled to pass the order of punishment when the OA, in which the show cause notice is under challenge, is pending. He has raised the plea of absence of registration of the KVS. The applicant has also submitted written arguments.



8. Shri S. Rajappa, learned counsel for the respondents, submits that the conduct of the applicant towards the girl students was found to be highly objectionable, and in the preliminary inquiry and subsequent inquiry, the allegations were held proved. He contends that the duties of a Teacher are noble in nature, and any objectionable act on the part of a Teacher towards girl students is highly reprehensible. He submits that the very purpose of incorporating Article 81(B) in the Education Code is to ensure that the Teachers who resort to such acts, do not take advantage of the detailed procedure provided for under the CCS (CCA) Rules, 1965. He contends that the prescribed procedure was followed, and no grounds exist for interference in the matter. The learned counsel has also contradicted the various contentions advanced by the applicant.

9. The list of proceedings which are challenged in this OA, is furnished at the threshold itself. Since all of them are in relation to the disciplinary proceedings initiated against the applicant, we do not take any exception to the challenge to that many proceedings, in one and the same OA.

10. The discussion can be started by taking note of the notice dated 16.09.2014, which is the first one challenged by the applicant. It reads as under:



“Keeping in view the repeated complaints of the students and parents, and as per observation of the undersigned, it is found that:

- 1) You are not attending morning assembly.
- 2) You are neither maintaining teachers diary nor submitting to the undersigned.
- 3) You are not submitting notebooks of Mathematics of your concerned classes that is VI A, VI C, VII C, VIII C, IX C to the Principal as per schedule.
- 4) You are not solving the problems of Mathematics of your class and used to say to solve by own.
- 5) You are using Laptop in the classroom for your personal work.
- 6) You have not covered syllabus of SA 1 and also not informed syllabus to the students.
- 7) By providing red pen, you have forced the IXth students to just tick the copies of junior classes.
- 8) You have forcibly asked students to correct examination copies too.
- 9) You have provided your personal contact no. to the students and ask them to talk to you on 09:00 pm onwards.
- 10) You are forcing the students to put their signature on blank paper. The intention behind it is not understood.
- 11) You are using slang words to the students during classroom teaching.
- 12) You used to give corporal punishment to the students which is against norms.
- 13) You used to furnish negative statements about Principal and Vidyalaya administration.

Why not disciplinary action should be taken against you? Keeping in view the above points you

are hereby directed to give written explanation point wise, within ten days.”



As many as 13 acts and omissions on the part of the applicant were indicated, and except requiring the applicant to explain as to why disciplinary action be not taken against him, nothing prejudicial was decided. It was open to the applicant to submit explanation dealing with each and every allegation made against him. Instead, he has chosen to challenge the notice. Each one of the acts and omissions mentioned therein are serious in nature, and they are not expected from a Teacher. We do not find any basis to interfere with the same.

11. The second order challenged in the OA is the one dated 24.09.2009. It reads as under:

“Shri Anil Kumar Shukla, TGT (Maths) of K.V., Ramgarh Cantt is hereby informed that the preliminary inquiry committee is constituted against you regarding immoral behaviour towards the girl students. Hence, you are requested to appear before the inquiry committee which will be held in the Principal’s chamber, K.V., Ramgarh Cantt on 24-09-2014 at 10:30 AM.”

Hardly, one can take exception to such a notice. It is just informative about the meeting of the committee, it did not mention anything further.

12. The third one in challenge, is the order dated 26.09.2014. It reads as under:

“WHEREAS, proceedings under Article 81(B) of Education Code against Sh. Anil Kumar Shukla, TGT (Maths), K.V. Ramgarh Cantt is contemplated.

Now, therefore, the undersigned in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (1) of rule 10 of the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1965, as extended to Kendriya Vidyalayas, hereby place the said Sh. Anil Kumar Shukla, TGT (Maths) under suspension with immediate effect.



It is further ordered that during the period that this order shall remain in force, the Headquarters of Sh. Anil Kumar Shukla, TGT (Maths) shall be KV, Ramgarh Cantt and the said Sh. Anil Kumar Shukla shall not leave the Headquarters without obtaining the previous permission of the undersigned.”

The applicant was placed under suspension in contemplation of the proceedings under Article 81(B) of the Education Code. It has already been mentioned that complaints from five girl students were received alleging objectionable behaviour on the part of the applicant towards them. In matters of this nature, the respondents have their own settled procedure. On receipt of a complaint, preliminary inquiry is conducted, and depending on the outcome thereof, a detailed inquiry is conducted. It is but natural that the concerned employee is placed under suspension lest he meddles with the inquiries.

We do not find any ground to interfere with the order of suspension.



13. The next one under challenge in the OA is an office order dated 26.09.2014. Through this order, the competent authority has constituted the committee to conduct a summary inquiry. This is part of the prescribed procedure. The applicant is not able to point out any legal or factual infirmity in the said order.

14. The applicant has also challenged notice dated 08.10.2014 under Article 81(B). It reads as under:

“A summary inquiry has been conducted on 27.09.2014 at 10.30 am at KV, Ramgarh Cantt under the charge 81(b) against Mr. A. K. Shukla, TGT (Maths), KV, Ramgarh Cantt vide office order no.F.40064/2014-15/KVS(RNC)/4870-4876 dated 26.09.2014. Information has been sent to Principal, KV, Ramgarh Cantt on 26.09.2014 through email. You did not appear before the inquiry committee on said date. You are once again directed to appear before the inquiry committee at KVS, Regional Office, Namkum, Ranchi on 09.10.2014 at 11:00 am to make your representation against the charge, failing which appropriate disciplinary action will be taken as per article 81(b) of KVS Education Code.”

The applicant was informed that though he was earlier required to appear before the committee, he did not turn up, and another opportunity was given to him.

15. Annexure A-6, which too is challenged, is a letter dated 15.10.2014, addressed by the Deputy Commissioner to the Commissioner, KVS. This is after the conclusion of the summary inquiry ordered against the applicant. The Deputy Commissioner has summed up the conclusions in the inquiry report, and submitted the same to the Commissioner, as under:



“CONSLUSION OF THE SUMMARY INQUIRY REPORT

After careful consideration of the records and statements (questionnaire and open) and oral discussion, the committee has come to the conclusion that Shri Anil Kumar Shukla, TGT (Maths), Ramgarh Cantt has exhibited immoral sexual behaviour with the girl students of VIII-C.

(2) Recommendation of Chairman, VMC, KV, Ramgarh Cantt:

The Chairman, VMC, KV, Ramgarh Cantt, reported that he is agreed with the findings and opinion of the Preliminary Inquiry Committee and recommended that strict disciplinary action against Shri A. K. Shukla, TGT (Maths), KV, Ramgarh Cantt may be taken as per KVS Rules. (Encl-A)

(3) FIR filed by Moquesood Alam father of Miss Musarrat Asgari, Class VIII-C:

FIR has been lodged at PS Ramgarh by Moquesood Alam father of Miss Musarrat Asgari, Class VIII 'C' against the Charged Officer which was registered vide No.382/14; dated 26.09.2014 u/s 354/509 IPC. (Encl-B)

(4) Observation & recommendation of the undersigned:

1. Shri Anil Kumar Shukla, TGT (Maths), Ramgarh Cantt has deliberately avoided giving a statement to the Preliminary Inquiry

Committee despite he was available in the Vidyalaya. (Encl-C)



2. Based on Preliminary Inquiry, the Charged Officer was placed under suspension with immediate effect vide order No. F.40064/2014-15/KVS(RNC)/4870-4876 dated 26.09.2014 and the order was sent through Speed Post vide No.EJ2195112531IN; dated 26.09.2014 (Encl-D) and the same was refused by Sh. A. K. Shukla, hence it was returned to Regional Office, Ranchi on 13.10.2014. (Encl-E).
3. Summary Inquiry was conducted on 27.09.2014 at KV, Ramgarh Cantt. Since the Charged Officer requested for HPL on 25.09.2014 (Encl.F) through his email ID. However, he did not appear for the scheduled inquiry on 27.09.2014.
4. One more opportunity was given to him by the Inquiry Officer to appear before the Inquiry Committee on 09.10.2014 since the school was closed from 28.09.2014 to 08.10.2014 for the Autum Break. The intimation was sent to his email ID - anilkumarshukla67@gmail.com (Encl-G) as well as by SMS to the Charged Officer- Mobile No.9576508241 by the Inquiry Officer- Mobile No.9471009415 (Encl-H) on 08.10.2014 and there was no response from the Charged Officer.

The Charged Officer neither appeared for Summary Inquiry nor he invited himself before the Inquiry Officer (who is available in RO, Ranchi) to present his representation/statement against the charges levelled against him under Article 81(B). Moreover, he is seeking permission to proceed to Delhi to appear before the Hon'ble CAT, Principal Bench, Delhi on 13.10.2014 (Encl-I).

As per the opinion of the undersigned, the charge of misbehaviour with the girl students is more serious and it is necessary to appear before the Inquiry Committee that presenting himself before the Hon'ble CAT for the purpose of hearing vide OA No.1114/2013 on 13.10.2014.

It is evident that the charged officer has completely avoided the Inquiry Committee, hence, it is confirmed that the charged officer does not have any stand on the charges levelled against him.

The preliminary Inquiry Report (having 27 pages with Annexure 01 to 23) & Summary Inquiry Report

(having 39 pages with Annexure 01 to 20) in original alongwith Encl-(A) to Encl-(I) are forwarded herewith for your kind information and necessary action.”

Here again, it is a procedural step, and the applicant cannot take exception to that



16. The lack of any objectivity on the part of the applicant is evident from the fact that he has even challenged the order dated 27.10.2014, through which the suspension, which was operating against him, was revoked.

17. Annexure A-8 is the one in which the period of absence of the applicant from the date of revocation of suspension till 31.10.2014 was treated as unauthorised absence. The applicant does not state that he had attended to duties, but was still treated as unauthorisedly absent.

18. Annexure A-9 is the show cause notice dated 12.11.2014 issued to the applicant, requiring him to explain as to why his services be not terminated in view of the findings recorded against him in the proceedings. Unless it is shown that the authority who issued the show cause notice is not vested with the power, the Tribunal cannot interfere with the same.

19. During the pendency of this OA, the applicant was dismissed from service through order dated 22.12.2014. That is challenged by filing MA No.2257/2018. The order refers to the names of the students who complained against the applicant about

immoral behaviour towards them during school hours; the fact that misbehaviour of the applicant has damaged the reputation of the institution; the details of the preliminary inquiry and the summary inquiry that was conducted in this behalf; and the findings recorded therein. The disciplinary authority has also mentioned in paras 7, 8 and 9 as under:



“7. The undersigned is also of the considered views that:-

(i) On such sensitive matters relating to moral turpitude, no girl student/parent will come forward to lodge any false complaint against any teacher unless the truth is there;

(ii) The case has been considered as per the procedure laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in Babban Prasad Yadav Vrs. NVS & Others and as per Judgment dated 16-08-2010 in SLP No. 4627/2008 KVS Vrs. Rathin Pal wherein the submissions of the KVS have been upheld.

(iii) The Inquiry Committee was constituted as per the prescribed guidelines and allegations were held as established. Hence, the disciplinary proceedings initiated against Shri A.K. Shukla under the provisions of Article 81(B) of the Education Code for KVs is in order. An NGO member was also included in the Summary Inquiry Committee to ensure that the Inquiry findings are impartial;

(iv) In both the Preliminary Inquiry and Summary Inquiry Reports, it has been established that Shri A.K. Shukla, TGT (Math) has exhibited immoral sexual behaviour towards the girl students.

(v) The accused Shri A.K. Shukla has been given reasonable opportunity by providing all the relevant documents and sufficient time to prove his innocence and to make effective representation in his defence but failed to utilize the opportunity; and



(vi) The accused was not harassed unwarrantedly. The allegations of immoral behaviour leveled against him by the victim girl students were fully established during the course of the inquiries and found guilty of misbehaviour which amounts to moral turpitude involving immoral sexual behaviour towards the girl students. The undersigned agrees with the findings of the Summary Inquiry Committee. In such type of cases, the detailed inquiry under the CCS(CCA) Rules, 1965 is dispensed with in order to save the minor girls and their parents from the serious embarrassment and mental agony. Therefore, the undersigned also fully satisfied with the need for dispensing with the detailed inquiry in this case. The behaviour exhibited by Shri A.K. Shukla, TGT (Math) is highly inappropriate for which he deserves deterrent punishment. The undersigned therefore is of the view that since this is a very serious misconduct and the same stands proved during the Summary Inquiry, the continuance of service of Shri A.K. Shukla, will be hazardous to the congenial atmosphere of the Education Institution like Kendriya Vidyalaya in general and the girl students in particular and therefore he should not find a place in such a reputed institution like KVS where the destiny of tender hearts is shaped and ethics and values in them are infused.

8. Now, therefore, the undersigned being the Competent Authority in exercise of the powers conferred upon the undersigned under Article 81 (B) of the Education Code for the Kendriya Vidyalayas hereby terminates the services of Shri Anil Kumar Shukla, TGT (Math), Kendriya Vidyalaya, Ramgarh Cantt, (Jharkhan) with immediate effect. The pay and allowances as admissible under rules in lieu of notice period be paid to him.

9. If he wishes, he may prefer an appeal against this Order to the Vice Chairperson, KVS within 45 days of receipt of this Order."

The appeal preferred by the applicant was also rejected on 01.10.2015 by undertaking a detailed discussion.

20. It, therefore, needs to be seen as to whether the order of punishment passed against the applicant is vitiated in any manner.

21. The applicant has raised a typical plea by stating that the respondents have violated Section 19(4) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985. The provision reads as under:



“(4) Where an application has been admitted by a Tribunal under sub-section (3), every proceeding under the relevant service rules as to Redressal of grievances in relation to the subject-matter of such application pending immediately before such admission shall abate and save as otherwise directed by the Tribunal, no appeal or representation in relation to such matter shall thereafter be entertained under such rules.”

The gist of the provision is that in case an order is challenged before the Tribunal, any appeal, revision or other remedy availed against that very order, shall abate. If a show cause notice is challenged, the provision does not preclude or prohibit passing of a final order, unless the Tribunal passed an interim order. Therefore, we do not find any substance in the plea raised by the applicant.

22. Another plea is that the KVS is not a registered Society. It needs to be taken note only for rejection thereof. It is just understandable as to what relevance that has to the facts of the case. It is the same Society in which the applicant was appointed, and was working. The so called absence of registration is just his imagination, and nothing would turn upon that aspect. Added to that, no factual foundation is laid for it.



23. Now coming to the merits of the order of dismissal. The respondents have evolved a special procedure to deal with the cases of objectionable behaviour or harassment to girl students by the Teachers. Conducting of such proceedings under Rule 14 of the CCS (CCA) Rules would subject the students to serious harassment, if not insult. In *Avinash Nagra v Navodaya Vidyalaya Samiti* [(1997) 2 SCC 534], the Hon'ble Supreme Court dealt with the issue in detail. It was observed that any objectionable conduct from a Teacher towards girl students cannot be countenanced or tolerated. Extensive reference was made to the views expressed by Mahatma Gandhi and Dr. S. Radhakrishnan about the profession of teaching. Emphasis was also laid upon the education of girls. The dismissal of the Teacher on grounds of misbehaviour with the girl students was upheld.

24. The applicant raised the plea that the Teacher therein was only a probationer. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Director, Navodaya Vidyalaya Samiti & others v Babban Prasad Yadav & another* [(2004) 13 SCC 568], dealt with the same issue, in respect of a regular Teacher. In para 7, the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed as under:

“7. We are of the view that the High Court erred in reversing the decision of the Tribunal. The rule quoted earlier, explicitly deals with such a situation as obtains in the present case. The rule is not under challenge. All that is required for the court is to be satisfied that the preconditions to the exercise of power under the said rule are fulfilled. These

preconditions are: (7) holding of a summary enquiry, (2) a finding in such summary enquiry that the charged employee was guilty of moral turpitude; (3) the satisfaction of the Director on the basis of such summary enquiry that the charged officer was prima facie guilty; (4) the satisfaction of the Director that it was not expedient to hold an enquiry on account of serious embarrassment to be caused to the student or his guardians or such other practical difficulties and finally; (5) the recording of the reasons in writing in support of the aforesaid."



and reversed the judgment of the High Court, which had set aside the order of punishment.

25. Recently, this Tribunal decided OA No.344/2014 on 25.09.2014, wherein similar orders fell for consideration. After taking note of the judgment of the Supreme Court in *Babban Prasad Yadav's* case, the OA was dismissed. In the course of discussion, following was observed:

"7. It is rather unfortunate that the instances, that are borne out by record in this case, have occurred in a civilised society, not to speak of, in an institution established by a reputed organisation, like the KVS. We do not propose to detail the allegations and the further corroboration, out of sheer regard for decency. The nefarious and shameless activities on the part of the applicant came to light only when Shri Bipin Singh, cousin of one of the students, sent a complaint through an e-mail, at the behest of the mothers of 8 girl students of Class IX-H. The Assistant Commissioner of the Sangathan took note of the same, and appointed Principal of another KV, for conducting an inquiry. She submitted a report stating that the applicant exhibited immoral behaviour towards the girl students. Innocent girls were subjected to dirty, shameless and nefarious acts, which sometime they did not even share with their mothers, out of fear and shame. It was only when the activities were

being continued unabatedly, that some of them shared their experience with their mothers. Their mothers were hesitant to come up with the complaints, fearing humiliation to them and their beloved daughters.

8. One can really imagine the situation that if a mother comes forward with a complaint of this nature. Not only her child but also herself are likely to be subjected to social disrepute, for the shameless activities on the part of the applicant.....”



26. The applicant did not place the report of the summary inquiry before us, though he has filed documents running into about 500 pages. We do not find any remorse on the part of the applicant for the inconvenience and hardship caused to the girl students. On the other hand, his confrontation with the entire organisation of the KVS is evident throughout.

27. We do not find any merit in the OA. The same is accordingly dismissed. All the MAs shall stand disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

(A. K. Bishnoi)
Member (A)

/as/

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman