

**REPORT**

**ON**

*Ragging*

**MATTER / COMPLAINT RECEIVED FROM**

**S/SHRI JYOTI RANJAN AND VIVEK RANJAN  
DR. MGR EDUCATIONAL & RESEARCH INSTITUTE  
(Deemed to be University)**

**Submitted to University Grants Commission, New Delhi**

⊕ **Prof. P. Ramaih**  
Member

*Ranjit Singh*  
**Prof. Ranjit Singh**  
Member

*H. B. Sharma*  
**Shri. H. B. Sharma**  
Member-Secretary

*R. K. Kale*  
**Prof. R. K. Kale**  
Chairman

⊕ *Approved  
Letter attached.*

# Index

	<b>Page No.</b>
<b>I. Introduction</b>	<b>03</b>
<b>II. Summary of Deposition</b>	<b>04</b>
<b>III. Inquiry Reports</b>	<b>09</b>
<b>IV. Miscellaneous</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>V. Observation</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>VI. Conclusion</b>	<b>16</b>

REPORT ON MATTER / COMPLAINT RECEIVED FROM S/SHRI JYOTI  
RANJAN AND VIVEK RANJAN

I. Introduction

UGC vide letter of even No. dated 11<sup>th</sup> 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-5) 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 Chairman  
School of Life Sciences  
Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi – 110067.
- (b) Prof. P. Ramiah Member  
Former Rector  
Ambedkar Open University  
Hyderabad-500033
- (c) Prof. Ranjit Singh Member  
Director  
Netaji Subhash Institute of Technology  
Azad Hind Fauz Marg  
Sector-3, Dwarka, New Delhi – 110078
- (d) Shri H. B. Sharma Member-Secretary  
Under Secretary  
University Grants Commission  
Bahadurshah Zafar Marg  
New Delhi – 110002

The Expert Committee of UGC visited the Dr. MGR Educational and Research Institute (Dr. MGR Deemed to be University) on 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> January, 2009. On the first day i.e. 21<sup>st</sup> 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. Arvandan, Dean-Research
- 4) Dr. S. Dinakaran, Registrar
- 5) Dr. C. B. Pallnivelu, Add, Registrar
- 6) Dr. P. Sivakesan, Controller of Examinations
- 7) Dr. S. Sandilvelan, 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<sup>nd</sup> 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,

Ranjit Singh


- 301 -

the uncle of Shri Jyoti 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 committed 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 marksheets 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 1<sup>st</sup> 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 Vivke Ranjan and Shri Jyoti Ranjajn. 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 20<sup>th</sup> August, 2004 after both the events happened. Suspended students were asked to appear for personal inquiry before the committee alongwith their parents. All the students and their parents/guardians (excepy 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 opinioned 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.

*H. S. Kumar*

*Ranjit Singh*

*Dr. S. Dinakaran*

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 pared 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

*[Handwritten signature]*

*Ranjit Singh*

*[Handwritten signature]*

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 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Semesters. After personal discussion with him by Prof. Murli Krishna, Hod – EEE, he rectified his fault and started attending classes and labs in 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> 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 Ranjan 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.



205

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 inquiries 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 committee 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*



