

**HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE V.SUJATHA**

**WRIT PETITION Nos.22528, 19785, 19786, 19787,  
19788, 19789, 19790, 19793, 19799, 19820, 20021,  
20030, 22509, 25663 of 2023 and W.P.Nos.2620, 2625,  
2649 and 2653 of 2024**

**COMMON ORDER:**

All these petitions are filed claiming same relief by different petitioners, but the issue involved in these petitions is one and the same. Therefore, I am of the view that it is appropriate to decide all the petitions by common order taking Writ Petition No.22528 of 2023 as leading petition.

2) W.P. No.22528 of 2023 came to be filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following relief:-

“.... to issue an appropriate writ more in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent Registrar in issuing the Circular dated 20.04.2023 whereby and whereunder a demand is made to remit a sum of Rs.1,80,52,808/- towards University Common Services Fee (UCSF) for the academic years 2014-22 without any legal sanction or without disclosing any statutory Rule for making such a demand as being arbitrary, illegal and violative of Articles 14 and 19(1)(g) of the Constitution of India besides being in contravention of the Jawaharlal Technological University Act, 2008 and consequently set aside the impugned circular dated 20.04.2023 and issue....”

3) The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner is an institution offering Engineering Courses under various streams to the students of Krishna District and surrounding Districts of Andhra

Pradesh. The petitioner institution was established decades back and affiliated to respondent No.2 University. Respondent No.2 University issued a circular making unreasonable demand to pay a sum of Rs.1,80,52,808/- towards the University Common Services Fee (for short "UCSF") for the academic year 2023-24, without any statutory power and there is no reference to the University Grants Commission Rules for making such unreasonable demand. In the year 2006, the Government had constituted the "Annual Fee Regulatory Committee (for short "AFRC")" vide G.O.Ms.No.39 dated 24.06.2016 to determine the tuition fee to be charged by the private engineering colleges in the State. In terms of the above said G.O., a sum of Rs.1,850/- per student per annum was fixed as University Common Service Fee, which is to be paid to respondent No.2 university. The said G.O. was issued in exercise of powers conferred by Rules 8 and 9 of the University Rules 2011, however, these Rules 8 and 9 do not speak about the Services Fee, which is now sought to be levied through the impugned circular. Later, AFRC was abolished and in its place, the Government established respondent No.4 – Andhra Pradesh Higher Education Regulatory and Monitoring Commission (for short "APHERMC") through Act 20 of 2019. The APHERMC exercising its power determined the fee structure through notification by respondent No.1 vide G.O.Ms.No.15 dated 24.03.2020, whereby the University Common Services Fee is fixed in exercise of the powers conferred by Rule 8. Even, Rule 8 does not speak of any University Common Services Fee, which is now being demanded through the impugned circular.

4) It is the grievance of the petitioner that the impugned circular is not based on either any rule or the statute. Under the guise of impugned circular, respondent No.2 forwarded the list of colleges to respondent No.5 without including the name of the petitioner college, thereby disabling the petitioner institution to take part in the online counseling scheduled from 03.08.2023. Due to the impugned circular, not only the petitioner institution, the meritorious students would suffer irreparable loss and injury. Right to occupation is a fundamental right guaranteed by the Constitution and such precious right cannot be taken away by the respondent authorities by issuing the impugned circular making unreasonable demand. Challenging the circular dated 20.04.2023 issued by respondent No.2 demanding the petitioner to remit a sum of Rs.1,80,52,808/- towards UCSF, the present writ petition has been filed.

5) Respondent No.2 filed counter contending that in view of the directions issued by the Supreme Court in "**Islamic Academy of Education Vs. State of Karnataka**"<sup>1</sup> and other related legal propositions made Rules called the Andhra Pradesh Admission and Fee Regulatory Committee (for Professional Courses offered in Private Un-aided Professional Institutions) Rules, 2006 and as per the said rules the service fee is being collected. The common service fee is collected by the colleges from the students during admission as an infrastructural fee under which various expenses being met. The University is collecting the said fee on the instructions of the Andhra Pradesh Higher Education Regulatory &

---

<sup>1</sup> AIR 2003 SC 3724

Monitoring Commission. It is the fee towards the services rendered by the University. The University is not fixing the amount of fee towards services rendered by it rather it was as fixed by the Government on the recommendations of the erstwhile Admission and Fee Regulatory Commission and now, Andhra Pradesh Higher Education Regulatory and Monitoring Commission. The fee has to be collected from each student and be remitted to the University but not from the College funds. Further, once collected the fee towards common services from the students, for remitting the same to the University, it is not open to the colleges to retain the same. The students have paid it for the University. The present Writ Petition and other writ petitions are filed by the Colleges. But none of the students have raised any grievance in respect of the same. The Colleges cannot be the aggrieved parties because when they collected fee from the students, they are supposed to remit the same to the University as per the proceedings of the University. There are clear instructions from Andhra Pradesh Higher Education Regulatory Monitoring Commission and in turn from the University to collect the service fee from the students and to remit the same to the University. As a matter of fact, the colleges and the educational institutions have no locus standi to maintain the writ petitions questioning the action of the University.

6) It is further contended that the University is only claiming payment of fee collected by the colleges/educational institutions in terms of the recommendation made by HERMC and notified by the State Government. Earlier some of the colleges have filed the

similar petitions W.P.No.7873 of 2015 and batch, W.P.No.13427 of 2015, questioning the collection of common services fee from them in relation to the students pursuing Under Graduate and Post Graduate Engineering Courses in Private Unaided Institutions in the State of Telangana for the block period 2013-14 to 2015-16. The Hon'ble High Court passed a Common order in Writ Petition Nos.7873, 9799, 13427, 16267, 16343 and 16576 of 2015 ordered that "if the concerned institutions have not collected the said amount, the reasons under which they have not collected have to be informed to the University and it is for the University to take necessary action in pursuance thereof". When the matter was carried in appeal to the Division Bench, the Division Bench upheld the Judgment passed by the Hon'ble Single Judge in W.A.No.268 of 2016 on 28<sup>th</sup> July 2016. The petitioner college and similar colleges are not remitting the common services fee collected from the students for the last more than a decade due to filing of Writ Petitions before this Hon'ble Court as mentioned supra though the petitioner college and similar colleges collected such fee from the students and it appears that the petitioner college and similar colleges have diverted such fee for other purposes instead of reserving such funds and remit the same to respondent No.3 and the total amount due from the colleges is approximately Rs.191 crores since 2010-2011. The non-payment of affiliation fee and other fee timely by the affiliated colleges is preventing the smooth functioning of respondent No.3 though the colleges have been collecting tuition fee from the students directly and through

scholarships etc. As per the provisions of the Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University Act, the affiliated colleges shall pay affiliation fee and other fee as fixed by the Fee Regulatory Commission from time to time so as to allow the students for examinations of Graduation conducted by respondent No.3 University. Filing of the writ petition under various pretexts is with a view to avoid payment of the affiliation fee and other fee to respondent No.3 University, therefore, the present writ petition is liable to be dismissed.

7) Respondent No.4 - APHERMC filed counter contending that writ petitioner has no *locus standi* to file the present writ petition as it is only an intermediary who is collecting fee from the students who are under obligation to remit the same to the concerned Universities and the question of infringement or invasion of the Right of the Writ Petitioner, either under Constitution of India or under any Statute does not arise. Accordingly, the Writ Petitioner is disentitled to file the present Writ Petition. Initially, a body named Admission and Fee Regulatory Committee (hereinafter referred to as "AFRC") was tasked with the duty of determining the fee that can be levied by a college for a Three (3) Year block period. The said body was implementing the directions of a Division Bench of this Court in the case of "**Consortium of Engineering Colleges Managements Association Vs. Government of Andhra Pradesh**"<sup>2</sup>. Similar guidelines have been given by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of "**P.A.Inamdar Vs. State of**

---

<sup>2</sup> (2012) 3 ALT 686 DB

**Maharashtra**<sup>3</sup> Respondent No.4, had come into existence in the year 2019, by replacing AFRC, to regulate Higher Educational Institutions in the State of Andhra Pradesh. Erstwhile AFRC, has approved certain fee along with tuition fee for the various services rendered by universities to the students. However, several colleges used to collect the said fees and committed default in remitting the same with the universities. In a similar manner, petitioners herein, having collected Fees from the Students under the head of University Common Services Fees, has not remitted the same with the University concerned which is approved by erstwhile AFRC in the fee notified in the Government Orders issued by the Government.

8) Respondent No.4 further contended that merely because the impugned circular refers to no provision of law, it would not *per se* mean that the Universities are not entitled to collect University Common Services Fees. The Universities in the State render several services to colleges akin to the Petitioner in the State. Such services include imparting training to the teachers, holding meetings, access to publications, maintaining websites, etc., Such services may either be direct or indirect. For these services that are being rendered by the Universities, they are entitled to collect fees. This is the rationale behind the levy of Universities Common Service Fees.

---

<sup>3</sup> (2005) 6 SCC 537

9) Respondent No.4 further contended that if the fee collected by the petitioner college as approved by erstwhile AFRC and respondent No.4 Commission for the relevant block period apart from tuition fee from each student who is admitted is not remitted to the respective Universities for the services rendered by them and retaining such huge amounts of money with the petitioner college amounts to profiteering which is not permissible in law. Therefore, the petitioner college has to necessarily pay back such fee collected from the students claimed under University Common Services fees to the respective Universities concerned. In fact, the petitioner college in the fee proposals also claimed this component of fee, collected and paid to Universities and remitted towards University Common Services Fees, which is approved by erstwhile AFRC for each block period separately. Hence, such fee approved by the erstwhile AFRC to be collected from students by petitioner college is valid in law and the same is payable by the petitioner college to Universities. It is further contended that several Colleges in the State, including the petitioner College, have collected fees from the students towards common services and yet have not remitted the same with the Universities. Taking into consideration of all these things, respondent No.2 University had issued the impugned circular. As such, the petitioner College, having collected fees from the students towards common services, cannot evade from remitting the same with the University. The same would *per se* amount to unjust enrichment of the Petitioner College. In W.P.No.9026 of 2019, it has been categorically held by this Court



that if any statute/ordinance/regulation is passed in exercise of powers under Chapter IX of the Andhra Pradesh Universities Act, the University is entitled to claim such amount as additional fee from affiliated colleges. Therefore, the contention raised by the petitioner that the Respondent University has no power to levy or charge such fee impugned in the circular herein is totally devoid of merit and requested to dismiss the writ petition.

10) Petitioner filed reply affidavit to the counter filed by the respondents specifically contending that in the counter filed by respondent No.2 there is no whisper about the statutory power of the university to collect University Common Service Fee and that the respondent University has also failed to answer whether any statute is made to the extent of University Common Service Fee and for the services rendered by the University and requested to allow the writ petition.

11) Respondent No.2 filed additional counter contending that the A.P. Higher Education (EC) Department issued G.O.Ms.No.39 dated 24.06.2016, setting out the details of common service fee. They are examination related, academic audit, curriculum revision and content development, staff training, co-ordination meeting, University Publications, website maintenance. Various colleges have filed a batch of writ petitions in W.P.No.18703 of 2020 etc., but those writ petitions were dismissed observing that HERMC which has given notification was not made as party to the said writ petitions. However, in the said judgment, the Court referred to the

services that have been rendered by the University. After disposal of the batch of writ petitions, Special Chief Secretary to Government, Higher Education Department, A.P. Secretariat, Velagapudi addressed a letter to the Registrars of all the Universities directing them to take necessary action as per the above orders of the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. to expedite the process of recovering such due amounts including the University Service fee pending from all the concerned colleges at the earliest. In the JNTU Act, 2008 in Chapter II Section 4 (XVIII) it is observed that the University has to fix and receive fees subscriptions and deposits. In view of the proviso to Section 5, subsection 18, the University has been collecting the service fee as per the orders of the Government and Government has also fixed and framed rules. The Higher Education Department issued G.O.Ms.No.41 dated 06.08.2023, in which a notification has been published in exercise of powers conferred under Section 7 (b) of Andhra Pradesh Education Institutions (Regulation of Admissions and Prohibition of Capitation Fees Act, 1983). Further, the University is entitled to generate reasonable surplus for development of education and its expansion. In the present facts of the case, the amount to be remitted to the University towards common services, by no stretch of imagination, could be termed as unreasonable and cannot be accounted by University that by itself would not amount to unreasonable enrichment. The administration including financial affairs of the JNTUK, Kakinada is under the control of Andhra Pradesh Higher Education Department. As the A.P. Higher

Education Department itself has directed the University to collect the service fee, the University has been obeying the orders of the Higher Education Department. Under these circumstances, the collection of the service fee by the University is according to the rules. The petitioner and similar colleges are not remitting the common services fee collected from the students for the last more than a decade due to filing of Writ Petitions. The non-payment of affiliation fee and other fee timely by the affiliated colleges has been preventing the smooth functioning of 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent though the colleges have been collecting tuition fee from the students directly and through scholarships etc, requested to dismiss the writ petition.

12) Petitioner filed reply affidavit to the additional counter filed by the respondents specifically contending that the Managements are already paying affiliation fee, inspection fee and the students are paying the examination fee to the University. Hence, the payment of any other fee does not arise either from the student or the Managements. The Higher Education Department has no authority to direct the University to collect any service fee until a demand is made by the University. Further, the provisions of A.P.Capitation Fee Act 5 of 1983 do not speak about University Commission Service Fee. It is further contended that in the additional counter, the respondent University failed to substantiate the legal right of collecting the University Common Service fee from the students through the managements and requested to allow the writ petition.

13) Sri Mathukumilli Srivijay, learned counsel for the petitioners contended that the impugned circular is not based on either any Rule or the Statute and it is against the Jawaharlal Technological University Act. By virtue of the impugned Circular, the petitioner is subjected to grave hardship and loss. In the absence of any regulation or statute, respondent No.2 University is not entitled to claim any amount from the petitioner. The role of Government is minimal with regard to collection of University Common Services Fee by the University, hence respondent No.1 has no authority to issue any orders directing the managements to pay any such service fee. He further contended that the University is not providing any services, for which they are supposed to pay common services fee. Further, the petitioners never collected any fee under the head of common services fee from the students, hence there is no necessity to remit the same to the University.

14) Learned counsel for respondent No.4 contended that the Universities in the State are rendering several services to the colleges, such services include imparting training to the teachers, holding meetings, access to publications, maintaining websites etc. For the services that are being rendered by the Universities, they are entitled to collect fees. He further contended that several colleges in the State, including the petitioner college, have collected fees from the students towards common services, but they have not remitted the same with the Universities. Petitioner college having collected fees from the students towards common services, cannot evade from remitting the same with the University. Further, the writ

petitioner college is intermediary, who is collecting fee from the students, and they are under the obligation to remit the same to the concerned Universities, therefore, the question of infringement or invasion of the right of the petitioner college, does not arise and as such, the writ petitioner college is disentitled to file the present writ petition and requested to dismiss the writ petition.

15) Admittedly, Government issued notification vide G.O.Ms.No.15 Higher Education (E.C.) Department dated 24.03.2020 notifying the tuition fee and special fee structure for Graduate Engineering (B.Tech.) courses in Private Un-Aided professional Institutes in the State of Andhra Pradesh. As per the said G.O. the Private Un-Aided Engineering Colleges are permitted to collect an amount of Rs.1,850/- per annum per student towards common services rendered by the University to the college and such amount collected by the College shall be remitted to the concerned University. As stated in the said G.O., the services i.e. examination related, academic audit, curriculum revision and content, development, staff training, coordination meeting, University Publications Website Maintenance are being rendered by the University. The relevant portion of G.O.Ms.No.15 Higher Education (E.C.) Department dated 24.03.2020 is as follows:

“The Private Un-Aided Engineering Colleges are permitted to collect:-

(a).....

(b) An amount of Rs.1,850/- per annum per student towards common services rendered by the University to the College as mentioned below and such amount collected by the College shall be remitted to the concerned University.

Sl.No.	Services	Amount (Rs.)
1.	Examination related	600
2.	Academic Audit	300
3.	Curriculum Revision and Content	400
4.	Development	200
5.	Staff Training	100
6.	Coordination Meeting	50
7.	University Publications Website Maintenance	200
		-----
	Total	1850
		-----

16) Therefore, as per G.O.Ms.No.15 dated 24.03.2020, the private un-aided professional Institutions have to collect prescribed amount from the students towards common services rendered by the University and remit the same to the concerned university. Further, no material is placed on record to show that the said G.O.Ms.No.15 dated 24.03.2020 was challenged by any of the colleges. So, it can be presumed that the colleges would have implemented the directions given in the said G.O.Ms.No.15.

17) Learned counsel for respondent No.4 relied on "**CMR College of Engineering and Technology and Others Vs. The Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University (Hyderabad) and**

**Others**<sup>4</sup> wherein the Division Bench of High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad held as follows:

“Even if it is assumed, the argument based on the scheme/guidelines for autonomous colleges that after acquiring autonomous status, they are not entitled to collect common services fee, the colleges will have to seek revision as contemplated by the Rules, 2006, of common services fee either under examination related services or any other heads only after the relevant block period gets over. Even from bare perusal of the guidelines for autonomous colleges, we find that the University continues or suppose to render services like making use of expertise of the University Departments to frame their curricula, devise methods of teaching, examination and evaluation, etc. The parent University, under the guidelines, is obligated to accept the methodologies of teaching, examination, evaluation and the course curriculum of autonomous colleges also. The Universities are also expected to help all institutions and colleges, within its jurisdictional limits to develop their academic programmes, improve the faculty and to provide necessary guidance by participating in the deliberations of the different bodies of colleges. The university plays its role in permitting the colleges to issue their own provisional, migration and other certificates; to do everything possible to foster the spirit of autonomy; to ensure that degrees/diplomas/certificates issued indicate the name of the college; to depute various nominees of the University to serve in various committees of the autonomous colleges and to get feedback on their functioning and to create separate wings wherever necessary to facilitate smooth working of the autonomous colleges. Every service that the University is

---

<sup>4</sup> (2016) 6 ALT 477 (DB)

supposed to render even under the guidelines is either 'examination related' or 'academic audit related' or 'curriculum related' or 'development related' or 'staff training related'. It cannot be stated that the University does not render any services to the autonomous colleges. The appellant-colleges are not right in contending that they are entitled to retain the fees collected by them from the students towards common services.

In our opinion, once having collected the fees towards common services from the students, for remitting the same to the University, it is not open to the colleges to retain the same. The students have paid it for the University, and, as rightly observed by learned single Judge in the impugned order, none of the students has made any grievance in respect of this fees. That apart, the College, cannot, under any circumstances, decide whether the University renders any services and that they are entitled to retain the said amount collected towards common services to be rendered by the University.

.....From the facts of the present case, the amount to be remitted to the University towards common services, in our opinion, by no stretch of imagination, could be termed as 'unreasonable'

18) As per the law laid down in the said judgment, having collected the fees towards common services from the students, for remitting the same to the University, it is not open to the colleges to retain the same as the students have paid it for the University.

19) It is well settled that judicial review, as is well known, lies against the decision-making process and not the merits of the



decision itself. If the decision-making process is flawed *inter alia* by violation of the basic principles of natural justice, the decision itself would become ultra-vires. If the decision maker takes into consideration irrelevant materials or excludes relevant materials, admits materials behind the back of the person to be affected or is such that no reasonable person would have taken such a decision in the circumstances, the court may step in to correct the error by setting aside such decision and requiring the decision maker to take a fresh decision in accordance with the law. The court, in the garb of judicial review, cannot usurp the jurisdiction of the decision maker and make the decision itself.

20) In “**Fertilizer Corporation Kamgar Union (Regd.), Sindri v. Union of India**”<sup>5</sup>, the Apex Court observed as follows:

“We certainly agree that judicial interference with the administration cannot be meticulous in our Montesquieu system of separation of powers. The court cannot usurp or abdicate, and the parameters of judicial review must be clearly defined and never exceeded. If the directorate of a government company has acted fairly, even if it has faltered in its wisdom, the court cannot, as a super auditor, take the Board of Directors to task. This function is limited to testing whether the administrative action has been fair and free from the taint of unreasonableness and has substantially complied with the norms of

---

<sup>5</sup> (1981) 1 SCC 568

procedure set for it by Rules of public administration.”

(Emphasis supplied)

21) Judicial restraint in exercise of judicial review was considered in “***the State of (NCT) of Delhi v. Sanjeev***<sup>6</sup>” as follows:

“One can conveniently classify under three heads the grounds on which administrative action is subject to control by judicial review. The first ground is "illegality", the second "irrationality", and the third "procedural impropriety". These principles were highlighted by Lord Diplock in Council of Civil Service Unions v. Minister for the Civil Service (commonly known as CCSU case). If the power has been exercised on a non-consideration or non-application of mind to relevant factors, the exercise of power will be regarded as manifestly erroneous. If a power (whether legislative or administrative) is exercised on the basis of facts which do not exist and which are patently erroneous, such exercise of power will stand vitiated.”

(Emphasis supplied)

22) It needs no emphasis that complex executive decisions in economic matters are necessarily empiric and based on experimentation. Its validity cannot be tested on any rigid principles

---

<sup>6</sup> (2005) 5 SCC 181

or the application of any straitjacket formula. The Court while adjudging the validity of an executive decision in economic matters must grant certain measure of freedom, but however arbitrary decisions alone can be interfered with in judicial review.

23) Most peculiarly, the petitioners in all these writ petitions did not challenge any of the Government Orders, but on the other hand, the petitioners challenged the authority of the University in demanding the Common Services Fee by way of the impugned circular.

24) Learned counsel for the respondents relied on “***M/s. Al-Momin College of Education, Prakasam District Vs. Registrar, Acharya Nagarjuna University, Guntur***”<sup>7</sup>, wherein learned single Judge of this Court held as follows:

“Assuming for a moment that the demand made by the University is without any authority of law, as no Regulation or Ordinance was passed for collection of the fee under various heads, as mentioned in the table referred supra. The petitioners are not the aggrieved persons due to the act of the University, demanding to collect different kind of fee and at best, the student who seeks admission or who was already admitted in the educational institutions/colleges were the persons aggrieved.”

25) The facts of the above case are relevant to the present case as the present case is filed by the college, but not by the students, who are the aggrieved persons for collection of common services fee. As the petitioner/educational institution is only intermediary who is collecting fee from the students is under obligation to remit

---

<sup>7</sup> (2021) 4 ALT 326

the same to the concerned Universities and the question of infringement or invasion of right of the petitioner either under constitution or under any statute does not arise, thereby, the petitioner is disentitled to claim writ of mandamus, as claimed in the writ petition.

26) Learned counsel for the petitioner also relied on the order passed by this Court in “Dhanalakshmi College of Physical Education M.P.Ed. Vs. The State of A.P. (W.P.No.9026 of 2017 and batch dated 18.06.2021)” in support of his contentions. The law laid down in the said judgment is not in dispute, but the same is not applicable to the present facts of the case as the said case is filed challenging the action of the respondents therein in illegally and forcefully collecting 50% of the Tuition fee collected under management quota seats as additional fee.

27) Learned counsel for the petitioner further relied on the order passed by this Court in “Bapatla Educational Society Vs. Government of A.P. (W.P.No.14922 of 2020 dated 10.09.2020)” in support of his contentions. In the said case, this Court has dealt with the issue of blacklisting the petitioner college therein and set aside the impugned proceedings blacklisting the college.

28) However, it is also the case of the respondents that all the colleges have been collecting the Common Services Fee in pursuance of various Government Orders issued by the Government and it is a continuous process and though the colleges are collecting the said fee, they have failed to remit the same to the University. Further, as and when there is a demand from the

University, the petitioner Colleges are habituated in remitting the part of the said amount and thereafter obtaining affiliations for the subsequent years.

29) The specific contention raised by respondent No.4 in their counter is with regard to collection of common services fee by the petitioner is extracted as under:

“In fact, the petitioner colleges in the fee proposals also claimed this component of fee, collected paid to Universities and remitted towards University Common Services Fees, which is approved by erstwhile AFRC for each block period separately. Hence, such fee approved by the erstwhile AFRC to be collected from students by petitioner college is valid in law and the same is payable by the petitioner college to Universities.”

30) The said contention was not denied by the petitioner. So, it can be presumed that the petitioner – college has been collecting some amount towards Common Services Fee from the students. Having collected and paid certain amount to the University as and when demanded by the University, the petitioner college is not entitled to challenge the impugned proceedings. When the petitioner college has collected the said amount towards common services from the students, it is bound to remit the same to the University as per the law laid down in “**CMR College of Engineering and Technology and Others Vs. The Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University (Hyderabad) and Others**” (referred supra). Even otherwise, the petitioner without challenging G.O.Ms.No.15 dated 24.03.2020, by which colleges are permitted to collect Common Services Fee, challenged the subsequent

circular, which was in fact issued in pursuance of the earlier Government Order, as such the petitioner colleges are not entitled for any relief as claimed. Further, as discussed above, the petitioner colleges are not the aggrieved persons to file the writ petition. Therefore, the writ petition No.22528 of 2023 is liable to be dismissed.

31) In view of the aforesaid discussion in W.P.No.22528 of 2023, the other writ petitions are also liable to be dismissed.

32) Accordingly, all the writ petitions are dismissed. No costs.

33) Miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, in the Writ Petitions, shall stand closed.

---

**JUSTICE V.SUJATHA**

03.05.2024  
Ksp