*** THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE D.V.S.S.SOMAYAJULU**

AND

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.SRINIVAS

+ WRIT APPEAL Nos.214; 251; 264; 267; 268; 272; 276; 277; 279; 282; 413 and 452 of 2021

% 11th July, 2023

W.A.No.214 of 2021:

M. Venkateswara Rao and 6 others

... Appellants..

AND

$ D. Indeevar and 14 others.

... Respondents.

! Counsel for the Appellants : Mr.Motupalli Vijay Kumar, Senior Counsel
Mr. Manoj Kumar Bethapudi
Mr. P. Veera Reddy, Senior counsel
Mr. K.Jyothi Prasad
Mr. B. Adinarayana Rao, Senior counsel
Mr. Srinivasa Rao Bodduluri
Mr. J. Sudheer
Mrs. Kavitha Gottipati
Mr. S. Srinivasa Rao
Mr.Prof.Y. Ashok Kumar (Party in person)

^ Counsel for the respondents: Advocate General
Addl. Advocate General
Mr.N.Harinath, Dy.Solicitor General
GP for Services I
GP for Services III
GP for Higher Education
Mrs.A.V.S.Laxmi
Mr.N.A.Ramachandra Murthy, SC for APPSC
Mr.V. Venkata Nagaraju, SC for APPSC
Mr.Penjuri Venugopal, SC for JNTUA
Mrs.S. Parineeta
Mr. J. Ugranarasimha
Mr.Rambabu Koppineedi, SC for ANU
Mr. T.S.N. Sudhakar, SC for Krishna Univ.
Mr.Raja Reddy Koneti

Mrs.Y.Ratna Prabha, SC for Rayalaseema Univ.
Mr.S. Appadar Reddy
Mr.Butta Vijaya Bhaskar, SC for SVU
Mrs.M.Manikya Veena, SC for Padmavati Mahila Univ.
Mr.M. Chinnapa Reddy, SC for VSU Univ.
Mrs.Padmavathi Padnavis, SC for DUK
Mr.Siva Prasad Reddy Venati
Mr.Bathula Rajkiran, SC for JNTU
Mrs.Pulipati Radhika
Mr. K.V.Raghuveer
Mr. Tenepalli Niranjan, SC for Y.V.Univ.
Mr. P.S.P. Suresh Kumar
Mr. Yella Reddy Rajanala, SC for ANGRAU
Mrs. S. Siva Kuamri, SC for AU

< Gist:

> Head Note:

? Cases referred:

1) (2006) 2 ALD 1
2) 2017 SCC OnLine all 729 = (2017) 6 ALL LJ 722
3) (2019) 12 SCC 410
4) 2009 SCC OnLine All 420 : (2009) 3 AWC 2929
5) (2019) 12 SCC 385
6) AIR 1990 SC 2023
7) (1998) 4 SCC 1
8) (2004) 12 SCC 333
9) (1990) 4 SCC 55
10) 1995 5 SCC 173
11) (2007) 8 SCC 785
12) (2007) 11 SCC 528
13) (1974) 4 SCC 335

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE D.V.S.S.SOMAYAJULU

AND

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.SRINIVAS

WRIT APPEAL Nos.214; 251; 264; 267; 268; 272; 276; 277; 279; 282; 413 and 452 of 2021

COMMON JUDGMENT: *(per Hon'ble Sri Justice D.V.S.S.Somayajulu)*

These Writ Appeals are filed challenging the common order, dated 05.03.2021, passed in W.P.No.10813 of 2018 and Batch by the learned single Judge.

2) The essential issue in these writ appeals and the writ petitions is about the action of the Universities in the State of A.P., grouping of the subjects for the purpose of providing reservations relying upon the judgment of the Division Bench in W.A.No.43260 of 2016 of the Allahabad High Court and other case law. The writ petitioners contend that each department and each subject must be classified as a unit for the purpose of providing reservations. The universities started classifying the entire institution/University or college as a unit. Therefore, the batch of writ petitions were filed and the impugned orders came to be passed. Challenging the same the present set of

appeals were filed by the Professors, Assistant Professors and others.

3) Sri B.Adinarayana Rao, learned senior counsel commenced the arguments in this batch of Writ Appeals. According to the learned senior counsel in none of the writ petitions the issue of reservations being provided for Professors was challenged. He also submits that the professors were not heard before the impugned orders were passed. After seeking leave from the Court the Professors have challenged the impugned order. It is his contention that the writ petitioners are not applicants for the post of Professor yet an order was passed affecting the Professors also. It is also submitted that there is no reservation for the post of the Professor, which is a single post. As far as the issue of dividing the teaching posts into three groups as Arts, Science and Engineering Science it is submitted that learned single Judge relied upon the Writ Appeal of the Allahabad High Court overlooking the order passed by the Full Bench of the Combined High Court in the case of ***PVSV***

Prasad Rao v Andhra University[1]. It is pointed out that the order of the learned single Judge is, therefore, incorrect and the Full Bench of the Combined High Court is the complete answer to the issue. It is also pointed out in the alternative in the "8" available posts of the Professors; one was given for the woman and another two for physically disabled candidates. Therefore, it is submitted that horizontal reservation for women and the physically handicapped were also achieved. It is submitted that the group based reservations are very much valid and are inline with the Full Bench decision.

4) Sri Motupalli Vijay Kumar, learned senior counsel also commenced arguments and submitted the arguments in W.A.No.214 of 2021. His submissions are also similar. It is urged that the appellants are Professors, who were not made parties to the writ petitions, yet a detailed order was passed affecting their rights. It is also submitted that without considering the individual G.Os., that were challenged, the learned single Judge set aside all the G.Os., *en masse* pertaining to the appointment of Professors also.

[1](2006) 2 ALD 1

It is his contention that the Professors are proper and necessary parties and that in their absence orders could not be passed affecting their right.

5) Learned senior counsel Sri P. Veera Reddy, instructed by Sri K. Jyothi Prasad, also argued on similar lines. Sri J. Sudheer, learned counsel also argued in similar lines for Associate Professors. The learned counsel appearing for the parties also submitted a brief written note at request of this Court.

6) It is also the common submission of the learned counsels that the judgment of the Allahabad High Court is fact specific. It is also argued that there is no reservation prescribed for the post of Professors and the same was also noticed by the learned single Judge of this Court while granting an interim order earlier. The University Grants Commission or its directives are not applicable to the State universities is another submission that is raised in common. It is also submitted that the Professors who are now the appellants have resigned from their earlier jobs, which they were holding, appeared for the interview etc., and were selected for the current posts. It is submitted that

if they are deprived of this job / post they would suffer irreparable loss.

7) Learned Advocate General argued the matter for the respondents and also filed a written note. The primary contention urged by the learned Advocate General is that the judgment of the Allahabad High Court was upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and that it is good law. With regard to the Full Bench of the Andhra Pradesh High Court ***(PVSV Prasad Rao's case – 1 supra)*** learned Advocate General submits that 2 out of 3 Judges had a different view on the issue of grouping of subjects in the unit as provision of reservation. He also points out that horizontal reservation for Women and the Physically Disabled are to be provided in accordance with law and also Rule 22A of the A.P. State Subordinate Service Rules. Reservation for the disabled should be in line with the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 (for short "the Act 49 of 2016"). These are all as per the mandate of law as per the learned Advocate General. It is also pointed out both the Central Government enacted Act i.e., Central Educational Institutions (Reservation in Teachers' Cadre)

Act, 2019 (for short "the Act 10 of 2019") after the Allahabad High Court judgment mandating that for the purpose of reservation "institution" should be regarded as a unit. In the State of Andhra Pradesh also The Andhra Pradesh State Educational Institutions (Reservation in Teachers Cadre) Act, 2021 (for short "the Act 19 of 2021") was passed, by which the entire University would be treated as a Unit. It is submitted that the State would be following the newly enacted law. The Allahabad judgment is therefore not applicable in the State of Andhra Pradesh as per him. He also submits that a three member Committee constituted by the State has found a number of errors in the rationalisation. The same is reproduced in detail in additional counter filed in W.A.No.268 of 2021. With regard to the issue of Professors learned Advocate General submits that the presence of the Professors was not really necessary for adjudication of the writ petition. He contends that a pure question of law was agitated about the validity of the GOs and the subsequent notifications which were issued basing on the said GOs. Therefore, for deciding said *lis* the presence of the Professors was not really necessary

according to the learned Advocate General. He also submits that they did not implead themselves in the Writ Petition even though they were appointed subject to the result of the writ petition.

8) Learned Additional Advocate General also supports the submissions made by the learned Advocate General. Both of them rely upon the written note that has been submitted on behalf of the respondents.

COURT:

9) The first and foremost point that this Court needs to discuss is about the judgment of the Full Bench of the A.P. High Court in the case of ***PVSV Prasad Rao (1 supra)***. Sri Justice VVS Rao in the course of his conclusions held as follows:

> **"66.** On an analysis of cited precedents as above, the following broad principles would emerge:
>
> (a) In the absence of any indication in the binding rules or statutes, it is open to the University to treat all teaching posts as belonging to one class for application of Rule of Reservation.
>
> (b) While evolving the method of grouping various faculties for the purpose of providing reservation, University must ensure that equal opportunity for selection and appointment is available to all candidates

> in all faculties, discipline and/or speciality in such a manner that no one category gains monopoly in getting reserved posts.
>
> (c) If the method adopted by the University in classifying posts into a group/groups, or class/classes, is reasonable, the same does not suffer from the vice of illegality or unconstitutionality.
>
> (d) While laying a method for providing Rule of Reservation, the University must ensure fairness and transparency in the recruitment process at the stage of issuing notification-inviting applications, conducting selections and at the stage of recruitment.
>
> (e) If there is any binding statute or rule requiring the University to follow the method of roster, it should be strictly adhered to at the stage of recruitment notification as well as recruitment.
>
> (f) If reservation is effected with reference to statutory roster, there is lesser likelihood of injustice because the aspiring candidates would know whether there is a post or posts in the department/faculty/group in which such candidates desires to compete for the post and
>
> (g) While giving the notification University should indicate to which of the posts and in which of the department/faculty reservation is provided. This has effect on the entire recruitment in the given recruitment year with reference to the roster."

10) Justice J. Chalameswar and Justice Goda Raghu Ram agreed with Justice VVS Rao on all the issues but on the issue of clubbing of posts they lodged a caveat in the sense that they held as follows in paras 34 and 35.

"34. The contentions of the learned Counsel for the University on the main question may now be noticed. The groupwise reservation does not in any manner impinge Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India. The Supreme Court in *University of Cochin* v. *Dr. N. Raman Nair* (supra) upheld groupwise reservation when the University treated all posts of Lecturers as belong to one class and posts of Readers another class for applying rule of reservation. The rule of reservation or method and manner of providing reservation cannot be of rigid universal application. When the University adopts *rationale* and unilateral method of classifying posts of Lecturers/Readers into groups as units of reservation, the same cannot be termed inequitable or arbitrary. The University has adopted the guidelines/directions issued by first respondent in G.O.Ms. No. 927, dated 20.11.1982 and G.O.Ms. No. 995, dated 16.12.1982 wherein it was directed that rule of reservation should be implemented by following Rule 22 of the General Rules by adopting prescribed 100 point roster. In the absence of any rule to mention reservation subject-wise in each group, the dicta laid down by the Supreme Court in *Suresh Chandra Verma* v. *Chancellor, Nagpur University* (supra) has no application.

35. The reservation for SCs/STs/BCs provided by grouping arts, sciences and technology faculties separately does not in any manner amount to irrational classification nor it is arbitrary. If reservation is resorted subject-wise, candidates belonging to reserved categories may not even get right for being considered for posts though they can compete with OC candidates. When endeavour of the State is to provide reservation in all public posts, resorting to subject-

> wise reservation would work out to the detriment of reserved categories. Therefore, the University made appointments following roster points (groupwise), keeping in view the need of the University, overall interest of the reserved categories and specified requirements of particular departments or particular colleges. Following such a method, the University acted in a fair manner by scrupulously adhering to the principle of under-representation and un-representation while earmarking posts in each group for reserved classes."

11) In conclusion, they held that the clubbing of posts group wise or category wise is not *per se* bad. In the light of this decision, particularly what is stated in paragraphs 34 and 35 of the judgment, which are reproduced earlier, it cannot be said that the judgment of the Full Bench is the complete answer to the subject.

12) The next issue that arises for consideration is – Whether the learned single Judge was right in treating each subject and department as a unit and not the entire university or institution as a unit for the purpose of reservation?

13) It is a fact that the learned single Judge relied upon the case of ***Vivekanand Tiwari &Anr., v. Union of India***[2] wherein the Division Bench of Allahabad High Court held that clubbing of posts by treating the entire institution or University as a unit would be impracticable, violative of Articles 14 and 16 and discriminatory also. This judgment of the Hon'ble Allahabad High Court was confirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of the ***Vijay Prakash Bharati v. Union of India &Ors.***[3]. The Division Bench of the Allahabad High Court in this judgment relied upon an earlier judgment in the case of ***Viswajeet Singh V State of U.P.,***[4], this judgment of the Allahabad High Court in ***Dr.Viswajeet Singh case*** was affirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***Sanjeev Kumar v State of U.P.,***[5]. Therefore, as the issue of classification of the entire University as a Unit etc., is already discussed in the judgment which was affirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, this Court is of the opinion that the learned single Judge did not commit any

[2]2017 SCC OnLine all 729 = (2017) 6 ALL LJ 722
[3](2019) 12 SCC 410
[4] 2009 SCC OnLine All 420 : (2009) 3 AWC 2929
[5](2019) 12 SCC 385

error in relying upon the judgments. Due to the affirmation by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India the judgments have become the law of the land.

14) Apart from that this Court also notices that the Division Bench in the case of ***Vivekananda Tiwari (2 supra)*** also discussed the other Supreme Court judgments on the subject including ***Dr. Suresh Chandra Varma v Chancellor Nagpur University***[6] and other cases. The Constitution Bench judgment in the case of ***Post Graduate Institute of Medical Education and Research v. Faculty Association***[7] was also considered in the passing and ***State of U.P. and others v M.C. Chattopadhyaya and others***[8] was also considered. In the case of ***Dr. Suresh Chandra Verma and Others v The Chancellor, Nagpur University and others***[9] which was mentioned earlier, the following was held in paragraph 11 of the SCC report.

> **"11.** The argument based on Section 57(4)(*a*) of the Act to support the procedure adopted by the University is, according to us, not well merited. The contention is that since Section 57(4)(*a*) requires the University to

[6]AIR 1990 SC 2023
[7](1998) 4 SCC 1
[8](2004) 12 SCC 333
[9](1990) 4 SCC 55

> state in the advertisement only the total number of posts and the number of reserved posts and not postwise, i.e. subjectwise, the employment notice in question was not bad in law. According to us, the word "post" used in the context has a relation to the faculty, discipline, or the subject for which it is created. When, therefore, reservations are required to be made "in posts", the reservations have to be postwise, i.e. subjectwise. The mere announcement of the number of reserved posts is no better than inviting applications for posts without mentioning the subjects for which the posts are advertised. When, therefore, Section 57(4)(*a*) requires that the advertisement or the employment notice would indicate the number of reserved posts, if any, it implies that the employment notice cannot be vague and has to indicate the specific post, i.e. the subject in which the post is vacant and for which the applications are invited from the candidates belonging to the reserved classes. A non-indication of the post in this manner itself defeats the purpose for which the applications are invited from the reserved category candidates and consequently negates the object of the reservation policy. That this is also the intention of the legislature is made clear by Section 57(4)(*d*) which requires the selection committees to interview and adjudge the merits of each candidate and recommend him or her for appointment to "the general posts" and "the reserved posts", if any, advertised."

15) Therefore, the contention of the learned senior counsel that the learned single Judge committed an error in relying

upon the judgment of the Allahabad High Court in the case of ***Vivekanand Tiwari (2 supra)*** alone is not really correct. The judgment of the ***Vivekanand Tiwari (2 supra)*** has been affirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The point of law that is considered and finalised in the said judgment is also the law laid down by various other judgments of the Supreme Court of India.

16) As far as reservation to women, deprived sections and the physically disabled are concerned it is also clear that many of the notifications did not provide the necessary clarity that is required under law. The advertisement did not specify the quota or the posts for which it is applicable. As per the Act 49 of 2016 the percentage of reservation has been raised to 4% for the physically disabled. This was also not noted / considered. These are all statutory requirements which have to be followed. The law mandates that appropriate / proper reservations should be provided to the women, the deprived sections and the physically disabled etc. The required clarity spelling out the details is not present in these notifications, which are the subject matters of the challenge. The learned single Judge also

pointed out that in a member of notifications the roster points were not properly fixed. It was also pointed that only the number of posts reserved were given. The lack of uniformity is also pointed out. Even the Full Bench decision referred to by the appellants i.e., ***PVSV Prasad Rao case (1 supra),*** in the conclusions in paragraph 66 reproduced above, clearly laid down as follows:

> **66.** On an analysis of cited precedents as above, the following broad principles would emerge:
>
> Xx
>
> Xx
>
> (d) While laying a method for providing Rule of Reservation, the University must ensure fairness and transparency in the recruitment process at the stage of issuing notification-inviting applications, conducting selections and at the stage of recruitment.
>
> (e) If there is any binding statute or rule requiring the University to follow the method of roster, it should be strictly adhered to at the stage of recruitment notification as well as recruitment.
>
> Xx
>
> (g) While giving the notification University should indicate to which of the posts and in which of the department/faculty reservation is provided. This has effect on the entire recruitment in the given recruitment year with reference to the roster. (Emphasis supplied).

This has not been done.

17) The Rights to Persons with Disabilities Act 2016 was held to be rightly applicable by the learned single Judge and the increase in reservation from 3 to 4% was also noticed. Therefore, in the opinion of this Court the horizontal reservations provided for women and persons with disabilities have to be implemented. Learned single Judge rightly relied upon judgments in ***Anil Kumar Gupta v State of U.P.***[10] as confirmed in ***Rajesh Kumar Daria v Rajasthan Public Service Commission***[11]. Both these judgments are still good law and it is mandated that the notification itself should clearly and categorically mentioned the reservations. Mere fact that incidentally some women were appointed or that a person with a physical disability is appointed will not meet the rigour of the law that is laid down by the statutes and the judgments referred to above. The Notification itself should specify all the necessary details in line with the statute and the rule. Fairness and transparency that is required at all stages will only be

[10]1995 5 SCC 173
[11](2007) 8 SCC 785

achieved right from the inception and the publication of the notification if the same are clearly and categorically mentioned. The rule of law is to be followed meticulously and scrupulously during the entire process from notification till recruitment. The Government has also produced G.O.Ms.No.40, dated 25.07.2016, which was issued subsequent to the judgment of the ***Rajesh Kumar Daria (11 supra)*** providing 33 1/3 % reservation for women and the subsequent G.O. on the subject.

18) In addition, this Court also notices that the State of Andhra Pradesh has enacted Act 24 of 1997 i.e., A.P.Regulation of Reservation for Appointment of Public Services Act 1997. Section 2 (d) of the Act 24 of 1997 is as below.

> "Section 2 (d) **"Public Services"** means, services in any office or establishment of,-
> (i) the Government;
> (ii) a local authority i.e.,
> (a) a Gram Panchayat,
> (b) a Mandal Parishad or a Zilla Parishad established under the Andhra Pradesh Panchayat Raj Act, 1994,
> (c) a Municipality constituted under the Andhra Pradesh Municipalities Act, 1965, and

> (d) Municipal Corporation established under the relevant law, for the time being in force, relating to Municipal Corporations;
> (iii) a Corporation or undertaking wholly owned or controlled by the Government;
> (iv) a body established under any law made by the Legislature of the State whether incorporated or not **including a University**; and
> (v) any other body established by the State Government or by a society registered under any law relating to the registration of societies for the time being in force and receiving funds from the State Government either fully or partly, for its maintenance or any educational institution, whether registered or not, but receiving aid from the Government."

Thus, it is clear that Section 2 (d)(iv) and 2 (d)(v) of the Act are squarely applicable to the current case as the Universities are publishing notifications.

19) The rule of reservation is defined in Section 2 (e) of this Act as follows:

> 2(e) "Rule of Reservation" means any rule or provision for the reservation of appointments or posts in favour of the Scheduled Castes or the Scheduled Tribes or the Backward Classes or Women in the Special Rules applicable to any particular service or the General Rule 22 of the Andhra Pradesh State and Subordinate Service Rules, as the case may be.

20) Therefore, in the opinion of this Court the respondent universities were also bound to keep this Act 24 of 1997 in mind while publishing the notifications.

21) Another argument that was advanced was that there cannot be reservation for single post and in particular for the professor's post. As per the Constitution Bench judgment in ***Post Graduate Institute of Medical Education and Research (7 supra)*** it is settled law that there could not be reservation in respect of isolated or single post. However, in ***M.C. Chattopadhyaya (8 supra)*** it was held as follows:

> **"6.** While, therefore, we are of the considered opinion that there can be a reservation in respect of post of Professor and the provisions of the Reservation Act would apply, but the same cannot be applied taking all the Professors as a cadre and it has to be made subjectwise, as has been earlier construed and held by this Court. We are also of the opinion that there cannot be a reservation for an isolated post. We further observe that in deciding the question of reservation the appropriate authority must follow the roster as has been published in exercise of power under Section 3(5) of the Reservation Act and then the roster should be duly complied with in accordance with the principles enunciated by this Court in *Sabharwal case* [(1995) 2

SCC 745 : 1995 SCC (L&S) 548 : (1995) 29 ATC 481 :
JT (1995) 2 SC 351] ."

22) A similar issue was also considered by the Allahabad High Court in its Division Bench. It was also followed by the learned single judge in the impugned order. Therefore, it cannot be said that the rule of reservation will not apply at all in the case of Professors. It depends on the fact situation.

23) In addition to the general submissions made on the correctness of the judgment of the learned single Judge it is also argued vehemently that the Professors were not made parties to the writ petition and that the applicants for the post of Assistant professors had challenged their notifications, but the learned single Judge granted an order against the Professors also. This Court notices that in W.P.No.20227 of 2018 the prayer was to set aside the advertisement KRU / E1 / Rec / Professor / Advt. / 2017, dt.15.09.2017. Similarly in W.P.No.33349 of 2018 also the prayer was to set aside the advertisement TS/1/2017, dated 25.10.2017 and TS/4/2017 dated 29.12.2017. In addition, in Writ petition No.10813 of 2018 it is stated that

the 4th petitioner is eligible for the post of Professor. It is also prayed that the notification bearing No.C1/JNTU/Estt/1/Professor/2017, dated 23.10.2017 should be set aside. This Court, therefore, finds that it is not correct to state that none of the notifications relating to Professors were challenged. In many of the writs a notification regarding "Professors" is also challenged. Apart from that this Court notices that the ambit of challenge in all these writ petitions is very wide. The writ petitioners are questioning the policies of the Government and the G.Os., commencing from G.O.Ms.No.995, dated 16.12.1982, G.O.Ms.No.420, dated 18.11.1995, G.O.Ms.No.456, dated 21.12.1985 and the 100 point roster also in Rule 22 of the Subordinate Service Rules. It is also pointed out that there are certain excess representations for reserved categories and less representation for others and that the constitutional upper limits have also been breached. The issue of women's reservation is also highlighted in the course of the writ petition etc. Therefore, what is in challenge in these writ petitions is the policy of the Government from 1982 onwards; the validity of the rules

and the actions of the universities in the issuance of the notifications. Learned single Judge rightly found that the notifications were not in accordance with law. Once he came to the conclusion that the notifications are not in accordance with the statute, he was duty bound, in the opinion of this Court, to set aside the same.

24) In fact this Court notices that the presence of the Professors in the writ petitions was not actually absolutely necessary to decide the correctness of the notifications. They were a proper party in the opinion of this Court but not a necessary party, without whose presence the issue could not have been decided. When the validity of the rule is challenged it is not necessary to implead all the persons who are likely to be affected ***(Government of Andhra Pradesh v G. Jaya Prasad Rao[12]).*** In addition, this Court notices that the Professors (writ appellants) who participated in the interviews etc., were given appointment subject to outcome of the writ petitions. Thus, they were aware that their appointment was contingent on the result of the writ petitions. They did not take any steps to implead

[12] (2007) 11 SCC 528

themselves and to urge their issues before the learned single judge. Having failed to do so and having accepted the appointment, which is subject to the result of the writ petition, they now cannot contend that the learned single Judge committed an error in deciding the matter without hearing them. This Court also relies upon para 15 of the judgment reported in ***General Manager, South Central Railway v AVR Siddhantti and Others***[13] in support of this finding.

25) After considering all the submissions made, this Court is of the opinion that the judgment of the learned single Judge does not suffer from any infirmities / flaws. The Writ Appeals should fail. Accordingly all the Writ Appeals are dismissed. The State has also, in the course of its written submissions and oral submissions, stated that the State would abide by the law and take all necessary steps as directed by the learned single Judge and also in accordance with the Act 19 of 2021. In the additional counter affidavit filed in W.A.No.268 of 2021 etc., the State argued to take steps based on the committee report dated 31.12.2020 also.

[13](1974) 4 SCC 335

It is hoped that all the constitutional and legal mandates would be scrupulously followed by the State by issuing fresh notifications in accordance with statute, the regulations governing the subject and the case law on the subject. The said exercise should be completed within two months keeping in view the interest of the institutions, the students, the faculty and the circumstances.

26) With these observations the Writ Appeals are dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

27) Consequently, Miscellaneous Applications pending, if any, shall also stand dismissed.

_____

JUSTICE D.V.S.S.SOMAYAJULU

_____

JUSTICE V.SRINIVAS

Date:11.07.2023
Note: LR copy be marked.
B/o
Ssv