

GAHC010268132025



undefined

THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

Case No. : WP(C)/7101/2025

ANJUMAN ARA BEGUM
D/O-LATE AYUB ALI, R.O -FLAT NO 1B, DALIMI RESIDENCY,
GHORAMARA, BHETAPARA, SURUJMUUKHI PATH, GUWAHATI, KAMRUP
Metro, PIN -781028

VERSUS

THE ASSAM ROYAL GLOBAL UNIVERSITY
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR ADMINISTRATION, BETKUCHI, NH 37,
GUWAHATI 781035, ASSAM

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR. D K AGARWALA, SHAHANAWAZ CHOWDHURY

Advocate for the Respondent : ,

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ROBIN PHUKAN

ORDER

15.12.2025

Heard Ms. U. Chatterji, learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. In this petition, under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has challenged the Termination order, dated 25.10.2025, and also prayed for issuing direction to the respondent University to reinstate the

petitioner for continuation of his service and also to direct the respondent University to release all salary dues, arrears and consequential benefits, with interest.

3. Ms. Chatterji, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was serving as an Associate Professor and approved Ph.D. Supervisor, at the Royal School of Law and Administration (RSLA), Assam Royal Global University and her service was terminated vide order, dated 25.10.2025, w.e.f. 17.10.2025; and the said termination order was issued without any notice, charge-sheet, inquiry, hearing, recorded reasons or compliance with mandatory safeguards under the UGC Act, 1956; the UGC Regulations 2018, 2022 and 2023; and the respondent University's Ph.D. Grievance and Disciplinary Regulations.

3.1 Ms. Chatterji, also submits that the petitioner had joined in service on 22.08.2022 and had completed her probation period successfully and had also received several increments and was approved as Ph.D. Guide by the University Research Council, on 12.01.2023, and she had also supervised six scholars; some of who are at the final submission stage and required continuity of supervision, plagiarism clearance and the mandatory originality certificate under UGC Regulation 11(4).

3.2 Ms. Chatterji, further submits that since the month of March-June, 2025, the respondents have irregularly initiated a guide-change for one scholar, without following the mandatory SRC-DRC-URC structure, prescribed under the RGU Ph.D. Regulations, 2024, without granting the petitioner any hearing.

3.3 Thereafter, on 10.10.2025, the Registrar suddenly directed the petitioner to resign immediately, without mentioning any allegation or complaint received against her, and threatened her with dire consequences, when she sought only

limited time to complete her scholar's submissions; and that the petitioner has also been denied fair hearing by the Vice-Chancellor and the Chancellor. Being aggrieved, the petitioner has approached this Court by filing the present petition.

4. While the matter was listed on 12.12.2025, a question was put to the learned counsel for the petitioner as to whether, a writ petition is maintainable against a private respondent.

5. Then, the learned counsel for the petitioner had prayed for and was granted time, till today, to satisfy this Court, regarding the maintainability of this present petition against the private University.

6. Today, Ms. Chatterji, learned counsel for the petitioner has produced as many as 5 (five) decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, which are as follows-

(i) Dr. Janet Jeyapaul v. SRM University & Ors., Civil Appeal No. 14553 of 2015, decided on December 15, 2015;

(ii) Roychan Abraham v. State of U.P. and Others, Writ-A No. 63708 of 2014, decided on February 26, 2019;

(iii) K. Krishnamacharyulu and Ors. v. Sri Venkateshwara Hindu College of Engineering and Anr., Civil Appeal No. 1774 of 1997, decided on February 21, 1997;

(iv) Army Welfare Education Society New Delhi v. Sunil Kumar Sharma & Ors. etc., Civil Appeal Nos. 7260-7264 of 2024 (arising out of S.L.P. (Civil) Nos. 3133-3137 of 2021); and

(v) St. Mary's Education Society & Anr. v. Rajendra Prasad Bhargava & Ors., Civil Appeal No. 5789 of 2022.

On the basis of the aforementioned decisions, Ms. Chatterji submits that this writ petition is maintainable.

- 7.** The submission of Ms. Chatterji needs further consideration.
- 8.** At this stage, notice be issued to the respondent, returnable in four weeks.
- 9.** Steps upon respondent be taken by a registered post/speed post as well as by usual process, within a week from today.
- 10.** Additionally, dasti service is also permitted and after effecting service upon the respondent by dasti mode, the petitioner shall file an affidavit before this Court to that effect.
- 11.** However, the question of maintainability of the petition against a private University is kept open.
- 12.** Registry shall list this matter on **19.01.2026**.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant