

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM
PRESENT
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN**

**Tuesday, the 17th day of February 2026 / 28th Magha, 1947
CONTEMPT CASE(C) NO. 2424 OF 2025(S) IN WP(C) 28246/2025**

PETITIONER/PETITIONER:

**PROF. DR. K.S. ANILKUMAR, AGED 51 YEARS,
S/O. KARUNAKARAN NAIR, REGISTRAR (UNDER SUSPENSION),
UNIVERSITY OF KERALA, UNIVERSITY BUILDINGS, PALAYAM,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 034, RESIDING AT SREE DHANYA APARTMENTS,
PONGUMMOODU, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695 001.**

**BY SRI.ELVIN PETER P.J. (SENIOR ADVOCATE) ALONG WITH M/S. K.R.GANESH,
ADARSH BABU C.S., AHSANA E. & ASHIK J. VARGHESE**

RESPONDENT/RESPONDENT NO.2:

**DR. MOHAN KUNNUMMAL, VICE CHANCELLOR, UNIVERSITY OF KERALA,
UNIVERSITY BUILDINGS, PALAYAM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 034.
RESIDING AT G4, NAVANI APARTMENTS, ZENANA MISSION ROAD,
CHEMBUKKAVU, THRISSUR, PIN - 680 020.**

**This Contempt of court case (civil) having come up for orders on
17.02.2026, the court on the same day passed the following:**



P.T.O.

P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN, J

Con Case (C) No.2424 of 2025

Dated this the 17th day of February, 2026

ORDER

This contempt case is filed alleging violation of Annexure-A6 judgment. Annexure-A6 is the judgment dated 10.09.2025. The allegation in the contempt case is that even now, the directions are not complied. I am of the prima facie opinion that a judgment of the High Court cannot be kept in cold storage by a Vice Chancellor of an University, who is the respondent herein. It will be better to extract the relevant directions in Annexure-A6 judgment:

" In view of the above findings regarding the correctness of the second meeting held, it is not necessary to probe further. The challenge against the suspension hence fails and the prayers regarding the same are rejected. The writ petition is disposed of directing the 2nd respondent to convene a meeting of the Syndicate through the Registrar in Charge to consider whether the suspension should be continued and the Syndicate may decide accordingly. The decision taken by the Syndicate will necessarily be binding on the Vice Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor will have to give effect to it, subject to the powers of the Chancellor."

Con Case (C) No.2424 of 2025

2

2. A writ petition was filed by the Syndicate members before this Court as WP (C) No.35976 of 2025 stating that the Vice Chancellor is not convening the Syndicate meeting. After getting instructions from the Vice Chancellor, that writ petition was disposed of, recording the submission that the Syndicate meeting was convened. Now, a Syndicate meeting's minutes is produced in this contempt as Annexure-A8. As per Annexure-A8, the Syndicate decided to revoke the suspension of the Registrar and decided to reinstate him pending enquiry.

3. The contention of the respondent, who is represented through a lawyer is that in the contempt case, the violation alleged is that the Syndicate meeting is not convened. The counsel appearing for the respondent submitted that, the respondent wants to file an affidavit. I am not inclined to give any further time to the respondent. This Contempt Case is pending before this Court from 13.10.2025 onwards. No affidavit is filed in this contempt case as on today. As far as the pleadings in the contempt case is concerned, it is a settled position that, the petitioner's duty is only to bring to the notice of this court about the contempt. Thereafter, it is the duty of this court to find out whether there is any contempt or not.

Con Case (C) No.2424 of 2025

3

4. The direction in the Annexure-A6 judgment is that, the decision taken by the Syndicate will necessarily be binding on the Vice Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor will have to give effect to it, subject to the powers of the Chancellor. It is an admitted fact that the Syndicate decided to revoke the suspension and reinstate the Registrar. Now, the Counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that, the Vice Chancellor is not agreeing with Syndicate's decision stating that it is in violation of the Kerala University First Statutes, 1977. The counsel for the respondent submitted that the matter is placed before the Chancellor and the decision of the Chancellor is awaited. A perusal of Annexure-A6, it is clear that, the direction is to the effect that the decision of the syndicate is binding to the Vice Chancellor. As I observed in the beginning, the judgment of the High Court cannot be kept by the Vice Chancellor indefinitely, like this. Immediate action is necessary, when there is a direction from this Court. Admittedly, Annexure-A6 became final. A perusal of the minutes of the Syndicate would show that the Vice Chancellor is objecting to the decision of the Syndicate itself. That itself prima facie shows that he committed contempt. The respondent will appear in person before this Court for taking further steps in the contempt case on

Con Case (C) No.2424 of 2025

4

11.03.2026. In the meanwhile, if the directions are complied or if the judgment or order is varied or modified, the appearance is dispensed with.

Post on 11.03.2026.

Sd/-
P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN
JUDGE

SSG



APPENDIX OF CON.CASE(C) 2424/2025

ANNEXURE A6

**CERTIFIED COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 10.09.2025 IN
W.P.(C) NO. 28246/2025 OF THIS HON'BLE COURT.**

ANNEXURE A8

**TRUE COPY OF THE RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE SYNDICATE
DATED 1.11.2025 REFERRED TO THE CHANCELLOR BY THE
RESPONDENT ALLEGING VIOLATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE
KERALA UNIVERSITY ACT AND STATUTES.**

