



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR**



D.B. Civil Special Appeal No. 1269/2025

Dr. Balraj Singh S/o Sh. Ranbir Singh, R/o Vice-Chancellors
Residence, Sri Karan Narendra Agriculture University, Jobner,
Jaipur (Raj). Presently Residing At House No. 364, Sector-23
Gurugram-122017

----Appellant

Versus

1. Chancellor Sri Karan Narendra Agriculture University,
Jobner Through Its Secretary, Raj Bhawan, Jaipur.
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Department Of
Agriculture, State Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. Sri Karan Narendra Agriculture University, Through Its
Registrar, Jobner, Jaipur.

----Respondents

Connected With

D.B. Civil Special Appeal (Writ) No. 1284/2025

1. Chancellor, Sri Karan Narendra Agriculture University,
Jobner, Through Its Secretary, Raj Bhawan, Jaipur.
2. Sri Karan Narendra Agriculture University, Through Its
Registrar, Jobner, Jaipur.

----Appellants

Versus

1. Dr. Balraj Singh S/o Sh. Ranbir Singh, R/o
Vice-Chancellors Residence, Sri Karan Narendra
Agriculture University, Jobner, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Department Of
Agriculture, State Secretariat, Jaipur.

----Respondents

For Appellant(s) : Mr. Sunil Samdaria with
Mr. Arihant Samdaria &
Mr. Mahendra Singh Godara

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Rajendra Prasad, Sr. Advocate
assisted by Ms. Harshita Thakral &
Mr. Tanay Goyal
Mr. P.C. Sharma
Mr. Hardik Singh, AAAG with
Ms. Mansi Sharma



HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE MR. SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BALJINDER SINGH SANDHU

Judgment

30/10/2025

1. There are two appeals preferred against the judgment passed by the learned Single Judge dated 14.10.2025.
2. D.B. Special Appeal No.1269/2025 has been filed by the appellant-writ petitioner, who is dissatisfied with the judgment passed by the learned Single Judge to the extent of the observations made by the learned Single Judge after allowing the prayer made by the appellant-writ petitioner seeking quashing of the impugned order dated 07.10.2025, whereby he had been suspended from the post of Vice-Chancellor of Sri Karan Narendra Agriculture University, Jobner, Jaipur (for short 'the University').
3. Learned counsel submits that once the Court reached to the conclusion that the order dated 07.10.2025 is not sustainable in law, there was no occasion for the learned Single Judge to have proceeded to put restrictions under Section 25-A(2) of the Sri Karan Narendra Agriculture University, Jobner, Act, 2013 (for short 'the Act of 2013) restraining him from performing the function of Vice-Chancellor or taking any decision pursuant to reinstatement and also not allowing him to be considered for any other appointment till the enquiry report is submitted to the Chancellor and any decision is taken by the Chancellor on the said report. He submits that virtually the appellant has been put to a position where he cannot continue in employment or appointment anywhere else.





4. In D.B. Civil Special Appeal (Writ) No.1284/2025 preferred by the University challenge is made to the observation and operative part of the judgment dated 14.10.2025.

5. Mr. Rajendra Prasad, learned Senior Counsel submits that while there was no occasion for the learned Single Judge to have proceeded to pass order on 14.10.2025 i.e. on the day when the concerned respondent had already completed the tenure of his office and asked him to be reinstated. He submits that further observations made in the judgment with respect to the consultation with the State Government and the powers to be exercised by the Chancellor need to be left open for examination before this Court, as in his submission, the view taken by the learned Single Judge is erroneous.

6. It is also contended that the powers exercised by the Chancellor in terms of Section 9(1) and 9(2) of the Act of 2013 with regard to the constitution of the committee and the powers to be exercised by the Chancellor under Section 25-A(1) of the Act of 2013 have been wrongfully interpreted and considered by the learned Single Judge, however, he submits that the matter has become academic in the present case, as the term of office of the respondent stand already expired. He prays that the issue may be left open to be examined in some other case, more so when a new Vice-Chancellor has already been appointed and is serving with the University since then.

7. We have considered the submissions.

8. We noticed that the appellant had initially challenged the order dated 07.10.2025, whereby the *ex-officio* Chancellor of the University passed an order suspending him from the post of





Vice-Chancellor, which was going to end on 14.10.2025. The learned Single Judge after taking into consideration the various provisions of the Act of 2013, proceeded to hold that the power of removal of Vice-Chancellor vests with the Chancellor, but it would be mandatory for him to consult with the State Government before exercising its powers.

9. The question arises whether the word used "consultation" is directory or can be taken up even later on. The question also arises whether the Chancellor, is required to first conduct a detailed enquiry and, thereafter, alone take a decision or can proceed to suspend the Vice-Chancellor after receiving confirm information which he may ask to be inquired into, subsequently, after issuing orders of suspension. These aspects need to be examined, but considering the fact that so far as the appellant is concerned, his term of employment as a Vice-Chancellor stood already expired on 14.10.2025, we refrain from proceeding and examining these aspects and leave it open to examine in some appropriate case, if need so arises. As regards the grievance of the appellant-Dr. Balraj Singh with regard to observations made by the learned Single Judge is concerned, we find that the directions issued by the learned Single Judge restraining the appellant from being considered for any appointment till the enquiry report is submitted to the Chancellor, would be putting things too far, more so when his term stood already expired. The enquiry, if any, which was the basis or not for passing of order dated 07.10.2025, is no more required to be looked into at this stage and has attained *fait accompli*.





10. We, therefore, deem it appropriate to delete the part of the order relating to the observations made by the learned Single Judge with regard to doing substantial justice and restraining the appellant from not being considered for any appointment. The said part is deleted from the order passed by the learned Single Judge to that extent alone.

11. The appeal i.e. D.B. Civil Special Appeal (Writ) No.1284/2025 filed by the University stands disposed of with the observations that the question raised are left open to be examined in appropriate case, as stated above.

12. The appeal i.e. D.B. Special Appeal No.1269/2025 filed by the appellant-writ petitioner is allowed to the aforesaid extent.

13. It is made clear that order passed by the learned Single Judge as well as in the present cases shall not be treated as a precedent in any other case.

14. A copy of this order be placed in connected file.

(BALJINDER SINGH SANDHU),J (SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA),ACTING CJ

SANJAY KUMAWAT/RAJAT/194-195

