

Ö  
C.A.No. 3612 OF 2000  
ITEM NO.111COURT NO.11SECTION-XVI

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

CIVIL APPEAL NO.3612 OF 2000

GIRJA SHANKAR & ANR.

.....  
APPELLANT(S)

:VERSUS:

CHANCELLOR, CH. CHARAN SINGH UNIVERSITY & ORS.

.....  
RESPONDENT(S)

(With application for permission to place addl. documents  
on record and with Office Report)

Date : 19/08/2003 This appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BRIJESH KUMAR  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR

For Appellant (s) Apellant-in-person.

For Respondent (s) Mr. Yunus Malik,Adv.  
Mr. L.R. Singh,Adv.

Mr. S. Wasim A. Quadri,Adv.  
Mr. Deepak K. Singh,Adv.  
Mr. Kamalendra Mishra,Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

The appeal is dismissed as infructuous in terms of the signed order.

(A.S. BISHT)(KANWAL SINGH)  
COURT MASTER

COURT MASTER

[Signed order is placed on the file]

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO.3612 OF 2000

GIRJA SHANKAR & ANR.

.....  
APPELLANT(S)

:VERSUS:

CHANCELLOR, CH. CHARAN SINGH UNIVERSITY & ORS.

.....  
RESPONDENT(S)

O R D E R

By means of this appeal the appellants have challenged the nomination of Shri R.P. Chaddha and Dr. Megh Raj Sharma, to the Executive Council of Ch. Charan Singh University, Meerut, by the Chancellor in exercise of the powers under Section 20(1)(g) of the U.P. State Universities Act .

It is to be noted that the objection of the appellants is that Shri R.P. Chaddha, at the time of his nomination was Secretary of the Institute of Science and Technology, Ghaziabad, affiliated to Meerut university. That being the position he could not be nominated to the Executive council. So far as the other

:2:

nomination is concerned it is contended that a person is not entitled to be nominated more than two consecutive terms. However, we find that the nomination took place in 1999, for a period of two years. That period has expired long before. If for the sake of argument it may be accepted that appellants' contentions may be right, it is not possible, presently to grant any relief to the appellants. A futile writ is not usually to be issued. This appeal is rendered infructuous. It is thus dismissed as such.

.....J  
( BRIJESH KUMAR )

.....J  
( ARUN KUMAR )  
NEW DELHI;  
AUGUST 19, 2003.