

CR

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE ZIYAD RAHMAN A.A.

THURSDAY, THE 5TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2024 / 14TH AGRAHAYANA, 1946

WP(C) NO. 22835 OF 2024

PETITIONER/S:

- 1 AMEEN AKBARALI.U
AGED 25 YEARS
S/O ISHAQUE.U, ULUVAN HOUSE, NELLIKUTHU P.O, MANJERI,
MALAPPURAM-, PIN - 676122
- 2 R.S KASHINADHAN
AGED 25 YEARS
S/O RAJEEV S, THIRUVATHIRA HOUSE, KIZHAKKUM BHAGOM,
CHITHARA P.O, KOLLAM, PIN - 691559
- 3 AJAY.J
AGED 24 YEARS
S/O JAYAKUMAR.K, KRISHNAVILASAM, ANANDAPPALLY P.O,
PANNIVIZHA, ADOOR, PATHANAMTHITTA-, PIN - 691525
- 4 SINJO JOHNSON
AGED 24 YEARS
S/O JOHNSON GEORGE,ELEVENKOTTU SNEHA BHAVAN.
ODANAVATTOM P.O, KOTTARAKKARA, KOLLAM-, PIN - 691512

BY ADVS.
NANDAGOPAL S.KURUP
ADITH KIRAN R.S.

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 KERALA VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES UNIVERSITY
POOKODE, WAYANAD-, REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR., PIN -
680505
- 2 COLLEGE OF VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES UNIVERSITY



2024:KER:90865

WP(C)No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

2

POOKODE, LAKKIDI P.O, WAYANAD-, REPRESENTED BY ITS
DEAN., PIN - 673576

- 3 THE VICE CHANCELLOR
KERALA VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES UNIVERSITY,
POOKODE, WAYANAD-, PIN - 680505
- 4 THE DEAN, COLLEGE OF VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY
POOKODE, LAKKIDI P.O, WAYANAD, PIN - 673576
- 5 ANTI-RAGGING COMMITTEE, COLLEGE OF VETERINARY AND
ANIMAL SCIENCES UNIVERSITY
POOKODE, LAKKIDI P.O, WAYANAD REPRESENTED BY THE HEAD
OF THE INSTITUTION- THE FOURTH RESPONDENT., PIN -
673576
- 6 THE DEAN, COLLEGE OF VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES
, MANNUTHY, THRISSUR, PIN - 680651
- 7 SHEEBA M.R, (SOUGHT TO BE IMPEADED)
W/O JAYAPRAKASH T., RESIDING AT PAVITHRAM, VINOD
NAGAR, KURAKODE, NEDUMANGAD P.O., THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
DISTRICT (SOUGHT TO BE IMPEADED)

BY ADVS.
NISHA GEORGE
GEORGE POONTHOTTAM (SR.)
KAVYA VARMA M. M.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON
18.11.2024, ALONG WITH WP(C) NOS.21140/2024, 22028/2024 AND
CONNECTED CASES, THE COURT ON 05.12.2024 DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:



2024:KER:90865

WP(C)No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

3

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE ZIYAD RAHMAN A.A.

THURSDAY, THE 5TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2024 / 14TH AGRAHAYANA, 1946

WP(C) NO. 21140 OF 2024

PETITIONER/S:

ARUN K
AGED 23 YEARS
KELOTH, THAZHE KANIYARAM, MANANTHAVADY, WAYANAD
DISTRICT, PIN - 670645

BY ADVS.
SANTHARAM.P
REKHA ARAVIND
P.G.GOKULNATH
PAUL P. ABRAHAM

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 KERALA VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES UNIVERSITY,
WAYANAD BY ITS REGISTRAR
POOKKOD, WAYANAD DISTRICT, PIN - 673576
- 2 THE VICE CHANCELLOR
THE KERALA VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES UNIVERSITY,
POOKKOD, WAYANAD DISTRICT, PIN - 673576
- 3 THE COLLEGE OF VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCE, POOKOD
REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL, POOKKOD, LAKKIDI P.O.,
WAYANAD DISTRICT, PIN - 673576
- 4 THE PRINCIPAL
THE COLLEGE OF VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCE, POOKOD,



2024:KER:90865

WP(C)No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

4

LAKKIDI P.O., WAYANAD DISTRICT, PIN - 673576

- 5 THE DEAN
THE COLLEGE OF VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCE, POOKOD,
LAKKIDI P.O., WAYANAD DISTRICT,, PIN - 673576
- 6 THE ANTI-RAGGING COMMITTEE
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN, THE COLLEGE OF
VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCE, POOKOD, LAKKIDI P.O.,
WAYANAD DISTRICT, PIN - 673576
- 7 CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION (CBI)
REPRESENTED BY ITS DIRECTOR, PLOT NO 5-B, CGO
COMPLEX, LODHI ROAD, NEW DELHI, PIN - 110003

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON
18.11.2024, ALONG WITH WP(C)NOS.22835/2024 AND CONNECTED CASES,
THE COURT ON 05.12.2024 DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



2024:KER:90865

WP(C)No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

5

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE ZIYAD RAHMAN A.A.

THURSDAY, THE 5TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2024 / 14TH AGRAHAYANA, 1946

WP(C) NO. 22028 OF 2024

PETITIONER/S:

- 1 MOHAMMED DHANISH.M
AGED 23 YEARS
2 ND YEAR BVSC & AH STUDENT, COLLEGE OF
VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES, POOKODE, WAYANAD,
RESIDING AT MEEMPATTA HOUSE, CHENAYIKKUNNU,
PATHAPPIRIYAM.P.O, EDAVANNA, MALAPURAM, PIN - 676123
- 2 REHAN BINOY
AGED 20 YEARS
2 ND YEAR BVSC & AH STUDENT, COLLEGE OF
VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES, POOKODE, WAYANAD,
RESIDING AT CRA 179, PALAKUDY HOUSE, PLAVILA LANE,
PONGUMOODU, MEDICAL COLLEGE P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,
PIN - 695011
- 3 ADITHYAN.V
AGED 20 YEARS
2 ND YEAR BVSC & AH STUDENT, COLLEGE OF
VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES, POOKODE, WAYANAD,
RESIDING AT PUTHIYOTTUMKARA HOUSE, PANTHIRIKARA
AVADUKA.P.O, PERUVANNAMUZHI, KOZHIKKODE, PIN - 673528
- 4 ALTHAF.A
AGED 22 YEARS
2 ND YEAR BVSC & AH STUDENT, COLLEGE OF
VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES, POOKODE, WAYANAD,
RESIDING AT CHETTIYAN VILAKOM HOUSE, PARAVUR,
THEKKUMBHAGOM.P.O, KOLLAM, PIN - 691319
- 5 SOUD RISAL.E.K



2024:KER:90865

WP(C)No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

6

AGED 22 YEARS
2 ND YEAR BVSC & AH STUDENT, COLLEGE OF
VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES, POOKODE, WAYANAD,,
EDATHOLA KURIKKAL HOUSE, PAKKANAPPURAYA,
KANNATTIPPADI.P.O, MALAPPURAM, PIN - 676304

BY ADV P.C.SASIDHARAN

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 KERALA VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES UNIVERSITY,
POOKODE, WAYANAD , REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR., PIN
- 680505
- 2 THE VICE CHANCELLOR
KERALA VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES UNIVERSITY,
POOKODE, WAYANAD, PIN - 680505
- 3 THE ANTI-RAGGING COMMITTEE
COLLEGE OF VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES, POOKODE,
WAYANAD, REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN., PIN - 673576
- 4 THE DEAN
COLLEGE OF VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES, POOKODE,
WAYANAD, PIN - 673576

BY ADV MANU GOVIND

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON
18.11.2024, ALONG WITH WP(C)NOS.22835/2024 AND CONNECTED CASES,
THE COURT ON 05.12.2024 DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



2024:KER:90865

WP(C)No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

7

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE ZIYAD RAHMAN A.A.

THURSDAY, THE 5TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2024 / 14TH AGRAHAYANA, 1946

WP(C) NO. 25806 OF 2024

PETITIONER/S:

AKHIL K
AGED 28 YEARS
S/O VELAYUDHAN K, KOTTAYIL HOUSE, AMAYUR P. O.,
KOPPAM, PATTAMBI, PALAKKAD DISTRICT, PIN - 679303

BY ADVS.
K.S.ARUN KUMAR
RAJI T.BHASKAR
VIJAY SANKAR V.H.

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 KERALA VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES UNIVERSITY
POOKODE, LAKKIDI P. O., WAYANAD, PIN- 673576
REPRESENTED BY ITS VICE CHANCELLOR, PIN - 673576
- 2 THE VICE CHANCELLOR
KERALA VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCE UNIVERSITY,
POOKODE, LAKKIDI P. O., WAYANAD,, PIN - 673576
- 3 THE DIRECTOR OF ACADEMICS & RESERCH
KERALA VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCE UNIVERSITY,
POOKODE, LAKKIDI P. O., WAYANAD,, PIN - 673576
- 4 THE REGISTRAR (ACADEMIC & RESERCH)
KERALA VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCE UNIVERSITY,
POOKODE, LAKKIDI P. O., WAYANAD,, PIN - 673576



2024:KER:90865

WP(C)No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

8

- 5 THE JOINT REGISTRAR (ACADEMIC & RESEARCH)
KERALA VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCE UNIVERSITY,
POOKODE, LAKKIDI P. O., WAYANAD,, PIN - 673576
- 6 THE DEAN
COLLEGE OF VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES, POOKODE,
LAKKIDI P. O., WAYANAD, PIN - 673576
- 7 THE ANTI RAGGING COMMITTEE
COLLEGE OF VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES, POOKODE,
LAKKIDI P. O., WAYANAD, REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN,
PIN - 673576

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON
18.11.2024 ALONG WITH WP(C)NOS.22835/2024 AND CONNECTED CASES,
THE COURT ON 05.12.2024 DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



2024:KER:90865

WP(C)No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

9

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE ZIYAD RAHMAN A.A.

THURSDAY, THE 5TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2024 / 14TH AGRAHAYANA, 1946

WP(C) NO. 28606 OF 2024

PETITIONER/S:

ARUN K
AGED 23 YEARS
KELOTH, THAZHE KANIYARAM, MANANTHAVADY, WAYANAD
DISTRICT, PIN - 670645

BY ADVS.
SANTHARAM.P
REKHA ARAVIND
P.G.GOKULNATH

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 THE KERALA VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES UNIVERSITY
POOKKOD WAYANAD DISTRICT, REPRESENTED BY ITS
REGISTRAR, PIN - 673576
- 2 THE VICE CHANCELLOR
THE KERALA VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES UNIVERSITY,
POOKKOD, WAYANAD DISTRICT, PIN - 673576
- 3 THE DEAN, THE COLLEGE OF VETERINARY AND ANIMAL
SCIENCE, POOKOD
LAKKIDI P.O., WAYANAD DISTRICT, PIN - 673576
- 4 THE ANTI-RAGGING COMMITTEE, REPRESENTED BY ITS
CHAIRMAN
THE COLLEGE OF VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCE, POOKOD,



2024:KER:90865

WP(C)No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

10

LAKKIDI P.O., WAYANAD DISTRICT., PIN - 673576

5 ANTI RAGGING SQUAD, REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN
THE COLLEGE OF VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCE, POOKOD,
LAKKIDI P.O., WAYANAD DISTRICT., PIN - 673576

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON
18.11.2024 ALONG WITH WP(C)NOS.22835/2024 AND CONNECTED CASES,
THE COURT ON 05.12.2024 DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



2024:KER:90865

WP(C)No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

11

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE ZIYAD RAHMAN A.A.

THURSDAY, THE 5TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2024 / 14TH AGRAHAYANA, 1946

WP(C) NO. 29685 OF 2024

PETITIONER/S:

- 1 N.ASIF KHAN
AGED 23 YEARS
S/O NOUSHAD KHAN,, ASIF MANZIL, KIZHAKKEPURAM P.O,
ATHIROOR,VARKALA, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
DISTRICT,KERALA,, PIN - 695310
 - 2 AMAL IHSAN
AGED 23 YEARS
S/O NOUSHAD A ARY HOUSE, CLUB KUNNU,VTC,MANANTHAVADY
P.O WAYANAD DISTRICT,, PIN - 670645
- BY ADVS.
V.SHYAM
P.ARUN
SAHEERA K.

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 KERALA VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES UNIVERSITY,
POOKODE, WAYANAD-REP BY ITS REGISTRAR, PIN - 673576
- 2 THE VICE CHANCELLOR
KERALA VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY,POOKODE ,WAYANAD DISTRICT, PIN - 673576
- 3 THE ANTI-RAGGING COMMITTEE
KERALA VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES



2024:KER:90865

WP(C)No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

12

UNIVERSITY,POOKODE,WAYANAD DISTRICT, PIN - 673576

4 THE DEAN
KERALA VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY,POOKODE,WAYANAD-, PIN - 673576

BY ADV MANU GOVIND

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON
18.11.2024 ALONG WITH WP(C)NOS.22835/2024 AND CONNECTED CASES,
THE COURT ON 05.12.2024 DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



2024:KER:90865

WP(C)No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

13

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE ZIYAD RAHMAN A.A.

THURSDAY, THE 5TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2024 / 14TH AGRAHAYANA, 1946

WP(C) NO. 30162 OF 2024

PETITIONER/S:

- 1 ABHISHEKH S
AGED 23 YEARS
S/O.SAJI P.K., PAZHAYIDATHU HOUSE, RAMAKKAL MEDU
P.O., KARUNAPURAM VILLAGE, IDUKKI DISTRICT, PIN -
685552
- 2 DONES DAIE
AGED 23 YEARS
S/O. DAIE JOHN, THURAKKAL PUTHENPURAYIL HOUSE,
KOTHAKUTHY, MUTHALAKODAM P.O., KARIKKODE VILLAGE,
THODUPUZHA, IDUKKI DISTRICT, PIN - 685605

BY ADVS.
N.M.MADHU
C.S.RAJANI

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 THE KERALA VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES UNIVERSITY
POOKODE, WAYANAD DISTRICT, REPRESENTED BY ITS
REGISTRAR, PIN - 673576
- 2 THE COLLEGE OF VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY
POOKODE, LAKKIDI P.O., WAYANAD DISTRICT REPRESENTED
BY ITS DEAN, PIN - 673576



2024:KER:90865

WP(C)No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

14

- 3 THE DEAN
COLLEGE OF VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES UNIVERSITY,
POOKODE, LAKKIDI P.O., WAYANAD DISTRICT, PIN - 673576
- 4 THE ANTI-RAGGIN COMMITTEE
COLLEGE OF VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES UNIVERSITY,
POOKODE, LAKKIDI P.O., WAYANAD DISTRICT, REPRESENTED
BY ITS CHAIRMAN, PIN - 673576
- 5 THE VICE CHANCELLOR
KERALA VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES UNIVERSITY,
POOKODE, WAYANAD DISTRICT, PIN - 673576

BY ADV MANU GOVIND

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON
18.11.2024, ALONG WITH WP(C)NOS.22835/2024 AND CONNECTED CASES,
THE COURT ON 05.12.2024 DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



2024:KER:90865

WP(C)No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

15

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE ZIYAD RAHMAN A.A.

THURSDAY, THE 5TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2024 / 14TH AGRAHAYANA, 1946

WP(C) NO. 33231 OF 2024

PETITIONER/S:

AKASH .S.D.
AGED 22 YEARS
S/O SARATHCHANDRAN, VIJAYAMMA NIVAS, KONJIRAVILA,
MANAKKAD P.O KALIPPANKULAM, MANAKKAD VILLAGE,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695009

BY ADVS.
S.K.ADHITHYAN
SHAHINA NOUSHAD
REUBEN CHARLY

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 THE KERALA VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES UNIVERSITY,
POOKOD, WAYANAD, PIN - 673576
- 2 THE VICE CHANCELLOR
THE KERALA VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES UNIVERSITY,
POOKKOD, WAYANAD, PIN, PIN - 673576
- 3 THE DEAN
THE COLLEGE OF VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCE, POOKOD
LAKKIDI P.O, WAYANAD DISTRICT, PIN – 673576,
PIN - 673576
- 4 THE ANTI-RAGGING COMMITTEE
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN, THE COLLEGE VETERINARY



2024:KER:90865

WP(C)No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

16

AND ANIMAL SCIENCES, POOKKOD, LAKKIDI P.O, WAYANAD,
PIN - 673576

5 ANTI-RAGGING SQUAD
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN, THE COLLEGE OF
VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCE, POOKOD, LAKKIDI P.O,
WAYANAD, PIN - 673576

BY ADV MANU GOVIND

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON
18.11.2024, ALONG WITH WP(C)NO.22835/2024 AND CONNECTED CASES,
THE COURT ON 05.12.2024 DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



2024:KER:90865

WP(C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

17

JUDGMENT

**[WP(C) Nos.22835/2024, 21140/2024, 22028/2024,
25806/2024, 28606/2024, 29685/2024,
30162/2024, 33231/2024]**

.....

In all these writ petitions, the challenge is made against an order issued by the Kerala Veterinary and Animal Sciences University (hereinafter referred to as the 'University'), by which, 19 students of the University were proceeded against as part of disciplinary proceedings and imposed with the penalty of expulsion from the college and debarring them from securing admission in any other college for a period of three years. (*For the sake of convenience, the documents and respondents are hereinafter referred to as per the sequence shown in WP(C) No.22835 of 2024, unless otherwise specifically mentioned*)

2. The facts that led to the filing of these writ petitions are as follows: All the petitioners are students of Bachelor of Veterinary Science and Animal Husbandry (B.V.Sc & A.H) under the University. The petitioners include students studying from 2nd year to the final



2024:KER:90865

WP(C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

18

year of the course. The subject matter of this writ petition is an unfortunate incident that occurred in the college hostel on 18.02.2024, in which one student of the second year, by the name Sidharathan, was found dead by hanging in the bathroom of the hostel. In connection with the incident, Crime No.77/2024 was registered by the Vythiri Police Station, as per Ext P1, under section 174 of the Cr.P.C. Immediately thereupon, the Station House Officer of the said police station issued a letter to the University to enquire whether the deceased was subjected to any ragging by the students. The National Anti Ragging Cell of the University Grants Commission (UGC) also forwarded complaints in this regard received by them, to the University. Accordingly, a meeting of Anti Ragging Committee (hereinafter referred to as the 'Committee'), the 5th respondent, which is a body created under Regulation 6.3 of the UGC Regulations on Curbing the Menace of Ragging in Higher Educational Institutions, 2009, (hereinafter referred to as 'Regulations'), of the 1st respondent University, was convened on 22.02.2024.

3. Based on the decision taken by the said Committee, the



2024:KER:90865

WP(C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

19

Dean of the College took a decision as per Ext P2, to suspend some of the petitioners (12 students) from the college and the hostel, pending enquiry. In the meantime, the petitioners were implicated as accused in the crime referred to above by the police, wherein the offences under section 120B, 341, 323, 324, 342, 355, 306 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 4 read with section 3 of the Kerala Prohibition of Ragging Act, 1998, were incorporated during the course of the investigation. By that time, the issue drew the media attention, and hence the petitioners kept themselves away from the public view for some time. Eventually, all the petitioners were arrested by the police on various dates from the last week of February to the first week of March 2024. They were later released on bail as per Ext P3 order passed by this court on 31.05.2024.

4. In the meanwhile, the Anti Ragging Squad (hereinafter referred to as the 'Squad'), which is also a fact-finding authority constituted under Regulation 6.3 of the UGC Regulations, conducted an enquiry, and submitted an interim report before the Committee, holding some students guilty of assaulting the deceased Sidharthan



2024:KER:90865

WP(C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

20

by keeping him detained in the hostel for two days from 16.02.2024 and inflicting injuries on his body, accusing the said Sidharthan that he misbehaved with a girl. These assaults and ill-treatment by the students allegedly compelled the said Sidharthan to commit suicide. It is stated that, before submitting the said interim report, the Squad recorded the statements of 97 witnesses, and as part of the said enquiry, the petitioners and other students were issued with notices to attend the enquiry, which was conducted on 26th to 28th of February, 2024. Exhibit P10 is the said interim report and acting upon the said report, the Committee took a decision on 01.03.2024, to impose penalty upon the petitioners and other students, i.e., total 19 students including the petitioners. The penalty proposed for all of them was dismissal from the college with a further punishment of debarring them from securing admission in any other educational institution for a period of three years. Accordingly, the Dean, issued Ext P4 order by which the said penalty was imposed on 2.03.2024. Ext P11 is the minutes of the meeting of the Committee, which was held on 01.03.2024. Subsequently, a final report was submitted by



2024:KER:90865

WP(C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

21

the squad as evidenced by Ext P12, on 20.03.2024. As part of the said enquiry, the statements of 167 persons were recorded including the statements of 97 persons recorded and referred to in Ext P10 interim report. It is the definite case of all the petitioners that, the petitioners were never served with copies of the reports of the Squad, and the decisions of the Committee, at no point of time and even though the father of one of the petitioners requested copies of these documents under the Right to Information Act, the same was expressly declined by the authorities stating that the same are confidential. Ultimately they obtained the said copies when the CBI, who was entrusted with the investigation of the criminal case, filed charge sheet against the petitioners before the criminal court and along with the said charge sheet, the copies of these documents were filed. It is also the case of the petitioners that, the enquiry conducted by the Squad was without giving them a proper notice and an opportunity to defend the proceedings. These writ petitions are filed by the respective petitioners, who are among the 19 students who are imposed with the penalty as referred to above.



5. The petitioners have raised various contentions, such as, the lack of authority for the Dean to initiate such a proceeding and impose a penalty, violation of principles of natural justice as no proper opportunity was granted to the petitioners, the improper constitution of the Squad and the Committee, discrepancies in the procedure adopted by the said Squad and the Committee while completing the proceedings, etc.

6. Disputing the contentions raised, the University and the Dean have filed counter affidavits justifying the actions taken by them and explaining the procedure followed by them while imposing the penalty. In some of the writ petitions, the maintainability of the writ petitions are also raised by them.

7. Heard the respective learned counsels for the petitioners and the Standing Counsel for the University.

8. In WP(C) No. 22835/2024, the University raised serious objection as to the maintainability of the writ petition, in view of the fact that petitioners 1 and 2 therein have earlier filed statutory appeals before the Vice Chancellor and later have withdrawn the



2024:KER:90865

WP(C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

23

same. Therefore, it was contended by the learned Standing Counsel for the respondents that the same amounts to abandonment of the claim and hence, the reliefs sought by them in the present writ petition cannot be considered. It was also contended that when the party who has a remedy to file an appeal against the impugned order, has chosen not to pursue the same, this court cannot entertain the said challenge under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. In this regard the learned Standing Counsel placed reliance upon the decision rendered by a Division Bench of this Court in **Sohams Foundations Engineering Pvt Ltd (M/s)v. Union of India and Another [2012 (1) KHC 849]**.

9. However, I am not inclined to accept the said contention. It is true that petitioners 1 and 2 filed appeals before the Vice Chancellor and also filed WP(C) No.21217/2024 before this court wherein, an interim order was passed by this Court on 12.06.2024 directing the Vice Chancellor to consider the said appeals and pass orders. The case of the petitioners is that, the said appeals were filed against Ext.P4 order passed by the Dean, whereas the appeal is



2024:KER:90865

WP(C)No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

24

contemplated as per clause 9.1(c) of the UGC Regulations, only against the order passed by the Anti Ragging Committee. The copy of the decision of the Committee was not provided to the petitioners as well. Therefore, Exts. P21 and P22 were submitted by the said petitioners before the Vice-chancellor for withdrawing the said appeals without prejudice to their right to challenge the same before the appropriate forum. Besides, WP(C)No.21217/2024 filed by them, was also withdrawn, as evidenced by Ext. P23, without prejudice to the right of the petitioners to approach this court, on the same cause of action. This court has already granted that permission as per Ext P23. Therefore, I do not find any justification in denying the said right to the petitioner merely because, earlier, they filed appeals. Moreover, it is also an undisputed fact that copies of the decision of the Anti-Ragging Committee were not issued to them, and the same was received by the petitioners along with the final report submitted by the CBI at a later point in time i.e after filing of the appeals referred to above.



2024:KER:90865

WP(C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

25

10. The contention raised by the respondents that, as the petitioners 1 and 2 did not pursue the appeal, they cannot seek the remedies in the writ petition also does not appear to be sustainable in the facts and circumstances in this case. One of the main grounds of challenge by the petitioners is based on the violations of the principles of natural justice, and this court is not called upon to decide any factual questions relating to allegations raised against the petitioner. The documents would clearly indicate that, the petitioners were not provided with copies of the enquiry reports (interim as well as final) and copies of the decision of the Committee, so as to enable them to utilise the opportunity to avail the statutory remedy of appeal, effectively. Therefore, for the purpose of considering the challenge on the limited question as to whether there are violations of principles of natural justice to the extent it warrants interference in the proceedings, is a matter which is open for this court to consider in this proceeding under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. The respondents cannot, therefore, challenge the maintainability of the writ petition by raising a contention that the petitioners did not avail of



2024:KER:90865

WP(C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

26

the alternate remedy without providing them the materials that are essential to invoke the said remedies.

11. The contention regarding the existence of the alternative remedy was raised by the University in other writ petitions as well, but the same cannot be entertained for the reason mentioned above.

12. In WP(C) No. 22028/2024, the petitioners therein raised a contention with regard to the competence of the 4th respondent therein, i.e., the Dean, to initiate the proceedings and impose the penalty. The said contention is based on the stipulations contained in section 61 of the Kerala Veterinary and Animal Sciences University Act, which reads as follows:

“61. Disciplinary powers and discipline among students.

(1) All powers relating to discipline and disciplinary action in relation to the students of the University Departments and institutions and colleges, maintained by the University, shall vest in the Vice-Chancellor.

(2) The Vice-Chancellor may, by order, delegate all or any of his powers under this Act as he deems fit, to such other officers or body as he may nominate or create in that behalf.”

It was also contended that the 4th respondent is the Faculty Dean, as contemplated under Statute 62 of the Kerala Veterinary & Animal Sciences University First Statutes, 2014 (hereinafter referred to as



2024:KER:90865

WP(C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

27

‘Statutes, 2014’), and the powers of the said Dean are contemplated under Statute 63, which do not include the disciplinary powers.

13. However, I do not find any merit in the said contention. Section 61(2) of the Act, specifically empowers the Vice- Chancellor to delegate all or any of the powers under the Act, as he deems fit, to such other officers or body as he may nominate or create by an order. The 1st respondent in WP(C) No. 22028/2024, produced Ext R1(a) along with their counter affidavit, which is an order dated 6.10.2017, enabling the Higher Officers of University to delegate the powers to the other officers as and when necessary. Even though in the said order, the reference was made only to section 68 of the University Act, later, a further clarificatory order Ext.R1(c) was issued by the University based on the order of the Vice-Chancellor in respect of the delegation of the powers of discipline under section 61 (2) as well. It is also to be noted in this regard that Ext R1(b), which is the compilation of the powers thus delegated to the Dean, includes the power to initiate disciplinary proceedings against the students as well, as per serial No. 7 therein. Besides, serial No. 20 in Ext R1(b)



2024:KER:90865

WP(C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

28

confers power on the Dean to exercise supervision and control over the discipline of students and take appropriate disciplinary action. Thus, there was a valid delegation specifically enabling the Dean to exercise the powers to conduct disciplinary proceedings against the students.

14. Similarly, with regard to the contention regarding the powers of the Dean as contemplated under Statutes 62 and 63 of Statutes, 2014 also, I do not finding any merit. This is because, as per Statutes, 2014, there are two types of Deans: one is the Dean as the head of Constituent College, and the other is the faculty Dean. Statutes 48 to 55 of the First Statutes, 2014 deal with the Dean of Constituent College. The powers of the Dean are contemplated under Statute 54, and sub clause (d) thereof, provides that he shall maintain discipline among the students and staff of the college and be responsible for the due observance of the statutes/regulations/rules relating to the Colleges. The expression "Constituent college" is defined in section 2(i) of the Act, as "*.. a college owned and managed by the University*". The "College" is



2024:KER:90865

WP (C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con. Cases

29

defined under section 2(h) which reads as follows:

“2(h) “College” means an institution imparting education in Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Dairy Science and Technology, owned and managed by the University or other institutions affiliated to the University situated in the State of Kerala.”

“Dean” is defined under section 2(j) as “... chief academic and administrative head of a college.”

15. Thus, from a conjoint reading of the above provisions, it is evident that the Dean of a Constituent College is the head of such college, who is entrusted with the duty to maintain discipline in the college and is empowered to initiate disciplinary proceedings against the students, as well as the teaching and non-teaching staff. As far as the Dean referred to Statutes 62 and 63 of the First Statute 2014 is concerned, he is a separate authority, who is the senior most Dean in the Faculty and shall exercise the powers specifically conferred upon him as per Statute 63, which are distinct from the Dean, who is the head of the Constituent College. As far as the college in which the incident occurred is concerned, there is no dispute that the said college is owned and managed by the University and, therefore, it is a constituent college as defined under section 2(i) of the Act. Thus,



the 4th respondent, being the head of the said college, is empowered to perform all the duties as contemplated in Statute 54, which include the maintenance of discipline in the college. Therefore the contention raised by the petitioners on this ground is not legally sustainable.

16. Another contention raised by the petitioner is with regard to the constitution of the Anti Ragging Squad and the manner in which the proceedings have been concluded. The UGC Regulations, 2009, a copy of which is produced as Ext P13 in WP(C)No. 22835/2024, provides for the authorities and the manner in which an enquiry in relation to the allegation of ragging has to be conducted. Regulation 6.3 (a) to (e) of the UGC Regulations are relevant in this regard, which read as follows:

“6.3. Every institution shall constitute the following bodies; namely,

a) Every institution shall constitute a Committee to be known as the Anti-Ragging Committee to be nominated and headed by the Head of the institution, and consisting of representatives of civil and police administration, local media, Non Government Organizations involved in youth activities, representatives of faculty members, representatives of parents, representatives of students



belonging to the freshers' category as well as senior students, non-teaching staff; and shall have a diverse mix of membership in terms of levels as well as gender.

b) It shall be the duty of the Anti-Ragging Committee to ensure compliance with the provisions of these Regulations as well as the provisions of any law for the time being in force concerning ragging; and also to monitor and oversee the performance of the Anti-Ragging Squad in prevention of ragging in the institution.

c) Every institution shall also constitute a smaller body to be known as the Anti-Ragging Squad to be nominated by the Head of the Institution with such representation as may be considered necessary for maintaining vigil, oversight and patrolling factions and shall remain mobile, alert and active at all times.

Provided that the Anti-Ragging Squad shall have representation of various members of the campus community and shall have no outside representation.

d) It shall be the duty of the Anti-Ragging Squad to be called upon to make surprise raids on hostels, and other places vulnerable to incidents of, and having the potential of, ragging and shall be empowered to inspect such places.

e) It shall also be the duty of the Anti-Ragging Squad to conduct an on-the-spot enquiry into any incident of ragging referred to it by the Head of the Institution or any member of the faculty or any member of the staff or any student or any parent or guardian or any employee of a service provider or



2024:KER:90865

WP (C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con. Cases

32

by any other person, as the case may be; and the enquiry report along with recommendations shall be submitted to the Anti-Ragging Committee for action under clause (a) of Regulation 9.1.

Provided that the Anti-Ragging Squad shall conduct such enquiry observing a fair and transparent procedure and the principles of natural justice and after giving adequate opportunity to the student or students accused of ragging and other witnesses to place before it the facts, documents and views concerning the incident of ragging, and considering such other relevant information as may be required.”

17. It is evident from the above that, a fact-finding enquiry has to be conducted by the Squad and based on the report so submitted by the Squad, the Committee has to take a decision as to penalty to be imposed upon the students, who are guilty of the committing any acts which amounts to ragging. Acting upon the said decision of the Committee, the institution shall impose the penalty. The same is evident from Regulation 9 (1) (a) and (b) of the UGC Regulations, which read as follows:



"9. Administrative action in the event of ragging.-

9.1 The institution shall punish a student found guilty of ragging after following the procedure and in the manner prescribed hereunder:

a) The Anti-Ragging Committee of the institution shall take an appropriate decision, in regard to punishment or otherwise depending on the facts of each incident of ragging and nature and gravity of the incident of ragging established in the recommendations of the Anti-Ragging Squad.

b) The Anti-Ragging Committee may, depending on the nature and gravity of the guilty established by the Anti-Ragging Squad, award, to those found guilty, one or more of the following punishments, namely;

i Suspension from attending classes and academic privileges.

ii. Withholding/withdrawing scholarship/fellowship and other benefits

iii. Debarring from appearing in any test/examination or other evaluation process.

iv. Withholding results.

v. Debarring from representing the institution in any regional, national or international meet, tournament, youth festival, etc.

vi. Suspension/expulsion from the hostel.

vii. Cancellation of admission.

viii. Rustication from the institution for period ranging from one to four semester.

ix. Expulsion from the institution and consequent debarring



from admission to any other institution for a specified period.

Provided that where the persons committing or abetting the act of ragging are not identified, the institution shall resort to collective punishment.”

18. One important aspect to be noticed is that, in the proviso to Regulation 6.3(e), it is specifically mentioned that, Anti Ragging Squad shall conduct the enquiry observing a fair and transparent procedure and the principles of natural justice, after giving the students accused of ragging to place the facts, documents and views, concerning the incident of ragging. The main contentions raised by the petitioners are regarding the violation of the above provision, as according to them, neither notices were issued to them properly, nor a proper opportunity to contest the matter was also provided.

19. Since the proviso to Regulation 6.3 (e) specifically provides for adherence to the principles of natural justice and a fair opportunity for the accused students to place their materials and views, this is a contention which requires to be considered in the light of the



2024:KER:90865

WP(C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con. Cases

35

materials available. In this regard, the specific contentions of all the petitioners is that, at the time when the enquiry was conducted by the Squad on 26th 28th of February 2024, all of them were not in a position to appear before the Squad due to more than one reason. Firstly, it was contended that they were not issued with a proper notice of the proceedings. The admitted case of the University in this regard is that, the notices were issued by the University, through e-mails to the petitioners and also through their advisers provided to them, as part of the scheme of the studies. Thus the question that arises is whether the same would amount to the proper compliance of the requirements contemplated under the proviso to Regulation 6.3(e) of UGC Regulations.

20. It is evident from Ext P10 that the enquiry was conducted on the 26th and 28th of February 2024 and as part of the same, the statements of 97 persons were recorded. However, the crucial aspect to be noticed is that the petitioners have a specific case that, at the time when the said enquiry was being conducted, an atmosphere which was conducive for them to appear before the



authorities was not in existence. The incident, which is the subject matter of enquiry, received wide media attention throughout the State, and it was projected as the major headline in all the visual and print media. There was a huge outcry from the general public, who expressed their anguish through various social media platforms, asking for immediate punishment of the culprits. The police have also implicated the petitioners in the crime registered in this regard. Therefore, according to the petitioners, they were compelled to keep themselves away from the public eye while attempting to invoke their legal remedies. All of them were arrested during the last week of February and the first week of March as well. Since they were forced to sever all ties with the other people during the said period, there was no occasion for them to receive the notices or to attend the enquiry in response to the same.

21. As far as the contention regarding the non-service of the notice is concerned, admittedly, the same was served only through e-mails and through their advisors. Evidently, no attempts have been taken to serve the notice to the residential addresses of the



2024:KER:90865

WP(C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con. Cases

37

petitioners, even though the same were within the knowledge of the authorities concerned. No attempts have been made to issue notices to the parents of the petitioners as well. In this regard, the contention of the learned Standing Counsel that, as at the relevant time, the petitioners were keeping themselves away from the clutches of the law, with an intention to escape from the police, they cannot contend that, non service of the notice caused prejudice to them. According to the learned Standing Counsel, they cannot raise a contention of non-service of notice upon them, as at the relevant time they themselves were voluntarily keeping away from the legal procedure to escape from the proceedings in connection with the criminal case in connection with the same incident. Therefore, the Squad was not supposed to wait for the petitioners until they got rid of such difficulties. It was pointed out that, in such circumstances, they should have acted as law-abiding citizens by subjecting themselves to legal proceedings.

22. I am of the view even though there is some force in the said contention, it as such cannot be accepted. The fact remains that, the



notices issued to the petitioners were through e-mail only and no attempt was made to serve them to their respective residential addresses. Apparently the proceedings were continued by the Squad, even without verifying whether the notices were served to them or not. Therefore, the said course adopted by the Squad cannot be accepted as proper, particularly since the penalties suggested by them were very severe and of such nature to have a serious impact on the careers and lives of the petitioners. The notices claimed to have been sent through the advisors of the petitioners cannot be treated proper notices under any circumstances. No provisions are brought to my notice by the respondents, which would show that the notices to advisors could be treated as proper notice for the purpose of a disciplinary enquiry, which involves such harsh punishments.

23. Even if it is assumed that the notices were properly served upon the petitioners, still, the proceedings now initiated cannot be treated as in compliance with the principles of natural justice. It is an admitted fact that, only two notices were issued to the petitioners, which are Exts. P2 and P7 (produced in WP(C) No. 22835/2024).



2024:KER:90865

As far as Ext P2 is concerned, the same is the order suspending the 12 students. The said notices were served to the 12 students referred to therein which includes some of the petitioners herein. However, the same cannot be treated as proper notice for the enquiry. In the said notice, even though the incident, which is the subject matter, was referred to in brief, it did not contain the individual allegations against each and every student who was suspended as per the said notice. The proviso to clause 6.3(e) of the UGC Regulations clearly specifies that the enquiry shall be conducted observing a fair and transparent procedure and the principles of natural justice, and after giving adequate opportunity to the students to place the facts, documents and views concerning the incident. Thus, the relevant rules specifically contemplate a reasonable opportunity for enabling the accused students raise their defence and submit the evidence to establish their case, and this obligation can be fulfilled only if they were informed of the exact allegation against each of them individually. In Ext. P2, apart from a general description of the incident in brief, there are no individual allegations. It also does not



2024:KER:90865

WP(C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

40

contain any memo of charges as well.

24. Another important aspect is that, Ext. P2 notice was issued only to 12 students whereas the punishment of dismissal was imposed for 19 students. Thus, as far as the seven students who were not suspended as per Ext P2 are concerned, there was no such notice.

25. The next notice is Ext. P7 notice. (*This notice is issued to one of the petitioners and it is an admitted fact the contents of the notice issued to the other petitioners are exactly similar.*) Under no circumstances the said notice can be treated as a notice for initiating proceedings against the petitioners. The contents of the said notice are as follows:

“ Sub: Anti-ragging squad-enquiry into the complaint of ragging and subsequent death of Sri Sidharthan J.S(22-BVP-250)-notice to appear before the enquiry committee-issued.

Name of the student—Kashinathan RS(19-BVP-256)

This is to inform that you are directed to compulsorily appear before the enquiry committee in person with you college ID card, all evidence (oral and document), for submitting your statement and informing the committee about what you know about the alleged ragging and subsequent death of Sri Sidharathan JS(22-BVP-250), to



2024:KER:90865

WP (C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con. Cases

41

defend the allegation.

Enquiry date- 28.02.2024

Time -9 am

*Venue- Dean's Conference hall, College of Veterinary & Animal
Sciences, Pookode"*

26. Conspicuously, even though in the said notice, it is mentioned that it is "*to defend the allegation*" nothing is mentioned about the allegations and the individual charges against the persons to whom such notices were issued. It is an admitted fact that, Ext P7 was the form of notice, sent to all the students against whom proceedings are initiated.

27. On the said question, it was vehemently contended by the learned Standing Counsel for the University that merely because there was a violation of principles of natural justice, that by itself cannot be reason to interfere in the proceedings, and it must also be shown that such violation resulted in injustice. Reliance was placed on **Glynn Versus Keele University and Anr. (1971 (1) WLR 487)**, the **Principal, Government Engineering College v. John (1978 SCC OnLine ker 183)**, **Hira Nath Mishra and others v. Principal,**



2024:KER:90865

WP(C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

42

Rajendra Medical College, Ranchi and another [(1973) 1 SCC 805], Manu Vilson v. Sree Narayana College (1996 SCC OnLine Ker 316 == 1996 (1) KLT 788) and Dharampal Satyapal Limited v. Deputy Commissioner of Central Excise Gauhati and others [(2015) 8 SCC 519]

28. In para 4 of the **Johns's** case (supra), it was observed as follows:

“4. We do not think it is reasonable to understand that the College Council referred to and acted upon certain undisclosed and secret evidence. There is no foundation in the pleadings for coming to such a conclusion. The files were made available to us by the learned Government Pleader. And, we are satisfied, having regard to the nature of the complaint that had to be enquired into, and in particular, to the principles laid down by the Supreme Court in Hira Nath v. Rajendra Medical College, Ranchi ((1973) 1 SCC 805 : AIR. 1973 SC. 1260) and by the recent decision of this Court in O.P. Nos. 2740, 2741, 2742 of 1978 etc., 1979 KLT. 45 that the enquiry has been fairly conducted in accordance with the principles of natural justice which have been recognised to have application in this sphere of enquiries. The learned Judge has referred to the decision in Glynn v. Keele University (1971 (1) W.L.R. 487). The applicability of the rules of natural justice in matters of academic discipline has come in for a good amount of discussion. As Professor Wade remarks in his ‘Administrative Law’ (4th Edn. P. 478), the Courts



have in general held that academic disciplinary proceedings require the observance of the principles of natural justice, but equally they have refused to apply unduly strict standards, provided the proceedings are substantially fair. In the English Courts, the pronouncement in Herring Templeman (1973 (3) A.E.R. 569) has highlighted this aspect. The principle of the decision in some of the earlier decisions, came in for critical comment in the journals (See for instance, 85 Law Quarterly Review p. 468, 1971 Canadian Bar Review p. 624, 1974 Law Quarterly Review p. 6). In particular, in our country the Supreme Court has recently laid down that the principle in Hira Nath's case ((1973) 1 SCC 805 : AIR. 1973 SC. 1260), that the principle of natural justice does not apply in its full vigour to those enquiries. In view of this, we cannot accept the reasoning or the conclusion of the learned Judge that the enquiry offended the principle of natural justice. We think the enquiry was fair and that was substantial compliance with natural justice.

In the said decision, strict rules of natural justice are not required in academic disciplinary proceedings; what is required is that the procedure has to be substantially fair.

29. In **Dharampal Satyapal Ltd's** case (supra), the following observations were made in paragraph 39, as follows:

"39. We are not concerned with these aspects in the present case as the issue relates to giving of notice before taking action. While emphasising that the principles of natural justice cannot be applied



*in straitjacket formula, the aforesaid instances are given. We have highlighted the jurisprudential basis of adhering to the principles of natural justice which are grounded on the doctrine of procedural fairness, accuracy of outcome leading to general social goals, etc. Nevertheless, there may be situations wherein for some reason—perhaps because the evidence against the individual is thought to be utterly compelling—it is felt that a fair hearing “would make no difference”—meaning that a hearing would not change the ultimate conclusion reached by the decision-maker—then no legal duty to supply a hearing arises. Such an approach was endorsed by Lord Wilberforce in *Malloch v. Aberdeen Corpn.* [(1971) 1 WLR 1578 : (1971) 2 All ER 1278 (HL)] , who said that : (WLR p. 1595 : All ER p. 1294)*

“... A breach of procedure ... cannot give [rise to] a remedy in the courts, unless behind it there is something of substance which has been lost by the failure. The court does not act in vain.”

*Relying on these comments, Brandon L.J. opined in *Cinamond v. British Airports Authority* [(1980) 1 WLR 582: (1980) 2 All ER 368 (CA)] that : (WLR p. 593 : All ER p. 377)*

“... no one can complain of not being given an opportunity to make representations if such an opportunity would have availed him nothing.”

In such situations, fair procedures appear to serve no purpose since the “right” result can be secured without according such treatment to the individual.”



2024:KER:90865

WP(C)No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

45

Thus, it was observed that in cases where the compliance of the nature of justice would serve no purpose or result in a different outcome, it is not necessary to interfere with the proceedings.

30. From the above it is clear that, mere violation of principles of the natural justice by itself cannot be a justification to interfere with the proceedings unless the same resulted in serious prejudice to the party concerned and such violation impacted the outcome of enquiry or adherence of principles of natural justice would have resulted in a different conclusion. To be precise, in cases where the compliance of natural justice would not affect any change in the decision taken, and it is only a formality, it is not necessary to interfere.

31. Thus, such a test is to be applied to the facts of this case. As mentioned above, allegations that can be understood from the orders issued by the authorities and the findings in the enquiry are that the petitioners have participated in the act of violence against Sri. Sidharathan J.S, and such violence ultimately led to his death by hanging. However, in the notices issued to them i.e either in Ext P2 or Ext P7, it is not mentioned about the individual charges levelled



against them, so as to enable them to reply to the respective charges. Had such an opportunity been provided, it would have been possible for them to raise their defence and produce materials to substantiate their defence, by adducing oral or documentary evidence. However, when such allegations and specific charges were not put to them specifically, they were denied that opportunity. This opportunity would have been something that must have impacted the final decision, at least for some of the petitioners. Even in respect of the persons who are likely to be found guilty, even after a proper enquiry, there could be some variations in the findings with regard to the gravity of the individual role of such persons, which may have an impact on the punishment to be imposed upon them. In short, such opportunities could have an impact on the final conclusions arrived by the Squad and the Committee, in the proceedings impugned in these writ petitions. Hence, failure on the part of the Anti Ragging Squad and the Committee in putting the specific allegations to the petitioners and giving them the opportunity to explain the same and to furnish materials to defend the allegations are very crucial which



2024:KER:90865

WP(C)No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

47

would certainly affect the sustainability of the proceedings as such.

32. Another contention raised by the petitioners is regarding the non-furnishing of the enquiry report, statements of the witnesses and the denial of the opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses. In this regard, the contention of the learned Standing Counsel for the University is that, the statements of witnesses could not have been given to the petitioners, as there were possibilities of the witnesses being threatened or otherwise being influenced. The learned Standing Counsel submitted in detail about the circumstances under which the incident took place, which extended from 16.02.2024 to 18.02.2024, where the victim was subjected to brutal assault in front of the other inmates of the hostel for almost two days, but yet none was in a position to report the matter to the authorities due to fear. It was also pointed out that the witnesses who gave statements before the Squad also had apprehension about their safety. Therefore, it was contended by the learned Standing Counsel that, in such circumstances, furnishing the statements, thereby revealing the identity of the witnesses, would have caused serious



prejudice to the enquiry. Reliance was placed on **Hira Nath's** case (supra) rendered by the Honourable Supreme Court.

33. As rightly contended by the learned Standing Counsel for the University, **Hira Nath's case (supra)**, such a situation was specifically considered by the Honourable Supreme Court and it was observed that when such a threat is there, it is not necessary to issue the copy of the inquiry report, and the statements of witnesses. It was also found that the proceedings therein, without giving an opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses, were justifiable. However, in the said decision, while arriving at the said conclusion, the Honourable Supreme Court considered the fact that the enquiry committee therein adopted a different procedure, and on being convinced of the said procedure, no interference was made. To be precise, in the said case, the enquiry committee explained to the accused students the complaint against them, a written charge was handed over to them, and they were given the opportunity to give an explanation in writing. However, in these cases, none of the petitioners were given notice of the charges, specifying the individual allegations against them or the



gist of the incriminating materials also were not served to them. Therefore, even though the respondents are justified in not giving the statements of the witnesses and giving an opportunity to cross-examine them, as there were chances of the witnesses being threatened or otherwise influenced, the same cannot be a justification for denying the opportunity to be issued with notices containing the specific allegations against them. Besides, the petitioners should have been served with at least the gist of the statements of the witnesses who have stated the individual roles of the respective petitioners and asked the petitioners for their comments/reply on them in writing. This is because, even though strict adherence to the principles of natural justice by giving the petitioner copies of the statement of witnesses and the opportunity to cross-examine them could be counter-productive, and need not be insisted upon being a matter of academic disciplinary proceedings (*as held in John's case (supra)*), a balance ought to be attained to protect the rights of the petitioners thereby to ensure a substantially fair enquiry. In this case, no such proceedings have been initiated, and hence an interference



is necessary.

34. The petitioners have raised further contentions with regard to the procedure adopted by the Anti Ragging Committee while taking the decision as per Ext P11, and also as to the correctness of the decision on the Ext P10 interim report submitted by the Squad. However, in view of the finding and the decision to interfere with the orders passed by the Committee and the Dean, already taken by this court for the reasons mentioned above, it is not necessary to go into the said questions.

35. While arriving at the conclusions above, this court is conscious of the fact that this an incident which shook the conscience of the people of the State as a whole, due to the brutality of the atrocities committed upon a young man, which led to his death. The attention it garnered in the State throughout and the outcry of the people requiring the punishment of the culprits also cannot be ignored. There cannot be any doubt that the culprits are to be identified and awarded with stringent punishment, irrespective of any political affiliation or any other reasons. However, those elements



cannot be treated as reasons to do away with fairness in the enquiry by following the principles of natural justice. In this judgment, this court did not enter into any finding the on the sustainability of the allegations against any of the petitioners, and interference was only to ensure that, a reasonable opportunity is provided to the petitioners to defend the allegations raised against them.

36. Even while interfering with the punishment imposed upon the petitioners, the efforts the members of the Squad and the Committee made also deserve appreciation. Within a short span of time, they recorded the statements of 97 witnesses for the interim report (total 167 witnesses), collated the data, carried out deliberations, and passed the orders. This court does not intend to find fault with them, but the records would indicate that the said authorities were under pressure to complete the proceedings within a period of seven days as contemplated in proviso to Regulation 7 of the UGC Regulations. Besides, the pressure mounted upon them consequent to the media attention the issue drew at the relevant time and the uproar from the general public, also must have compelled them to conclude the



enquiry expeditiously. Thus, while completing the enquiry in such circumstances, the principles of natural justice, which is one of the essential requirements of a fair enquiry, were compromised. As far as the period of seven days stipulated in Regulation 7 of the UGC Regulations are concerned, it was practically impossible to complete the enquiry in respect of a case of this nature where the statements of large number of witnesses are to be recorded. Apparently, the Regulation never envisaged such kind of an enquiry and therefore the said period can only be treated as directory in nature. The seriousness of the allegations, wide attention the issue garnered through media, and the huge public outbursts, seeking the blood of the culprits are not by themselves matters that can have an impact on the statutory authorities while exercising their powers. A decision by strictly following the rules and regulations by ensuring a fair procedure contemplated under the law has to be taken at any cost.

In such circumstances, all these writ petitions are disposed of:

- (i) Quashing the reports of the Anti Ragging Squad (interim



and final), (Exts. P10 and P12 in WP(C) No. 22835/2024), the decision taken by the Anti Ragging Committee in the meeting held on 01.03.2024 to impose punishment to the petitioners (Ext. P11 in W.P(C) No 22835/2024) and the order bearing No CVAS/PKD/ACAD(1)/944/2024 dated 02.03.2024 passed by the Dean of the College of Veterinary and Animal Sciences University, Pookode (Ext. P4 in WP(C) 22835/2024), to extent the said orders/reports apply to the petitioners herein.

- (ii) The University is directed to conduct a fresh enquiry, after furnishing memos of charges to the petitioners specifying the individual allegations against each of them and furnishing them the gist of the statements of the witnesses, requiring the petitioners to submit written explanations for the same. However, the statements of the witnesses need not be recorded afresh, and the gist of such statements regarding the involvement of the petitioners shall be furnished to the petitioners without revealing the identity of



the witnesses. Such gist of statements has to be prepared based on the statements of witnesses already recorded by the Anti-Ragging Squad.

- (iii) The petitioners shall be re-admitted to the college by permitting them to continue their studies on the campus at Mannuthy, subject to the final outcome of the enquiry, to be conducted in the manner as referred to above. The results of the examinations, which they have already attended on the strength of the interim orders passed by this court need not be published unless and until the enquiry is completed and if any of the petitioners are found guilty in such proceedings, such examinations shall stand cancelled. In case any of the petitioners are found not guilty, the results of the examinations, they attended on the strength of the interim order can be published provided they were otherwise eligible to write the said examinations.
- (iv) If any of the petitioners are found guilty in such enquiry to be conducted, while imposing the punishment, the period of



2024:KER:90865

WP(C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

55

punishment which they have already undergone will have to be adjusted, against the penalty to be imposed.

- (v) The enquiry as mentioned above shall be completed within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

Sd/-

**ZIYAD RAHMAN A.A.
JUDGE**

pkk



2024:KER:90865

WP (C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con. Cases

56

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 21140/2024

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT P1	TRUE COPY OF FIR IN CRIME NO. 77/2024 OF VYTHIRI POLICE STATION
EXHIBIT P2	TRUE COPY OF FIR IN CRIME NO. RC-0502024-S0002/SC-II/CBI, NEW DELHI
EXHIBIT P3	FINAL REPORT IN CRIME NO. RC-0502024-S0002/SC-II/CBI, NEW DELHI.
EXHIBIT P4	TRUE COPY OF ORDER DATED 31.05.2024 IN B.A NO. 3705 OF 2024 .
EXHIBIT P5	TRUE COPY OF MINUTES OF THE MEETING DATED 22.02.2024 HELD AT 2.00 PM BY 6TH RESPONDENT.
EXHIBIT P6	TRUE COPY OF MINUTES OF THE MEETING DATED 22.02.2024 HELD AT 4.30 PM BY 6TH RESPONDENT.
EXHIBIT P7	TRUE COPY OF ORDER DATED 22.02.2024 ISSUED BY 5TH RESPONDENT.
EXHIBIT P8	TRUE COPY OF ORDER DATED 02.03.2024 TO EXPEL STUDENTS.
EXHIBIT P9	TRUE COPY OF APPEAL PREFERRED BY PETITIONER'S FATHER TO 2ND RESPONDENT DATED 30.05.2024.
EXHIBIT P10	TRUE COPY OF NOTIFICATION DATED 19.05.2024.
EXHIBIT P11	TRUE COPY OF RECEIPT OF 1ST INSTALLMENT FEE OF PETITIONER DATED 13.03.2023
EXHIBIT P12	TRUE COPY OF RECEIPT OF 2ND INSTALLMENT FEE OF PETITIONER DATED 03.02.2024
EXHIBIT P13	TRUE COPY OF REPRESENTATION DATED 09.05.2024 BEFORE 2ND RESPONDENT BY PETITIONER'S FATHER.
EXHIBIT P14	TRUE COPY OF ORDER DATED 10.06.2024 IN W.P(C) NO. 20502 OF 2024 OF HIGH COURT OF KERALA.



2024:KER:90865

WP (C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con. Cases

57

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 22028/2024

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT P1	THE TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM REPORT DATED 18/2/2024
EXHIBIT P2	THE TRUE COPY OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ANTI RAGGING COMMITTEE HELD ON 1/3/2024
EXHIBIT P3	THE TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS CVAS/PKD/ACAD(1)/944/2024 OF THE 4 TH RESPONDENT DEAN DATED 2/3/2024
EXHIBIT P4	THE TRUE COPY OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 22/5/2024 BY THE ANTI RAGGING COMMITTEE

RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT R1(A)	TRUE COPY OF ORDER NO KVASU/GA/C/0504/2017 DATED 06.10.2017
EXHIBIT R1(B)	TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT PAGES OF THE COMPENDIUM
EXHIBIT R1(D)	TRUE COPY OF THE 52ND MEETING OF THE BOARD OF MANAGEMENT DATED 29.06.2017
EXHIBIT R1(C)	TRUE COPY OF ORDER DATED 29.06.2024 ISSUED BY THE VICE CHANCELLOR
EXHIBIT R4(A)	COPY OF NOTICE DATED 24.02.2024 ISSUED TO THE 1ST PETITIONER
EXHIBIT R4(B-1)	COPY OF THE RESPONSE LETTER DATED 27.02.2024 RECEIVED FROM THE PARENT OF THE 1ST PETITIONER
EXHIBIT R4(B-2)	COPY OF THE RESPONSE LETTER DATED 27.02 2024 RECEIVED FROM THE PARENT OF THE 3RD PETITIONER
EXHIBIT R4(B-3)	COPY OF THE RESPONSE LETTER DATED 27.02.2024 RECEIVED FROM THE 4TH PETITIONER
EXHIBIT R4(B-4)	COPY OF THE RESPONSE LETTER DATED NIL RECEIVED FROM THE PARENT OF THE 5TH PETITIONER
EXHIBIT R4(C)	COPY OF THE FINAL REPORT FILED BY THE CBI AND PRODUCED AS EXHIBIT P7 IN WPC 20502 OF 2024
EXHIBIT R4(D)	TABULAR COLUMN SHOWING THE PERCENTAGE OF ATTENDANCE PROCURED BY THE PETITIONERS AS ON



2024:KER:90865

WP (C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

58

29.06.2024

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT P5

THE TRUE COPY OF THE UNIVERSITY ORDER CVAS/PKT/ACD
CELL/2917/2023 DATED 6/11/2023

EXHIBIT P6

THE TRUE COPY OF THE MEETING HELD AT 2.30 PM ON
22/2/2024 OF THE ANTI-RAGGING COMMITTEE

EXHIBIT P7

THE TRUE COPY OF THE MEETING HELD AT 4.30 PM ON
22/2/2024 OF THE ANTI-RAGGING COMMITTEE



2024:KER:90865

WP (C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

59

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 25806/2024

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT P1	A TRUE COPY OF THE ALLOTMENT MEMO DTD 12.12.2023
EXHIBIT P2	A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DTD 22.02.2024 ISSUED BY 6TH RESPONDENT
EXHIBIT P3	A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DTD 02.03.2024 PASSED BY THE 6TH RESPONDENT UNDER CLAUSE 9.1(B) OF UGC REGULATIONS ON CURBING THE MENACE OF RAGGING IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS, 2009
EXHIBIT P4	A TRUE COPY OF THE APPEAL FILED BY THE PETITIONER UNDER CLAUSE 9.1(C) OF UGC REGULATIONS ON CURBING THE MENACE OF RAGGING IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS, 2009 BEFORE THE 2ND RESPONDENT



2024:KER:90865

WP (C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con. Cases

60

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 28606/2024

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT P 1	TRUE COPY OF FIR IN CRIME NO. 77/2024 OF VYTHIRI POLICE STATION
EXHIBIT P2	TRUE COPY OF FIR IN CRIME NO. RC-0502024-S0002/SC-II/CBI, NEW DELHI
EXHIBIT P3	TRUE COPY OF FINAL REPORT FILED BY CBI ON 25.04.2024 BEFORE THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE COURT, ERNAKULAM
EXHIBIT P4	TRUE COPY OF ORDER DATED 31.05.2024 BY THIS HON'BLE COURT IN B.A NO. 3705 OF 2024
EXHIBIT P5	TRUE COPY OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF ANTI-RAGGING SQUAD HELD ON 22.02.2024
EXHIBIT P6	TRUE COPY OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF ANTI-RAGGING COMMITTEE WITH AVAILABLE MEMBERS HELD ON 22.02.2024
EXHIBIT P7	TRUE COPY OF THE URGENT MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON 22.02.2024 AT 04.30 PM
EXHIBIT P8	TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER BY THE 5TH RESPONDENT DATED 23.02.2024
EXHIBIT P9	TRUE COPY OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF ANTI-RAGGING SQUAD HELD ON 24.02.2024
EXHIBIT P10	TRUE COPY OF INTERIM REPORT DATED 01.03.2024 WAS SUBMITTED BY ANTI-RAGGING SQUAD
EXHIBIT P11	TRUE COPY OF ORDER DATED 02.03.2024 TO EXPEL 19 STUDENTS, INCLUDING PETITIONER FROM THE COLLEGE
EXHIBIT P12	TRUE COPY OF MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF ANTI-RAGGING COMMITTEE HELD ON 13.03.2024
EXHIBIT P13	TRUE COPY OF THE FINAL REPORT DATED 20.03.2024 SUBMITTED BY THE SQUAD WITH A FORWARDING NOTE DATED 21.03.2024 BY THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE SQUAD
EXHIBIT P14	TRUE COPY OF THE STATEMENT OF DEAN-IN-CHARGE DATED 11.04.2024 GIVEN TO THE CBI



2024:KER:90865

WP (C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con. Cases

61

EXHIBIT P15 TRUE COPY OF ORDER DATED 25.06.2024 IN W.P(C) NO. 21140
OF 2024

RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT R5(A) A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 12.10.2023
CONSTITUTING THE ANTI-RAGGING SQUAD

EXHIBIT R5(D) A TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS
NO.CVAS/PKT/ACAD/2917/2023 DATED 01.03.2024
CONSTITUTING THE ANTI-RAGGING COMMITTEE

EXHIBIT R5(B) A TRUE COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION NO.
PA/DEANVETPKT/10/2024 DATED 21.02.2024

EXHIBIT R5(C) A TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE DATED 24.02.2024

EXHIBIT R5(C)A A TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE SENT THROUGH EMAIL ON
25.02.2024

EXHIBIT R5(C)B A TRUE COPY OF A SCREENSHOT TAKEN ON 9:30 PM 25.02.2024
OF THE NOTICE SENT THROUGH WHATSAPP

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT P16 LEGAL OPINION DATED 30.03.2024 ISSUED BY THE STANDING
COUNSEL TO 1ST RESPONDENT.



2024:KER:90865

WP (C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con. Cases

62

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 29685/2024

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT-P1	A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 31/5/2024 OF THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF KERALA IN BAIL APPLICATION NO.3607/2024 AND BA 3302/2024
EXHIBIT-P2	THE TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM REPORT DATED 18.02.2024
EXHIBIT-P3	A TRUE COPY OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ANTI-RAGGING COMMITTEE HELD ON 01.03.2024
EXHIBIT-P4	THE TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS CVAS/PKD/ACAD(1)/944/2024 OF THE 4 TH RESPONDENT DEAN DATED 2/3/2024
EXHIBIT-P5	THE TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS WHEREBY THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ANTI-RAGGING COMMITTEE WAS APPROVED DATED 22.05.2024
EXHIBIT-P6	A COPY OF THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR DATED 26.03.2024 OF THE 1ST RESPONDENT

RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT R1(C)B	TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION GIVEN BY THE 2ND PETITIONERS MOTHER TO THE STUDENT ADVISOR
EXHIBIT R1(A)	TRUE COPY OF REPORT DATED 01.03.2024
EXHIBIT R1(B)A	TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE DATED 24.02.2024 SENT BY EMAIL TO THE 1ST PETITIONER
EXHIBIT R1(B)B	TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE DATED 24.02.2024 SENT BY EMAIL TO THE 2ND PETITIONER
EXHIBIT R1(C)A	TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 27.02.2024 FROM THE 1ST PETITIONER WITH COVERING LETTER
EXHIBIT R4(A)	COPY OF THE REPORT DATED 01.03.2024 OF THE ANTI RAGGING SQUAD
EXHIBIT R4(B)	COPY OF THE NOTICE DATED 24.02.2024 SENT BY EMAIL TO THE 1ST PETITIONER
EXHIBIT R4(B)A	COPY OF THE NOTICE DATED 24.02.2024 SENT BY EMAIL TO THE 2ND PETITIONER



2024:KER:90865

WP (C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

63

EXHIBIT R4(D)	COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGES OF THE COMPENDIUM
EXHIBIT R4(C)	COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 27.02.2024 FROM THE 1ST PETITIONER TO THE STUDENT ADVISOR ALONG WITH THE COVERING LETTER
EXHIBIT R4(C)A	COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 28.02.2024 GIVEN BY THE 2ND PETITIONERS MOTHER TO THE STUDENT ADVISOR



2024:KER:90865

WP (C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con. Cases

64

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 30162/2024

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT P1	TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE OF THE FIRST PETITIONER FOR THE 10TH CLASS EXAMINATION
EXHIBIT P1 (A)	TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE OF THE FIRST PETITIONER FOR THE 12TH CLASS EXAMINATION
EXHIBIT P2	TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE OF THE SECOND PETITIONER FOR THE 10TH CLASS EXAMINATION
EXHIBIT P2 (A)	TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE OF THE SECOND PETITIONER FOR THE 12TH CLASS EXAMINATION
EXHIBIT P2 (B)	TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGES OF THE PETITIONERS' MARK LIST OF THE FIRST YEAR IN THE PRESENT COURSE
EXHIBIT P2 (C)	TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGES OF THE PETITIONERS' MARK LIST OF THE SECOND YEAR IN THE PRESENT COURSE
EXHIBIT P2 (D)	TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGES OF THE PETITIONERS' MARK LIST OF THE THIRD YEAR IN THE PRESENT COURSE
EXHIBIT P3	TRUE COPY OF THE F.I.R. IN CRIME NO.77/2024 DATED 18.02.2024 OF VYTHIRI POLICE STATION, WAYANAD DISTRICT
EXHIBIT P4	TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM REPORT DATED NIL ISSUED BY ANTI-RAGGING SQUAD
EXHIBIT P5	TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO. CVAS/ PKD/ CAD(1)944/2024 DATED 02.03.2024 ISSUED BY THE THIRD RESPONDENT
EXHIBIT P6	TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS DATED 29.02.2024 ISSUED BY THE THIRD RESPONDENT
EXHIBIT P7	TRUE COPY OF THE CIRCULAR BEARING NO. KVASU/DAR/ACAD/B3/30353 (3) DATED 26.03.2024 ISSUED BY THE DIRECTOR (ACADEMICS & RESEARCH), KERALA VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES UNIVERSITY, WAYANAD
EXHIBIT P8	TRUE COPY OF THE APPEAL DATED 12.07.2024 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONERS TO THE FIFTH RESPONDENT
EXHIBIT P9	TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER DATED 25.06.2024 IN W.P. (C) NO.21765/2024 OF THIS HON'BLE COURT
EXHIBIT P9 (A)	TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER DATED 01.07.2024 IN I.A.



2024:KER:90865

WP (C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

65

NO.1/2024 IN W.P.(C) NO.22028/2024 OF THIS HON'BLE COURT

RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT R1(A)

TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE DATED 24.02.2024 PUBLISHED ON
THE NOTICE BOARD OF THE COLLEGE HOSTEL

EXHIBIT R1(B)

TRUE COPY OF LIST CONSOLIDATING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF
NOTICES SERVED ON 25.02.2024



2024:KER:90865

WP (C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con. Cases

66

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 33231/2024

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT P1	A TRUE COPY OF FIR IN CRIME NO. 77/2024 OF VYTHIRI POLICE STATION
EXHIBIT P2	A TRUE COPY OF FIR IN CRIME NO. RC-0502024-S0002/SC-II/CBI, NEW DELHI
EXHIBIT P3	TRUE COPY OF THE FINAL REPORT FILED BY CBI ON 25.04.2024 BEFORE THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE COURT, ERNAKULAM,
EXHIBIT P4	TRUE COPY OF THE BAIL APPLICATION FILED BY THE PETITIONER DATED 31.05.2024 B.A NO. 2306 OF 2024
EXHIBIT P5	TRUE COPY OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF ANTI-RAGGING SQUAD HELD ON 22.02.2024
EXHIBIT P6	TRUE COPY OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF ANTI-RAGGING COMMITTEE WITH AVAILABLE MEMBERS HELD ON 22.02.2024
EXHIBIT P7	TRUE COPY OF THE URGENT MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON 22.02.2024 AT 04.30 PM
EXHIBIT P8	TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT DATED 23.02.2024
EXHIBIT P9	TRUE COPY OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF ANTI-RAGGING SQUAD HELD ON 24.02.2024
EXHIBIT P10	TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM REPORT DATED 01.03.2024 WAS SUBMITTED BY ANTI- RAGGING SQUAD.
EXHIBIT P11	TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION WAS TAKEN TO EXPEL 19 STUDENTS, INCLUDING PETITIONER FROM THE COLLEGE BY AN ORDER DATED 02.03.2024
EXHIBIT P12	COMMITTEE. A TRUE COPY OF MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF ANTI-RAGGING COMMITTEE HELD ON 13.03.2024
EXHIBIT P13	,TRUE COPY OF THE FINAL REPORT DATED 20.03.2024 WAS



2024:KER:90865

WP(C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con.Cases

67

SUBMITTED BY THE SQUAD, WITH A FORWARDING NOTE
DATED 21.03.2024 BY THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE SQUAD.

EXHIBIT P14

TRUE COPY OF THE STATEMENT OF DEAN-IN-CHARGE DATED
11.04.2024 GIVEN TO THE CBI



2024:KER:90865

WP (C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con. Cases

68

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 22835/2024

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT P1	TRUE COPY OF THE FIRST INFORMATION REPORT DATED 18.02.2024 IN CRIME NO. 77/2024 REGISTERED AT THE VYTHIRI POLICE STATION, WAYANAD
EXHIBIT P2	TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 22.02.2024 ISSUED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT
EXHIBIT P3	TRUE COPY OF THE COMMON ORDER DATED 31.05.2024 IN B.A NO.S 4028/2024 AND 4082/2024 PASSED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT
EXHIBIT P4	TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NUMBERED CVAS/PKD/ACAD (1) 944/2024 DATED 02.03.2024 ISSUED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT
EXHIBIT P5	TRUE COPY OF THE APPEALS PREFERRED BY THE PARENTS OF THE 1ST PETITIONER BEFORE THE 2ND RESPONDENT DATED 02.05.2024 .
EXHIBIT P6	TRUE COPY OF THE APPEALS PREFERRED BY THE PARENTS OF THE 2ND PETITIONER BEFORE THE 2ND RESPONDENT DATED 27.05.2024 .
EXHIBIT P7	TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE DATED 24.02.2024, RECEIVED BY THE 2ND PETITIONER THROUGH E-MAIL
EXHIBIT P8	TRUE COPY OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE DATED 02.04.2024 SUBMITTED BY THE FATHER OF THE SECOND PETITIONER BEFORE THE PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER OF THE 3RD RESPONDENT
EXHIBIT P9	TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY DATED 07.05.2024 RECEIVED BY THE FATHER OF THE SECOND PETITIONER FROM THE PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER OF THE 3RD RESPONDENT
EXHIBIT P10	TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGES OF THE INTERIM REPORT OF THE ANTI-RAGGING SQUAD DATED NIL
EXHIBIT P11	TRUE COPY OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE 5TH RESPONDENT COMMITTEE DATED 01.03.2024
EXHIBIT P12	TRUE COPY OF THE FINAL REPORT OF THE ANTI-RAGGING SQUAD DATED 20.03.2024 ALONG WITH THE COVERING LETTER DATED 21.03.2024 SUBMITTED BY THE ANTI-RAGGING SQUAD TO THE 4TH RESPONDENT
EXHIBIT P13	TRUE COPY OF THE UGC REGULATIONS ON CURBING THE



2024:KER:90865

WP (C) No. 22835 of 2024 &
Con. Cases

69

MENACE OF RAGGING IN HIGHER EDUCATIONAL
INSTITUTIONS, 2009

EXHIBIT P14	TRUE COPY OF THE RE-NOTIFICATION NO. KVASU/EXAMS/C2/4/2024 (I) DATED 19.05.2024 ISSUED BY THE CONTROLLER OF EXAMINATIONS, KERALA VETERINARY AND ANIMAL SCIENCES UNIVERSITY ANNOUNCING THE EXAMINATION SCHEDULE FOR THE 4TH YEAR B.V.SC & A.H (2019 AND EARLIER ADMISSION)
EXHIBIT P15	TRUE COPY OF THE RECEIPTS EVIDENCING PAYMENT OF FEES FOR THE 4TH YEAR B.V.SC & A.H BY THE 1ST PETITIONER
EXHIBIT P16	TRUE COPY OF THE RECEIPTS EVIDENCING PAYMENT OF FEES FOR THE 4TH YEAR B.V.SC & A.H BY THE 2ND PETITIONER
EXHIBIT P17	TRUE COPY OF THE NEWS PUBLISHED IN MATHRUBHUMI.COM ON 02.03.2024 INCLUDING THE LOOK NOTICE PUBLISHED AGAINST THE PETITIONERS
EXHIBIT P18	TRUE COPY OF THE MINUTES OF THE 5TH RESPONDENT COMMITTEE HELD ON 22.05.2024
EXHIBIT P19	TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER PASSED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT DATED 12.10.2023 CONSTITUTING THE ANTI-RAGGING SQUAD
EXHIBIT P20	TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 12.10.2023 FORMING THE ANTI-RAGGING COMMITTEE PASSED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT
RESPONDENT EXHIBITS	
EXHIBIT R1(A)	COPY OF THE NOTICE NO. KVASU/GO/D2/3544/2024 DATED 15.06.2024
EXHIBIT R1(B)	COPY OF LETTER DATED 22.6.2024 ACKNOWLEDGING WITHDRAWAL OF THE APPEAL, GIVEN BY THE 1ST PETITIONER
EXHIBIT R1(C)	COPY OF LETTER DATED 22.6.2024 ACKNOWLEDGING WITHDRAWAL OF THE APPEAL, GIVEN BY THE 2ND PETITIONER

//TRUE COPY//
SD/- P.S. TO JUDGE