

**HON'BLE CHANCELLOR, NATIONAL LAW UNIVERSITY, JODHPUR,
RAJASTHAN**

[REDACTED], [REDACTED] Student of Semester V, B.A.
LL.B. (Hons.), National Law University, Jodhpur.

---Appellant

Versus

1. National Law University, Jodhpur, through its Registrar, National Law University, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
2. Anti-Ragging Committee, National Law University, Jodhpur, through its Chairman.
3. Anti-Ragging Squad, National Law University, Jodhpur, through its Chairperson.

--Respondents

[REDACTED] appellant-student.
Mr.Mudit Nagpal with Mr. Nishant Gaba, Advocate for appellant-student.

Dr. Sunita Pankaj, Registrar, NLU, Jodhpur.
Prof. (Dr.) Shilohu Rao (Law), Professor – Chairperson of Anti-ragging
Committee, NLU, Jodhpur.

HON'BLE THE CHANCELLOR

ORDER

06/10/2026

1. The appellant, who is a student of 3rd Year V-Semester, B.A. LL.B. (Hons.) has preferred this appeal under Regulation 9.1(c) (ii) of the UGC Regulations on Curbing the Menace of Ragging in Higher Educational Institutions, 2009, against the office order dated 20.08.2026, by which the Registrar, National Law University, Jodhpur has passed the following order against him:

"NLU/JODH/ARC01/2026/8865-8876 Date : 20/08/2026

OFFICE ORDER

Subject : Execution of Disciplinary Action and Sanctions against [REDACTED] pursuant to the Decision and Order of the Anti-Ragging Committee (Complaint No.RJ_0262).

Whereas, Complaint No.RJ_0262 regarding an incident of ragging was received from the National Anti-Ragging Helpline (UGC) and referred for a detailed enquiry under the UGC Regulations on Curbing the Menace of Ragging in Higher Educational Institutions, 2009;

And whereas, the Anti-Ragging Committee of National Law University, Jodhpur, in its meeting held on 12.08.2026, duly considered the Inquiry Report of the Anti-Ragging Squad, the medical reports, show-cause notices, written replies, and oral submissions made during the personal hearing;

And whereas, the Anti-Ragging Committee has established the charge of ragging against [REDACTED] under Regulations 3(b), 3(g), 3(h), and 5(b) of the UGC Regulations, 2009;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of the Decision and Order of the Anti-Ragging Committee, the undersigned hereby issues the following executive orders regarding [REDACTED]

1. Hostel Suspension : [REDACTED] is hereby suspended from the Hall of Residence for a period of 1 (one) year with immediate effect. He is directed to vacate his hostel accommodation immediately.

2. Debarment from Representation: He is debarred from representing the University in any regional, national, or international meet, sports tournament, or youth festival for the entire academic year 2026-2027.

3. Campus Restrictions: During the period of hostel suspension, [REDACTED] :

- Is strictly prohibited from accessing any University sports facilities, including the Gym.
- Is barred from participating in any cultural activities or events of the University, including the annual festival NH-65.
- Is permitted restricted access to the University Library strictly between 8:00 A.M. and 8:00 PM only.

4. No-Contact & Anti-Retaliation Directive: [REDACTED] shall not contact, approach, or communicate with - directly or indirectly - the complainant or any witness/person who provided a statement in this enquiry. Any breach of this directive or any act of intimidation/retaliation shall be treated as a fresh act of ragging and will invite immediate stringent disciplinary action under the law.

Sd/-

Dr. Sunita Pankaj

Registrar, National Law University, Jodhpur"

2. The notice has been issued to the respondent-University and response has been filed by it.
3. Mr. Mudit Nagpal, learned counsel for the appellant-student would submit that neither the summons, the show cause notice nor the office order identifies any act done by the appellant. He was not a party to the corridor altercation between first-year students.
 - 3.1. He would further submit that the notice alleges no physical act, injury or use of force against the appellant. Yet he stands convicted under Regulation 3(g) (physical abuse/bodily harm).
 - 3.2. He would also submit that despite a specific written request dated 09.08.2026, the complaint and its particulars were never furnished at any stage. The summons even cited an incident of 07.08.2026 "at University Campus", while the notice cited the night of 06.08.2026 at SRK Hall. The appellant was made to answer a case he was never told.
 - 3.3. He would further submit that the NLU, Jodhpur is on the outskirts of the city (Nagaur Road, Mandore), and no safe or suitable accommodation is available nearby. The appellant has had to live in an ill-equipped lodge since 09.08.2026, at considerable cost and inconvenience.
 - 3.4. He would also submit that the impugned office order held the appellant liable for ragging and was circulated to eleven offices, including wardens, library, gym and campus security, as well as to his parents. Every restriction he visibly faces on campus marks him before his peers. This lasting damage to his reputation flows from a finding reached without a fair process.

- 3.5. He would further submit that the appellant is barred from sports facilities, gym, cultural events and University representation for 2026-27, and his library access is restricted. He has represented the University in volleyball since his admission. With limited semesters remaining, these opportunities cannot be restored later.
- 3.6. He would also submit that the proviso mandates a fair and transparent procedure and adequate opportunity to the accused to place facts, documents and views. No such opportunity was given; the recital that his statement was recorded on 09.08.2026 is specifically denied.
- 3.7. He would further submit that the Inquiry Report dated 10.08.2026, the medical reports and the Committee's decision dated 12.08.2026 were relied upon but never supplied. Reliance on undisclosed material is a settled breach of natural justice.
- 3.8. He would also submit that the notice referred only to Regulation 9.1(b), a punishment provision. The finding under Regulations 3(b), 3(g), 3(h) and 5(b) travels beyond the notice. Regulation 5(b) is an institutional mandate, not a definition of 'ragging'.
- 3.9. He would further submit that out of the three witnesses named in writing and orally, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], both present in [REDACTED] that night, were not examined.
4. On the other hand, Dr. Sunita Pankaj, Registrar, NLU, Jodhpur and Prof. (Dr.) Shilohu Rao (Law), Professor - Chairperson of

Anti-ragging Committee, NLU, Jodhpur, the representatives of the respondent-University would support the impugned order.

- 4.1. They would submit that it was an enquiry by an educational institution into the conduct of its own student, conducted under a statutory regulation which prescribes its own procedure. It was not a criminal trial and the body which conducted it, was a domestic body of the University, not a court proceeding.
- 4.2. They would further submit that in the case of **Board of High School and Intermediate Education, U.P. Vs. Bagleshwar Prasad**¹, the Supreme Court considered the cancellation by an educational authority of a student's examination result upon a finding of unfair means. It held that domestic enquiries of that character are not bound by the technical rules of evidence which govern criminal trials; that what is required of such an authority is that it should act honestly, in good faith and in accordance with the principles of natural justice; with the conclusions reached by educational authorities in matters of discipline, such authorities being better placed to judge them.
- 4.3. They would also submit that the standard of proof to be established is the preponderance of probabilities, not proof beyond reasonable doubt, and material of the kind upon which the University proceeded was sufficient to meet that standard. The said material comprised the hour at which a fresher was summoned, the presence of a senior student in the room, the record of telephone calls, the account given by the appellant of what he was told before the anti-ragging squad and his failure

{6}

to report incident to the university authorities as per his undertaking given on ragging.

4.4. They would further submit that much of the appeal is, in substance, an invitation to test these proceedings by the standards of a criminal trial which would require corroboration of every allegation, to treat the absence of cross-examination as fatal, and to treat the non-supply of documents as vitiating the enquiry. This is not the standard that the law applies to a domestic enquiry by an educational institution.

4.5. As regards non-supply of the complaint particulars and the inquiry reports, they would submit that the Regulations prescribe their own complete procedure for the enquiry, and that the following procedure is contained in the proviso to Regulation 6.3(e) :

"Provided that the Anti-Ragging Squad shall conduct such enquiry observing a fair and transparent procedure and the principles of natural justice and after 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."

4.6. They would also submit that the right conferred on the appellant is a right to place before the Squad the facts, documents and views concerning the incident. It is a right to submit, not a right to receive or demand any documents or details of complainants. Neither Regulation 6.3(e), nor Regulation 9.1 which governs the decision nor Regulation 9.1(c) which creates his rights for appeal, contain any provision requiring an institution to furnish an accused student

with the complaint, the enquiry report, the statements of witnesses or any other material. The appellant exercised in full the right that the Regulations did confer upon him. He placed before the Squad his oral statement, and before the Committee a written reply with two annexures and the names of three witnesses.

- 4.7. They would further submit that Regulation 6.2(g) provides that the identity of an informant "shall be protected and shall not be subject to any adverse consequence only for the reason for having reported such incidents". The complainant is a minor and the UGC National Anti-Ragging Helpline directed in terms that his identity is not disclosed. The complaint and his statement could not have been furnished in unredacted form consistently with that obligation. The University was not at liberty to disclose what the Regulations required it to protect, and it would be a curious construction of a protective code that obliged an institution to hand over to the accused the document whose confidentiality the code commands.
- 4.8. They would also submit that the proviso invokes "the principles of natural justice" and in a domestic enquiry those principles require that the person proceeded against know the substance of the case he must meet and have a fair opportunity to answer it. University is not required to themselves supply or deliver every document on the file. The appellant was aware of the case, the show-cause notice identified the complaint by number, its source, the complainant's description, the date of the incident and the Hall of Residence. He himself pleads, at

{8}

paragraph 11 of the appeal, that he was orally informed of the alleged incident of the night of 06.08.2026 at SRK Hall of Residence. And his reply of 12.08.2026 is a narrated account of that very night, timed from 10:00 to 11:00 P.M.

- 4.9. They would further submit that although the Regulations confer no right of supply, the University has furnished the entire record with this statement and does not oppose the grant of liberty to the appellant to file supplementary grounds upon any of it. The University's objective is to show with whole material that the appellant should have no complaint of any kind upon that score.
- 4.10. They would also submit that the actions taken by the respondent-University were strictly in accordance with the provisions of UGC regulations and reasonably taken, while keeping the welfare of the students into consideration. The report submitted by the University to the UGC has been accepted and until today the UGC has not directed any further action in this regard. This is an affirmative indication of the actions taken by the University being reasonable and just.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the appellant and the representatives of the respondent-University.
6. The following findings have been recorded in the inquiry report dated 14.08.2026 of the Anti-Ragging Squad:

"11. Findings

On a consideration of the material and statements before it, the Squad finds as follows:

1. It is not in dispute that the complainant was called to SRK Hostel by [REDACTED] on the night of 6th August 2026, and that some form of altercation took place between

them. The complainant's original allegation of being struck twice with a rod is not supported by any medical examination, which found his vitals stable and no visible marks on his body, and which the complainant himself resiled from during the inquiry. What remains on record, on [REDACTED] own version (relayed to him by [REDACTED], is an admission that [REDACTED] "slapped" the complainant once - a materially lesser degree of physical force than originally alleged, and one that [REDACTED] himself denies.

2. There exist material and significant contradictions between the version of the complainant and the versions of the two accused students, particularly as to the location of the assault, the manner and severity of the physical assault, the role and knowledge of [REDACTED], and, most critically, the allegation that he directed [REDACTED] to sexually assault the complainant.

3. The complainant's own conduct after the incident - including his conversation with the accused in which he admitted to abusing them, the sequence in which he chose to report the matter, and his clarification during the inquiry regarding the "death threat" allegation - are relevant circumstances that the Squad has taken into account, though they do not, by themselves, discredit the complaint in its entirety.

4. Given the gravity of the allegations - particularly the allegation of attempted sexual assault, which could not be ascertained by the Squad during the inquiry due to contradictory statements by the complainant and accused students, the Squad is of the view that the allegation pertaining to threat of sexual assault cannot be ascertained.

5. Independent of the disputed allegations, it is not in dispute that : (i) a first-year student was called, at a late hour, to the hostel room of a senior/co-resident student; (ii) the complainant chose to visit the [REDACTED] in his Room on his own volition without informing any authority despite being fully aware of the threats made and University prohibitions; (iii) at least some physical altercation took place between the complainant and [REDACTED]; (iv) [REDACTED] was present in the room at the time of incidence and was aware of the complainant being called by [REDACTED] to his room in an agitated state; (v) [REDACTED] was not involved in the physical altercation between the complainant and [REDACTED].

6. These facts, even on the accused students' own version, disclose conduct inconsistent with the standards expected in interactions with first-year students, and are sufficient, *prima facie*, to attract the provisions of the UGC Regulations on Curbing the Menace of Ragging in Higher Educational Institutions, 2009, and the

{10}

University's Anti-Ragging Regulations, pending final determination.

6.1. The following recommendations have been made in the aforesaid inquiry report.

"12. Recommendations

In light of the above, the Squad recommends as follows:

- 1. The reported incident constitutes an act of ragging as per the UGC Anti-ragging Regulations is established in accordance with clause (b), (g), and (h) of Regulation 3 of the UGC Regulations on Curbing the Menace of Ragging in Higher Educational Institutions, 2009, and the University's Anti-Ragging Regulations framed thereunder.*
- 2. Matter be placed before Anti-Ragging Committee for award of appropriate and suitable punishment to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] as per the above mentioned Regulations.*
- 3. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] be directed to maintain no contact, direct or indirect, with the complainant, and appropriate interim measures (including, if necessary, change of hostel room/hostel for the accused students, or restrictions on their movement within SRK Hostel) be put in place to ensure the complainant's safety and to prevent any possibility of intimidation or retaliation."*

7. A careful perusal of the report would show that it is not the case of the University that the appellant herein has called the complainant in his hostel room. It is also the case of the University that the complainant, on his own volition, chose to visit the room of the other student who was held liable for the incident, without informing any authority and further a physical altercation took place between complainant and the other student who was held liable for the incident and only finding recorded against the present appellant is that he was present in the room where the incident took place. It was further recorded finding that the present appellant was not involved in

the physical altercation between the complainant and the other student who was held liable for the incident of the ragging.

8. Having considered the rival contentions of the parties and having gone through the record, and considering the findings of the competent authority, and further considering the fact that no proper/reasonable opportunity has been afforded to the appellant to place his case, it is a fit case where the impugned order deserves just to be set aside.
9. Accordingly, the impugned office order dated 20.08.2026 is hereby set aside. However, it is made clear that the appellant would maintain good conduct on campus and in the hostel, and will not contact or approach the complainant or any witness and he is warned to be careful in future. It is also made clear that I have not made any opinion with regard to the other student, if any, who has been held liable for the incident.
10. The present appeal stands disposed of accordingly.

(SANJAY K. AGRAWAL), C.J.
CHANCELLOR

Skant/-