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I. Introduction

UGC vide letter of even No. dated 11th August, 2008 constituted a Expert Committee consisting of the followings, to look into the matter/complaint received from S/Shri Jyoti Ranjan and Vivek Ranjan forwarded by the Government of India, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of Higher Education, New Delhi, vide their letter No. F.9-9/2008 (U-S) dated 16.06.2008 regarding harassment case of two students who complained about ragging and are therefore being harassed by Dr. MGR Educational and Research Institute (Deemed University) Chennai – 600095:

(a) Prof. R. K. Kale
School of Life Sciences
Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi – 110067.

(b) Prof. P. Ramiah
Former Rector
Ambedkar Open University
Hyderabad-500033

(c) Prof. Ranjit Singh
Director
Netaji Subhash Institute of Technology
Azad Hind Fauz Marg
Sector-3, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110078

(d) Shri H. B. Sharma
Under Secretary
University Grants Commission
Bahadurshah Zafar Marg
New Delhi – 110002

Chairman
Member
Member
Member-Secretary

The Expert Committee of UGC visited the Dr. MGR Educational and Research Institute (Dr. MGR Deemed to be University) on 21st and 22nd January, 2009. On the first day i.e. 21st January, 2009 around 10 AM the UGC Expert Committee was received by Dr. M. K. Padmanabhan, Vice-Chancellor of the University. He briefed the committee about the incidence of ragging and matter/complaint made by S/Shri Jyoti Ranjan and Vivek Ranjan. Dr. G.C. Kothandan, Executive Director, Dr. S. Dinakaran, Registrar and other officials of the University were also present. The Committee requested the Vice-Chancellor to submit the note covering all the points made in his brief as well as other related documents. At the end of the meeting,
the Chairman of the UGC Committee expressed grateful thanks to the Vice-Chancellor for welcoming them and then requested him to provide the suitable place where it can conduct the proceedings of enquiry. Then, the committee shifted to the separate hall for the same. The following officials deposed before the committee.

1) Dr. G. C. Kothandan, Executive Director
2) Dr. P. Kaliyaperumal, Dean-purchase
3) Dr. P. Arvindan, Dean-Research
4) Dr. S. Dinakaran, Registrar
5) Dr. C. B. Pallinivelu, Add, Registrar
6) Dr. P. Sivakesan, Controller of Examinations
7) Dr. S. Sandivelan, Dean E&T
8) Shri. K. Gurunathan, Estate Officer
9) HoD, Bio-Technology
10) Shri. L. Ramesh, HoD, EEE
11) Shri. S. Balakrishan, Examination Cell

The Committee asked the Vice-Chancellor that he should make sure to send any person serving in the University when called for the deposition as a witness or for cross examination or for any other purposes related to the inquiry.

Both, S/Shri. Jyoti Ranjan and Vivek Ranjan appeared before the committee on the 22\textsuperscript{nd} January, 2009. The committee assured them full cooperation in conducting the proceedings. They were told to give all information and evidences which they have. They were also told not to have any hesitation or fear while deposition and can take as much time as they wanted/needed. Further, it was informed to them that they can call anybody as a witness or for the cross-examination or to get any other information/clarification related to this case.

II. Summary of the Depositions

(1) **Shri Jyoti Ranjan**: In his deposition, Shri. Jyoti Ranjan stated that Shri. Tanamay Sinha ragged by 10 students on 18.04.04 and kidnapped on 19.04.04. Shri. Ranjan reported the matter to the police station with prior intimation to the Dean of the Discipline, mentioning therein the names of the ten students who were alleged to be involved in the act of ragging and kidnapping. He stated that the parents of these ten students were intimated and invited to attend the meeting with the Inquiry Committee, which was enquiring these incidences. Accordingly, the parents of the students came and deposed before the committee. Thereafter, the University revoked the suspension of the ten students concerned immediately. Further, Shri. Jyoti Ranjan Stated that their parents were not invited even after their repeated request. In the month of February, 2005 a letter was sent to Shri. Surya Nandan Sinha, the father of Shri. Jyoti Ranjan. Shri. B. P. N. Sinha,
the uncle of Shri Jyoit Ranjan and others came to meet the Inquiry Committee. However, Dr. Bhawanishankar, chairman of the Inquiry Committee remained absent without giving any intimation to the students concerned and their parents. The college management asked these student, Shri Jyoti Ranjan and Vivek Ranjan to sign blank paper and also tried to get apology from them. These two students viz. S/Shri Jyoti Ranjan and Vivek Ranjan approached the State Human Rights Commission, Chennai for justice. The college also forced them to take back case reported to the police station. The inquiry committee of the college looking into the matter of the ragging and kidnapping did not inform the suspension of these two students to the respective Department of the college where they were registered, which caused lot of chaos in their academic activities. As a result they could not appear in the semester examinations in time. Apart from this, it was alleged by the college that Shri Jyoti Ranjan was involved in malpractice in Neural Network course. He subsequently tried to appear, since he need the certificate, in the re-examination on the request of the college management. However, the college returned his letters and examination form along with the examination fee. At the end of the deposition, Shri. Jyoti Ranjan thanked the UGC Committee for patient hearing and its concern. He also mentioned that he did not want to invite anybody as witness or for cross-examination.

(2) Shri Vivek Ranjan: After narrating the incidence of ragging and kidnapping of Mr. Tanamay Sinha on 18.08.04 and 19.08.04 respectively, he informed the committee that he was not a complainant but a prime evidence (prime evidence means a prime witness). He mentioned that the charge leveled by the Dr. MGR University was completely vague. Accordingly to him, he brought Mr. Tanamay Sinha back from the lonely place/highway. As far as a course called BMA 101 Mathematics-I is concerned he got ‘B Grade’ when Kuruvilla was CoE. Since, as a practice college dispersed the marksheet only after one year (approx), as a result he did not get printed result and in the meantime he was suspended. Although he requested for the marksheet, the same was denied by the University. On revoking the suspension, he requested for the same but was informed that it was lost in the flood. He further mentioned that, in its representation dated 16.04.08 the college has clearly written to the Raghvan Committee that he passed in BMA 101 course. But still the Duplicate Marksheet reads as “F” Grade in this subject. He was forced to reappear BMA 101 paper again. He mentioned that in meantime this course was coded as BMA 103 in the second semester, in which he scored “A” Grade. He submitted this information to UGC, MHRD and Raghvan Committee when he made a representation to these organizations. He stated that the marksheet for 1st Semester was lost by the class coordinator and he was not liable to rewrite the examination. Mr. Balakrishnan, to whom they referred as Bala from Examination Cell, was cross examined. Shri. Vivek Ranjan stated that Shri. Bala was confused and puzzled.

(3) Dr. K. C. Kothandan, Executive Director: He stated that he joined the University in the month of February, 2005 and had no personal knowledge about the so called ragging incident which appeared earlier. He came to know about the same only through the existing file.

Accordingly to him Shri. Jyoti Ranjan and Vivek Ranjan approached him with a letter regarding the suspension and requesting to revoke it. Since the letter was addressed to the Chancellor, he
directly approached the Chancellor and after discussing, he revoked the suspension of three students on 26.03.2005 namely, Shri Jyoti Ranjan, Shri Vivek Ranjan and Shri Tanamay Sinha.

(4) Dr. M. K. Padmanabhan, Vice-Chancellor: Although Dr. Padmanabhan, vice-chancellor briefed the committee about the incidence of ragging and kidnapping after receiving the committee, he submitted a note on certain financial fraud committed by Shri Vivek Ranjan with regards to Canera Bank, Bakaro Steel City. He mentioned that Shri Vivek Ranjan was involved in a forgery case and try to emphasis that Shri Vivek Ranajan is history-sheeter.

(5) Dr. Kaliyaperumal: He did not give any additional information.

(6) Dr. P. Arvindan: The same as in the case of Dr. Kaliyaperumal.

(7) Dr. S. Dinakaran, Registrar: He stated that he assume the office of the Registrar on 01.06.2006. The entire episode took place before his joining. He has no personal knowledge about the episode that had happened in respect of Shri Vivek Ranjan and Shri Jyoti Ranjain. According to him, as a Registrar he issued course completion certificate to both of these students since they had completed the duration of four years of B.Tech programme. However, the Registrar presented the case study on Shri Jyoti Ranjan and Vivek Ranjan on ragging incident. As per his presentation, Jyoti Ranjan presented his petition to Dean (CPD) on 20.08.2004 complaining that his younger brother Shri Tanamay Sinha was ragged by 10 students on 18.08.2004 and presented the list of those supposed to have ragged Shri Tanamay Sinha. He further stated that Shri Tanamay Sinha kidnapped on 19.08.04. Based on this complaint the ten students immediately placed under suspension w.e.f. 20.08.2004 and Inquiry Committee was constituted to look into the case. The complaint was given to the college only on 20th August, 2004 after both the events happened. Suspended students were asked to appear for personal inquiry before the committee along with their parents. All the students and their parents/guardians (except Gyan Vardhan Jha) appeared before the committee. Shri Jyoti Ranjan, Vivek Ranjan and Tanmay Sinha were also asked to appear before committee. Students and their parents were asked to submit their written statements. During the questioning of Shri Jyoti Ranjan, the complainant, he mentioned that rightly or wrongly, we have compromised. Nearly 6 out of 10 students who were supposed to have ragged, completely denied the allegation and said that they were in various places at the time of ragging. It was brought to the notice of the committee that the students who supposed to have ragged, had prior history of quarrel and unpleasant incidents with Jyoti Ranjan and Vivek Ranjan. The Registrar also requested to take note that inquiry committee of college had concluded that the allegations of ragging were false and charge was not proved. Further the case of kidnapped was also false and the charge was not proved. The college inquiry committee opined that all the so called incidents where due to certain enmity and misunderstanding among the 13 (10+3) students. The committee was of the view that suitable punishment may be awarded to these 13 students for the act of commission and omission. The committee had a discussion with students and parents. The parents gave undertaking that they would ensure that their wards would be fully discipline during their studies in the university. Based on this assurance and discussions the suspension of these 10 students was revoked and allow to attend classes.
Due to the allegations made against complainants by 10 students and their parents, yet another committee of two members namely Prof. R. Bhawanishankar, Dean (CPD) and Mr. K. Gurunathan, Chief Controller was constituted. At this time the 3 students viz. Jyoti Ranjan, Vivek Ranjan and Tanamay Sinha were suspended w.e.f. 19.10.2004. Since these 3 students failed to bring their parents for the meeting with the inquiry committee, they were kept under suspension. However, later on the management took a review, on its own, in the interest of the 2 students and revoked their suspension.

The Registrar also submitted another note related to the claim of Vivek Ranjan that he passed with Grade A in first Semester, Mathematic Paper (BMA 101) but was marked “F” in the original grade sheet. According to the note of the Registrar, Vivek Ranjan should have appeared for BMA 103 (the relevant Maths paper meant for B.Tech – Industrial Bio-Technology, but wrote BMA 101). In the next exam he was actually absent (marked in Grade sheet as AB), but has erased the B and produced a Xerox copy as if he has secured grade ‘A’. when he was asked to produce the original he never brought it (though he claim that he has shown us personally). The Registrar refuted the claim of Vivek Ranjan. According to the Registrar, if the corresponding credits were obtained by Vivek Ranjan it could be inferred as follows:

Total Credit of the certificate No. 27185 comes to 19
Total Credits of the certificate No.06785 comes to 46 (with Absent “AB”)
If it was Grade ‘A’ the credits should come to 50 (the credit points will be adding only when the subjects are passed by the student)

(8) Dr. P. Sivakesan, Controller of Examination : He brought the following point to the notice of the UGC Expert Committee. At the beginning of the University during 2003-04, the examination applications were filled only by the candidates. In December, 2006 he (Vivek Ranjan) wrote the paper 101 Mathematics −I and failed. In May 2007 he wrote the paper BMA 103 −Bio-Mathematics but failed. Vivek Ranjan has not applied for November 2007 examination. Both the candidates applied for May 2008 examinations but not appeared for the examination. Jyoti Ranjan had appeared for Neural Networks on 24.05.07 and committed a malpractice. Every semester time table is published on the internet.

(9) Shri Gurunathan, Estate Officer : In connection with the ragging the identification parade was conducted and Tanamay Sinha identified 10 suspended students. The identified students, when appeared before the inquiry committee, produced recorded evidence in this connection, ten student mentioned that at the time of ragging they all were outside and none were on the spot. Tanamay Sinha failed to produce either any recordable evidence or any eye-witness to this regards and hence the committee in their finding stated that ragging was not proved. In connection with the kidnapping incident, Tanamay Sinha or Jyoti Ranjan or Vivek Ranjan did not produce any documental evidence or any eye-witnesses or any proof in this regards and also not indicated any particular person. Further, Jyoti Ranjan had not produced an auto-rickshaw with
Driver No. or not identified the kidnapping van used in this matter. Hence, the committee in their findings stated that kidnapping was not proved. The committee was in the opinion that all the so called incidences were due to certain enmity and misunderstanding among the 13 students. The committee was of the view that suitable punishment could be awarded to the 13 students for the act of Commission and Omission.

(10) **HoD, Bio-Technology**: Vivek Ranjan was irregular in the class and would not attend cycle tests regularly. He was prone to missing classes and producing letters of participation in national conferences.

(11) **Shri S. Balakrishnan, Examination Cell**: As per the request of the candidate Vivek Ranjan, the HoD of IBT Department issued the provisional grade sheet on 28.03.2006 clearly state that he was AB (Absent) in BMA 101. Further, he stated that Vivek Ranjan secure 19 credits in the first semester and 46 credits (both 1st & 2nd Semester) if he had passed the paper BMA 101, he should have 50 credits. This was also made clear the evidence that he did not appear for the paper BMA 101 (Absent).

(12) **Shri L. Ramesh, HoD – EEE**: in the opinions of the Department Jyoti Ranjan was irregular in attending classes and labs in 3rd, 4th and 6th Semesters. After personal discussion with him by Prof. Murli Krishna, HoD – EEE, he rectified his fault and started attending classes and labs in 6th, 7th and 8th Semester. He suspended from the University against ragging complaint. He completed his project in final semester.

(13) **Note from the Former Vice-Chancellor, Prof. R. M. Vasagam**: Prof. Vasagam was the Vice-Chancellor of the Dr. MGR University. During his period the incident of ragging and kidnapping took place. He was requested by the present Vice-Chancellor of Dr. MGR University to come down to Chennai and meet the UGC Committee. He claimed that no seats were available in the flight and he could not made it and he submitted his note through the present vice-chancellor.

Prof. Vasagam is also presently the vice-president (Administration) of the Dr. MGR Educational and Research Institute. He claimed the familiarity with the case of Mr. Jyoti Ranjan and Vivek Ranjan. He stated the following in his note:

Very detailed and extensive inquiry was conducted by the first committee into this incident and based on the interviews held with the batch of 10 students who were supposed to have ragged Tanamay Sinha and also inquiring in full about the case of kidnapping alleged by Tanamay Sinha. He agreed with the recommendation of the committee that this was an unfair case foisted by Jyoti Ranjan / Vivek Ranjan on these 10 students. The inquiry clearly revealed that there were prior cases of quarrel and enmity between these students and Jyoti Ranjan / Vivek Ranajan and this has resulted in an unfair allegation of ragging and kidnapping on the batch of 10 students. The first inquiry committee of the MGR University had observed that there was no prima-facie case to prove either of the allegations.
The former vice-chancellor further mentioned that a number of unfair practices were followed by Mr. Jyoti Ranjan / Vivek Ranjan including a case of bank forgery wherein they clearly forged the letter head of Cannara Bank, Bokaro Steel City, asking the university to pay an amount of Rs.24000/- directly to Vivek Ranjan. On verification with the bank it was found to be a forged letter.

At the end of the period of third inquiry, in spite of the fact the inquiry committee wanted to take a serious action against them, the university revoked the suspension and also treated leave of absentee during suspension as if they have attended and allowed them to write the examination. The fees paid for the third semester for practical and theory, was adjusted as special case. They were given additional opportunity to take internal assessment as a special case to qualify for the fourth semester.

III. Inquiry Reports

During the proceedings it came to the notice of the UGC committee that Dr. MGR University conducted 3 inquires on the matter relate to the ragging / kidnapping and on representation of S/Shri Jyoti Ranjan and Vivek Ranjan. The UGC Committee asked the University committee to submit the copies of reports of all the three inquiry committees.

1. First Inquiry Committee: Based on the complaint about the ragging and kidnapping incident on 18.08.2004 and 19.08.2004 respectively, the ten students mentioned in the complaint were immediately placed under the suspension w.e.f. 20.08.2004 (date of the complaint). Three member inquiry committee were constituted to look into this matter. The students concerned were asked to appear before the inquiry committed along with their parents. On the deposition of the all students concerned and parents of the 10 suspended students, it was concluded that

"the committee is of the opinion that all the so called incidences are due to certain enmity and misunderstanding among 13 students, the committee is in that view that the suitable punishment may be awarded to the 13 students for their act of commission and omission".

UGC committee also noted the following statements in the section, “Findings of the Inquiry Committee” (constituted by the Dr. MGR University) that,

"even though the so called victim has identified all the suspected 10 students of indulging in ragging on Tanamay Sinha, there was no evidence to prove the charges. Hence, this allegation is false and the charges is not proved."

"Similarly, in the case of so called kidnapping incident on 19.08.2004, the victim has also not identified any of the ten suspended students and there is a no documentary evidence or any
other evidence produced either by Tanamay Sinha or Jyoti Ranjan the complainant to prove this allegation. “

2. **Second Inquiry Committee** : in the circular of the Dr. MGR University dated 19th October, it is stated that in order to explore further truth in the case of the suspension order on the 10 students was not revoked and their suspension continued to unearth the facts of the case. In case of 3 students, who had registered a complaint were also suspended till inquiry is completed and notified through circular of 19th October 2004. Accordingly, the two member committee was constituted through the same circular. The 3 students (S/shri Jyoti Ranjan, Vivek Ranjan and Tanamay Sinha) were asked to meet this two member committee along with parents only. The silent feature of the findings of this inquiry committee is given below:

The committee looked into the findings of the first constituted inquiry committee against the 10 students based on the representation from Jyoti / Vivek Ranjan. The committee noted the observation of the first inquiry committee that the case of ragging as well as abduction were false and charges were not proved. It is further noted that the so called incidences were due to certain enmity and misunderstanding among the 13 students. Based on the deposition of students and their parents before the first inquiry committee drawn certain firm conclusions. The second inquiry committee also agreed with the findings and conclusions of the first inquiry committee that there had been number of incidences of quarrel and enmity between the 10 students alleged for ragging against Jyoti / Vivek Ranjan. To substantiate this point, the second inquiry committee had chosen some of the samples from the proceedings of the first inquiry committee, particularly the statements of parents of the 10 suspended students.

It is mentioned in the proceeding of second committee that it had extensive discussions and perused all the files and recordings in great depth and prima-facie established the view that both Mr. Vivek Ranjan and Jyoti Ranjan are not at all innocent and they had unnecessarily foisted a false case of ragging and abduction. Mr. Tanmay Sinha had also colluded with the others because he was living in their room and purportedly related.

3. **Third Inquiry Committee** : After the revocation of suspension of S/shri Jyoti & Vivek Ranjan on 29.03.05, both these students approached the university authority on 14th April, 2005 with the request to allot the Internal for 3rd and 4th Semester as soon as possible to avoid their academic losses. As a follow up, the university appointed the (third) committee to consider their representation and to make recommendations for the further action.

The committee considered the representation of above mentioned two students and the request was discussed and the following decisions were taken.

(i) The Students can take 3rd Semester arrear papers examination
(ii) The students are allowed to take 4th Semester pending papers both practical and theory papers.
(iii) Fees paid for the 3rd semester practical and theory will be adjusted as a special case.
(iv) Examination fees for both practical and theory for IVth Semester to be paid by students immediately.
(v) The students have to take internal assessments examination to qualify for 4th semester.
(vi) This decision is taken on the basis of the written letter submitted by the students
assuring that they will take all the exams together as per our schedule.

IV. Miscellaneous

The UGC Committee carefully gone through all other material provided by the UGC, Dr. MGR University and S/shri Jyoti Ranjan and Vivek Ranjan. These sources have been cited / mentioned / used wherever they were required during the writing of this report.

V. Observations

1. As soon as the complaint of ragging and kidnapping of Mr. Tanamay Sinha was brought to the notice of the university, the ten students allegedly involved in this incident were immediately placed under suspension. This prompt action of the university is very appreciable.

2. University also constituted the inquiry committee immediately to look into the matter related to ragging and kidnapping.

3. It is quite clear from the proceedings of the first inquiry committee that the parents of the ten suspended students were also asked to appear before the committee. The UGC expert committee failed to understand the logic behind inviting the parents of the concerned students as they were not witness to the incident of ragging and kidnapping.

4. This act of the inquiry committee inviting the parents to depose before the inquiry committee was procedurally wrong. Indeed, involving the parents might have hampered finding the truth as no ward is likely to accept his misconduct in the presence of the parents.

5. It appears from the deposition of the parents that they were at the forefront to defend and testify the good conduct and behaviour of their wards. Further it appeared that the deposition of the parents created the fear-psychosis in the mind of the students and authorities of the University.

6. Although, the second inquiry committee was constituted to unearth the truth of the case they have just gone through the proceeding of the first inquiry committee and some of the files. The committee reiterated the findings of the earlier committee and also concluded it that the three students were not innocent and allegation made by them were false. Surprisingly, they have not provided any new convincing evidence to draw such conclusion.

[Signatures]
7. On the findings of the first inquiry committee, the university could have taken a suitable action against the erring students and the matter should have ended here only. The continuance of the suspension of the three students namely Jyoti Ranjan, Vivek Ranaján and Tanamay Sinha after the first inquiry, and constitution of the second committee adversely affected the academic pursuits and career of the concerned students.

8. Again coming back to first inquiry committee, the so called victim was consistently asked to produce evidence or witness that he was ragged. Tanmay was the only person allegedly ragged by the 10 students. In such situation how it was possible for Tanamay to provide the documentary evidence or the witness. Therefore, inference drawn by the first inquiry committee that the charge of ragging was not proved, appear to be on the vague ground. However, on the other hand the oral deposition of parents (who were not witnesses to the incidences) probably was given more weightage and in turn it influenced the findings, inference and conclusions of the first inquiry committee.

9. The parents of the 10 students alleged to be involved in ragging / kidnapping, appeared before the first inquiry committee and gave the statements. The second inquiry committee considered / treated these statements as a complaints against S/shir. Jyoti Ranjan and Vivek Ranaján. The second inquiry committee was constituted to unearth the facts related to ragging / kidnapping case. Since it has limited terms and conditions, the UGC Committee failed to understand the reason to dig out old files containing some information relate to behavior / conduct of S/shri Jyoti Ranjan and Vivek Ranaján. Had these two students been involved in the act of indiscipline in the past, the university should have dealt with such cases / incidents administratively or through the separate inquiry committee by giving the specific terms and references. From the Recording of the second inquiry committee, submitted to the UGC Committee, one gets the impression that the second inquiry committee made an attempt to show these students as history-sheeter. This possibility is also supported by the notes submitted to the UGC Committee by the former as well as present vice-chancellor. It also appeared that the second inquiry committee exceeded its brief. The committee should have confined its work to find the truth related to the incident of ragging and kidnapping.

10. One of the conclusion of the first inquiry committee was that the incidence of ragging / kidnapping was not proved. However, it does not mean the case was false or ragging / kidnapping did not take place. In the light of this, the suspension of Jyoti and Vivek Ranjan, probably could not be justified as the university did not provide the compelling reasons to take such harsh action.

11. It is stated in the presentation of the case study by the university before the UGC Committee that all the students and their parents were worried that continued presence of Jyoti Ranjan and Vivek Ranjan in the University would not guaranty the safety of the students and create a congenial atmosphere for study over the next two to three years. Instead of assuring, the parents and the students about the safety, the management of the university was in agreement
with the perception of students and parents and preferred to keep these two students under suspension. It is difficult to believe that the institute such as Dr. MGR University could not deal with the undisciplined behavior (?) of two students.

12. According to the University, the period of perception of worries was over two to three years. How it disappeared within about six months and resulted into revocation of suspension of S/shri Jyoti and Vivek Ranjan. The revocation was suggestive of the wrong perception of the university and decision to suspend S/shri Jyoti and Vivek Ranjan was perhaps taken under the pressure of parents. However, the university has clarified that decision to revoke the suspension of S/shri Jyoti and Vivek Ranjan was taken keeping the interest on future of these two students in mind. If it were true, then the university should have kept the interest and future of these two students in mind before placing them under suspension or keeping them under suspension. On the other hand, S/shri. Jyoti Ranjan and Vivek Ranjan attributed revocation to their appeal for justice to the State Human Rights Commission, Chennai. The UGC Committee has no reason to disbelieve them.

13. In the presentation, the university mentioned that the (first) inquiry “committee has concluded that the allegation or ragging is false and the charge could not proved. Further the case of kidnapping is also false and the charge was not proved”. Indeed this statement is part of the ‘findings’ and not the part of ‘conclusion’. However, this findings of the first committee appears to be contradictory. If the allegation of ragging was false then the matter was crystal clear and there was nothing more to prove. And if, the charge is not proved then it does not mean that the incident of ragging did not take place. The same is applicable in case of kidnapping.

14. While highlighting the above facts, it was not the intention of the UGC Committee to argue or to agree or disagree with the university but to understand the all aspects of the case. Perhaps, as stated elsewhere, it would have been wise, had the university taken the findings and conclusions of the first inquiry committee to its logical end, it would have avoided the problem of defending, arguing and counter arguing the matter related to the case of ragging / kidnapping and alleged harassments to the students.

15. During the deposition of the Registrar before the UGC Committee, he stated that he issued Course Completion Certificate to Shri Jyoti Ranajan and Vivek Ranajan since they had completed the duration of four years of B.Tech. Programme. It appeared to be contradictory as University is stating that these two students have not completed the courses and they are supposed to clear one course. When students were pleading that they have cleared all the courses and asking for Degree Certificate, they are not ‘technically’ wrong.

16. It is quite appreciable that the Chancellor had appointed (third) committee to consider the representation of S/shri Jyoti Ranjan and Vivek Ranjan. The committee was also asked to make recommendations for the future action. Through this committee the university tried to help the
students to complete their courses by allowing them to take examinations. This gesture of the university is praiseworthy.

17. The UGC committee was provided the background information by the UGC in the form of documents. On going through these documents, certain contradictory/misrepresentations were noticed. For example, Dr. MGR University in its letter dated 05.08.2008 and 27.08.2008 written to the secretary, UGC and Joint-Secretary, UGC respectively, mentioned that “The duly appointed inquiry committee has found both the students guilty of ragging” (letter dated 27.08.2008). In another letter dated 05.08.08 is also stated that, “After due inquiry they both (S/Shri Jyoti Ranajan and Vivek Ranjan) were found to be guilty of committing the act of ragging”. These two statements carrying the same meaning contradict the findings and conclusions of the (first) Inquiry Committee set up by the University. Indeed, the one students mentioned above was complainant and other was witness (directly/indirectly in kidnapping case). The (first) inquiry committee has found that the charge was false and ragging / kidnapping were not proved and that there was enmity among the students. This was an act of omission and commission as mentioned elsewhere in the present report.

18. In the letter written by Executive Director of Dr. MGR University, on 27.08.2008 to Dr. K. P. Singh, Joint Secretary, UGC: it is stated that, “Sending intimation of examinations Scheme / Schedule to out station students is not practice in any educational institution. In fact, it is in their own interest to contact fellow students or University Office. It is our practice to notify everything through the institute / university notice boards. The University office at Campus is also helpful in such matters.” There should have been institutional mechanism in the university to inform the outstation students about the exams schedule and other academic related matters. Indeed, had this mechanism been in practice, the present chaotic situation would not have arisen. The absence of such mechanism landed Dr. MGR University as well as concerned student in the present tangle. Since our country is geographically widespread it becomes difficult to move from one place to another place with a short notice and more so for the students.

The Controller of Examination, Dr. MGR University submitted in writing that every year University uploads the Examination Time Table on the internet as well as on university notice board. Surprisingly this part is not reflected in the above mention letter dated 27.08.2008 and it is difficult to understand the inconsistency on the part of the University in presenting this case.

19. Mr Jyoti Ranjan appeared in the ‘Neural Network’ paper but the result was withheld on the ground of Malpractice in the examination, which was reported by the Invigilator. According to report of the Invigilator, Mr. Jyoti Ranjan was found coping from a paper by keeping under his answer paper. On being caught, Jyoti Ranjan threw the paper out of the window. He also refused to give in writing and left the answersheet on his desk and walked out of the hall. Although, the Invigilator dutifully reported the matter, this act of Mr. Jyoti Ranjan could not be term, ‘technically’, as malpractice. Because the invigilator was not able to take anything in writing from him neither he could procure a piece of paper from which he was coping.
20. According to the University, Vivek Ranjan was supposed to appear in subject 'Mathematics' having code no. BMA 103. Instead he appeared in January, 2004 for the Code No. 101 which is also a Mathematics paper meant for other Engineering paper and he passed same. It is unbelievable that the university permitted / allowed Vivek Ranjan to appear in wrong paper. This should have immediately came/brought to the notice of the authority of the University by the concerned people. By allowing to write wrong paper, university has invited problem for itself as well as for the student.

21. There are series of arguments and counter arguments related to examinations and results involving above two students, as a result, the matter became so complicated and complex un-enabling the UGC committee to draw any firm conclusion in this regard. Both the parties were mainly argued through logic.

22. According to the University, Shri Vivek Ranjan instead of appearing for Mathematics Code 103, he appeared for Code No. 101 in January 2004, which was also a Mathematics paper meant for other Engineering Branches. Its syllabus was also different. He passed this paper Code No. 101. In December 2006, he wrote the BMA 101 Mathematics and failed. In May 2007, he wrote BMA 103 Bio-Mathematics but failed. Shri Vivek Ranjan did not apply for November 2007 examination. Again he applied for May 2008 examination but did not appear. In view of above, it seemed that Vivek Ranjan not cleared/passed the relevant paper, and he applied/appeared in subsequent examinations. Therefore, it is perhaps not correct on part of Vivek Ranjan to claim that he cleared/passed BMA 101 (relevant subject) which was recoded as BMA 103. If he was sure that he passed in a relevant course with Code BMA 101 then he should have refused to apply or appear subsequently in BMA 101 or BMA 103.

23. The University stated that Mr. Vivek Ranjan appeared in January 2004 examination in paper with Code No. 101 instead of paper Code No. 103. In subsequent examination he was marked absent "AB". According to the University he fabricated the Grade Sheet particularly the letter "AB" as "A" removing "B" from the Marksheet and took Xerox copy of it and claimed that he had passed the subject with "A" grade. He failed to produce the Original Marksheet or Marks statement for verification. Further, if he had passed paper Mathematics Code 103 the total credits would have been 50 and not 46. The Xerox copy submitted by him states only 46 credits. On the other hand Shri Vivek Ranjan claimed that he had submitted the original marksheet to Mr. Bala working in examination cell, for correction. However, Mr. Bala denied this during the cross-examination.

The clarification given by the University appear to be logically correct. Since the UGC Committee could not see the original marksheet it was difficult for it to draw any firm conclusion. In the statement given by the Controller of Examinations, it is mentioned that Shri. Jyoti Ranjan appeared for Neural Network-BEEE10 on 24.05.07 and committed a malpractice. Although, Shri Jyoti Ranjan has claimed elsewhere he was shocked by the allegation of malpractice and also
stated that he can neither "FAIL" nor he can commit any act of malpractice. But subsequently, he applied for May 2008 examination but did not appear.

This background suggested that Mr. Jyoti Ranjan yet to clear/pass Neural Network paper –BEEE 10.

VI. Conclusion

1. Dr. MGR University promptly took notice and constituted the committee to look into the matter related to ragging and kidnapping. However, subsequently it did not handle this incident and follow up actions with care which adversely affected the academic pursuits of three students. While probing the incident of ragging and kidnapping, the inquiry committee invited the parents of the concerned students involved in this incident, for deposition. The UGC Committee felt that the appearance of the parents before the inquiry committee influenced the outcome of the inquiry. Although, the University was within its rights to contact the parents of concerned students and informed them about incident and involvement of their wards in the incident and even to discuss the matter to find out the solution to discipline the concerned students etc., it was not perhaps wise decision to invite them to appear before the inquiry committee as they were not witness to the incident. This invitation helped them to advocate/plead before the committee to prove the innocence of their wards. Further, the students allegedly involved in ragging/kidnapping were not likely to tell the truth in the presence of their parents out of fear. Therefore, there is a reason to believe that the presence of parents during the proceedings of the inquiry committee as well as their appearance before the committee made all the difference.

2. Further, perhaps there were no compelling reasons or sufficient ground to suspend first these three students and then keep them under suspension for longer period as they were either complainant, victim or witness to the incident. This action also created chaotic situation and disturbed their academic activities.

3. During the presentation, the University projected S/shri Jyoti Ranjan and Vivek Ranjan as a problematic and undisciplined students. Indeed the university should have taken right action at right time against their undisciplined behavior, if found, administratively or through other available mechanisms.

4. The matter related to incident of ragging / kidnapping should have ended with taking the findings/recommendations of the first inquiry committee to the logical end. Instead, the university converted solution into problem as it preferred to appoint second inquiry committee, which dug out the old graves and treated the deposition of parents before the first inquiry committee as complaints against S/shri Jyoti Ranjan and Vivek Ranjan and tried
to project them as habitual problematic and undisciplined. The second inquiry committee also tried to prove that they foisted a false case of ragging and abduction.

5. The university records as well as repeatedly submitting the examination forms or appearing for the examination by S/shri Jyoti Ranjan and Vivek Ranjan suggested that both have to clear / pass BEE 10 – Neural Network and BMA 103 (old Code No. BMA 101) – Mathematics respectively, and still the university had given them the Course Completion Certificate.

6. In addition, after going through carefully, all the documents provided by the UGC, Dr. MGR University and two concerned students as well as statements given by the all deponents, the UGC Committee perceived that academic pursuits and in-turn career of S/shri Jyoti Ranjan and Vivek Ranjan were determinately affected due to mishandling of the incident of ragging/kidnapping and subsequent fall-out. Shri Tanmay Sinha, so called victim, has to discontinue his study and leave the Dr. MGR University.
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