

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA,  
AT HYDERABAD**

THURSDAY, THE TWENTY SECOND DAY OF JANUARY

TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX,

**:PRESENT:**

**THE HONOURABLE MRS JUSTICE SUREPALLI NANDA**

**WRIT PETITION NO: 2067 OF 2026**

**Between:**

Gunti Pavani, D/o. G. Jejra.

**Petitioner**

**AND**

1. The Prof. Jayashankar Telangana Agricultural University, rep. by its Registrar, Administrative Office, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad - 500030.
2. The Director of Agriculture, Government of Telangana, Hyderabad.
3. The State of Telangana, rep by its Principal Secretary, Agriculture and Co-operation Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad.

**Respondents**

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith, the High Court may be pleased to issue Writ, order or orders or direction more particularly one in the nature of writ of mandamus declaring action of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent in expelling/debarring the petitioner from the prosecution of B.Sc (Agriculture) vide his proceedings in Memo No.1920/Acad/2025, dated 08/01/2026 as being arbitrary, illegal, unjust and violative of Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India besides being gross violation of Principles of Natural Justice as well as doctrine of Audi Alteram Partem and praying for a consequential declaration that the petitioner is entitled to prosecute and complete their B.Sc (Agriculture) in the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent University with all consequential benefits.

AND WHEREAS the High Court upon perusing the petition and affidavit filed herein and upon hearing the arguments of SRI Veda Vikas Mudiraj, Advocate, for the respondent No.1 and GP FOR AGRICULTURE, for the respondent Nos. 2 & 3, directed issue of notice to the Respondents herein to show cause as to why this WRIT PETITION should not be admitted.

**IA NO: 1 OF 2026**

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition, the High Court may be pleased to direct the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent to forthwith allow the petitioner to continue and prosecute their B.Sc (Agriculture) in the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent university by duly suspending the impugned Orders issued vide Memo No.1920/Acad/2025, dated 08/01/2026 by the 1st respondent and consequential relieving orders issued thereof in so far as the petitioner is concerned, pending disposal of WP No. 2067 of 2026, on the file of the High Court.

The petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Petition and the affidavit filed in support thereof and upon hearing the arguments of Sri A PHANI BHUSHAN Advocate for the Petitioner,, SRI Veda Vikas Mudiraj, Advocate, for the respondent No.1 and GP FOR AGRICULTURE, for the respondent Nos. 2 & 3, the Court made the following.

**ORDER**

Heard Sri A Phani Bhushan, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner.

It is the specific case of the petitioner that the order impugned dated 08.01.2026 vide Memo No.1920/Acad/2025 had been issued to the petitioner herein, expelling/debarring the petitioner from the respondent University duly canceling their admissions in the colleges and Hostels and further repatriating the petitioner to the parent department with immediate effect by invoking Clause 3, sub-clause (i) of PJTAU (Professor Jayashankar Telangana Agricultural University) Regulations 2016 i.e.. Student Conduct and Discipline. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner approached the Court by filing the present writ petition.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner mainly puts forth the following submissions:

- (i) That the Memo impugned dated 08.01.2026 of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent is in clear violation of principles of natural justice.
- (ii) The Memo impugned not only expelled/debarred the petitioner by cancelling her admissions in Colleges and Hostels unilaterally, but also repatriated the petitioner to her parent department with immediate effect with a specific direction to the petitioner to leave immediately under intimation to the Registrar of the Respondent University.

(iii) The Memo impugned inflicts stigma on the students thereby effecting the career and future of the students,

Therefore, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner is entitled for the relief as prayed for in the present writ petition.

Sri Veda Vikas Mudiraj, learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of the Respondent University seeks time.

A bare perusal of the impugned Memo/ Proceedings dated 08.01.2026 issued by the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent University, clearly indicates that the Memo impugned had been passed without issuing notice to the petitioner herein. The same is admittedly borne on record, is in clear violation of the principles of natural justice. The Memo impugned also is stigmatic in nature as it indicates at the threshold itself that the petitioner indulged in malpractice, leakage of question papers and bribing of staff members, which admittedly cannot be proved against the petitioners herein without a detailed enquiry being conducted into the said allegations in accordance to law, after putting the petitioner on prior notice, which admittedly even according to the respondents no such enquiry took place in the present case.

The High Court of Andhra Pradesh in the Judgment dated 05.03.2002 in W.P.No.1486 of 2002 in "V. RAMCHANDER GOUD-PETITIONER v. CONTROLLER OF EXAMINATIONS, OSMANIA UNIVERSITY HYDERABAD AND ANOTHER -RESPONDENTS" dealing with the case of involvement of student in malpractice of paras 8 and 9 observed as under:

"8. The Supreme Court in Board of High School and Intermediate Education v. Ghanshyam Das Gupta, AIR 1962 SC 1110 observed that the effect of the decision of the Committee may in an extreme case blast the career of a young student of life and in any case will put a serious stigma on the examinee concerned which may damage him in later life. The nature of misconduct which the Committee has to find in such

cases is of a serious nature, for example, impersonation commission of fraud, and perjury and the Committee's decision in matters of such seriousness may even lead in some cases to the prosecution of the examinee in Courts.

9. In *Y. Nalini Kanth v. Controller of Examination, Nampally, Hyderabad*, 1999 (5) Andh LD 452 this Court while referring to decisions in *A. Ramakoteswara Rao v. Vice-Chancellor, Nagarjuna University Guntur*, (1990) 3 Andh LT 1: (AIR 1991 Andhra Pradesh 71), *S.L. Kapoor v. Jagmohan*, AIR 1981 SC 136 and *Vibhu Kapoor v. Council of Indian School Certificate Examination*, AIR 1985 Delhi 142 (FB) held that cancelling the examination and debaring the candidate from appearing in future examinations for the mal-practice of copying forbidden material in the answer sheet without issuing a show cause notice to the candidate is bad."

The Constitutional Bench of the Apex Court in the Judgment dated 06.02.1962 passed in Civil Appeal No.132 of 1959 reported in AIR 1962 Supreme Court 1110 in "BOARD OF HIGH SCHOOL AND INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION U.P. ALLAHABAD-APPELLANT Vs. GHANSHYAM DAS GUPTA AND OTHERS-RESPONDENTS", very clearly observed that action in cases involving examinees using unfair means, the Principle of audi alteram partem applies and that the competent authority i.e., the Committee should necessarily act in a quasi-judicial manner. The relevant portion at para 12 of the said judgment is extracted hereunder:

"12. It is urged on behalf of the appellant that there are a large number of cases which come up before the Committee under R.1(1), and if the Committee is held to act judicially as a quasi-judicial tribunal in the matter it will find it impossible to carry on its task. This in our opinion is no criterion for deciding whether a duty is cast to act judicially in view of all the circumstances of the case. There is no doubt in our mind that considering the totality of circumstances the Committee has to act judicially when taking action under R.1(1). As to the manner in which it

should give an opportunity to the examinee concerned to be heard, that is a matter which can be provided by Regulations or Bye-laws if necessary: As was pointed out in *Local Government Board v. Alridge*, 1915 A.C. 120 all that is required is that the other party should have an opportunity of adequately presenting his case. But what the procedure should be in detail will depend on the nature of the tribunal. There is no doubt that many of the powers of the Committee under Chapter VI are of administrative nature; but where quasi-judicial duties are entrusted to an administrative body like this it becomes a quasi-judicial body for performing these duties and it can prescribe its own procedure so long as the principles of natural justice are followed and adequate opportunity of presenting his case is given to the examinee. It is not however, necessary to pursue this matter further, for it is not in dispute that no opportunity whatsoever was given to the respondents in this case to give an explanation to present their case before the Committee. We are therefore of opinion that though the view of the High Court that the Committee was acting merely administratively when proceeding under R.1(1) is not correct, its final decision allowing the writ petition on the ground that no opportunity was given to the respondents to put forward their cases before the Committee is correct. We therefore dismiss the appeal. No order as to costs in the circumstances. Appeal Dismissed."

Taking into consideration:

- (1) The aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case,
- (2) The submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners, and the learned standing counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent University;
- (3) The contents of the impugned order dated 18.01.2026 vide Memo No.1920/Acad/A2/2025 issued by the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent University herein,

- (4) The fact as borne on record that the petitioners had not been put on prior notice prior to issuance of the Memo impugned dated 08.01.2026 of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent,
- (5) The observations of the Apex Court in the Judgments referred to and extracted above,

This Court opines that *prima facie* case is made out by the petitioner for grant of interim suspension of the impugned Memo dated 08.01.2026 of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent, hence the impugned Memo dated 08.01.2026 of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent stands suspended, for a period of three (03) weeks from today.

List the matters on 30.01.2026 along with W.P.Nos.1908, 1522, 1329 of 2026 for the counter of the respondents.

//TRUE COPY//

SD/-P.PONNA KRISHNA  
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

  
SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The Registrar, Prof. Jayashankar Telangana Agricultural University, Administrative Office, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad - 500030.
2. The Director of Agriculture, Government of Telangana, Hyderabad.
3. The Principal Secretary, Agriculture and Co-operation Department, State of Telangana, Secretariat, Hyderabad. (RR 1 to 3 by SPAD)
4. One CC to SRI. A PHANI BHUSHAN Advocate [OPUC]
5. The Section Officer, Writ ( Non Service), High Court at Hyderabad.
6. One spare copy  
SRT

**HIGH COURT**

**SNJ**

**DATED:22/01/2026**

**List the matters on 30.01.2026 along with W.P.Nos.1908, 1522, 1329 of 2026 for the counter of the respondents**

**ORDER**

**WP.No.2067 of 2026**

**DIRECTION**

