



1

WP-26612-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT INDORE

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIJAY KUMAR SHUKLA

ON THE 11th OF JULY, 2025WRIT PETITION No. 26612 of 2025*DR. BHARAT SINGH**Versus**THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS AND OTHERS*

.....
Appearance:

Shri Vibhor Khandelwal - Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri Shrey Raj Saxena - Dy.A.G for the respondent/State.

Shri Abhinav Dhanodkar - Advocate for the respondent Nos.3&4.

.....

ORDER

In the instant petition, the petitioner who is holding the substantive post of Incharge Dean of Agriculture College, Indore has challenged the legality and validity of order dated 15/5/2025 passed by the State Government appointing the committee to make an enquiry on the complaint that University has made appointment of the petitioner in violation of Rules. The petitioner has further challenged the order passed by the State Government dated 7/7/2025/Annexure P-7 by which the University has been directed to conduct an independent enquiry in the matter of appointment of the petitioner keeping in view the recommendation of the committee which has been duly accorded administrative approval. The challenge has been made to the action of the State Government on the ground that State Government has no jurisdiction to interfere with the affairs of the University



and the impugned orders have been passed in violation of principles of nature justice.

2. Considering the aforesaid submissions, counsel for the State was directed to seek instruction that under what provisions of law, the aforesaid orders have been passed.

3. Counsel for the State submitted that the University is established under the provisions of Madhya Pradesh Rajmata Vijayaraje Sindhiya Krishi Vishwavidyalaya Adhiniyam, 2009. He drawn attention of this Court to Section 11 of the said Adhiniyam, 2009 which confers power to the State Government to call an inspection to the affairs of the university.

4. Counsel for the respondent further argued that the petition is premature as no cause of action has occurred so far. They further raised objection that the petitioner has not disclosed the source from where he got these internal correspondence between the State Government and the University as these orders are not addressed to the petitioner.

5. Per contra, counsel for the petitioner argued that Section 11 of the Adhiniyam, 2009 would not attract in the present case as the aforesaid provisions only confers power on the State Government to call an inspection in respect of infrastructure irregularities. He submitted that the order annexure P-1 was circulated amongst the students in the college and from there he got copy of the said order. He argued that as per the language of the order dated 7/7/2025 Annexure P-7, the State Government has passed mandatory directions to the university to transfer the petitioner to other agriculture college and to hold a detailed enquiry.



6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the orders Annexure P-1, Annexure P-6 & Annexure P-7, this Court finds that the State Government has only constituted a committee for making an enquiry on the complaint that university has made appointment of the petitioner in violation of the Rules. Annexure P-6 is a communication report by the Chairman of the Committee addressed to the State Government. Admittedly on the said recommendation, still no action has been taken by the State Government. Thus, from the record it is pellucid that no order has been passed by the competent authority of the university on the order of the State Government or on the recommendation of the committee. Further, the orders impugned have not been addressed to the petitioner. Thus, the petition is premature, hence, no interference is called for.

7. Accordingly, the petition being premature is hereby **dismissed**.

8. However, the competent authority will take action against the petitioner, if it so desires, in accordance with the law.

(VIJAY KUMAR SHUKLA)
JUDGE

PK