## SUPREME COURT OF INDIA RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

## Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 1445/2023

[Arising out of impugned judgment and order dated 06-12-2022 in WA No. 2964/2014 (GM-RES) passed by the High Court of Karnataka at Bengaluru]

DR. C. D. VENKATESH

Petitioner(s)

## **VERSUS**

THE REGISTRAR, BANGALORE UNIVERSITY & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(IA No. 18373/2023 - APPLICATION FOR TAKING ON RECORD)

## WITH

SLP(C) No. 1692/2023 (IV-A)

(IA No. 18563/2023 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES)

SLP(C) No. 1824/2023 (IV-A)

(IA No. 68865/2023 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES)

Date: 08-04-2025 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ MISRA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.V. VISWANATHAN

For Petitioner(s): Mr. Shailesh Madiyal, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Mahesh Thakur, AOR

Ms. Divija Mahajan, Adv.

Mr. Ranvijay Singh Chandel, Adv.

Ms. Geetanjali Bedi, Adv.

Mrs. Geetanjali Bedi, Adv.

Mr. Suvendu Suvasis Dash, AOR

Mr. Ashok Panigrahi, Sr. Adv.

Ms. Swati Vaibhav, Adv.

Mr. Nabab Singh, Adv.

Ms. Geetanjali Das Krishnan, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Nizam Pasha, Adv.

Mr. Lzafeer Ahmad B. F., AOR

Mr. Siddharth Kaushik, Adv.

Ms. Supreeta Sharanagouda, AOR

Mr. Sharanagouda Patil, Adv.

Mrs. Supreeta Sharanagouda (aor), Adv.

Mr. Jyotish Pandey, Adv.

Mr. Kumar Kartikey, Adv.

Mr. M L Meena, Adv.

Ms. Neelu Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Maibam Nabaghanashyam Singh, AOR

Ms. Purvi Goyal, Adv.

Mr. Kartik Hooda, Adv.

Mr. Sumit Saddi, Adv.

Mr. D. L. Chidananda, AOR

Mr. V. N. Raghupathy, AOR

Mr. Raghavendra M. Kulkarni, Adv.

Mr. M. Bangaraswamy, Adv.

Mr. Venkata Raghu Mannepalli, Adv.

Mr. Md. Apzal Ansari, Adv.

Mr. Manoj Ranjan Sinha, Adv.

Mr. Vishal Agrawal, Adv.

Mr. Rameshwar Prasad Goyal, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following O R D E R  $\,$ 

- 1. Having regard to the reasons recorded in the impugned judgment(s); the fact that Women's Studies was notified as a separate subject with a separate Code by the UGC; and the advertisement also specified that the qualification must be in the relevant subject i.e., referrable to the field in which recruitment was to be made, we do not find any such palpable error in the impugned judgment(s) which may call for our interference under Article 136 of the Constitution. The Special Leave Petitions are accordingly dismissed.
- 2. However, we clarify that if the petitioners have continued to serve the institution under the interim order(s) of this Court or the High Court, whatever emoluments that have been paid to them, shall not be recovered from them.

3. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand closed.

(NITIN TALREJA)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(MAMTA RANI)
COURT MASTER (NSH)