

IN THE HIGH COURT OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

W.P. No. 15669 of 2023

Between:

Dr M.A.Saif Ali

... Petitioner

And

The State of Telangana and others

... Respondents

JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED ON: 11.09.2023

THE HON'BLE MRS JUSTICE SUREPALLI NANDA

1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers : yes
may be allowed to see the Judgment?
2. Whether the copies of judgment may be
marked to Law Reporters/Journals? : yes
3. Whether Their Lordships wish to
see the fair copy of the Judgment? : yes

SUREPALLI NANDA, J

THE HON'BLE MRS JUSTICE SUREPALLI NANDA**W.P. No. 15669 of 2023****% 11.09.2023****Between:**

Dr M.A.Saif Ali

..... Petitioner

And

\$ The State of Telangana and others

... Respondents

< Gist:

> Head Note:

! Counsel for the Petitioner : Mr Chandrasen Law Office

^Counsel for Respondents : Mr K.V.V.Vedantha Charya

? Cases Referred:

1. (2013) 15 SCC 570
2. 2020(10) SCC 670

HON'BLE MRS JUSTICE SUREPALLI NANDA

W.P. No. 15669 of 2023

ORDER:

Heard the Learned Counsel for the Petitioner, learned Government Pleader for Medical and Health appearing for respondents 1 to 4 and the Learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of the 5th Respondent.

2. This Writ Petition is filed praying to issue a Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the 5th Respondent in suspending the petitioner vide notice dated 09.06.2023 without giving an opportunity to be heard, in flagrant violation of Regulation No. 23 of the National Medical Commission (Prevention and Prohibition of Ragging in Medical Colleges and Institutions) Regulations, 2021 and without considering the representations dated 28.04.2023, 23.05.2023 and 02.06.2023 as illegal, arbitrary, unconstitutional, against the Principles of Natural Justice and violative of Article 14 and 21 of the Constitution and coupled with flagrant violation of Regulation No. 23 of the National Medical Commission

Prevention and Prohibition of Ragging in Medical Colleges and Institutions). Regulations, 2021, and consequently set aside the suspension order/notice dated 09.06.2023.

3. The case of the Petitioner, in brief, is as follows:

a) The petitioner was falsely implicated in Crime No. 69/2023 dated 22.02.2023 of P.S. Matwada, alleging that he was responsible for the alleged suicide of late Ms. Dharavath Preeti, a 1st year Post Graduate Student (Anesthesia), Kakatiya Medical College. The petitioner was arrested by the police and remanded in prison on 22.02.2023 and was enlarged on bail on 20.04.2023.

b) After the release of the petitioner from judicial remand, the petitioner went to the college to attend regular classes. However, he was informed by the college authorities and teaching staff that he was not yet permitted to attend the classes and "they heard" that the petitioner was suspended but did not provide any official communication to that extent.

c) The petitioner submitted a letter dated 28.04.2023, requesting the 5th respondent, to permit the petitioner to attend classes. Despite such a letter, the 5th respondent

issued a reply letter under the oral instructions of the Director of Medical Education, dated 01.05.2023, in which no clarity was given to the petitioner about the suspension.

d) However, the last paragraph of the above said letter, reads that the Anti-ragging Committee had unanimously decide to "inform to the candidate that the matter is not in the purview of the institution" in accordance with the Medical Council of India (Prevention and Prohibition of Ragging in Medical Colleges/Institutions) Regulations, 2009 amendments.

e) The petitioner submitted another letter dated 23.05.2023 clearly explaining his case and requesting the 5th respondent to permit him to classes. Soon after receiving the said letter, on the same day i.e., 23.05.2023, the office of the 5th respondent served a suspension letter to the petitioner, dated 04.03.2023, which was never disclosed or communicated to the petitioner till 23.05.2023.

f) Aggrieved by the suspension letter dated 04.03.2023, the petitioner approached the 2nd respondent, who is the appellate authority according to the National Medical

Commission Prevention and Prohibition of Ragging in Medical Colleges and Institutions) Regulations, 2021, herein after called as the Governing Regulations, 2021, but the 2nd respondent refused to act on the same and instructed the petitioner to approach the 5th respondent. Therefore, the petitioner again submitted a representation dated 02.06.2023 requesting the 5th respondent to reconsider their decision of suspension.

g) Subsequently, the 5th Respondent without acting on the various representations, more specifically representations dated 28.04.2023, 23.05.2023 and 02.06.2023, issued another NOTICE vide Rc.No. 145/Peshi/2023 dated 09.06.2023 further suspending the petitioner from 04.03.2023 for a period of one year.

h) The enquiry committee and the impugned suspension order violates the mandatory procedure and principles laid down under Regulation No. 23 of the National Medical Commission Prevention and Prohibition of Ragging in Medical Colleges and Institutions) Regulations, 2021. Alongside, if the petitioner is punished in this manner by suspending from the

college, he will lose his career opportunities and thereby a basic right to life is violated.

i) Therefore, the suspension orders dated 04.03.2023 and 09.06.2023 against the petitioner are illegal and arbitrary since the petitioner was never given a chance to be heard and the representations dated 28.04.2023, 23.05.2023 and 02.06.2023 were never taken into consideration. Hence this Writ Petition.

4. The counter affidavit filed by the Respondent No. 3, in brief, is as under:

a) On 21.02.2023, the petitioner was heard by the committee headed by Professor of Anesthesia along with few other Assistant Professors and the detailed enquiry was recorded by the members of committee and the report was submitted to the Anti Ragging Committee as per the procedure laid down under Regulation No.23 of the National Medical Commission (Prevention and Prohibition of Ragging in Medical colleges and Institutions) Regulations 2021.

b) The petitioner was also given a chance and was heard by the Principal and HOD of Anesthesia even though there was a lot of public uproar and political pressure to suspend immediately, however the petitioner was issued notice along with suspension since the petitioner was already communicated orally of his suspension, which he accepted and on receipt of suspension orders and with malafide intention was submitting applications requesting permission to attend classes.

c) The petitioner's contention of Violation of Regulation No 23 does not arise as he was served notice along with suspension orders on 04.03.2023. The petitioner did not receive such orders for the reasons being his officially notified home address was changed, he is not attending at working place (Department of Anesthesia) as he was in police remand. The anti-ragging committee and the police enquiry has reported the petitioner's involvement in the mental harassment of Dr. Preethi and recommended for suspension for one year. There are evidences of involvement of the petitioner in mental harassment and the same is submitted to this court.

d) After release on bail, the petitioner was handed over with the suspension which he accepted and prior to receipt, he submitted representation on 28.04.2023 only requesting to allow him to classes which shows that he has information of his suspension.

e) The anti-ragging committee met regularly on the representation of the petitioner and decided to continue the suspension orders and the same was informed to the petitioner. The petitioner is aware of the anti-ragging committee reports and with malafide intension to escape the punishment, has filed this writ.

f) The Respondents have acted immediately on the representations of the petitioner dated 28.04.2023, 23.05.2023 and 01.06.2023 by convening the Anti ragging committee meetings on 01.05.2023, 01.06.2023, and 09.06.2023 and informed the decision taken by the committee to continue the suspension of the petitioner.

g) The allegation of the petitioner against the Anti ragging committee is baseless as the Anti ragging committee has enquired all the co students, interneers, Doctors and other

staff who was present on duty with Dr.Preethi on the day of alleged harassment by the Petitioner

h) The respondent has acted as per the guidelines of National Medical Commission (Prevention and prohibition of ragging in medical college/institutions) 2021 and there are no vested interests to the respondents to punish the petitioner as the petitioner will lose his career opportunities if acted in violation of the Act's and rule's. Hence, the Writ Petition is without merits and is liable to be dismissed.

PERUSED THE RECORD :

5. National Medical Commission (Prevention and Prohibition of Ragging in Medical Colleges and Institutions) Regulations, 2021 define Ragging under Rule 3 as under:

Rule 3 : Definition of Ragging : Ragging shall mean any disorderly conduct, whether by words spoken or written or by an act which has the effect of teasing, treating or handling with rudeness any other student, indulging in rowdy or undisciplined activities which causes or is likely to cause annoyance, hardship or psychological harm or to raise fear or apprehension thereof in a fresher or a

junior student or asking the students to do any act or perform something which such student will not in the ordinary course and which has the effect of causing or generating a sense of shame or embarrassment so as to adversely affect the physique or psyche of a fresher or a junior student.

6. Chapter III, Measures to Prohibit and Prevent Ragging by Institutions Rule 11 pertaining to Institutional Committees and Related Measures reads as under :

"11. Institutional committees and related measures. (1) Every medical college or institution shall constitute the following committees and related measures as provided in regulation 6.3 of the UGC Regulations on Curbing the Menace of Ragging in Higher Educational Institutions, 2009 and under these regulations.

(2) The medical college or institution shall constitute an Anti-Ragging Committee.

(3) The Anti-Ragging Committee shall broadly comprise of the following members duly constituted by the Head of the Institution and shall have a diverse mix of persons of different levels and gender, namely: -

- (i) Head of the Institution;
- (ii) representatives of faculty members;
- (iii) representatives of students belonging to the freshers' category;
- (iv) representatives of senior students;
- (v) representatives of parents;
- (vi) representatives of non-teaching staff.
- (vii) representatives of civil and police administration;
- (viii) representatives of local media; and

(ix) Non-Government Organizations involved in youth activities.

(4) The duties of the Anti-Ragging Committee include but is not limited to

(i) overall monitoring of Anti-Ragging activities of the medical college or institution;

(ii) ensuring compliance with the provisions concerning ragging both of these regulations as well as the provisions of any law for the time being in force;

(iii) monitoring the activities of the Anti-Ragging Squad;

(iv) investigate reports of ragging, if any, or approve committees formed for this purpose;

(v) make suggestions for improvement of measures taken by the medical college or institution for prohibiting and preventing ragging.

7. Chapter IV of the said Rules dealing with Incidents of Ragging and Rule 23 there under pertaining to Institutional Enquiry or Investigation and Report reads as under :

(1) The Head of the Institution shall constitute a specific committee to inquire into or investigate the incident of ragging without waiting for the report of any other authority, even if this is being investigated by the police or local authorities.

(2) The inquiry or investigation shall be conducted thoroughly including on-the-spot or site of the incident in a fair and transparent manner, without any bias or prejudice, upholding the principles of natural justice and giving adequate opportunity to the student or

students accused of ragging and other witnesses to place before it the facts, documents and views concerning the incident of ragging, and considering such other relevant information as may be required.

- (3) The entire process shall be completed and a report duly submitted within seven days of the information or reporting of the incident of ragging.**
- (4) The report shall be placed before the Head of the Institution or the Anti-Ragging Committee.**
- (5) The Anti-Ragging Committee shall examine the report, decide on and recommend further administrative action to the Head of the Institution.**

**8. Para 11 of the Counter Affidavit para (i) to (v) –
Page 6 to 8 reads as under :**

“(i) The decision of the Anti Ragging committee was made on detailed enquiry by the HOD of Anaesthesia. The petitioner was personally enquired by the committee led by Professor of the Anaesthesia and (4) other committee members on 21.02.2023, and submitted their report. The Anti ragging committee has examined and taken the excerpts of it and submitted their report to the Head of the institution, but with malafide intentions the petitioner is alleging of violation of principles of natural justice. The petitioner was also made party by the Anti

ragging committee and heard him and the same report is submitted to Hon'ble High court.

(ii) The allegation of the petitioner against the Anti ragging committee is baseless as the Anti ragging committee has enquired all the co students, interneers, Doctors and other staff, who were present on duty with Dr Preethi on the day of alleged harassment by Dr Saif Ali and recorded all material evidences of his alleged involvement in the crime. The HOD and other staff findings were also recorded and will be submitted to the Hon'ble High court showing his involvement in the crime and there was no violation of regulations 2021 and procedural guidelines or Regulation No 23.

(iii) The petitioner was orally informed about all the proceedings going on him as the petitioner was in police remand and on release on bail he was personally furnished all the copies of suspension and notices from time to time basing on his availability.

iv) The allegation made by petitioner that the entire enquiry was conducted only one single day is baseless allegation. The Anti ragging committee has met several times discussing the issue and submitted different reports recommending the continuation of the suspension orders of Dr Saif Ali. The Anti ragging committee has conducted enquiries of HOD. Doctors Staff and co students.

(v) The petitioner contention that the Principal is concluding the enquiry as per the National medical

commission (prevention and prohibition of ragging in medical college/institutions) 2009 is baseless allegation, the principal and the Anti ragging committee was following (prevention and prohibition of ragging in medical college/institutions) 2021 and there was no negligent manner or violation of Principles of natural justice.

9. Notice impugned dated 09.06.2023 of the 5th respondent in Rc.No.145/Peshi.2023, reads as under:

" Dr Saif, PG in Anesthesiology is here by suspended from 04.03.2023 for a period of one year. During the above period he is not permitted to attend the academics/theory practical classes, library or Hostels.

This decision is taken on the recommendations of the anti ragging committee. The Anti ragging committee has proposed one year suspension to Dr Saif, PG in Anesthesiology from 04.03.2023, basing on their enquiry and understanding on the incident of alleged ragging of Dr Preethi, in which Dr Preethi has suffered mental harassment by Dr Saif."

10. A bare perusal of the minutes of the meeting held on 01.05.2023 in the Principal Chamber, KMC, Hanumakonda at 3.00 PM towards Ani-ragging in Rc.No.Peshi/Meeting/2023 reads as under:

"Minutes of the Meeting:

01. An Anti Ragging Meeting was conducted on 01.05.2023, as per the Medical Council of India (Prevention and Prohibition of Ragging in Medical Colleges/Institutions) Regulations, 2009 amendments incorporated up to April, 2018.

02. All the matters of discipline within teaching institutions, must be resolved within the campus except those impinging on law and order or breach of peace or public tranquility, all of which should be dealt with under the penal laws of the land.

03. Hence, it was unanimously decided by the Anti Ragging Committee to inform the same to the candidate as the matter is not in the purview of the institution.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION:

DISCUSSION :

11. It is the specific case of the Petitioner that the Petitioner is a medical student of the 5th Respondent college and had been falsely implicated in Crime No.69 of 2023, dated 22.02.2023 of PS Matwada, under Section 306 read with 109, 354 IPC, Section 4(v) T.S .Prohibition of Ragging Act, Sec.3(1)(r), 3(1)(w)(ii), 3(2)(5) SC/ST (POA) Amendment Act, 2015 alleging

that the Petitioner was responsible for the alleged suicide of late Ms. Dharavath Preeti, a 1st year Post Graduate student (Anesthesia), Kakatiya Medical College and after the said alleged incident the Petitioner was arrested by the Police and remanded in the prison on 22.02.2023 and was enlarged on bail by the Court of II ADJ-cum-Special Court for SC/ST cases at Warangal on 20.04.2023. It is further the case of the Petitioner that after the release of the Petitioner in Judicial Remand, the Petitioner went to the college to attend regular classes and resume his routine academics, but the Petitioner was stopped from attending the classes and the Petitioner was informed that the Petitioner had been suspended on 04.03.2023 which was never communicated to the Petitioner till 23.05.2023. In response to the order of suspension dated 04.03.2023 issued by the 5th Respondent herein and served on the Petitioner on 23.05.2023, the Petitioner vide letter dated 02.06.2023 addressed to the 5th Respondent requested to reconsider the Petitioner's case and to revoke the suspension forthwith, the Petitioner clearly

in the said letter dated 02.06.2023 contended that the Petitioner is innocent and the Petitioner will prove his innocence before the Court of Law and that in all the proceedings held against the Petitioner including the enquiry conducted by the committee constituted by the college to enquire into the Petitioner's case that has decided to suspend the Petitioner, the Petitioner was never made a party nor an opportunity was given to the Petitioner to be heard and the same is in violation of principles of natural justice and hence the suspension of the Petitioner has to be set aside.

12. The Petitioner was further served with the impugned notice dated 09.06.2023 by the 5th Respondent herein vide Rc.No.145/ Peshi/2023, and a bare perusal of the same indicates that the Petitioner herein is suspended from 04.03.2023 for a period of one year and during the above period Petitioner is not permitted to attend the academics/theory practical classes, library or hostels and the said decision was taken on the recommendations of the Anti Ragging

Committee who had proposed one year suspension to the Petitioner herein from 04.03.2023, basing on their enquiry and understanding on the incident of alleged ragging of Dr.Preethi in which Dr. Preethi had suffered mental harassment by the Petitioner herein.

13. The Petitioner challenges the impugned notice dt. 09.06.2023 issued by the 5th Respondent vide Rc.No.145/ Peshi/2023, suspending the Petitioner from 04.03.2023 for a period of one year on the following grounds :

(i) It is passed in clear violation of principles of natural justice without notice to the Petitioner, without the Petitioner being provided with an opportunity of hearing before the Committee constituted by the 5th Respondent College to inquire into Petitioner's case, the inquiry having been conducted behind the back of the Petitioner.

(ii) The regulations in force as on date i.e., (Prevention and Prohibition of Ragging in Medical College/Institutions) 2021 had not been followed by the Anti Ragging Committee.

(iii) The decision of the Anti Ragging Committee was made on inquiry by HOD of

Anesthesia and the principles laid down under Regulation No.23 of the National Medical Commission (Prevention & Prohibition of Ragging in Medical Colleges and Institutions) Regulations 2021 had not been followed.

(iv) The impugned order of suspension was served on the Petitioner on 23.05.2023 whereas the Petitioner was suspended on 24.03.2023 itself and the said decision was taken behind the back of the Petitioner contrary to the procedure laid down in Regulation No.23 of the National Medical Commission (Prevention & Prohibition of Ragging in Medical Colleges and Institutions) Regulations 2021.

(v) The full findings of the Ragging Committee had not been served upon the Petitioner till as on date nor the Petitioner was given an opportunity to be heard.

14. Basing on the above said grounds the Petitioner pleaded that the Writ Petition should be allowed.

15. The counter affidavit filed by the Respondents in particular para 11 it is contended that a detailed inquiry was conducted by the HOD of Anesthesia and that the Petitioner was personally inquired by the Committee led by the Professor

of Anesthesia and 4 other Committee members on 21.02.2023 and submitted their report and there was no violation of Regulations 2021 or Regulation No.23 and Respondents further contended that there is no vested interest to the Respondents to punish the Petitioner and therefore the present Writ Petition needs to be dismissed since the same warrants no interference by this Court.

CONCLUSION :

16. A bare perusal of the proceedings dated 01.05.2023 of the 5th Respondent herein in Rc.No.115/Peshi/2023 (filed as material document exhibit P5 at page 29 of the writ papers filed by the Writ Petitioner) addressed to the Petitioner herein para 2 in particular clearly indicates that the inquiry was conducted as per Medical Council of India (Prevention and Prohibition of Ragging in Medical Colleges/ Institutions) Regulations 2009 Amendment incorporated up to April 2018.

17. A bare perusal of the contents of the Minutes of Meeting held on 01.05.2023 in the Principal Chamber,

KMC, Hanmakonda, at 3.00 p.m., towards Anti Ragging clearly indicates at Sl.No.1 in the minutes of the meeting that an Anti Ragging Meeting was conducted on 01.05.2023 as per the Medical Council of India (Prevention and Prohibition of Ragging in Medical Colleges/ Institutions) Regulations 2009 Amendment incorporated up to April 2018.

18. This Court opines that the specific averments made by the Respondents in the Counter Affidavit para 11 (ii) and (v) that there is no violation of Regulations 2021 and procedural guidelines or Regulation No.23 is totally a false statement on oath before this Court. The same is established beyond doubt on perusal of the minutes of the meeting held on 01.05.2023 and also on perusal of Ex.P5 i.e., letter Rc.No.115/Peshi/2023, dt. 01.05.2023 of the 5th Respondent addressed to the Petitioner herein.

19. A bare perusal of the members of the Anti Ragging Committee in the letter dated 03.03.2023, which is a letter by the 5th Respondent herein to the Supervisor-I

Anti Ragging Helpline University Grants Commission Net Bureau (filed as material document along with the counter filed by the Respondents herein at page 20), refers to a 14 Member Anti Ragging Committee and a clear finding arrived at and as reflected in the details of inquiry is that the Sub Inspector of Police has mentioned that it is only a suspicion of harassment by Dr. Saif and further referring to punishment in the said letter dt. 03.03.2023 it is clearly observed in conclusion portion that the Committee had not taken any decision regarding the punishment to the Petitioner i.e., till as on 03.03.2023, but strangely the Petitioner was suspended on 04.03.2023 itself.

20. This Court on perusal of record opines that the plea of the Respondents in the counter affidavit that the Principal and Anti Ragging Committee followed National Medical Commission (Prevention and Prohibition of Ragging in Medical College/Institutions) 2021 and further strictly followed all the procedural guidelines and Regulation No.23 is totally false and incorrect.

21. This Court on perusal of the record pertaining to the Members of the Committee as constituted and reflected in letters dated 03.03.2023, 01.05.2023, 01.06.2023 and 09.06.2023 clearly understands that the members are not the same in all the meetings held, and opines that admittedly Regulation No.23 had not been followed and the Head of the Institution had not constituted a specific committee to inquire into or investigate the incident of ragging as stipulated in Regulation 23 of National Medical Commission (Prevention and Prohibition of Ragging in Medical College/Institutions) 2021.

22. A bare perusal of the contents of the notice dt. 04.03.2023 issued by the 5th Respondent herein Rc.No.Speical/KMC/2023 clearly indicates that a detailed inquiry is conducted on 03.03.2023 into the subject issue and a conclusion arrived at "that there was mental harassment of Dr.Preethi by Dr.Saif but there was no physical or sexual harassment according to the inquiry" . But the said conclusion arrived at on 04.03.2023 is totally contrary to the findings and

observations in the 14-member committee report dt. 03.03.2023 which held that it is only a suspicion of harassment by the Petitioner.

23. A bare perusal of the contents of the letter dt. 22.06.2023 in Rc.No.Spl/KMC/2023 of the 5th Respondent (addressed to the learned Government Pleader, Medical, Health and Family Welfare, High Court of Telangana, Hyderabad) forwarded to the Court during the course of hearing at 4th para, it is observed as under :

"Since prima facie, Dr. Saif Ali was found guilty of harassment of Dr. Preethi and since police investigation is also going on, and there was a lot of political and public uproar on death of Dr. Preethi and might cause disturbance in the society if delayed in imposing punishment to Dr. Saif Ali, so the Principal has suspended for one year immediately on 09.06.2023 to subside the public uproar of death of a medical student".

24. The above para clearly indicates that the order impugned had been passed in the circumstances as explained by the 5th respondent in his letter dated 22.06.2023 contrary to the conclusion arrived at on

03.03.2023 by the 14-Member Anti Ragging Committee which clearly held that it is only a suspicion of harassment by the petitioner and as on 03.03.2023 the Anti-ragging Committee had not taken any decision regarding the punishment to Dr. Saif Ali, but however, suspended the Petitioner unilaterally from 04.03.2023 for a period of one year vide proceedings dated 09.06.2023 of the 5th Respondent herein in Rc.No.145/Peshi/2023 on the basis of an inquiry conducted in clear violation of principles of natural justice and without following the procedural guidelines as prescribed in National Medical Commission (Prevention and Prohibition of Ragging in Medical College/Institutions) Regulations 2021 and in particular Regulation 23.

25. The Apex Court in the judgment reported in (2013) 15 SCC 570 in Sumit Mehta vs. State of N.C.T. of Delhi at para 13 observed as under :

The law presumes an accused to be innocent till his guilt is proved. As a presumably innocent person, he is entitled to all the fundamental rights including the

right to liberty guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution.

26. The Full Bench of Apex Court in Judgment dt. 08.10.2020 reported in (2020) 10 SCC 670 in Ankita Kailash Khandelwal and Ors., vs. State of Maharashtra and Others at para 24 (b) observed as under :

“If the law presumes an accused to be innocent till his guilt is proved, the Appellants as presumably innocent persons, are entitled to all the fundamental rights including the right to liberty guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution and are entitled to pursue their course of study so long as exercise of said right does not hamper smooth conduct and progress of the prosecution.”

27. Taking into consideration the aforesaid facts and circumstances and the view taken by the Apex Court in the Judgments reported in (2013) 15 SCC 570 in Sumit Mehta vs. State of N.C.T. of Delhi and Full Bench of Apex Court in Judgment dated 08.10.2020 reported in (2020) 10 SCC 670 in Ankita Kailash Khandelwal and Ors., vs. State of Maharashtra and Others and also in view of the discussion and conclusion arrived at as above, the Writ

Petition is allowed as prayed for and the impugned notice dated 09.06.2023 in Rc.No.145/Peshi/ 2023 is set aside.

28. It is however open to the respondents to proceed afresh in the matter if the respondents intend to do so duly following the principles of natural justice by providing reasonable opportunity to the petitioner and following the procedural guidelines prescribed in National Medical Commission (prevention and Prohibition of Ragging in Medical Colleges/Institutions) Regulations, 2021, the governing Act as on date and in particular Regulation 23. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending, shall stand closed.

SUREPALLI NANDA, J

Date: 11.09.2023

Note: L.R.Copy to be marked.

b/o

kvrn