

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DEVAN RAMACHANDRAN

TUESDAY, THE 11<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF OCTOBER 2022 / 19<sup>TH</sup> ASWINA, 1944

WP(C) NO. 24824 OF 2022

PETITIONER:

SHARAF ARTS AND SCIENCE COLLEGE COMMITTEE,  
REGISTRATION NO. 792/2006,  
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,  
PADNE POST,  
KASARGOD DISTRICT, PIN - 671312

BY ADV P.K.RAVISANKAR

RESPONDENTS:

- 1 STATE OF KERALA  
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,  
HIGHER EDUCATION (P) DEPARTMENT,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695001
- 2 KANNUR UNIVERSITY  
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR,  
THAVAKKARA, CIVIL STATION POST,  
KANNUR DISTRICT, PIN - 670002
- 3 THE VICE CHANCELLOR  
KANNUR UNIVERSITY,  
THAVAKKARA, CIVIL STATION POST,  
KANNUR DISTRICT, PIN - 670002
- 4 T.K.C. EDUCATION AND CHARITABLE SOCIETY,  
REGISTRATION NO. KSR/CA/234/2021,  
REPRESENTED BY ITS PRESIDENT,  
THEKKEPURAM, PADNE POST,  
KASARGOD DISTRICT, PIN - 671312
- 5 ADDL R5, MOHAMMED RAFAEEK T.K.M,  
S/O.ABDUL RAHEEM, AGED 48 YEARS, THEKKEKOLAYATH,

THEKKEPPURAM, PADNE, KASARGOD-671 131  
(ADDL R5 IS IMPEADED AS PER ORDER DATED DATED 19-  
08-2022 IN IA 1/2022)

BY ADVS.  
I.V.PRAMOD  
KODOTH SREEDHARAN  
P.A.MOHAMMED SHAH  
RENOY VINCENT  
HELEN P.A.  
ARUN ROY  
SHAHIR SHOWKATH ALI  
ALEESHA SHEREEF

**OTHER PRESENT:**

SMT.PARVATHY.K-GP

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON  
11.10.2022, ALONG WITH WP(C).27569/2022, THE COURT ON THE SAME  
DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DEVAN RAMACHANDRAN

TUESDAY, THE 11<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF OCTOBER 2022 / 19<sup>TH</sup> ASWINA, 1944

WP(C) NO. 27569 OF 2022

PETITIONER:

SELF-FINANCING ARTS & SCIENCE COLLEGE MANAGERMENTS  
WELFARE ASSOCIATION (KSMA)  
KERALA STATE COMMITTEE, (REG.NO. TVM/TC/1278/2012)  
KSMA OFFICE, AMBIKA COMPLEX NO.1056, PALLIKUNNU,  
KANNUR - 670004, REPRESENTED BY ITS PRESIDENT.

BY ADVS.  
GEORGE POONTHOTTAM (SR.)  
NISHA GEORGE  
SIDHARTH.R.WARIYAR

RESPONDENTS:

- 1 THE STATE OF KERALA  
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, HIGHER EDUCATION (P)  
DEPARTMENT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695001.
- 2 KANNUR UNIVERSITY  
THAVAKKARA, CIVIL STATION P.O., KANNUR - 670002.  
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR.
- 3 THE VICE CHANCELLOR,  
KANNUR UNIVERSITY, THAVAKKARA, CIVIL STATION P.O.,  
KANNUR - 670002.
- 4 T.K.C. EDUCATION & CHARITABLE SOCIETY,  
REG.NO.KSR/CA/234/2021, THEKKEPURAM, PADNE POST,  
KASARGOD DISTRICT - 671312.

**WP(C)Nos.24824/2022 & 27569/2022**

**4**

BY ADVS.

SHRI.I.V.PRAMOD, SC, KANNUR UNIVERSITY

I.V.PRAMOD

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON  
11.10.2022, ALONG WITH WP(C).24824/2022, THE COURT ON THE SAME  
DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

**CR**

## **JUDGMENT**

All power is held in trust and finally accountable to the people it springs from; its well informed and responsible exercise alone being the justification for its grant.

2. An 'Administrative Sanction', issued by the Government of Kerala to the Kannur University, for starting a new Unaided Arts and Science College by name 'TKC Education and Charitable Society' ('TKC' for short), is the genesis of the controversy projected in these Writ Petitions.

3. Since the contentions of the petitioners in these cases are analogous and because the reliefs sought for are similar - if not identical, I am certain that they require to be heard and disposed of together, which I propose to do through this judgment.

4. Brevity would do well for this judgment because most of the facts are not in dispute.

5. 'TKC' made an application for starting a new Arts and

Science College to the Kannur University for the academic year 2022-23; but which was found to be defective by its Registrar, who issued a letter, dated 05.02.2022, notifying them that the land offered do not belong to them, but to six other persons; and further that said extents are not contiguous to each other.

6. It transpires that 'TKC' offered certain clarifications to the afore letter, which was then considered by the Registrar again, in conjunction with the Land Acquisition Officer of the University; but to find that the earlier defects still remained. He thus intimated of the said factum through letter dated 26.03.2022, making it clear therein that they have been granted time to 'clear the discrepancies' within 15 days thereafter.

7. It is conceded that 'TKC' was unable to rectify the defects within the time granted, but that they approached the Registrar through letter dated 19.05.2022, wherein, they conceded that at least 45 cents of land was not lying contiguous to the balance offered by them; and therefore, that they

propose to substitute it with another one acre which, however, was in the name of an individual, who was their member. They thus informed the Registrar that *'we will register that property also within three months or on the earliest as per the instructions given by the same'* (sic) and then made a request to the effect: *'please do needful to start the new college'* (sic).

8. Incredibly, the Registrar placed this letter of 'TKC' before the Vice Chancellor of the University on the same day, who made an endorsement in his own hand writing on it: *'urgent ... R for u/a. place before syndicate meeting on 27.05.2022. Dr.Ashokan and Sri.M.C.Raju to conduct inspection on 21.05.2022'* (sic).

9. The afore endorsement of the Vice Chancellor lead to an inspection to be conducted by the Inspection Team on 21.05.2022 itself and they submitted a report before the Vice Chancellor recommending *'to grant provisional affiliation subject to NOC to a new Arts and Science College to TKC Education and Charitable Society at Padanna with effect from 2022-23*

*academic year'* (sic), but without mentioning therein any deficiency or defect *qua* the land offered.

10. It is expressly admitted by the University that the Vice Chancellor approved the afore Inspection Report on 15.06.2022 and directed that the matter be placed before its Syndicate. It is also without dispute and unequivocally conceded that the Syndicate considered the file on 27.06.2022, but since NOC from Government had not been received by them, they endorsed the word 'noted' after recording: '*reporting the approval of Inspection Report by the Vice Chancellor on starting new Arts and Science College (2022-23) by TKC Education and Charitable Society'* (sic).

11. While so, Government issued the impugned 'Administrative Sanction' dated 26.07.2022, inditing therein that they were acting as per the letter of the Registrar dated 17.06.2022, which appears to have reached the University a few days later.

12. It is at this stage that W.P.(C)No.24824/2022 was



filed; and, by an interim order dated 05.08.2022, all further action based on the impugned "Administrative Sanction" of the Government was directed to be deferred.

13. In the meanwhile, W.P.(C)No.27569/2022 – was filed by an Association of the Managements of Self Financing Arts and Science Colleges – wherein, they again challenged the "Administrative Sanction" of the Government, as also the Minutes of the Syndicate of the University, producing it as Ext.P3.

14. I have heard Sri.George Poonthottam – learned Senior Counsel, instructed by Sri.A.L.Navaneeth Krishnan, appearing for the petitioner in W.P.(C)No.27569/2022; Sri.P.K.Ravi Sankar – learned counsel for the petitioner in W.P.(C)No.24824/2022; Sri.I.V.Pramod – learned Standing Counsel for the Kannur University; Sri.Kodoth Sreedharan – learned counsel appearing for the TKC; Sri.Mohammed Shah appearing for the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent in W.P.(C)No.24824/2022 and Smt.Parvathy Kottol – learned Government Pleader appearing

for the official respondents.

15. As I have said in the prefatory paragraphs of this judgment, the sole controversy in this case is whether the Vice Chancellor of the Kannur University acted correctly in having directed the application of "TKC" to be proceeded to the stage of inspection, thus leading to obtention of "Administrative Sanction" from the Government; and if not, whether said "Administrative Sanction" is liable to be set aside.

16. There is no disputation against the fact that Chapter V of the Kannur University First Statutes, 1998 ("First Statutes", for short) enumerates the provisions relating to the procedure for processing the applications leading to affiliation of Colleges. It is normally the Syndicate of the University, which is to consider the applications seeking affiliation; and it is also stipulated in Statute 6 thereof, that it shall be done not later than 30<sup>th</sup> day of April, preceding the academic year in which the College/Course is proposed to be started.

17. The afore provisions assume great importance in this

case because, when "TKC" made their application and it was found to be defective, as seen above, the Registrar of the University issued letters dated 05.02.2022 and 26.03.2022 asking them to cure it and granted them 15 days from the date of the latter, presumably because he was aware that unless the defects are cured at least by mid April, same would not be able to be considered by the Syndicate – being constrained by the time frame in Statute 6 of the "First Statutes".

18. However, admittedly, "TKC" did not do so; and after the deadline under Statute 6 of the "First Statutes", they approached the Registrar with letter dated 19.05.2022 and merely requested him to "do the needful to start the new College" (sic), though unambiguously intimating him that they will need at least three months time to satisfy the land requirements as per the mandatory Statutory Scheme.

19. Indubitably, the afore letter could not have been considered by the Registrar or by any other Authority, since "TKC" unreservedly admits that they did not satisfy the

imperative requirements and that they will require at least three months time to do so.

20. But, ineffably, the Registrar placed this letter before the Vice-Chancellor on the same day and the said Authority, through the aforementioned endorsement, not merely considered it; but went on to constitute an Inspection Committee and even fixed the date of inspection as being 21.05.2022; with a further instruction that the file be placed before the Syndicate on 27.05.2022.

21. Further actions appear to have then gone on record speed because, based on the endorsement made by the Vice Chancellor on the letter of "TKC" dated 19.05.2022, the Inspection Committee - so constituted - went on to complete the inspection on the very next day, namely 20.05.2022; and presented their Report before the Vice Chancellor apparently on the same day. The Vice Chancellor, thereupon, accepted the Inspection Report, which incredulously recommended commencement of the course by "TKC", without referring to the

admitted fact that they did not satisfy the statutory land requirements, on 15.06.2022.

22. The march of events between 20.05.2022 – when the Inspection Committee placed the Report before the Vice Chancellor, and 15.06.2022 – when a decision was taken by the latter Authority to approve it, are unclear. I say so because, as per the endorsement made by the Vice Chancellor on the aforementioned letter of “TKC”, the files were to be placed before the Syndicate on 27.05.2022. Of course, the pleadings on record, on behalf of the Registrar of the University, would show that this had not been done; and therefore, that the files continued to be with the Vice Chancellor, who made subsequent endorsement on the Inspection Report, approving it, on 15.06.2022.

23. Strangely, the Registrar, solely on such basis, issued a letter to the Government on 17.06.2022, which led to the “Administrative Sanction” impugned in these cases.

24. Before I proceed to analyse the validity of the actions

of the Vice Chancellor and the worth of the impugned "Administrative Sanction" issued by the Government on its basis, it must be borne in mind that said Authority has been statutorily vested with great powers when it requires immediate action, enabling him to exercise any power vested with the Syndicate or Academic Council of the University. It does not require to be stated specifically that the Vice Chancellor is expected to act judiciously and strictly circumscribed by the limits under Section 11 of the Kannur University Act, 1996 ("Act" for short) and that he cannot choose to do as he pleases, even when the Syndicate or the Academic Council is not in session.

25. I have chosen to remind the afore obligation of the Vice Chancellor because, whatever be the reasons that he may cite, the fact remains that he could have exercised any power under Section 11 of the Act in favour of "TKC", only after he had satisfied himself that their application was complete in all respects, complying with all the statutory requirements as are

mandated and that any discrepancy therein had been rectified before the date mentioned in Statute 6 of Chapter V of the "First Statutes".

26. However, in the case at hand, the Vice Chancellor appears to have acted much in excess of his powers and dealt with an application which was, admittedly, incomplete and in error – which fact was unequivocally conceded to by "TKC" in their letter dated 19.05.2022.

27. Noticing the afore facts on 05.08.2022 – when this matter was taken up initially, I granted time till 19.08.2022, for the Vice Chancellor to explain his conduct by producing all relevant documents. Thereafter, on 19.08.2022, further time was sought for by Sri.I.V.Pramod – learned Standing Counsel for the University, pursuant to which, the matter was listed on 26.08.2022. On that date, Sri.I.V.Pramod requested for further time to produce documents, including the letters referred to in the impugned "Administrative Sanction" of the Government; and the matter was thus called on 02.09.2022. However, on that

date also, further time was sought on behalf of the Vice Chancellor.

28. On 22.09.2022, when the matter was again considered, a Statement was filed on behalf of the Vice Chancellor of the University by the learned Standing Counsel – Sri.I.V.Pramod; but this Court found it necessary that said Authority, as well as the Registrar of the University, file independent affidavits, producing all relevant documents; and granted time for such purpose till 28.09.2022.

29. On 28.09.2022, an affidavit of that date was filed on behalf of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent – Registrar of the University, and it was informed that the Vice Chancellor could not do so, because he was out of India.

30. As a last chance, therefore, this Court adjourned the matter to be called on 30.09.2022, so that the Vice Chancellor, if he was so advised, could file an affidavit in support of his action. But on that day, Sri.I.V.Pramod submitted that said Authority is still out of India and that the affidavit of the



Registrar of the University may be treated as one filed by him also.

31. As reflected earlier, the impugned "Administrative Sanction" of the Government can find favour with this Court only if the processes followed by the Vice Chancellor prior to it are assessed to be irreproachable.

32. Sri.I.V.Pramod – learned Standing Counsel for the University, vehemently argued that even if this Court is to find any error on the part of the Vice Chancellor in having been made the afore extracted endorsement on the letter of the "TKC" dated 19.05.2022, it would still be not crucial, because such action did not obtain any benefit to the petitioners - they having not been sanctioned the College by the Syndicate of the University yet. He then added that, in fact, the Syndicate of the University has neither considered the applications of the "TKC" yet; nor will they act on the Inspection Report already settled by the team constituted by the Vice Chancellor – it being not acceptable; and that the whole process will be commenced against and completed strictly as per the "Act" and the "First

Statutes”, after confirming that it is now in order. He asserted that, therefore, at the best, the petitioners can only allege – without admitting – that the Vice Chancellor has acted without full thought of the Statutory Scheme and nothing more. He concluded, predicating that the Vice Chancellor had not approved the Inspection Report, so as to facilitate the grant of affiliation to “TKC”, but only so that the files could be placed before the Syndicate of the University.

33. I am afraid that the matter cannot be treated as light as Sri.I.V.Pramod has presented it afore.

34. This is because, the Vice Chancellor of the University is an Authority with great responsibility, power and dignity. He is expected to act in the highest traditions and in implicit compliance with the statutory provisions and prescriptions; but cannot construe himself to be armed with the unlimited power or unbridled privileges.

35. As is admitted, the Vice Chancellor could have acted only under Section 11 of the “Act”, and that too, when there

was an emergency, requiring him to take immediate action.

36. However, in the case at hand, it is needless to say, there was no such emergency and there was no requirement for any immediate action by the Vice Chancellor, at the time when "TKC" preferred its letter dated 19.05.2022 before the Registrar of the University. When this letter was placed before the Vice Chancellor, he ought to have considered the same in its proper perspective, circumscribed by the limits of his powers; but instead of doing so, he accepted it and directed an inspection on the application of "TKC", knowing fully well – it being unreservedly admitted in the said letter itself – that they had not satisfied the land requirements, as are statutorily mandated.

37. Furthermore, there could have been any cause for urgency because, as is fully admitted, the statutory time limit for consideration of the application of "TKC" for the academic year 2022-23 had expired even on 19.05.2022, when they addressed the Registrar.

38. Needless to say, the Vice Chancellor acted incorrectly at this stage; and should he have chosen, could have stopped all further processes and steps pursuant thereto. If he had done so, this Court may have found mitigating factors in his favour.

39. However, this was not the way things have fallen thereafter.

40. Based on the endorsement made by the Vice Chancellor on the letter of "TKC" dated 19.05.2022, the Inspection Team caused an inspection on 25.02.2022 itself and placed their report before him, who, on 15.06.2022, made an endorsement online that the said Inspection Report has been "approved". This approval, contrary to the afore recorded argument of Sri.I.V.Pramod, was to the recommendations of the Inspection Team "to grant provisional affiliation subject to NOC" (sic).

41. This is certainly baffling because, when the application of "TKC" was defective, as was limpidly admitted by them, one

fails to gather how the Vice Chancellor could have approved the "Inspection Report", which itself appears to have been settled in disregard to the statutory prescriptions.

42. To make matters worse, the Registrar of the University forwarded a letter to the Government on 17.06.2022 – which can only be based on the action of the Vice Chancellor and his orders, because the Syndicate had not even dealt with the application of "TKC" until then – seeking their concurrence, which led to the impugned "Administrative Sanction" dated 26.07.2022.

43. In the meanwhile, on 27.06.2022, the files relating to the application of "TKC" was placed before the Syndicate of the University, which made an endorsement thereon – after noticing the actions of the Vice Chancellor – to the effect: "noted". As this Court has already recorded in one of the earlier interim orders, had the "Administrative Sanction" of the Government been received by the Syndicate on that date, it was certainly possible that they may have granted, or at least considered

grant of affiliation, to "TKC"; which then, would have ended in a complete travesty of the processes under the "Act" and the "First Statutes". Though the files do not specifically reveal so, the impugned "Administrative Sanction" appears to have been received by the Syndicate later; but, by then, the first among the above Writ Petitions, namely W.P.(C)No.24824 of 2022, had already been filed, in which an order of interdiction was issued by this Court.

44. Therefore, it is evident that the primary reason why the application of "TKC" is still pending, without any action being taken thereon by the Syndicate, is because of the afore factors.

45. At this juncture, I must record that all the documents referred to in this judgment have been produced and marked as Ext.R2(a), along with the affidavit of the Registrar dated 26.09.2022; and indubitably, they have been endorsed by the Vice Chancellor also, on account of the submissions made on his behalf by Sri.I.V.Pramod, that the said affidavit be

construed as having been filed by him also.

46. In the face of the above enumerated expressly admitted documents, it is irrefragable that the Vice Chancellor acted solely on the basis of the letter of "TKC", allowing their concededly incomplete application to be processed and taken forward to the stage of inspection; and then approved the resultant Inspection Report.

47. Of course, the question whether the Registrar acted upon the instructions of the Vice Chancellor, in addressing the letter dated 17.06.2022, to the Government seeking their concurrence, has not been specifically stated or denied in his affidavit; but the fact that he did so would certainly justify a presumption that he would not have acted on his own, but only under the advice of the Vice Chancellor.

48. From the afore narrative, it becomes ineluctable that the "Administrative Sanction" issued by the Government was based on the letter of the Registrar, which in turn, emanated out of an incomplete and defective application of "TKC". These

surely, therefore, cannot find imprimatur in law.

49. That said, one may not be able to find fault with the Government in having issued the "Administrative Sanction" since, perhaps, they were not aware of the afore facts, when they considered the letter of the Registrar dated 17.06.2022.

50. In summation, when this Court is convinced that the Vice Chancellor acted in excess of the powers vested with him and in a manner which he ought not to have, the report of the "Inspection Committee" constituted by him, as also further proceedings thereon – including at the hands of the Registrar and that of the Syndicate – are rendered vitiated.

51. Axiomatically, the impugned "Administrative Sanction" issued by the Government would also be without legs to stand on.

52. I must record at this time that Sri.Kodoth Sreedharan – learned counsel appearing for "TKC", made a valiant attempt to sustain the impugned "Administrative Sanction" issued by the Government, relying upon the judgment of the Honourable



Supreme Court in ***The Vice-Chancellor, Utkal University and Ors. v. S.K.Ghosh and Ors. (MANU/SC/0012/1954)***.

His argument was that, when there was substantial compliance with the provisions of law, minor variations would not be a ground to set aside the final decision. I am afraid that this judgment would not be of any avail to "TKC" because it is a precedent for the proposition that when compliance of the procedure is obtained in the spirit of law, mere waiver of notice, as required under the applicable Statutes, would not be fatal.

53. But here, as has already been concluded above, the Vice Chancellor acted upon an admittedly defective and incomplete application of "TKC", which he certainly could never have done; and hence not merely are the principles of "substantial compliance" not attracted, but would, in fact, render anathema to the conduct of the said Authority.

54. Sri.Kodoth Sreedharan then relied upon ***Poonam Viji and Others v. Thapar Institute of Engineering and Technology (Deemed University), Patiala and Another***

**University (2001 KHC 3828)**, which is a judgment of the Punjab and Haryana High Court, dealing with emergency powers of a Vice Chancellor. I fail to understand why this judgment has been cited because, even assuming that the Vice Chancellor could have exercised emergency powers in this case, the crucial question is whether he could have done so on an admittedly incomplete and defective application, particularly when the Registrar of the University had already found it to be so and when "TKC" did not comply with the time frames given to them for rectifying the defects.

55. Before I close, I must also record the submissions of Sri. George Poonthottam – learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner in W.P.(C)No.27569 of 2022, that even the lands now offered by the "TKC" cannot be accepted by the University because they are "Paddy Lands", as is evident from Ext.P5 in the said Writ Petition. I am, however, of the firm view that this is not an issue which this Court can consider now because, going by the "First Statutes", it is the Syndicate of the

University which has to assess all applications for affiliation in its proper perspective. I record that Sri.I.V.Pramod – learned Standing Counsel for the University, also affirms this, reiterating that the entire process with respect to the application of “TKC” will be considered afresh, scrupulously under the provisions of the “Act” and the “First Statutes”.

In the afore circumstances, I allow these Writ Petitions and set aside the “Administrative Sanction” dated 26.07.2022, granted by the Government to the Kannur University in favour of “TKC” – which has been produced as Ext.P6 in W.P. (C)No.24824 of 2022 and as Ext.P4 in W.P.(C)No.27569 of 2022.

As a consequence of the afore conclusions and holdings, all action of the Vice Chancellor, commencing from his endorsement on the letter of “TKC” dated 19.05.2022, as also the subsequent “Inspection Report”, will stand set aside; however, with liberty being reserved to the Syndicate of the University to reconsider the application of “TKC”, subject to the

requirements under law being satisfied, for the apposite academic year as per Statute 6 of Chapter V of the "First Statutes". This shall be done only after confirming that the application of "TKC" is now complete in all respects and that it is no longer defective - as has been today asserted by Sri.Kodoth Sreedharan, their learned counsel.

Needless to say, all contentions of the petitioners with respect to the other issues impelled by them, including on the nature of land offered by "TKC", the educational need of the area, etc., are left open to be pursued by them in future, if so warranted.

Sd/-

**DEVAN RAMACHANDRAN  
JUDGE**

RR/AKV/ANB

**APPENDIX OF WP (C) 24824/2022**

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

Exhibit P1 TRUE COPY OF THE G.O. (MS) NO. 206/2022/HEDN DATED 23-4-2022 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT

Exhibit P2 TRUE COPY OF THE COMPLAINT DATED 12-5-2022 SUBMITTED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE PETITIONER TO THE 3RD RESPONDENT

Exhibit P3 TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 1-6-2022 SUBMITTED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE PETITIONER TO THE 3RD RESPONDENT

Exhibit P4 TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PORTION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SYNDICATE OF THE KANNUR UNIVERSITY HELD ON 27-6-2022

Exhibit P5 TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 12-7-2022 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER TO THE 1ST RESPONDENT

Exhibit P6 TRUE COPY OF THE G.O. (RT) NO. 1156/2022/HEDN DATED 26-7-2022 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT

RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

Exhibit R4(A) TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER IN W.P(C) 22381/2017 DATED 25/07/2017 OF THIS HONOURABLE COURT

Exhibit R4(B) TRUE COPY OF THE APPROVAL AND THE DIRECTION BY THE UNIVERSITY DATED 20/06/2022

Exhibit R4(C) TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION FILED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY DATED

31/12/2021

Exhibit R2(a)            A TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION WITH OTHER DOCUMENTS.

Annexure R2(a)        A TRUE COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION GIVEN BY THE REGISTRAR TO THE GOVERNMENT BEARING NUMBER ACAD A1/2310/NEW COLLEGES, COURSES, PIS/2022-23 DATED 17.06.2022

**APPENDIX OF WP(C) 27569/2022**

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

- Exhibit P1 COPY OF THE LIST OF COLLEGES ON WHOSE BEHALF THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED.
- Exhibit P2 TRUE COPY OF THE FORM-2 OF CHAPTER V OF KANNUR UNIVERSITY STATUTE, 1998.
- Exhibit P3 TRUE COPY OF THE MINUTES OF THE SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY HELD ON 27TH JUNE 2022.
- Exhibit P4 TRUE COPY OF THE GOVERNMENT ORDER BEARING G.O.(RT) NO.1156/2022/HEDN DATED 26.07.2022.
- Exhibit P5 TRUE COPY OF THE TAX RECEIPT ISSUED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF LAND REVENUE DATED NIL.