



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 12TH DAY OF JUNE 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B M SHYAM PRASAD

REVIEW PETITION NO. 544 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

NATIONAL ASSESSMENT AND
ACCREDITATION COUNCIL (NAAC)
PB NO. 1075, NAGARBHAVI,
BENGALURU-560072
REPRESENTED BY
MR. ARUN M
NOW ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. T P MUTHANNA., ADVOCATE)



AND:

1. DR. PRIYA N (M.SC., PH. D)
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS
W/O SRIHARI SRINIVASAN
ASSISTANT ADVISER
NATIONAL ASSESSMENT AND
ACCREDITATION COUNCIL
P B NO. 1075, NAGARBHAVI,
BENGALURU-560072.



2. THE UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION
(MINISTRY OF EDUCATION),
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
BAHADURSHAH ZAFAR MARG
NEW DELHI - 110002
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. H. SUBRAMANYA., SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. LOKESH M., ADVOCATE)

THIS REVIEW PETITION IS FILED UNDER SECTION
114 R/W ORDER 47 RULE 1 OF CPC 1908, PRAYING TO
REVIEW THE ORDER DATED 10.07.2024, IN WP NO.
6924/2022 (S-PRO) PASSED BY THIS HONBLE COURT.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ADMISSION,
THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B M SHYAM PRASAD

ORAL ORDER

This Court has disposed of the petition in
W.P.No.6924/2022 [S-PRO] by order dated 10.07.2024
quashing the Endorsement dated 23.03.2022 and
declaring that the first respondent's past services as
an Assistant Professor with the Central University
must be reckoned to consider completion of eight years
in the feeder cadre of an Assistant Adviser with the
petitioner. This Court has directed the petitioner to



consider the first respondent's case for promotion calling upon the petitioner to communicate its decision within eight [8] weeks. The petitioner has filed a Writ Appeal in W.A.No.1423/2024 [*S-PRO*], which stands disposed of on 28.10.2025 as withdrawn reserving liberty to the petitioner to file a review petition.

2. Sri. T. P. Muthanna, the learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that during the pendency of the writ appeal, the Communication dated 06.11.2024 is received from UGC stating that the Guidelines issued for maintenance of standards in higher education are not applicable to the posts with the petitioner and that appointments and promotions with the petitioner are governed by the respective Cadre Recruitment Rules. The learned counsel proposes to argue for a review of this Court's order dated 10.07.2024 in the light of this Communication dated 06.11.2024 stating that the first respondent's



entitlement should only be considered under the Cadre Recruitment Rules.

3. Sri H. Subramanya Jois, the learned Senior Counsel for the first respondent, submits that after this Court's order dated 10.07.2024, the petitioner has addressed a letter and the Communication dated 06.11.2024 is in response thereto, and the learned Senior Counsel submits that re-examining the petitioner's defence in the light of this Communication would tantamount to revisiting the merits of this Court's order as in an appeal and that would be outside this Court's purview under Section 114 of Code of Civil Procedure.

4. This Court must observe that this Court is not persuaded to opine that an error apparent is pointed out to justify a review, and this Court cannot infer an error from the contents of the Communication dated 06.11.2024 which does not even allude to the



reasons assigned by this Court. Therefore, the petition
is rejected.

SD/-
(B M SHYAM PRASAD)
JUDGE

SA
Ct:sr