

(2018) 04 MP CK 0046

In the Madhya Pradesh High Court

Case No : Writ Petition No.6237 OF 2016, 3527, 5027, 5087, 4069, 6201, 5819, 6301, 18739, 2840, 2839, 2842, 2841 OF 2017

Laxmi Dhakad & Anr

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Madhya Pradesh & Ors

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 13-04-2018

Acts Referred:

Constitution of India — Article 142, 226

Indian Penal Code 1860 — Section 120B, 201, 420, 467, 468, 471

Madhya Pradesh Recognized Examination Act, 1937 — Section 3, 3(d)(1), 4

Citation : (2018) 04 MP CK 0046

Hon'ble Judges : SANJAY YADAV, J;ASHOK KUMAR JOSHI, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : U.K. Bohre, Prashant Sharma, Amit Lahoti, Kumar Gaurav Sharma, Vivek Jain, Raghvendra Dixit, Nidhi Patankar, Vivek Khedkar, C.R. Roman, Anuradha Singh, K.K. Prajapati

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

.....

In this batch of writ petitions, common issue emerges as to whether the respondent Gajaraja Medical College, Gwalior is justified in cancelling the".....

admission of the petitioners to MBBS course to which they were admitted in the year 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011 through Pre-Medical Test".....

Examinations held in these years.....

(2) The cancellation of admission to MBBS course is for the reason that each of the petitioners allegedly adopted unfair means in fetching the.....

admissions either through impersonation through scorers or by other unfair means.....

(3) It is a common fact in all these petitions that each of the petitioners is facing

criminal charges for an offence punishable under Sections 419, 420,",,,,,
467, 468, 471, 201, 120B of IPC and Section 3 / 4 of Madhya Pradesh
Recognized Examination Act, 1937.",,,,,

(4) It is also a common fact in this batch of writ petitions that each of these
petitioners after an inhouse enquiry was earlier rusticated from the course.,,,,,

The rustication orders, however, were set aside on the anvil of the decision in
Pratibha Singh Ku. (Minor) Vs. The State of Madhya Pradesh",,,,,

and others [2014 (III) MPJR 178] wherein the Division Bench of this Court held
that the examining body i.e. Madhya Pradesh Professional,,,,,

Examination Board (VYAPAM for short) is not divested of power to take
action for illegality committed during examination merely because,,,,,

the candidate has been admitted to course. However, on finding that there was a
breach of principle of audi alteram partem, Division Bench quashed",,,,,

the order of rustication passed by the Dean of the respective colleges granting
liberty to the VYAPAM to pass appropriate orders in accordance with,,,,,

law [Please see Paragraphs 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 of the judgment in Pratibha Singh
Ku. (Minor) (supra)].",,,,,

(5) As a result whereof, respective orders were passed in case of each of the
petitioners also following the decision in Arun Sharma & Ors Vs. State",,,,,

of M.P. and Ors [2015(3) MPLJ 206]; Bhimsen Yadav Vs. The State of Madhya
Pradesh WP.No.1530/2015 decided on 17/08/2015, quashing the",,,,,

order of rustication passed by the Dean of the concerned Medical College with a
liberty to the VYAPAM to take action if the case is covered within,,,,,

the parameters of Clause 3.2 and 3.3 of Pre-Medical Test Entrance Examination
Rules of respective years.,,,,,

(6) Later, a Division Bench of this Court at Gwalior in Santosh Badole Vs. The
State of M.P. and others [WP.7010/2016], decided on 03.10.2016",,,,,

held that Clause 3.2 and 3.3 of the Examination Rules empower the Dean of
respective medical colleges to initiate action if it is found that the,,,,,

admission has been sought contrary to the stipulations contained in the
examination rules. Following the said principle, another Division Bench in",,,,,

Nitin Ken Vs. State of M.P. and others [WP.8200/2016 decided on 05.12.2016]
held that the Dean, G.R. Medical College is empowered to pass",,,,,

appropriate order under the Examination Rules without awaiting the result in the
Criminal Case pending against the petitioners therein; after affording,,,,,

an opportunity of hearing.,,,,,,

(7) With the reinstatement of the petitioners came another round of litigation wherein the petitioners sought direction for declaration of their results.,,,,,,

These writ petitions were W.P.No.7073/16, WP.7586/16, WP.2807/16 and WP.8959/16 wherein co-ordinate Bench disposed of the petitions on",,,,,,

03.05.2017 in the following terms:,,,,,

6. Accordingly, this petition is disposed of with following directions :-",,,,,,

(i) The Dean of the concerned college, where petitioner is admitted, is required to conduct enquiry first on the aspect as to whether decision in the case",,,,,,

of Nidhi Kaim (supra) of the Apex Court applies to the case of the petitioner. If the answer to this question is in affirmative then the competent",,,,,,

authority i.e. Dean is directed to proceed ahead by passing appropriate orders without affording any opportunity to the petitioner in terms of the",,,,,,

decision of the Apex Court in Nidhi Kaim (supra).,,,,,

(ii) In case the answer to the question is in the negative, then the Dean of the concerned college shall pass appropriate orders in terms of the relevant",,,,,,

statutory PMT Rules in accordance with law after giving due and sufficient opportunity to the petitioner of being heard.,,,,,,

(iii) It is needless to emphasize that if the Dean does not rusticate the petitioner then he be allowed to pursue his course, appear in the examination and",,,,,,

be informed about the result of the same.,,,,,,

No Cost. 6.,,,,,,

(8) These directions became the foundation for present litigation wherein the admission of respective petitioners to the MBBS course has been",,,,,,

cancelled.,,,,,,

(9) In Writ Petitions No.2839/17, WP.2840/17, WP.2841/17, WP.2842/17 and WP.6237/16 (WP.6237/16 is connected with WP.2839/17, the fate",,,,,,

whereof depends on the decision in WP.2839/2017], the order cancelling the admission to MBBS course is passed on 19.04.2017. Since order dated",,,,,,

19.04.2017 which is under challenge in this set of writ petitions is substantively similar, for the sake of convenience, the order passed in",,,,,,

WP.No.2839/2017 is reproduced below:,,,,,

dk;kZy; vf/k"Bkrk",,,,,,

Â Â xtjkjktk fpfdRlk egkfo?kky; Xokfy;j dzekad 14998@,-,-@;w-th-@2017Â Â Â

Â Â Xokfy;j fnukad 19-04-17 dk;kZy; vkns'k",,,,,

Nk= vjfoUnz /kkdM+ iq= Jh txnh'k izlkn /kkdM+ ih,eVh izos'k o""kZ &2008
ih,eVh jksy u0 234297 irk xzke /ksfj;k iksLV xkftxf'koijh e-iz- ds fo:) uxj iqfyl v/
kh{kd 'kgj iwoZ Xokfy;j }kjk i= Ã?ekad
uiqv@'kgj@iwoZ@LVsuks@ih,eVh@336@14 fnukad 23-3-2014 ds vuqlkj",,,,,

vijk/k dzekad 449@14 /kkjk;s 419] 420] 467] 468]471] 201]120 ch Hkknfo
3@4 ijh{kk vf/kfu;e ds rgr iathc) izdj.k ,oa dk;kZy; iqfyl v/kh{kd dsUnzh;",,,,,

vUos""k.k C;wjks dsEi Xokfy;j ds }kjk fnukad 09-10-2016 }kjk izdj.k la[;k
RC2172015S0109 esa ,oa iqfyl v/kh{kd dsUnzh; vUos""k.k C;wjks dsEi",,,,,

Xokfy;j ds i= dzekad RC2172015S0109@619Â fnuakd 19-04-2017 ds }kjk vkids
fo:) izdj.k iathc) gksus ds dkj.k ,oa ekuuh; loksZPp U;k;ky; ubZ",,,,,

fnYyh vihy flfoy 1727@16 fnuakd 13-02-2017 esa ikfjr fu.kZ; dks IS)kafrd :i ls
vuqlj.k djrs gq;s e;/izns'k O;kolkf;d ijh{kk e.My Hkksiky dsÂ ih,eVh",,,,,

izos'k&2008 ds fu;e 3-2 ,oa 3-3 ds lanHkZ esa egkfo|ky; ds ,echch,l ikB~;dze ls
Rrdky izHkko ls fu""dkflr fd;k tkrk",,,,,

gSA,,,,,

vf/k""Bkrk",,,,,

Â xtjkjktk fpfdRlk egkfo?kky;Â Xokfy;j,,,,,

(10) Likewise in another set of Writ Petitions; Viz, WP.3527/17, WP.4069/17,
WP.5027/17 and WP.5087/17, order under challenge which is similar is",,,,,

dated 03.06.2017 and for convenience is reproduced from WP.3527/17:,,,,,

dk;kZy; vf/k""Bkrk",,,,,

xtjk jktk fpfdRlk egkfo?kky; Xokfy;j dzekad 21987Nk= 'kk[kk@Lukrd@2017Â Â Â
Â Â Â Â Â Â Xokfy;j] fnukad 03-06-17 dk;kZy; vkns'k",,,,,

Nk= fodze flag jeu iq= Jh lkscju flag jeu ih-,e-Vh izos'k o""kZ 2010 jksy u-
521010 irk&xzke vkyksjhiqjk rglhy xksgn] ftyk fHk.M e-iz- ds }kjk xtjkjktk",,,,,

fpfdRlk egkfo|ky; Xokfy;j esa izos'k o""kZ &2010 esa izos'k izkIr fd;k Fkka vkids }
kjk izLrqr leLr izi=ksa dks l{ke ,tsfUl;ksa }kjk ijh{k.k ds i'pkr ik;k",,,,,

x;k fd vkids }kjk e;/izns'k O;kolkf;d ijh{kk e.My Hkksiky ds ih-,e-Vh izos'k o""kZ
&2010 ds fu;e fcUnq dzed 3-2 dk mYya?ku fd;k x;k gSA vr% vkidk",,,,,

izos'k xtjkjktk fpfdRlk egkfo?kky; Xokfy;j esa rRdky izHkko ls fujLr fd;k tkrk
gSA,,,,,

vf/k""Bkrk",,,,,

xtjkjktk fpfdRlk egkfo?kky;Â Xokfy;j,,,,,

(11) Similar orders cancelling the admission to MBBS course of the petitioners who were admitted in the year 2007 and 2009 are under challenge in,,,,,

WP.16528.17,Â WP.6201.17, WP.5819.17,Â WP.6301.17,Â WP.18739.17.",,,,,

(12) Taking into consideration the similarity of the issues and the facts involved in this batch of writ petitions, they were heard analogously and some",,,,,

on different dates and are decided by this common order.,,,,,

(13) Leading the submissions in WP.2840.17, it is contended on behalf of the petitioners that impugned order dated 19.04.2017 cancelling the",,,,,

admission to MBBS course has been passed without giving any opportunity of hearing. It is urged that earlier on the basis of registration of Criminal,,,,,

Case vide Crime No.449/2013 the petitioner was suspended from the classes by order dated 13/01/2014 whereafter show-cause notice was issued on,,,,,

11.04.2014 as to difference in the photographs of the petitioner in the OMR sheet and admission form submitted by the petitioner in the college. The,,,,,

petitioner filed the reply. However, no orders were passed on the show-cause as the criminal investigation was pending. The petitioner who was",,,,,

permitted to continue her internship by order dated 10.11.2014 subject to that in the investigation if the evidence are found against her then the,,,,,

permission shall stand cancelled and that the order passed by the High Court would be binding and that an affidavit of under taking be executed. That,,,,,

in a Writ Petition No.64/2015 filed by the petitioner for direction to issue internship completion certificate and for issuance of NOC, by way of an",,,,,

interim measure the respondents were directed to issue internship completion certificate, subject to final outcome of the case by order dated",,,,,

15.12.2015. The said writ petition was dismissed on 30.08.2017 as infructuous. It is contended that the petitioner was issued the internship completion,,,,,

certificate and the petitioner was granted permanent registration by Madhya Pradesh Medical Council. That on completion of Graduation a bond was,,,,,

sought from the petitioner on 3/8/2016 of undertaking to serve in rural area for 12 months. The petitioner thereafter filed Writ Petition No.6237/2016,,,,,

for grant of NOC to pursue higher studies. And during pendency thereof, the admission of the petitioner to MBBS Course has been cancelled. the",,,,,

cancellation is being challenged on the ground that the authorities having permitted the petitioner to complete her course while the investigation was,,,,,

pending cannot on the self same set of facts cancel the registration to the MBBS

course. It is urged that unless there is positive and material cogent,,,,,
evidence on record, the action cannot be taken merely on assumption that the
petitioner's photograph does not match and there is mist-match of" ,,,,,
signature on OMR sheet. It is urged that no independent enquiry was held to
bring home the allegation of use of unfair means. It is further contended,,,,,
that even the reasons which find mention in the cancellation order i.e. on the
principle of decision in Nidhi Kaim does not sound material and,,,,,
reasonable in the teeth of the facts of said case which emanated from the
allegation regarding mass copying by pairing. It is urged that in the case of,,,,,
the petitioner the allegations are that there is mismatch of photograph in the
OMR sheet and the admission form of the petitioner. However whether,,,,,
there is any such mismatch is yet to be concluded by the Central Bureau of
Investigation and therefore the conclusion arrived at by the authorities of,,,,,
the G.R. Medical College are without any foundation. It is urged that mere
registration of an FIR is not a conclusion of trial establishing a guilt. And,,,,,
the cancellation based on such FIR is void ab initio. It is urged that there being
no evidence on record to establish that the petitioner sought admission,,,,,
by unfair means, the order deserves to be quashed. (14) Similar submissions are
tendered in WP.2839/17, WP.2841/17 and WP.2842/17. In writ" ,,,,,
petition 4069/17, learned counsel for the petitionerÂ has adopted the arguments
tendered in WP.2849/17.Â" ,,,,,
(15) Respondents Gajaraja Medical College and the Central Bureau of
Investigation have respectively filed their return.,,,,,
(16) The Dean, G.R. Medical College, in its return has to submit that the
petitioners are not entitled for the relief sought in the petitions as they are" ,,,,,
subjected to criminal prosecution for the offences punishable under Sections 419,
420, 467, 468, 471, 201, 120B of IPC and Section 3 / 4 of Madhya" ,,,,,
Pradesh Recognized Examination Act, 1937. It is urged that present writ petitions
are not tenable in the light of the principle of law laid down by the" ,,,,,
Hon'ble Supreme Court in â??Nidhi Kaim and another Vs. State of Madhya
Pradesh and othersÂ [(2017) 4 SCC 1]â?. It is urged that as the,,,,,
petitioners are found admitted to MBBS course by adopting unfair means, the
admissions have been annulled by impugned order which is just and" ,,,,,
proper in the given facts of these cases. It is urged that in similar fact situation,
the Principal Seat of this High Court at Jabalpur in Writ Petition" ,,,,,

No.6768/2015 Niharika Tiwari Vs. State of M.P. & Ors and the connected writ petitions has dismissed the writ petitions on 04.07.2017. Further,,,,,

relying on the decision in Nidhi Kaim (supra) on paragraph 64, 65(iii), 65 (iv), 65(v), 67, 73, 74 and 75, it is urged that in the nature of the fraud",,,,,

committed by respective petitioners in obtaining the admission to MBBS course, the impugned order cannot be faulted with on the allegations that the",,,,,

principle of natural justice has been violated.,,,,,,

(17) It is further urged on behalf of Dean, G.R. Medical College, that in order to verify the process adopted regarding involvement of the petitioners",,,,,

under VYAPAM Scam and as per directives in Writ Petition No.1370/2014, a High Power Committee and Action Committee was constituted and the",,,,,

fact finding report was prepared by the Committee on the basis of relevant documents. The Committee observed that the photographs enclosed by the",,,,,

petitioners in the forms submitted at VYAPAM and at college level mismatched, the names of the petitioners were placed in the list of suspicious",,,,,

candidates of VYAPAM Scam. It is urged that with registration of FIR against the petitioners, on collation thereof the petitioners were found",,,,,

indulged in unfair means in obtaining admission to MBBS course. It is urged that, therefore, the registration of the petitioners to MBBS course has",,,,,

been cancelled after issuing notice to each of the petitioners and hearing them in person.,,,,,,

(18) It is further contended that the petitioners have not deliberately impleaded the VYAPAM as respondent to evade their photo-matching in the",,,,,

form submitted by them while applying for appearing in the entrance examination. It is urged that for non-joinder of necessary party the petitions",,,,,

deserve to be dismissed.,,,,,,

(19) The Central Bureau of Investigation, in its return, submitted that the petitioner Laxmi Dhakad (WP.2839/2017) has been included as accused in",,,,,

the case on the basis of the report of the committee of professors of GRMC, Gwalior, which found discrepancy in her photographs available on her",,,,,

admission form and her OMR Sheet (all details of the candidate PMT 2008 prepared by VYAPAM). It is urged that Special Investigation Team",,,,,

Gwalior has not filed the charge-sheet against her. However, while transferring the case to the Central Bureau of Investigation, SIT Gwalior",,,,,

submitted a list of 271 accused persons, out of which 81 were named with FIR

and role of 190 surfaced during investigation conducted by the SIT,",,,,

Gwalior, showing 82 persons as absconders, in which the accused petitioner Laxmi Dhakad figured as absconder. Hence, CBI registered the case as",,,,

RI2172015S0109 against 271 accused persons, including Laxmi Dhakad. It is urged that the accused has been examined by the CBI during the",,,,

investigation and her document, i.e. Admission Form submitted in GRMC, Gwalior, Test Admit Card and all details of candidate, were forwarded to",,,,

the photo experts for analysis/opinion. It is contended that though in the light of the opinion of the SEQD, Bhopal, received vide No./CID/QD/CX-",,,,

731/13/253/14 dt. 07.06.2014, indicatingÂ that accused petitioner Laxmi Dhakad herself appeared in the PMT 2008 examination and no solver",,,,

appeared against her in the said examination, however, the photograph, which was sent for analysis, was not of the quality which could serve the basis",,,,

for matching. It is, however, contended that with available circumstances the accused petitioner cannot be exonerated of the charges levelled against",,,,

her. Similar stand is taken in respect of petitioner Arvind Dhakad; WP.2839/2017; Writ Petition No.2840/2017 Laxmi Dhakad; Satya Prakash Patel:,,,,

WP.2841/2017; Sarsij Singh Parihar: WP.2842/2017 and Writ Petition No.6237/2016 Arvind Dhakad and others.,,,,,

(20) It is further contended that after investigation charge-sheet was filed by the local police in Crime No.89/2015 against Arvind Kumar, Shehban",,,,

Naeem, Shishupal Singh Yadav, Devendra Kumar Gupta, Mohd. Naeem, Raju Ahirwar and Rupesh Kushwaha under Sections 120-B read with",,,,

Section 109, 417, 419, 420, 467, 468 & 471 of IPC and Section 3(d)(1) / 4 of Madhya Pradesh Recognized Examination Act, 1937. It is contended that",,,,

the petitioner Arvind Kumar Gupta was arrested on 12.03.2015. During custodial interrogation, he admitted of not appearing in PMT 2009",,,,

Examination, had arranged solver through one Rupesh Kushwaha and had paid Rs.3.25 lacs. It is contended that the expert report as to the",,,,

handwriting in OMR sheet also revealed that it was not of the petitioner Arvind Gupta. It is contended that the solver is still absconding.,,,,,

(21) In respect of Shiv Pratap Singh Pawaiyya, it is urged on behalf of the CBI that he is one of the accused in Crime No.224/2014 for the offences",,,,

under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B, 201 of IPC and Section 3 / 4 of Madhya Pradesh Recognized Examination Act, 1937 along with 9 other",,,,

co-accused for securing selection in PMT 2009 by illegal means through middlemen Hargyan Vimal, Shishupal Yadav and Vijay @ Imran, who",,,,,

arranged the solver to appear in his place in the examination. It is urged that expert opinion was received from SEQD, Bhopal Vide No.CID/QD/CX-",,,,,

474-A/14 dated 28.05.2015 which has opined that the specimen signatures/ Handwriting of the accused i.e. Shiv Pratap Singh Pawaiyya does not,,,,,

match with those on the Questioned Documents i.e. OMR sheets.,,,,,

(22) In respect of Vikram Singh Raman, it is stated on behalf of the CBI that he is also an accused in Crime No.224/2014 for the offences under",,,,,

Sections 120B, 201, 417, 419, 420, 467, 468 & 471 of IPC and Section 3(d)(1) (2)/ 4 of Madhya Pradesh Recognized Examination Act, 1937 for",,,,,

securing admission in PMT 2010 fraudulently and by illegal means through solver arranged by the middlemen Hargyan Vimal. It is urged that the,,,,,

opinion given by the Finger Print Expert, Finger Print Bureau, Police Headquarters, Bhopal Vide No.51A/2015 dated 01.04.2015 shows mismatch of",,,,,

thumb impression of this petitioner in the OMR sheet.,,,,,

(23) Respondent Gajaraja Medical College has produced the record relating to in house enquiry in respect of all the petitioners of the academic years,,,,,

2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010. The Enquiry Reports are reproduced for ready reference:",,,,,

Admission Batch 2007:,,,,,

1. Writ Petition No.6301/17 (Dharmendra KumarShakya Vs. State of M.P.& Ors),,,,,

2. Writ Petition No.6201/17 (Pradeep Rajoriya Vs.State of M.P. & Ors),,,,,

Minutes and Proceedings of the in-house committee:,,,,,

1. The first meeting was held at the chamber ofDr. A.C. Agarwal Chairman on 15th June, 2012.",,,,,

2. The meeting was attended by Dr. A.C. Agarwal Chairman & Professor Head Anatomy, Dr. Mrs. N. Belapurkar member and Professor",,,,,

Physiology Dr. V.P. Narve member and Associate Professor ENT. Dr. Rajkumar Arya member and Assistant Professor Pharmacology. Dr. Mrs.,,,,,

Ranjana Tiwari member and Associate Professor PSM could not attend the meeting as she was on summer vacation.,,,,,

3. The sealed envelop containing the documents related to batch 2007 sent by

our office, was opened in the presence of committee members." ,,,,,,

4. In total 110 (one hundred ten) forms were found in the packet.,,,,,,

5. Scrutiny and cross check of the forms was done by all the members available in the meeting.,,,,,,

6. The subsequent meetings were held during the office hours on daily basis till date except the government holidays and the scrutiny and typing work.,,,,,,
was carried out and all the committee members are present all the time.,,,,,,

7. The documents submitted of each candidates were as follows: ,,,,,,

(a) AttestationÂ Â formÂ Â withÂ Â pasted photograph of candidates.,,,,,,

(b) Pre Medical test (PMT) Admit Card.,,,,,,

8. The Photograph on the original TAC (Test Admit Card) was compare with the photograph pasted on the attestation form.,,,,,,

Following are the findings of the committee (List Enclosed),,,,,,

1. Photograph of following students are not matching. Roll No: ,,,,,,

559349, 509816, 570976, 507038, 539783," ,,,,,,

527899, 557066, 557884, 526735, 570861," ,,,,,,

527351, 522684, 506341, 520016, 523153, 564166." ,,,,,,

(Total Seventeen Students -16),,,,,,

2. No photograph available for matching. Roll No - 525778 (Total One -01),,,,,,

3. No difference was found in theÂ photograph of remaining 93 students.,,,,,,

The above written decision are unanimous decisions of the whole committee and is being forwarded to you for the further necessary actions.,,,,,,

Thanking you ,,,,,,

Faithfully yours.,,,,,,

Dr. Avinash Chandra ,,,,,,

Prof & Head Anatomy ,,,,,,

Chairman of the Committee ,,,,,,

Dr. Mrs. N. Belapurkar ,,,,,,

Member & Prof Physiology ,,,,,,

Dr. Ranjana Tiwari ,,,,,,

Member & Associate Professor PSM ,,,,,,

Dr. V.P. Narve,,,,,
Member & Associate Professor ENT,,,,,
53.,526735,"Dharmendra Kumar
Shakya",Not Matching,,
74.,520016,"Pradeep
Â Â Â Â Â Â Â Â Â Â Â
Kumar
Rajauria",Not Matching,,
I-
Ã?-" , "uke
Nk=@Nk=k", "firk@
vfHkHkkod
dk uke", "irk ,oa vU;
laidZ fooj.k", "egkfo|ky; }kjk
xfBr
tkÂip lfefr }kjk
mYYksf[kr
lfanX/krk dk dkj.k",fjekdZ
3-, "vjfoUn
/kkdM+ vuq-
Ã?234293- es-
Ã? -
&MCY;w&101
Js.kh lkekU;","Jh Tkxnh'k
izlkn /kkdM+","xzke ?
kksfj;kÂi
iks-
xkthxrglhy iksgjh
ftyk
f'koiqjh e-iz-","vks-,e-vkj- 'khV

,oa egkfo| ky; esa
izos'k QkWeZ 13
ij pLlk QksVks ,oa
vafdr
gLrk{kj fHkUu
gSa",
10,"y{eh /kkdM+
vuq-Ã?-223168
es Ã?-40 Js.kh
vks-ch-lh-", "JhÂ Â Â Â
dj.k
/kkdM", "dkÂiVs lgkc
dk ckx] 'kCn
izrki vkJe]
XOkkfy;j eiz-", "vks-,e-vkj- 'khV
,oa egkfo| ky; esa
izos'k QkWeZ 38
ij pLlk QksVks
fHkUu gSA",
20-, "LkR; izdk'k
iVsy vuq-
Ã?222986] es-
Ã?171 Js.kh
lkekU; ", "Jh gjukjk;.k
iVsy", "xzke & iqj
iksukFkiqj
ftyk
Nrjiqj e-iz-", "vks-,e-vkj- 'khV
,oa egkfo| ky; esa
izos'k QkWeZ Ã?-

90 ij pLlk QksVks
 ,oa vafdr gLrk{kj
 fHkUu gSaA",
 19-,"ljflt flag ifjgkj
 vuqÃ?-256939]
 esÃ? -
 MCY;w&55]
 Js.kh lkekU;","Jh txnh'k
 flag ifjgkj","xzke ltokuh
 rglhy flgkoy
 ftyk lh/kh e-
 iz-","vks-,e-vkj- 'khV
 ,oa egkfo| ky; esa
 izos'k QkWeZ Ã? -
 86 ij pLlk QksVks
 ,oa vafdr gLrk{kj
 fHkUu gSaA",
 dzekadÂ Â Â viqv @ 'kgj@iow Z@LVsuks@ih,eVh@509@15 fnukad 18-042015 }
 kjk lwpfr fd;k x;k gS fd Fkkuk >kWlh jksM esa vkids fo:) iathc)",,,,,
 vij/k dzekad 127@15 /kkjk;s 419]420]467]468]471]120ch Hkknfo 3@4 ijh{kk
 vf/kfu;e ds rgr dh xbZ foospuk ds nkSjku i;kZIr lk{; ik;s tkus ls fnukad,,,,,
 11-03-2015 dks fxjÂ¶rkj gksuk n'kkZ;k x;k gSA,,,,,
 ;g fd lhchvkbZ O;kie dsl dsEi Xokfy;j }kjk fn;s i= dzekad RC2172015(S)009Â
 ubZ fnYyh fnukad 09-10-2015 esa vkids fo:) izdj.k iathc) gSA,,,,,
 ;g fd mi;qDr of.kZr ifjLFkfr;ksa dks desVh }kjk laKku esa fy;s tdkj vkidks fnukad
 11-04-2016 dks egkfo|ky; ls fu""dkflr fd;k x;k Fkka ;g fd vius",,,,,
 fu""dklu ds fo:) Nk= }kjk fjV ;kfpdk dzekad 6220@2016 esa ikfjr fu.kZ; fnukad
 07-09-2016 ,oa egkfo|ky; ,D'ku desVh dh cSBd esa fy;s x;s fu.kZ;",",,,,
 fnukad 01-10-2016 ds vuqdze esa vkidks Nk= dks egkfo|ky; esa v/;;u dh vuqefr
 iznku dh xbZ FkhA ih-,e-Vh izos'k fu;e o""kZ 2009 ds iSjk dzekad 3-2",,,,,
 Â¼jkti= esa Hkh izdkf'kr gSÂ½ mYysf[kr gS&fn ,slk ik;k tkrk gS fd vH;FkhZ ds
 vkosnu i= esa izfof""V ds le;] vfHkys[kksa dh tkWp ds le;] lhV",,,,,

vkcaVu ds le; vFkok izos'k ds le; dksbZ tkudkj fNikbZ gS ,oa@vFkok xyr tkudkj nh gS rks fn;s x;s izos'k dHkh Hkh egkfo|ky; ds vf/k""Brk vFkok",,,,,

izkpk;Z }kjk dHkh Hkh fujLr dj fn;k tk;sxkA ih-,e-Vh- izos'k o""kZ 2009 ds iSjk 3-3 Â¼tks jkti= esa Hkh izdkf'kr gSÂ½ mYysf[kr gS&Nk= dks",,,,,

ngjkpj.k] vuq'kkughurk] vuqifLFkr jgus dk nks""kh ik;s tkus ij mlds fo:) vuq'kklukRed dk;Zokgh dhÂ tkosxh] ftlesa vf/k""Brk@izkpk;Z ds }kjk egkfo|ky;,",,,,

ls fu""dk'ku dh dk;Zokgh ,oa fo'ofok|ky; }kjk iath;u dk fujLrhdj.k fd;k tkuk Hkh lfEeyr gSA",,,,,

;g fd ekuuh; mPPk U;k;ky; [k.MihB Xokfy;j esa nk;j MCyw ih dzekad 2807@2016 ,oa ekuuh; loksZPp U;k;ky; ubZ fnYyh ds vkns'k dz 1727@16",,,,,

fnukad 13-02-2017 ds vuqdze esa ,oa mPp U;k;ky; [k.MihB ds MCY;w ih dz-2333@16 lrh'k 'kkD; ,oa vU; esa ikfjr fu.kZ; fnukad 06-042017 ds",,,,,

rkjrE; esa ,oe~ Nk=k ds laca/k esa miyC/k ,oe~ iznk; fd;s nLrkostksa ds iqu% voyksdu djus ij ,oe~ Nk= }kjk vius i{k esa O;fDrxr :i ls lquokbZ ds le;,",,,,

Hkh dksbZ ,slk lk{; izLrqr ugha fd;k ftlls ;s izrhr gks fd Nk= funksZ""k gSA",,,,,

vr% lfefr ;g vuq'kalk djrh gS fd ih-,e-Vh- izos'k fu;e o""kZ 2009 ds iSjk dzekad 3-2 ,oa 3-3 Â¼jkti= esa Hkh izdkf'kr gSÂ½ ds rgr dk;Zokgh fd;k tkuk",,,,,

mfpr gksxkA",,,,,

MkW ,l- MkW Jhefr MkW- T;ksfr MkW vks-ih-",,,,,

,uv;axj uhfyek fcany lnL; tkVo lnL;,",,,,

ps;jesu flag",,,,,

lnL;,,,,,

MkW jkts'k MkW lehj MkW- jatuk",,,,,

MkW",,,,,

xkSM+ xqIrk lnL; frokjh lnL;,,,,,

;ksxsUnz",,,,,

lnL;,,,,,

igkfj;k lnL;,,,,,

MkW lq/khj",,,,,

MkW ,l-ds- MkW vt; xkSjMkW vatuh tyt IDlsuk",,,,,

'kekZ lnL; lnL; lnL; dksfMZusVj",,,,,

2- Nk= & f'ko izrki flag ioS;k iq= Jh mn; flag ioS;k] ih-,e-Vhizos'k o""kZ 2009

jksy ua- 878024 irk xzke ukoyh rglhy xksgn ftyk fHk.M e0iz0 ds }kjk",,,,,

e/;izns'k ds fpfdRlk egkfo|ky; esa ,e-ch-ch-a,- ikB~;Ã?e esa izos'k gsrq e/;izns'k O;kolkf;d ijh{kk e.My }kjk izos'k ijh{kk dk vk;kstu fd;k x;k Fkk]",,,,,

ftlesa vkidk jksy uEcj 878024 Fkk ,oa vkidk ijh{kkQy O;kie }kjk ?kksf""kr fd;k x;k Fkk vkidks xtjk jktk fpfdRlk egkfo|ky; esa ,e-ch-ch,- ikB~;dze ds",,,,,

fy;s lhV vkcafVr gqbZA rRi'pkr~ vkiusÂ xtjkjktkÂ fpfdRlk egkfo|ky; Xokfy;j esa izos'k fy;kA,,,,,

dk;kZy; vfr- iqfyl v/kh{kd] 'kgj iow Z Xokfy;j dk i= dzekad 509 fnukad 18-04-2015 ds vuqlkj vkids fo:) vij/k dzekad 224@14 /kkjk;sa,,,,,

419]420]467]468]471]120ch Hkknfo 3@4 ijh{kk vf/kfu;e ds rgr ,QvkbZvkj ntZ gksdj iqfyl ds ikl i;kZIr lk{; gksus ij fnukad 21-072014 dks vkidh",,,,,

fxjÂ¶rkjh dh xbZ gSA mDr i= dks laKku es ysrq gq;s desVh }kjkÂ fnukad 11-04-2016 dks vkidks egkfo|ky; ls fu""dkflr fd;k x;k FkkA ekuuh; mPp",,,,,

U;k;ky; fjV ;kfpdk Ã?a- 2769@2016 ikfjr fu.kZ; fnukad 22-08-2016 ,oa 01-10-2016 dks egkfo|ky; gkbZikoj ,D'ku desVh esa fy;s x;s fu.kZ; vuqlkj Nk=",,,,,

dks egkfo|ky; esa v/;;u dh vuqefr iznku dh xbZ FkhA,,,,,

;g fd lhchvkbZ O;kie dsl dsEi Xokfy;j }kjk fn;s x;s i= Ã?ekad RC2172015(S)0077 ubZ fnYyh fnukad 09-10-2015 esa vkids fo:) izdj.k iathc) gSA,,,,,

ih-,e-Vh- izos'k fu;e o""kZ 2009 ds iSjk dzekad 3-2 Â¼jkti= esa Hkh izdkf'kr gSÂ½ mYysf[kr gS& ;fn ,slk ik;k tkrk gS fd vH;FkhZ ds vkosnu i= esa",,,,,

izfof""V ds le;] vfHkys[kksa dh tkWp ds le;] lhV vkcaVu ds le; vFkok izos'k ds le; dksbZ tkudkj fNikbZ gS ,oa@vFkok xyr tkudkj nh gS rks fn;s x;s",,,,,

izos'k dHkh Hkh egkfo|ky; ds vf/k""Brk vFkok izkpk;Z }kjk dHkh Hkh fujLr dj fn;k tk;sxA ih-,e-Vh- izos'k o""kZ 2009 ds iSjk 3-3 Â¼tkjkti= esa Hkh",,,,,

izdkf'kr gSÂ½ mYysf[kr gS Nk= dks nqjpkj.k] vuq'kkluhurk] vuqifLFkr jgus dk nks""kh ik;s tkus ij mlds fo:) vuq'kkluRed dk;Zokgh dh tkosxh] ftlesa",,,,,

vf/k""Bkrk@izkpk;Z ds }kjk egkfo|ky; ls fu""dklu dh dk;Zokgh ,oa fo'ofu|ky; }kjk iath;u dk fujLrhdj.k fd;k tkuk Hkh lfEefyr gSA",,,,,

;g fd ekuuh; loksZPp U;k;ky; ubZ fnYyh ds vkns'k Ã?1727@16 fnukad 13-02-2017 ds vuqdze esa ,oa mPp U;k;ky; [k.MihB ds MCY;w ih dz-",,,,,

2333@16 lrh'k 'kkD; ,oa vU; esa ikfjr fu.kZ; fnukad 0604-2017 ds rkjrE; esa ,oe~ Nk= ds laca/k esa miyC/k ,oe~ iznk; fd;s nLrkostksa ds iqu%",,,,,

voyksdu djus ij ,oe~ Nk= }kjk vius i{k esa O;fDrxr :i ls lquokbZ ds le; Hkh dksbZ ,slk lk{; izLrqr ugha fd;k ftlls ;s izrhr gks fd Nk= funksZ""k gSA",,,,,

vr% lfevr ;g vuq'kalk djrh gS fd ih-,e-Vh- izos'k fu;e o""kZ 2009 ds iSjk Ã?ekad 3-2 ,oa 3-3 Â¼jkti= esa Hkh izdkf'kr gSÂ½ ds rgr dk;Zokgh fd;k tkuk",,,,,

mfpr gksxkA,,,,,

MkW MkW jkts'k MkW lehj MkW- jatuk,,,,,

;ksxsUnz xkSM+ xqIrk lnL; frokjh lnL;,,,,,

igkfj;k lnL; lnL;,,,,,

MkW ,l-ds- MkW vt; xkSjMkW vatuh tyt MkW lq/khj",,,,,

'kekZ lnL; lnL; lnL; lDlsuk,,,,,

dksfMZusVj,,,,,

3- Nk= & vfjoUnz vfXugks=h iq= Jh ,p-,l vfXugks=h ih-,e-Vh izos'k o""kZ 2009 jksy ua- 878313 irk xksiky nkl dh xyh fla?ky oLrh eqjSuk e0iz0 ds }kjk",,,,,

e;/izns'k ds fpfdRlk egkfo|ky; esa ,e-ch-ch-a,l- ikB~;Ã?e esa izos'k gsrq e;/izns'k O;kolkf;d ijh{kk e.My }kjk izos'k ijh{kk dk vk;kstu fd;k x;k Fkk]",,,,,

ftlesa vkidk jksy uEcj 878313 Fkka ,oa vkidk ijh{kkQy O;kie }kjk ?kksf""kr fd;k x;k Fkk vkidks xtjk jktk fpfdRlk egkfo|ky; esa ,e-ch-ch-,l- ikB~;dze ds",,,,,

fy;s lhV vkcafVr gqbZA rRi'pkr~ vkusÂ xtjkjktkÂ fpfdRlk egkfo|ky; Xokfy;j esa izos'k fy;kA,,,,,

iqfyl }kjk fnukad 15-03-2014 dks vkids izos'k lacaf/k nLrkost tIr fd;s tk pqds gSA dk;kZy; vfrfjDr iqfyl v/kh{kd 'kgj iwoZ Xokfy;j }kjk i= dzekad,,,,,

viqv@'kgj@iwoZ@LVsuks@ih,eVh@509@15 fnukad 18-04-2015 }kjk lwfpr fd;k x;k gS fd Fkkuk >kWlh jksM esa vkids fo:) iathc) vijk/k Ã?ekad",,,,,

127@15 /kkjk;s 419]420]467]468]471]120ch Hkknfo 3@4 ijh{kk vf/kfu;e ds rgr dh xbZ foospuk ds nkSjku i;kZIr lk{; ik;s tkus ls fnukad 12-04-2015,,,,,

dks fxjÂ¶rkj gksuk n'kkZ;k x;k gSA,,,,,

;g fd mi;qDr of.kZr ifjLFkfr;ksa dks desVh }kjk laKku esa fy;s tkdj vkidks fnukad 11-04-2016 dks egkfo|ky; ls fu""dkflr fd;k x;k",,,,,

FkkaA,,,,,

;g fd mDr Nk= ds nLrkostks dh tkWp vf/k""Bkrk ds i= dzekad 6066&74@,l-,l-@;wth@2012 fnukad 29-02-2012 }kjk xBr desVh us viuh tkWp esa",,,,,

Nk= ds LFkkukarj.k izdj.k gksus ds dkj.k ewy VsLV ,MfeV dkMZ o ,Mfe'ku dkMZ miyc/k ugh Fksa tkWp lfevr us miyC/k nLrkostk ds vk/kkj ij",,,,,

QksVks dk feyku ugh gksuk ik;k x;kA QksVks dk feyku u gksus ds dkj.kA,,,,,

vf/k""Bkrk ds i= Ã?ekad 40@;wth@2013 fnukad 30-07-2013 iqfyl v/kh{kd Xokfy;j dks tkWp lfevr }kjk Nk= dks lafnX/k ik;s tkus ds vk/kkj ij mfpr",,,,,

dk;Zokgh gsrq izsf""kr fd;k x;k FkkA",,,,,

dk;kZy; uxj iqfyl v/kh{kd fo'ofok; Xokfy;j dk i= Å?ekad 336@14 fnukad 23-03-2014 ds vuqlkj vkids fo:) vij/k Å?ekad 449@14 /kkjk;s,,,,,

419]420]467]468]471]120 ch Hkknfo 3@4 ijh{kk vf/kfu;e ds rgr ,QvkbZvkj ntZ vkidks fnukad 27-01-2014 dks fxjÅ¶rkj gksuk n'kkZ;k x;k gSA",,,,,

;g fd iqfyl i= dks desVh }kjk laKku es fy;k x;k ,oa fnukad 11-04-2016 dks vkidks egkfo|ky; }kjk fu""dkflr fd;k x;k ;g fd vius fu""dklu ds fo:) Nk= }kjk fjV",,,,,

;kfpdk dzekad 3357@2016 nk;j dh Fkh ftles ekuuh; mPP U;k;ky; ds vkns'k ds vuqdze esa Nk= dks egkfo|ky; esa v/;;u dh vuqefr iznku dh xbZ FkhA",,,,,

;g fd lhchvkbZ O;kie dsl dsEi Xokfy;j }kjk fn;s x;s i= dzekad RC2172015(S)0030Å ubZ fnYyh fnukad 09-10-2015 esa vkids fo:) izdj.k iathc) gSA",,,,,

ih-,e-Vh- izos'k fu;e o""kZ 2009 ds iSjk dzekad 3-2 Å¼jkti= esa Hkh izdkf'kr gSÅ½ mYysf[kr gS& ;fn ,slk ik;k tkrk gS fd vH;FkhZ ds vkosnu i= esa",,,,,

izfof""V ds le;] vfHkys[kksa dh tkWp ds le;] lhV vkcaVu ds le; vFkok izos'k ds le; dksbZ tkudkj fhNkbZ gS ,oa@vFkok xyr tkudkj nh gS rks fn;s x;s",,,,,

izos'kÅ dHkh Hkh egkfo|ky; ds vf/k""Brk vFkok izkpk;ZÅ }kjk dHkh Hkh fujLr dj fn;k tk;sxA",,,,,

ih-,e-Vh- izos'k o""kZ 2009 ds iSjk 3-3 Å¼tks jkti= esa Hkh izdkf'kr gSÅ½ mYysf[kr gS Nk= dks nqjkpj.k] vuq'kklughurk] vuqifLFkr jgus dk nks""kh",,,,,

ik;s tkus ij mlds fo:) vuq'kklukRed dk;Zokgh dh tkosxh] ftlesa vf/k""Bkrk@izkpk;Z ds }kjk egkfo|ky; ls fu""dklu dh dk;Zokgh ,oa fo'ofok; }kjk iath;u dk",,,,,

fujLrhdj.k fd;k tkuk Hkh lfEeyr gSA",,,,,

;g fd ekuuh; mPp U;k;ky; [k.MihB Xokfy;j esa nk;j MCyw ih dzekad 156@2017 ,oa ekuuh; loksZPp U;k;ky; ubZ fnYyh ds vkns'k dza1727@16",,,,,

fnukad 13-02-2017 ds vuqdze esa ,oa mPp U;k;ky; [k.MihB ds",,,,,

MCY;w ih dza- 2333@16 lrh'k 'kkD; ,oa vU; esa ikfjr fu.kZ; fnukad 0604-2017 ds rkjrE; esa ,oe~ Nk=k ds lac/a k esa miyC/k ,oe~ iznk; fd;s",,,,,

nLrkostksa ds iqu% voyksdu djus ij ,oe~ Nk= }kjk vius i{k esa O;fDxr :i ls lquokbZ ds le; Hkh dksbZ ,slk lk{; izLqr ugha fd;k ftls ;s izrhr gks fd Nk=",,,,,

funksZ""k gSA",,,,,

vr% lfefr ;g vuq'kalk djrh gS fd ih-,e-Vh izos'k fu;e o""kZ 2009 ds iSjk dzekad 3-2 ,oa 3-3 Å¼jkti= esa Hkh izdkf'kr gSÅ½ ds rgr dk;Zokgh fd;k tkuk",,,,,

mfpr gksxA",,,,,

MkW ,l- MkW Jhefr MkW- T;ksfr MkW vks-ih-",,,,,,
 ,uv;axj uhfyek fcany lnL; tkVo lnL;" ,,,,,,
 ps;jesu flag,,,,,
 lnL;,,,,,
 MkW jkts'k MkW lehj MkW- jatuk,,,,,
 MkW,,,,,
 xkSM+ xqIrk lnL; frokjh lnL;,,,,,
 ;ksxsUnz,,,,,
 lnL;,,,,,
 igkfj;k lnL;,,,,,
 MkW lq/khj,,,,,
 MkW ,l-ds- MkW vt; xkSjMkW vatuh tyt IDIsuk" ,,,,,,
 'kekZ lnL; lnL; lnL; dksfMZusVj,,,,,
 1- Nk= & fodk'k egkSj iq= Jh vkse izdk'k egkSj ih-,e-Vh izos'k o""kZ 2010 jksy
 ua- 506227 irk& v'kksd gkbZ Ldwy fuEckth dh [kks y'dj Xokfy;j e-iz-",,,,,,
 ds }kjk e;/izns'k ds fpfdRIk egkfo|ky; esa ,e-ch-ch-a,likB~;Ã?e esa izos'k gsrq
 e;/izns'k O;kolkf;d ijh{kk e.My }kjk izos'k ijh{kk dk vk;kstu fd;k x;k",,,,,,
 Fkk] ftlesa vkidk jksy uEcj 258227 Fkka ,oa vkidk ijh{kkQy O;kie }kjk ?kksf""kr
 fd;k x;k Fkk vkidks xtjk jktk fpfdRIk egkfo|ky; esa ,e-ch-ch-,l-",,,,,,
 ikB~;Ã?e ds fy;s lhV vkcafVr gqbZA rRi'pkr~ vkiusÂ xtjkjktkÂ fpfdRIk egkfo|ky;
 Xokfy;j esa izos'k fy;kA iqfyl }kjk fnukad 05-02-2014] 09-07-2014,,,,,
 dks vkids izos'k ls,,,,,
 lacaf/kr nLrkost tIr fd;s x;sA,,,,,
 ;g fd dk;kZy; vfrfjDr uxj iqfyl v/kh{kd] 'kgj iwoZ Xokfy;j e-iz- }kjk i= Ã?ekad
 viqv@'kgj@iow Z@LVsuks@ih,eVh@509@15 fnukad 18-04-2015 }kjk",,,,,,
 lwfpr fd;k x;k gS fd Fkkuk >kWlh jksM ftyk Xokfy;j esa vkids fo:) iathc) vijj/k
 dzekad 392@14 /kkjk;sa,,,,,
 419]420]467]468]471]120 ch Hkknfo 3@4 ijh{kk vf/kfu;e ds rgr ,QvkbZvkjÂ
 ntZÂ gksdj iqfyl ds ikl i;kZIr lk{; gksus vkidks fnukad 13-09-2014 dks",,,,,,
 fxjQrkj gksuk n'kkZ;k x;kA,,,,,
 ;g fd fjV ;kfpdk Ã?ekad 1370@2014 ,oa leku ;kfpdkvksa esa ekuuh; mPp U;k;ky;
 tcyiqj dh ;qxyihB }kjk fnukad 27-03-2014 esa izfrikfnr O;oLFkk ds",,,,,,

iky u esa vkidks fnukad 24-07-2015 dks dkj.k crkvksa uksfVI tkjh fd;k x;k FkkaA,,,,,

;g fdÂ mDr dkj.k crkvk uksfVI dk tcko vkids }kjk fnukad 10-08-2015 egkfo|ky; esa fn;k x;k gSA,,,,,

;g fd dk;kZy; uxj iqfyl v/kh{kd] fo'ofu|ky; Xokfy;j }kjk i= Å?ekad uiqv@fofo@D;w@15 fnukad 20-04-2015 ,oa lhchvkbZ O;kie dsl dsEi Xokfy;j }kjk" ,,,,,

fn;s x;s i= Å?ekad RC2172015(S)0039 ubZ fnYyh fnukad 09-10-2015 esa vkids fo:) izdj.k iathc) fd;k x;k gS mDr i=ksa dks desVh }kjk laKku esa ysrs ,,,,,

gq;s vkidks fnukad 11-04-2016 dks egkfo|ky; ls fu""dkflr fd;k x;k FkkaA" ,,,,,

;g fd vius fu""dklu ds fo:) Nk= }kjk ekuuh; mPp U;k;ky; esa fjV ;kfpdk Å?ekad 2889@2016 fu.kZ; fnukad 14-07-2016 ,oa egkfo|ky; desVh dh cSBd" ,,,,,

esa fy;s x;s fu.kZ; fnukad 16-08-2016 ds vuqÅ?e esa vkidks egkfo|ky; esa v/;;u dh vuqefr iznku dh xbZ FkhaA ,,,,,

ih-,e-Vh- izos'k fu;e o""kZ 2010 ds iSjk dzekad 3-2 Â¼jkti= esa Hkh izdkf'kr gSÂ½ mYysf[kr gS&;fn ,slk ik;k tkrk gS fd vH;FkhZ ds vkosnu i= esa" ,,,,,

izfof""V ds le; vfHkys[kksa dh tkWp ds le;] lhV vkcaVu ds le; vFkok izos'k ds le; dksbZ tkudkjH fNikbZ gS ,oa@vFkok xyr tkudkjH nh gS rks fn;s x;s" ,,,,,

izos'k dHkh Hkh egkfo|ky; ds vf/k""BkrkÂ vFkok izkpk;Z }kjk dHkh Hkh fujLr dj fn;k tk;sxA" ,,,,,

ih-,e-Vh- izos'k o""kZ 2010 ds iSjk 3-3 Â¼atks jkti= esa Hkh izdkf'kr gSÂ½ mYysf[kr gS&N= dks nqjKpj.k] vuq'kklughurk] vuqifLFkr jgus dk nks""kh" ,,,,,

ik;s tkus ij mlds fo:) vuq'kklukRed dk;Zokgh dh tkosxh] ftlesa vf/k""Bkrk@izkpk;Z ds }kjk egkfo|ky; ls fu""dklu dh dk;Zokgh ,oa fo'ofu|ky; }kjk iath;u dk" ,,,,,

fujLrhdk.k fd;k tkuk Hkh lfEefyr gSA ,,,,,

;g fd ekuuh; mPp U;k;ky; [k.MihB Xokfy;j esa nk;j MCcyw ih dzekad 7073@2016 ,oa ekuuh; loksZPp U;k;ky; ubZ fnYyh ds vkns'k dz 1727@16 dq0" ,,,,,

fu/kh dse fu.kZ; fnukad 13-02-2017 dk vuq'kj.k djrs gq;s ,oa mPp U;k;ky; [k.MihB ds MCY;w ih dz- 2333@16 lrh'k 'kkD; ,oa vU; esa ikfjr fu.kZ;" ,,,,,

fnukad 06-04-2017 ds rkjrE; esa ,oe~ Nk= ds laca/k esa miyC/k ,oe~ iznk; fd;s nLrkostksa ds iqu% voyksdu djus ij ,oe~ Nk= }kjk vius i{k esa O;fDrxr" ,,,,,

:i ls lquokbZ ds le; Hkh dksbZ ,slk lk{; izLrrr ugh fd;k ftlls ;s izrhr gks fd Nk= funksZ""k gSA vr% lfefr ;g vuq'kalk djrh gS fd ih-,e-Vh izos'k fu;e o""kZ" ,,,,,

2010 ds iSjk dzekad 3-2 ,oa 3-3 Â¼jkti= esa Hkh izdkf'kr gSÂ½ ds rgr dk;Zokgh

fd;k tkuk mfpr gksxkA" ,,,,,
MkW ,l-,u- v;axj MkW Jhefr MkW- T;ksfr MkW vks-ih-" ,,,,,
ps;jesu uhfyek flag fcany lnL; tkVo lnL; ,,,,,
lnL; ,,,,,
MkW ;ksxsUnz ,,,,,
MkW jkts'k MkW lehj xqIrk MkW- jatuk ,,,,,
igkfj;k ,,,,,
xkSM+ lnL; lnL; frokjh lnL; ,,,,,
lnL; ,,,,,
MkW lq/khj ,,,,,
MkW ,l-ds- MkW vt; xkSj MkW vatuh tyt lDlsuk" ,,,,,
'kekZ lnL; lnL; lnL; dksfMZusVj ,,,,,

2. Nk= jktohj tkVo iq= Jh lkscju flag tkVo ih-,e-Vh- izos'k o""kZ&2010 dks egkfo|ky; ds i= Ã?ekad 22269 fnukad 24-07-2015Â }kjk dkj.k crkvksa" ,,,,,
uksfVI fn;k x;k Fkk ,oa Nk= }kjk mDr dkj.k crkvks uksfVI dk Li""Vhdj.k fnukad 10-08-2015 dks egkfo|ky; esa izLrq fd;k x;kA Nk= dks vfrfjDr iqfyl" ,,,,,
v/kh{kd fo'ofokj; ds i= dzekad viqv@'kgj@iwoZ@LVsuks@ih,eVh@15 fnukad 18-04-2015 ds vuqlkj Nk= jktohj tkVo iq= Jh lkscju flag tkVo izos'k" ,,,,,
o""kZ&2010 ds fo:) i;kZIr lk{; miyc/k gksus ij vijk/k dzekad 358@14 / kkjk;sa" ,,,,,
419]420]467]468]471]120 ch Hkknfo 3@4 ijh{kk vf/kfu;e ds rgr izdj.k iathc) fd;k x;k ,oa fxjQrkj fd;k x;k Fkk orZeku esa dk;kZy; iqfyl v/kh{kd" ,,,,,
dsUnzh; vUos""k.k C;wjks dsEi Xokfy;j ds i= dzekad 547 fnukad 0904-2016 es Nk= ds fo:) izdj.k la[;k RC2172015(S) 0096 es izdj.k iathc) gS Nk= ds" ,,,,,
Li""Vhdj.k esa ;g mYys[k fd;k gS fd mlds fo:) i;kZIr lk{; ugh gS tks fujk/kkj ,oa vIR; gS vr% lfejr Nk= jktohj tkVo iq= Jh lkscju flag tkVo dks rRdky" ,,,,,
izHkko ls egkfo|ky; ls fu""dklu dh vuq'kalk djrh gSA ;g vuq'kalk ekuuh; mPp U;k;ky; ds fu.kZ; ds vuqlkj ck/; gksxkA" ,,,,,
- 3- Nk= dk uke & foÃ?e flag jeu] firk&lkscju flag jeu fuoklh& vkykSjh iqjk] rglhy& xksgn ftyk fHk.MA Js.kh&,l-lh-] izos'k o""kZ& 2010 dk;Zokgh&" ,,,,,
- 1- iqfyl }kjk 05-02-14 ,oe~ 03-06-14 dks ewy nLrkost tCr fd;s x;s,oe~ iqfyl }kjk 30-05-2014 dks Nk= dh fxjQ~rkjh dh xbZA" ,,,,,
- 2- vfrfjDr iqfyl v/kh{kd ds i= fnukad ih-,e-Vh@509@15@fnukad 1804-15 }kjk

lwfrp fd;k x;k fd vkids vijk/kksa dh foospuk ds nkSjku i;kZIr lk{; ik;s",,,,,

tkus ls vijk/k Å?- 224@14 /kkjk,,,,,

419]420]467]468]471]120 B Hkknfo ,oe~ 3@4 ijh{kk vf/kfu;e ds rgr fxjQ~rkjh dh xbZ gSA",,,,,

3- Nk= dks vfrfjDr iqfyl v/kh{kd fofo ds i= Å?viqv@'kgj@iwoZ@LVsuks@ih-,e-Vh@509@15 fnukad 18-04-2015 ds vuqlkj Nk= foÅ?e flag jeu iq=",,,,,

Jh lkscju flag jeu ih-,e-Vh- izos'k o""kZ&2012 ds fo:) i;kZIr lk{; miyc/k gksus ij vijk/k Å?- 224@14",,,,,

/kkjk;sa 419]420]467]468]471]120 ch 109 rkfg 3@4 ijh{kk vf/kfu;e ds rgr izdj.k iathc) fd;k x;k ,oa fxjQ~rkj fd;k x;k Fkk dk;kZy; iqfyl v/kh{kd dsUnzh;",,,,,

vUos""k.k O;wjks dsEi Xokfy;j ds i= Å?- 547 fnukad 09-04-2016 esa Nk= ds fo:) izdj.k la[k RC2172015(S) esa izdj.k iathc) gS Nk= ds Li""Vhdj.k esa",,,,,

;g mYys[k fd;k gS fd mlds fo:) i;kZIr lk{; ugh gS tks fujk/kkj ,oa vIR; gSA vr% ;g lfevr Nk= foÅ?e flag jeu iq= Jh lkscju flag jeu ih-,e-Vh- izos'k",,,,,

o""kZ&2010 dks rRdky izHkko ls egkfo|ky; ls fu""dklu dh vuq'kalk djrh gSA",,,,,

4- Nk= dks vf/k""Bkrk }kjk fnukad 10-12-2013 dks fu""dkflr fd;k x;kA",,,,,

5- MCY;w ih 2845@2016 mPp U;k;ky; Xokfy;j ds vkns'kkuqlkj fnukad22-08-16 esa Nk= ds vf/k""Bkrk }kjk fn;s fu""dklu vkns'k 11-04-16 dks fujLr dj",,,,,

Nk= ds izfrosnu ij fopkj ,oa O;fDrxr lquokbZ ,oa izkd`frd U;k; ds fy;s vknsf'kr fd;k x;kA",,,,,

6- mijksDr vkns'k ds ifjiky esa Nk= dks l'krZ v;;u dh vuqefr nhxbZ ,oa 26-08-16 dks ekSf[kd ,oe~ fyf[kr :i ls lquk x;kA",,,,,

7- ;g fd ekuuh; loksZPp U;k;ky; ds vkns'k Å?- 1727@16 fnukad 13-02-17 ds vuqÅ?e ,oa mPp U;k;ky; [kaMihB Xokfy;j ds W.P.2333@16 Â¼lrh'k",,,,,

'kkD; ,oe~ vU;Â½ esa ikfjr fu.kZ; fnukad 06-04-2017 ds rkjrE; esa ,oe~ Nk= ds laca/k es miyC/k ,oe~ iznk; fd;s x;s nLrkostksa ds iqu% voyksdu djus",,,,,

ij ,oe~ Nk= }kjk vius i{k esa O;fDrxr :Ik ls lquokbZ ds le; gh dksbZ ,slk lk{; izLrqr ugh fd;k ftlls ;s izrhr gks fd Nk= funksZ""k gSA",,,,,

vr% lfevr ;g vuq'kalk djrh gS fd bl izdj.k ij izos'k fu;e 2007 ds fcUnq 3-2 ,oe~ 3-3 ds rgr fu;ekuqlkj dk;Zokgh dh 2. Nk= jktohj tkVo iq= Jh lkscju flag",,,,,

tkVo ih-,e-Vh- izos'k o""kZ&2010 dks egkfo|ky; ds i= Å?ekad 22269 fnukad 24-07-2015Â½ }kjk dkj.k crkvksa uksfVI fn;k x;k Fkk ,oa Nk= }kjk mDr",,,,,

dkj.k crkvks uksfVI dk Li""Vhdj.k fnukad 10-08-2015 dks egkfo|ky; esa izLrqr fd;k x;kA Nk= dks vfrfjDr iqfyl v/kh{kd fo'ofu|ky; ds i= dzekad",,,,,

viqv@'kgj@iwoZ@LVsuks@ih,eVh@15 fnukad 18-04-2015 ds vuqlkj Nk= jktohj

tkVo iq= Jh lkscju flag tkVo izos'k o""kZ&2010 ds fo:) i;kZIr lk{;" ,,,,,

miyc/k gksus ij vijk/k dzekad 358@14 /kkjk;sa ,,,,,

419]420]467]468]471]120 ch Hkknfo 3@4 ijh{kk vf/kfu;e ds rgr izdj.k iathc) fd;k x;k ,oa fxjQrkj fd;k x;k Fkk orZeku esa dk;kZy; iqfyl v/kh{kd" ,,,,,

dsUnzh; vUos""k.k C;wjks dsEi Xokfy;j ds i= dzekad 547 fnukad 0904-2016 es Nk= ds fo:) izdj.k la[;k RC2172015(S) 0096 es izdj.k iathc) gS Nk= ds" ,,,,,

Li""Vhdj.k esa ;g mYys[k fd;k gS fd mlds fo:) i;kZIr lk{; ugh gS tks fujk/kkj ,oa vIR; gS vr% lfeFr Nk= jktohj tkVo iq= Jh lkscju flag tkVo dks rRdky" ,,,,,

izHkko ls egkfo|ky; ls fu""dklu dh vuq'kalk djrh gSA ;g vuq'kalk ekuuh; mPp U;k;ky; ds fu.kZ; ds vuqlkj ck;/; gksxA" ,,,,,

3- Nk= dk uke & foÅ?e flag jeu] firk&lkscju flag jeu fuoklh& vkykSjh iqjk] rglhy& xksgn ftyk fHk.MA Js.kh&,l-lh-] izos'k o""kZ& 2010 dk;Zokgh&" ,,,,,

1- iqfyl }kjk 05-02-14 ,oe~ 03-06-14 dks ewy nLrkost tCr fd;s x;s,oe~ iqfyl }kjk 30-05-2014 dks Nk= dh fxjQ~rkjh dh xbZA" ,,,,,

2- vfrfjDr iqfyl v/kh{kd ds i= fnukad ih-,e-Vh@509@15@fnukad 1804-15 }kjk lwfpr fd;k x;k fd vkids vijk/kksa dh foospuk ds nkSjku i;kZIr lk{; ik;s" ,,,,,

tkus ls vijk/k Å?- 224@14 /kkjk ,,,,,

419]420]467]468]471]120 B Hkknfo ,oe~ 3@4 ijh{kk vf/kfu;e ds rgr fxjQ~rkjh dh xbZ gSA" ,,,,,

3- Nk= dks vfrfjDr iqfyl v/kh{kd fofo ds i= Å?viqv@'kgj@iwoZ@LVsuks@ih-,e-Vh@509@15 fnukad 18-04-2015 ds vuqlkj Nk= foÅ?e flag jeu iq=" ,,,,,

Jh lkscju flag jeu ih-,e-Vh- izos'k o""kZ&2012 ds fo:) i;kZIr lk{; miyc/k gksus ij vijk/k Å?- 224@14" ,,,,,

/kkjk;sa 419]420]467]468]471]120 ch 109 rkfg 3@4 ijh{kk vf/kfu;e ds rgr izdj.k iathc) fd;k x;k ,oa fxjQ~rkj fd;k x;k Fkk dk;kZy; iqfyl v/kh{kd dsUnzh;" ,,,,,

vUos""k.k O;wjks dsEi Xokfy;j ds i= Å?- 547 fnukad 09-04-2016 esa Nk= ds fo:) izdj.k la[;k RC2172015(S) esa izdj.k iathc) gS Nk= ds Li""Vhdj.k esa" ,,,,,

;g mYys[k fd;k gS fd mlds fo:) i;kZIr lk{; ugh gS tks fujk/kkj ,oa vIR; gSA vr% ;g lfeFr Nk= foÅ?e flag jeu iq= Jh lkscju flag jeu ih-,e-Vh- izos'k" ,,,,,

o""kZ&2010 dks rRdky izHkko ls egkfo|ky; ls fu""dklu dh vuq'kalk djrh gSA" ,,,,,

4- Nk= dks vf/k""Bkrk }kjk fnukad 10-12-2013 dks fu""dkflr fd;k x;kA" ,,,,,

5- MCY;w ih 2845@2016 mPp U;k;ky; Xokfy;j ds vkns'kkuqlkj fnukad22-08-16 esa Nk= ds vf/k""Bkrk }kjk fn;s fu""dklu vkns'k 11-04-16 dks fujLr dj" ,,,,,

Nk= ds izfrosnu ij fopkj ,oa O;fDrxr lquokbZ ,oa izkd`frd U;k; ds fy;s vknsf`kr fd;k x;kA" ,,,,,

6- mijksDr vkns'k ds ifjiky esa Nk= dks l'krZ v/;;u dh vuqefr nhxbZ ,oa 26-08-16 dks ekSf[kd ,oe~ fyf[kr :i ls lquk x;kA",,,,,

7- ;g fd ekuuh; loksZPp U;k;ky; ds vkns'k Å?- 1727@16 fnukad 13-0217 ds vuqÅ?e ,oa mPp U;k;ky; [kaMihB Xokfy;j ds W.P.2333@16 Å¼lrh'k",,,,,

'kkD; ,oe~ vU;Å½ esa ikfjr fu.kZ; fnukad 06-04-2017 ds rkjrE; esa ,oe~ Nk= ds laca/k es miyC/k ,oe~ iznk; fd;s x;s nLrkostksa ds iqu% voyksdu djus",,,,,

ij ,oe~ Nk= }kjk vius i{k esa O;fDrxr :Ik ls lquokbZ ds le; gh dksbZ ,slk lk{; izLrqr ugh fd;k ftlls ;s izrhr gks fd Nk= funksZ""k gSA",,,,,

vr% lfebr ;g vuq'kalk djrh gS fd bl izdj.k ij izos'k fu;e 2007 ds fcUnq 3-2 ,oe~ 3-3 ds rgr fu;ekuqlkj dk;Zokgh dh tk; 2. Nk= jktohj tkVo iq= Jh lkscju flag",,,,,

tkVo ih-,e-Vh- izos'k o""kZ&2010 dks egkfo|ky; ds i= Å?ekad 22269 fnukad 24-07-2015Å }kjk dkj.k crkvksa uksfVI fn;k x;k Fkk ,oa Nk= }kjk mDr",,,,,

dkj.k crkvks uksfVI dk Li""Vhdj.k fnukad 10-08-2015 dks egkfo|ky; esa izLrqr fd;k x;kA Nk= dks vfrfjDr iqfyl v/kh{k d fo'ofok|ky; ds i= dzekad",,,,,

viqv@'kgj@iwoZ@LVsuks@ih,eVh@15 fnukad 18-04-2015 ds vuqlkj Nk= jktohj tkVo iq= Jh lkscju flag tkVo izos'k o""kZ&2010 ds fo:) i;kZIr lk{; ",,,,,

miyc/k gksus ij vij/k dzekad 358@14 /kkjk;sa",,,,,

419]420]467]468]471]120 ch Hkknfo 3@4 ijh{k vkf/kfu;e ds rgr izdj.k iathc) fd;k x;k ,oa fxjQrkj fd;k x;k Fkk orZeku esa dk;kZy; iqfyl v/kh{k d",,,,,

dsUnzh; vUos""k.k C;wjks dsEi Xokfy;j ds i= dzekad 547 fnukad 0904-2016 es Nk= ds fo:) izdj.k la[;k RC2172015(S) 0096 es izdj.k iathc) gS Nk= ds",,,,,

Li""Vhdj.k esa ;g mYys[k fd;k gS fd mlds fo:) i;kZIr lk{; ugh gS tks fujk/kkj ,oa vLR; gS vr% lfebr Nk= jktohj tkVo iq= Jh lkscju flag tkVo dks rRdky",,,,,

izHkko ls egkfo|ky; ls fu""dklu dh vuq'kalk djrh gSA ;g vuq'kalk ekuuh; mPp U;k;ky; ds fu.kZ; ds vuqlkj ck/; gksxkA",,,,,

3- Nk= dk uke & foÅ?e flag jeu] firk&lkscju flag jeu fuoklh& vkykSjh iqjk] rglhy& xksgn ftyk fHk.MA Js.kh&,l-lh-] izos'k o""kZ& 2010 dk;Zokgh&",,,,,

1- iqfyl }kjk 05-02-14 ,oe~ 03-06-14 dks ewy nLrkost tCr fd;s x;s,oe~ iqfyl }kjk 30-05-2014 dks Nk= dh fxjQ~rkjh dh xbZA",,,,,

2- vfrfjDr iqfyl v/kh{k d ds i= fnukad ih-,e-Vh@509@15@fnukad 1804-15 }kjk lwfpr fd;k x;k fd vkids vij/kkksa dh foospuk ds nkSjku i;kZIr lk{; ik;s",,,,,

tkus ls vij/k Å?- 224@14 /kkjk",,,,,

419]420]467]468]471]120 B Hkknfo ,oe~ 3@4 ijh{k vkf/kfu;e ds rgr fxjQ~rkjh dh xbZ gSA",,,,,

3- Nk= dks vfrfjDr iqfyl v/kh{k d fofo ds i= Å?viqv@'kgj@iwoZ@LVsuks@ih-,e-

Vh@509@15 fnukad 18-04-2015 ds vuqlkj Nk= foÃ?e flag jeu iq=",,,,,

Jh lkscju flag jeu ih-,e-Vh- izos'k o""kZ&2012 ds fo:) i;kZIr lk{; miyc/k gksus ij vij/k k Ã?- 224@14",,,,,

/kkjk;sa 419]420]467]468]471]120 ch 109 rkfg 3@4 ijh{kk vf/kfu;e ds rgr izdj.k iathc) fd;k x;k ,oa fxjQ~rkj fd;k x;k Fkk dk;kZy; iqfyl v/kh{kd dsUnzh;" ,,,,,

vUos""k.k O;wjks dsEi Xokfy;j ds i= Ã?- 547 fnukad 09-04-2016 esa Nk= ds fo:) izdj.k la[;k RC2172015(S) esa izdj.k iathc) gS Nk= ds Li""Vhdj.k esa" ,,,,,

;g mYys[k fd;k gS fd mlds fo:) i;kZIr lk{; ugh gS tks fujk/kkj ,oa vIR; gSA vr% ;g lfefr Nk= foÃ?e flag jeu iq= Jh lkscju flag jeu ih-,e-Vh- izos'k" ,,,,,

o""kZ&2010 dks rRdky izHkko ls egkfo|ky; ls fu""dklu dh vuq'kalk djrh gSA" ,,,,,

4- Nk= dks vf/k""Bkrk }kjk fnukad 10-12-2013 dks fu""dkflr fd;k x;kA" ,,,,,

5- MCY;w ih 2845@2016 mPp U;k;ky; Xokfy;j ds vkns'kkuqlkj fnukad22-08-16 esa Nk= ds vf/k""Bkrk }kjk fn;s fu""dklu vkns'k 11-04-16 dks fujLr dj" ,,,,,

Nk= ds izfrosnu ij fopkj ,oa O;fDrxr lquokbZ ,oa izkd`frd U;k; ds fy;s vknsf'kr fd;k x;kA" ,,,,,

6- mijksDr vkns'k ds ifjiky esa Nk= dks l'krZ v/;;u dh vuqefr nhxbZ ,oa 26-08-16 dks ekSf[kd ,oe~ fyf[kr :i ls lqk x;kA" ,,,,,

7- ;g fd ekuuh; loksZPp U;k;ky; ds vkns'k Ã?- 1727@16 fnukad 13-02-17 ds vuqÃ?e ,oa mPp U;k;ky; [kaMihB Xokfy;j ds W.P.2333@16 Â¼lrh'k" ,,,,,

'kkD; ,oe~ vU;Â½ esa ikfjr fu.kZ; fnukad 06-04-2017 ds rkjrE; esa ,oe~ Nk= ds laca/k es miyC/k ,oe~ iznk; fd;s x;s nLrkostksa ds iqu% voyksdu djus" ,,,,,

ij ,oe~ Nk= }kjk vius i{k esa O;fDrxr :Ik ls lquokbZ ds le; gh dksbZ ,slk lk{; izLrqr ugh fd;k ftlls ;s izrhr gks fd Nk= funksZ""k gSA" ,,,,,

vr% lfefr ;g vuq'kalk djrh gS fd bl izdj.k ij izos'k fu;e 2007 ds fcUnq 3-2 ,oe~ 3-3 ds rgr fu;ekuqlkj dk;Zokgh dh tk;" ,,,,,

MkW ,l-,u- v;axj MkW Jhefr MkW- T;ksfr MkW vks-ih-" ,,,,,

ps;jesu uhfyek flag fcany lnL; tkVo lnL; ,,,,,

lnL; ,,,,,

MkW ;ksxsUnz ,,,,,

MkW jkts'k MkW lehj xqIrk MkW- jatuk ,,,,,

igkfj;k ,,,,,

xkSM+ lnL; lnL; frokjh lnL; ,,,,,

lnL; ,,,,,

MkW ,l-ds- MkW vt; xkSj MkW vatuh tyt MkW lq/khj",,,,,

'kekZ lNl; lNl; lNl; lDlsuk lNl;,,,,,

Admission Batch 2010:,,,,,

1. Writ Petition No.4069/2017 (Vikas Mahore Vs.State of M.P. & Ors),,,,,,

2. WP.1239/2017 (Rajveer Singh Jatav Vs. State of M.P. & Ors),,,,,,

3. Writ Petition No.3527/2017 (Vikram Singh Raman Vs. State of M.P. & Ors),,,,,,

Minutes and Proceedings of the in-house committee:,,,,,

(24) Considered the rival submissions and perused the record.,,,,,

(25) The first contention is that the respondents have grossly erred in extending the principle of law in Nidhi Kaim Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh and,,,,,

others [(2016) 7 SCC 615] and Nidhi Kaim and another Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh and others [(2017) 4 SCC 1].,,,,,

(26) In Nidhi Kaim (I) though the facts pertained to â??pairingâ? i.e. candidates managing to sit in pair in close proximity (described as 'scorer' and,,,,,

'beneficiary') i.e. mass copying in a planned manner. It was categorized as one of the specie of unfair practice. This would be evident from the,,,,,

following observation by their Lordships:,,,,,

â??39.1 Where there are allegations that students resorted to â??unfair means on a large scaleâ? at an examination, this court would not insist upon",,,,,

registration of a formal complaint. Any reliable information suggesting the occurrence of such malpractice in the examination is sufficient to authorize,,,,,

the examining body to take action because examining bodies are â??responsible for their standards and the conduct of examinationsâ? and â??the,,,,,

essence of the examination is that the worth of every person is appraised without any assistance from an outside sourceâ??.,,,,,

39.2 A lone circumstance could itself be sufficient in a given case for the examining body to record a conclusion that the students resorted to,,,,,

â??unfair means on a large scaleâ? in an examination. This Court approved the conclusion of the Bihar School Examination Board that the students,,,,,

had resorted to unfair means on a large scale in one examination centre [To assure itself regarding the correctness of the said inference, this Court",,,,,

undertook comparison of the answer papers of some of the students and recorded satisfaction that such answer papers â??showed such remarkable,,,,,

agreement in the answers that no doubt was left in the minds of this Court that

the students had assistance from an outside sourceâ?] and also,,,,,

approved the decision-making process of the Board on the basis of circumstantial evidence.,,,,,

The lone circumstance that the success rate of the students who appeared for the examination from the centre in question is too high in comparison to,,,,,

other centres.,,,,,

â??112.12. And lastly, the expression â??mass copyingâ? not being defined in any Act/Regulation/Rule, its meaning in ordinary parlance can be",,,,,

summed up as â??sizeable or large number of candidates found copying or discovered to have copied while answering their question paper by using,,,,,

unfair means in examinationâ??. In my view, this fully applies to the facts of the case at hand.â??" ,,,,,

(27) This negatives the contention on behalf of the petitioner that the principle of law laid down in Nidhi Kaim I is not applicable in this set of cases.,,,,,

(28) In the present set of cases, as is observed from the enquiry report the manner in which respective petitioners sought admissions to the MBBS" ,,,,,

course, it was within the competence and jurisdiction of the Dean, G.R. Medical College to have taken action without waiting for the outcome of" ,,,,,

criminal cases registered against each of these petitioners.,,,,,

(29) Further contentions that unless held guilty by the court of law, it is not within the competence of the respondent Medical College to cancel the" ,,,,,

admissions on the basis of in-house reports by committee which had no experts in its composition deserve to be negated first on the basis of the,,,,,

report by the in-house committee wherein the findings are arrived at after affording opportunity of hearing to respective students and secondly that the,,,,,

examination process being tampered with it is within the competence of the College Administration to take action against the breach mongers. In this,,,,,

context, reference can be had of the decision in Nidhi Kaim I (supra) wherein their Lordships were pleased to observe:" ,,,,,

â??49. In my opinion, the question of either â??blameâ? or â??penaltyâ? does not arise in the context. If tampering with the examination process" ,,,,,

took place, whether all or some of the appellants are culpable is a matter for a criminal court to examine as and when any of the appellants is sought" ,,,,,

to be prosecuted. But the fact that the examination process was tampered with is relevant for administrative action such as the one impugned herein.,,,,,

The said fact formed the foundation for the further enquiry for identifying the beneficiaries of such contaminated process. Having regard to the,,,,,

circumstances relied upon, I do not see anything illogical or untenable in the conclusions drawn by the expert committee which formed the basis for" ,,,,,

the impugned action of the Board.....Â,,,,,

50. Even otherwise, in my opinion, it would be futile to pursue the inquiry in this regard. Assuming for the sake of argument that the submission of the" ,,,,,

appellants is right and there are some cases (of the appellants) where the appellants can demonstrate (if an opportunity is given to them) that the,,,,,

circumstantial evidence is not foolproof and therefore the impugned order must be set aside on the ground of failure of natural justice, the Board would" ,,,,,

still be entitled (in fact it would be obliged in view of the allegation of systematic tampering with the examination process year after year) in law to,,,,,

conduct afresh enquiry after giving notice to each of the appellants. That would mean spending enormous time both by the Board and by the,,,,,

appellants for the enquiry and the consequential (inevitable) litigation regarding the correctness of the eventual decision of the Board.â?? ,,,,,

(30) In respect of the argument that it would be inequitable to cancel the admission of the petitioners, at this stage as the petitioners were admitted to a" ,,,,,

professional college on their merit. Suffice it to say that similar argument raised by the petitioner in Nidhi Kaim I (supra) has not been accepted. The,,,,,

petitioners are beneficiary of the fraud committed in the process of examination. The beneficiary of fraud cannot be allowed to continue with its,,,,,

benefit as has been held by the Supreme Court in the case of Nidhi Kaim I (supra):,,,,,

â??81. During the course of hearing, it could not be seriously disputed at the hands of learned counsel for the appellants, that the appellantsâ?? ,,,,,

admission to the MBBS course, was based on established deception and manipulation. All the same, we will expressly deal with the instant aspect of" ,,,,,

the matter, and the extent of the appellantsâ?? involvement, in the following paragraph. It was also not disputed at the hands of learned counsel, that" ,,,,,

the cause and effect of fraud, was determined by the Court of Appeal, in Lazarus Estates, Ltd. v. Beasley [Lazarus Estates Ltd. V. Beasley, (1956) 1" ,,,,,

All E.R.341 : (1956) 1 QB 702 : (1956) 2 WLR 502 (CA). The consequences of fraud, as determined by the Court of Appeal (in the above judgment)," ,,,,,

have been repeatedly approved, by this Court. In the above judgment Denning, L.J., had observed as under: (QB pp. 712-13)" ,,,,,

â??We are in this case concerned only with this point: Can the declaration be challenged on the ground that it was false and fraudulent? It can clearly ,,,,,

be challenged in the criminal courts. The landlord can be taken before the magistrate and fined Â£30 (see Sch. 2, para. 6) or he can be prosecuted on" ,,,,,

indictment, and (if he is an individual) sent to prison (see s. 5 of the Perjury Act, 1911). The landlords argued before us that the declaration could not" ,,,,,

be challenged in the civil courts at all, even though it was false and fraudulent, and that the landlords can recover and keep the increased rent even" ,,,,,

though it was obtained by fraud. If this argument is correct, the landlords would profit greatly from their fraud. The increase in rent would pay the fine" ,,,,,

many times over. I cannot accede to this argument for a moment. No court in this land will allow a person to keep an advantage which he has ,,,,,

obtained by fraud. No judgment of a court, no order of a Minister, can be allowed to stand if it has been obtained by fraud. Fraud unravels everything." ,,,,,

The court is careful not to find fraud unless it is distinctly pleaded and proved; but once it is proved it vitiates judgments, contracts and all transactions" ,,,,,

whatsoever; see, as to deeds, Collins v. Blantern [Collins V. Blantern, (1767) 2 Wils K.B. 341 : 95 ER 847], as to judgments, Duchess of" ,,,,,

Kingstonâ??s Case In re [Duches of Kingston case, In re, (1776) (1 Leach 146: 168 ER 175] and, as to contracts, Master v. Miller [Master v. Miller," ,,,,,

(1791) 4 Term Rep 320 : 100 ER 1042]. So here I am of opinion that, if this declaration is proved to have been false and fraudulent, it is a nullity and" ,,,,,

void and the landlords cannot recover any increase of rent by virtue of it.â?? ,,,,,

(emphasis supplied),,,,,

We need to say no more, in the manner how fraud has to be dealt with, whenever it is established. However, stated simply, nothing â?| nothing â?| and" ,,,,,

nothing, obtained by fraud, can be sustained, as fraud unravels everything. The question which arises for consideration is, whether the consequence of" ,,,,,

established fraud, as repeatedly declared by this Court, can be ignored, to do complete justice in a matter, in exercise of jurisdiction vested in this" ,,,,,

Court, under Article 142 of the Constitution. And also, whether the consequences of fraud, can be overlooked in the facts and circumstances of this" ,,,,,

case, in order to render complete justice to the appellants?" ,,,,,

82. The learned counsel for the appellants attempted to persuade us very strongly to overcome the law declared by this Court on the issue of ,,,,,

established fraud. Is it possible to accept such a contention? If the appellants' involvement is not serious, it may well be possible to accept the" ,,,,,

contention. Therefore, before we deal with the submissions canvassed, it is important to understand the extent and proportion of the shenanigans of" ,,,,,

the appellants. It is not in dispute that none of the appellants would have been admitted to the MBBS course, as their merit position in the PreMedical" ,,,,,

Test was not as a result of their own efforts but was based on extraneous assistance. The appellants were helped in answering the questions in the ,,,,,

Pre-Medical Test by meritorious candidates. The manipulation by which the appellants obtained admission involved not only a breach in the computer ,,,,,

system whereby roll numbers were allotted to the appellants to effectuate their plans. It also involved the procurement of meritorious ,,,,,

candidates/persons, who would assist them in answering the questions (in the PreMedical Test). The appellants' position, next to the helper concerned," ,,,,,

at the examination, was also based on further computer interpolations. Not only were the seating plans distorted for achieving the purpose, even the" ,,,,,

institutions where the appellants were to take the PreMedical Test were arranged in a manner as would suit the appellants, again by a similar process" ,,,,,

of computer falsification. This could only be effectuated by a corrupted administrative machinery. Whether the nefarious and crooked administrative ,,,,,

involvement was an inside activity, or an outside pursuit, is inconsequential. All in all, the entire scheme of events can well be described as a scam â?!" ,,,,,

a racket of sorts. The appellants or their parents would obviously have had to pay large amounts of money to the Vyapam authorities. The appellants' ,,,,,

admission to the MBBS course was therefore clearly based on a wellorchestrated plan which we can safely conclude as based on established fraud. ,,,,,

84. The controversy in the present case does not relate to a singular academic session. Whether or not this vitiated process of obtaining admission to ,,,,,

the MBBS course was adopted during the year 2007, and prior thereto, is not known. Because, MBBS admissions prior to 2008 were not investigated." ,,,,,

Investigation was initiated in the first instance with reference to admissions for the year 2013. Thereafter, investigation was extended to those who" ,,,,,

had gained admission to the MBBS course during the years 2008 to 2012. Investigation revealed a wellthought out, unethical plan, involving",,,,,

administrative support, during six consecutive academic sessions â? from 2008 to 2013. Vyapam was certain about the system having been",,,,,

manipulated at the hands of at least 634 candidates (during the years 2008 to 2012 itself). There may well have been others but no action was taken,,,,,

against them as their cases fell beyond the realm of suspicion (on the parameters approved and adopted by Vyapam).,,,,,

85. This Court, while dealing withadmissions during the years 2008 to 2012, followed the earlier judgment [NidhiKaim v. State of M.P., (2016) 7 SCC",,,,,

615 : 7 SCEC 611] wherein admissions to the MBBS course during the year 2013 were annulled. The High Court in all the matters consistently upheld,,,,,

the cancellation orders passed by Vyapam. This Court also reiterated the validity of the orders passed by the High Court, and thereby, upheld the",,,,,

Vyapam orders. In the above view of the matter, the factual and the legal position with reference to the admission of the appellants to the MBBS",,,,,

course being vitiated has attained finality. The fact that the appellants had gained admission to the MBBS course by established fraud does not (as it,,,,,

indeed, cannot) require any further consideration.",,,,,

86. In view of the sequence of factsnarrated above, it is not possible for us to accept that the deception and deceit adopted by the appellants was a",,,,,

simple affair which can be overlooked. In fact, admission of the appellants to the MBBS course was the outcome of a wellorchestrated strategy of",,,,,

deceit and deception. And therefore, it is not possible to accept that the involvement of the appellants was not serious. In fact, it was indeed the most",,,,,

grave and extreme, as discussed above.",,,,,

87. In the above view of the matter, it isnot possible for us to overlook the consequences of the declared legal position with reference to the",,,,,

consequence of fraud on the ground that the involvement of the appellants in the acts of fraud was not serious.â??Â",,,,,

(31) Further contention that since criminal prosecution is launched against the petitioners it will be beyond the competence of the authorities concerned,,,,,

to have cancelled the admission to MBBS course as merely because of launching of prosecution does not tantamount to establishing of guilt. Similar,,,,,

contention raised in â??Niharika Tiwari Vs. The State of Madhya Pradesh and

others [decided on 04.07.2017 in WP.6768/2015 and other connected,,,,,

matters]â?? has been negated wherein the Division Bench held in paragraph 21:,,,,,

â??21. We do not find any merit in the said argument, as the action of cancellation of the result on account of use of unfair means is a civil action,",,,,,

whereas conspiracy in manipulating the result is a proceeding now being investigated by the C.B.I. is a criminal action. The Civil and criminal,,,,,

proceedings are mutually exclusive and civil action on the same set of facts in respect of which criminal case has been registered is not an,,,,,

impediment. It was so held by the Division Bench of this Court in Pratibha Singh Ku. (Minor)â??s case (supra). It was observed as under:-,,,,,

â??85. It was argued that the fact that name of some of the candidates has been found in the material recovered by the police during the investigation,,,,,

cannot be the basis to take such a drastic action against the candidate until the charge is proved against him by the criminal court. In the first place,",,,,,

more or less similar argument advanced by the petitioners has already been considered and rejected on the finding that the standard of proof in the,,,,,

two proceedings is qualitatively different. Moreover, the civil action on the basis of same set of facts in respect of which criminal case has been",,,,,

registered and pending against the petitioners can be no impediment. Both proceedings are required to be taken to its logical end in accordance with,,,,,

law and are mutually exclusive. For the same reason, we reject the other argument of the petitioners that before taking final decision the Board ought",,,,,

to have factually ascertained the relevant facts by adopting inquisitorial inquiry as to who had indulged in the change of roll numbers to benefit,,,,,

selective candidates and whether the concerned candidate himself was responsible for that situation.â? Therefore, the C.B.I. is investigating the",,,,,

criminality part of the transactions which is distinct than cancellation of result on the basis of material collected by the Committee. Still further, the",,,,,

cases were being adjourned time and again for some reasons or the other, therefore, request at this stage to implead C.B.I. which has nothing to do",,,,,

with the impugned order passed by the Vyapamis only a delaying tactic to delay the decision so as to allow the candidates to continue with the course,,,,,

on the strength of interim orders granted earlier by the Court. Therefore, such a plea does not merit consideration.â??",,,,,

(32) In *Nidhi Kaim Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh and others* [(2016) 7 SCC 615], it is held by their Lordships: " , , , , ,

42. From an analysis of the above decisions, the following principles emerge: " , , , , ,

42.1 Normally, the rule of audi alteram partem must be scrupulously followed in the cases of the cancellation of the examinations of students on the " , , , , ,

ground that they had resorted to unfair means (copying) at the examinations. , , , , ,

42.2 But the abovementioned principle is not applicable to the cases where unfair means were adopted by a relatively large number of students and , , , , ,

also to certain other situations where either the examination process is vitiated or for reasons beyond the control of both students and the examining , , , , ,

body, it would be unfair or impracticable to continue the examination process to insist upon the compliance with audi alteram partem rule. " , , , , ,

42.3 The fact that unfair means were adopted by students at an examination could be established by circumstantial evidence. , , , , ,

42.4 The scope of judicial review of the decision of an examining body is very limited. If there is some reasonable material before the body to come to , , , , ,

the conclusion that unfair means were adopted by the students on a large scale, neither such conclusion nor the evidence forming the basis thereof " , , , , ,

could be subjected to scrutiny on the principles governing the assessment of evidence in a criminal court. , , , , ,

43. Cases such as the one on hand where there are allegations of criminal conspiracies resulting in the tampering with the examination process for the , , , , ,

benefit of a large number of students would be certainly one of the exceptional circumstances indicated in *Sinha*'s case provided there is some , , , , ,

justifiable material to support the conclusion that the examination process had been tampered with. , , , , ,

44. In the light of the principles of law emerging from scrutiny of the abovementioned judgments, we are of the opinion that case on hand can fall " , , , , ,

within the category of exceptions to the rule of audi alteram partem if there is reliable material to come to the conclusion that the examination process , , , , ,

is vitiated. That leads me to the next question " whether the material relied upon by the Board for reaching the conclusion that the examination , , , , ,

process was contaminated insofar as the appellants (and also some more students) are concerned and the appellants are the beneficiaries of such , , , , ,

contaminated process, is tenable?" ,,,,,

49. In my opinion, the question of either "blame" or "penalty" does not arise in the context. If tampering with the examination process took" ,,,,,

place, whether all or some of the appellants are culpable is a matter for a criminal court to examine as and when any of the appellants is sought to be" ,,,,,

prosecuted. But the fact that the examination process was tampered with is relevant for administrative action such as the one impugned herein. The ,,,,,

said fact formed the foundation for the further enquiry for identifying the beneficiaries of such contaminated process. Having regard to the ,,,,,

circumstances relied upon, I do not see anything illogical or untenable in the conclusions drawn by the expert committee which formed the basis for" ,,,,,

the impugned action of the BOARD. It is argued that the formula [The Expert Committee evolved a formula to examine whether a conclusion could ,,,,,

be reached with respect to the identified pairs that they had resorted to the unfair means. The facts relevant for the said formula are: (1) the total ,,,,,

number of questions answered by each number of the pair; (2) the number of correct answers given by each number of the pair and how many of the ,,,,,

said correct answers matched; (3) the number of wrong answers matched. After determining the abovementioned numbers with respect to each of ,,,,,

the identified pairs, greater weightage is given to the incorrect matching answers to arrive at a conclusion that the number of the identified pair" ,,,,,

resorted to unfair means at the examination.] adopted by the Board to record the conclusion that the members of the identified pairs resorted to unfair ,,,,,

means at the examination is without any scientific basis. I do not see any irrationality either in the formula or the decision of the Board to assign ,,,,,

greater weightage to the incorrect matching answers. There is nothing inherently suspicious about two candidates sitting in close proximity in an ,,,,,

examination and giving the same correct answer to a question because there can only one correct answer to a question. On the other hand, if they" ,,,,,

give the same wrong answer to a given question and if the number of such wrong answers is high, it can certainly generate a doubt and is a strong" ,,,,,

circumstance indicating the occurrence of some malpractice. Such a test was approved by this Court in Bagleshwar Prasad's case [Board of ,,,,,

High School and Intermediate Education v. Bagleshwar Prasad, AIR 1966 SC 875: (1963) 3 SCR 767:" ,,,,,

6.He admitted that the mistaken answers in the two papers were identical and he pleaded that he could not say anything as to why this,,,,,
happened.,,,,,

11.We have looked at the incorrect answers ourselves and we are not prepared to hold that the identical incorrect answers were given by the two,,,,,
candidates either by accident or by coincidence. Some of the incorrect answers, and, particularly, the manner in which they have been given, clearly",,,,,
suggest that they were the result of either one candidate copying from the other, or both candidates copying from a common source.].",,,,,

11. After examining the facts and the law laid down in abovementioned seven cases, in my opinion, the ratio laid down in these cases can be",,,,,
summarized thus :,,,,,

11.1 First, in a case where several candidates are found involved in mass copying or in other words, where vast majority of candidates were",,,,,
found to have resorted to use of unfair means in any examination then it is not necessary for the concerned Institute to give any show cause notice to,,,,,
any individual candidate before cancellation of his result.,,,,,

11.2 Second, when it is difficult to prove by direct evidence that the copying was done by the candidates then the same can be proved by",,,,,
drawing inference based on probabilities and circumstantial evidence.,,,,,

11.3 Third, there are several ways in which unfair means can be resorted to by the candidates for doing copying individually or in the large scale by",,,,,
vast majority of candidates.,,,,,

11.4 Fourth, where few candidates are found involved in doing copying then it is necessary to give to individual candidate a show cause notice by",,,,,
following rules of natural justice before taking any action against him.,,,,,

11.5 Fifth, there must be some material (whether direct or based on probabilities and circumstances) to prove that a candidate resorted to unfair",,,,,
means for doing copying in answering his question paper.,,,,,

11.6 Sixth, if there is adequate material to prove that the copying was done by individual candidate or by the candidates on a large scale then even if",,,,,

no report was submitted by any invigilator of any such incident yet it would be of no significance. 11.7 Seventh, the Court should not act as an",,,,,

appellate Court over the decision of Expert Committee to examine the issue of

"copying" or/and "mass copying", i.e., copying done on a large scale by vast majority of candidates and more so when the Expert Committee has found the candidate guilty of resorting to unfair means.

111.8 Eighth, the Court should be slow to interfere in the decision taken by the Expert Committee in such cases.

111.9 Ninth, if wrong answers of two candidates sitting in close proximity tallies with each other then it would be a strong circumstance of copying done by these two candidates.

111.10 Tenth, this Court has consistently maintained a distinction between a case of "copying" and "mass copying", i.e. copying done on a large scale by vast majority of candidates for applying the rules of natural justice to the case. In the case of former, rules of natural justice would be applicable and hence show cause notice to individual candidate who is accused of doing copying will have to be given to such candidate whereas in the case of latter, the rules of natural justice are not applicable and hence it is not necessary to give any show cause notice to any candidate involved in mass copying.

112.2 Second, there was uniform pattern adopted by the candidates for doing copy in the examinations. This circumstance lends support to the fact that "mass copying" was done by the candidates in a planned manner.

112.12 And lastly, the expression "mass copying" not being defined in any Act/Regulation/Rules, its meaning in ordinary parlance can be summed up as "sizable or large number of candidates found copying or discovered to have copied while answering their question paper by using unfair means in examination". In my view, this fully applies to the facts of the case at hand.

114. As held above, firstly, neither the writ court and nor this Court could sit as an appellate Court over the decision of the Expert Committee and find fault in the material relied on by the Committee; secondly, the method evolved by the experts was usually applied to find out as to whether two candidates had copied from each other and hence no fault could be noticed in it; thirdly, the decision to cancel the results was based on other contemporaneous material seized during the investigation by STF; fourthly, the decision to cancel the results was not taken in post-haste but was taken with full application of mind by the Expert Committee which consists of experts in subjects and lastly, this being a case of "mass copying", it was

neither necessary to give any show cause notice to the appellants and nor necessary to supply the material to the appellants. It is for these reasons, I",,,,, find no merit in this submission.,,,,,

(33) In Pratibha Singh Ku. (Minor) (supra), it is held by the Division Bench of this Court:" ,,,,,

â??122.If in the criminal case they were to be acquitted, it would presuppose that the action taken against them by the Board was inappropriate",,,,,

and unjust. We are not impressed by this argument. Inasmuch as, even if the petitioners were to be acquitted in the criminal case pending against",,,,,

them, that would not by itself vitiate the action taken by the Board on the basis of indisputable facts and circumstances. We have also noticed the",,,,,

settled legal position that the two proceedings are mutually exclusive and the quality of evidence/material to proceed in the matter in both these,,,,,

proceedings is markedly different.â??,,,,,

(34) The contours of judicial review under Article 226 of the Constitution are well defined that it is not intended to assume a supervisory role or don,,,,,

the robes of the omnipresent. In â??State of U.P. and another v. Johri Mal [(2004) 4 SCC 714]â??, it is observed by their Lordships:" ,,,,,

â??28. The scope and extent of power of the judicial review of the High Court contained in Article 226 of the Constitution of India would vary from,,,,,

case to case, the nature of the order, the relevant statute as also the other relevant factors including the nature of power exercised by the public",,,,,

authorities, namely, whether the power is statutory, quasi judicial or administrative. The power of judicial review is not intended to assume a",,,,,

supervisory role or don the robes of omnipresent. The power is not intended either to review governance under the rule of law nor do the courts step,,,,,

into the areas exclusively reserved by the suprema lex to the other organs of the State. Decisions and actions which do not have adjudicative,,,,,

disposition may not strictly fall for consideration before a judicial review court. The limited scope of judicial review succinctly put is:,,,,,

(i) Courts, while exercising the power of judicial review, do not sit in appeal over the decisions of administrative bodies;" ,,,,,

(ii) A petition for a judicial review would lie only on certain well defined grounds.,,,,,

(iii) An order passed by an administrative authority exercising discretion vested in

it, cannot be interfered in judicial review unless it is shown that" ,,,,,,

exercise of discretion itself is perverse or illegal. ,,,,,,

(iv) A mere wrong decision without anything more is not enough to attract the power of judicial review; the supervisory jurisdiction conferred on a ,,,,,,

Court is limited to seeing that Tribunal functions within the limits of its authority and that its decisions do not occasion miscarriage of justice. ,,,,,,

(v) The Courts cannot be called upon to undertake the Government duties and functions. The Court shall not ordinarily interfere with a policy decision ,,,,,,

of the State. Social and economic belief of a Judge should not be invoked as a substitute for the judgment of the legislative bodies. [See *Ira Munn v.* ,,,,,,

State of Illinois 94 US 113: 24 L Ed 77 (1876)] ,,,,,,

(35) Having, thus, considered, we are not inclined to cause any indulgence with the decision taken by the Gajaraja Medical College in cancelling the" ,,,,,,

admission of petitioners in the MBBS course. However, we make it clear that since the standard of proof in respect of cause of action arising from" ,,,,,,

civil action is different, the criminal action against the petitioners will have to be tested on the basis of legal and admissible evidence brought on record" ,,,,,,

by the prosecution and the defence. ,,,,,,

(36) Consequently, all the Writ Petitions and interim applications are dismissed. However, no costs." ,,,,,,