

15  
**K. Sankaranarayanan**  
GOVERNOR OF MAHARASHTRA



No: CS/ NU/ 37/09/ (6844)/ 842.

**Raj Bhavan**  
**Mumbai 400 035**  
Tel. : 022-23632660  
Fax : 022-23680505

15 March 2010.

## **ORDER**

**Subject :** Regarding the decisions of the Management Council of the Rashtrasant Tukdoji Maharaj Nagpur University to give University ground on the rent to the political party and to relax the condition under Clause 11 of the contract of Service of the Vice-Chancellor.

- Reference:**
1. Letter No. VC/C-8 (iii) /R/09/180, dated 22 January 2009 from the Vice-Chancellor, RTM Nagpur University, Nagpur.
  2. Letter No. VC/C-8 (iii) /R/ 09/182, dated 24 January 2009 from the Vice-Chancellor, RTM Nagpur University, Nagpur.
  3. Letter No. CS/NU/37/09/ (6844)/344, dated 2 February 2009, addressed to the Principal Secretary to Government, Higher & Technical Education Department, Mantralaya, Mumbai by the Chancellor's office.
  4. Letter No. CS/NU/37/09/(6844) /1644, dated 30 May 2009, addressed to the Principal Secretary to Government, Higher & Technical Education Department, Mantralaya, Mumbai by the Chancellor's office.
  5. Letter No. CS/NU/37/09/(6844)/2244, dated 7 July 2009, addressed to the Principal Secretary to Government, Higher & Technical Education Department, Mantralaya, Mumbai by the Chancellor's office.
  6. Letter No. CS/NU/37/09/(6844)/2845, dated 24 August 2009, addressed to the Principal Secretary to Government, Higher & Technical Education Department, Mantralaya, Mumbai by the Chancellor's office.

7. Letter No. संकीर्ण-२००९/(६४९/०९)/विशि-३, dated 12 & 22 October 2009 from the Deputy Secretary to the Government, Higher & Technical Education Department, Mantralaya.
8. Show Cause Notice No. CS/NU/37/09/(6844)/3896, dated 22 October 2009, from the Chancellor to the Management Council of the RTM Nagpur University (through the Vice-Chancellor & Chairman of the Management Council).
9. Letter No. VC/C-8(iii)/R/09/219, dated 4 November 2009 from the Vice-Chancellor & Chairman of the Management Council, addressed to the Chancellor.
10. Letter No. CS/NU/37/09/(6844) /4223, dated 12 November 2009 to the Management Council of the RTM Nagpur University (through Vice-Chancellor & the Chairman of the Management Council) from the Chancellor's office.
11. Letter No. VC/C-8(iii)/R/09/259, dated 9 December 2009 from the Vice-Chancellor to the Secretary to the Chancellor.
12. Letter No. R/C-8(iii)/R/09/110, dated 7 December 2009 from the Registrar & Secretary of the Management Council, RTM Nagpur University.
13. Letter No. VC/C-8(iii)/R/P-09/ dated 14 December 2009 from the Vice-Chancellor, RTM Nagpur University to the Chancellor.
14. Letter No. CS/NU/37/09/(6844)/4637-38, addressed to the Vice-Chancellor, RTM Nagpur University & copy endorsed to the Registrar & Secretary to the Management Council, RTM Nagpur University w/r to his letter Sr. No. 11 above by the Chancellor's office.
15. Letter No. VC/C-8(iii)/R/09/264, dated 15 December 2009, addressed to the Joint Secretary to the Chancellor.
16. Letter No. R/C-8(iii)/09/120, dated 18 December 2009, from the Registrar, RTM Nagpur University

17. Letter No. VC/C-8(iii)/09/P/294, dated 23 December 2009, from the Vice-Chancellor, RTM Nagpur University
18. Letter No. VC/C-8(iii)/R/09/298, dated 24 December 2009, from the Vice-Chancellor & Chairman, Management Council of RTM Nagpur University submitting therewith the reply of the Management Council to the Show Cause Notice, dated 22 October 2009.

I had received letters dated 22 January 2009 and 24 January 2009 from Dr. S. N. Pathan, Vice-Chancellor, RTM Nagpur University (hereafter referred as "the University") informing that:-

- i) the Management Council at its meeting held on 19 January 2009 has resolved to accept the request of Shri Nitin Gadkari, President, Bhartiya Janta Party, Maharashtra State to hold "National Executive Meeting" of BJP at the University ground from 6 to 8 February 2009 and levy the rent of Rs. 25,000/- per day.
- ii) the Management Council at its meeting held on 24 January 2009 has resolved to relax Condition 11 of the Agreement (Service Contract) executed by the Vice-Chancellor after his appointment as Vice-Chancellor of the University which prohibited the Vice-Chancellor to allow the University buildings and premises for the political activities.

2) As reported by the Vice-Chancellor, the facts in brief are as under :-

- i) Shri Nitin Gadkari, President, Bhartiya Janta Party, Maharashtra State vide his letter dated 31 December 2008 had requested the University to avail the University ground on rent for 3 days from 6 to 8 February 2009 to hold "National Executive Meeting" of BJP on the said ground.
- ii) The University took the legal opinion from its Counsel on whether the University can give its ground on rent to which he had opined that the University can give its buildings / grounds on rent.
- iii) On the basis of legal opinion, the Management Council at its meeting held on 19 January 2009 resolved to accept the request of Shri Nitin Gadkari and give its University ground on rent of Rs. 25,000/- per day to BJP for holding the "National Executive Meeting" from 6 to 8 February 2009.

- iv) The Vice-Chancellor took the opinion of the Advocate General of Maharashtra on 22 January 2009. The Advocate General has opined that the Vice-Chancellor is ordinarily bound and liable to carry out the directions of the Management Council as per the mandate of Section 14 (5) of the Act. No provision of the Act or rules or regulations is shown to him, which specially prohibits the Council from giving their premises to a political party for the meetings. In the present case, Management Council can waive the terms of clause 11 of terms of employment as agreed between the University and the Vice-Chancellor, which prohibit him from permitting the use of University buildings or its campus by any political party. This would clear the way in as much as he would be implementing the decision of the Management Council and would not be giving permission on his own accord and would not breach the terms of his Agreement with an University.
- v) The Vice-Chancellor of the University referred back the matter on the following grounds to the Management Council by calling an emergent meeting held on 24 January 2009 for reconsideration of the matter after taking the legal advice from the Advocate General:-
- a. the decision of Management Council in its meeting held on 19 January 2009 to give University ground to BJP for its "National Executive Meeting" on the request of Shri Nitin Gadkari is in contravention of condition 11 of Agreement  
  
(Service Contract) executed by the University with the Vice-Chancellor.
  - b. The condition 11 of the Agreement prohibits the Vice-Chancellor to give University premises to the political parties and exception cannot be made to give the premises on rent to the political parties.
  - c. If the Vice-Chancellor violates the condition 11 of the Agreement, he will be liable for action under Section 12 (13)(d-1) of the Maharashtra Universities Act, 1994, [hereinafter referred as "the Act"].
- vi) The Management Council at its meeting held on 24 January 2009 resolved that :-
- a. The opinion given by the Advocate General is valid. And the said opinion has been given to the University by clarifying the interpretations of the provisions in the Act.
  - b. The para 3 of the opinion is very clear and in that it has been clarified that there is no provision in the Act or rules or regulations to prohibit the Management Council to give the University

premises to the political party. The Management Council has taken note of the same.

- c. In para 3, the Advocate General has clarified that in the present case, the Management Council can relax the condition 11 in the Agreement between the University and the Vice-Chancellor.
- d. Therefore now, the Management Council by the Resolution clarifies that as it is clear from the opinion of the Advocate General that as per the Section 28 (d) of the Act, the Management Council has all the powers to give the University premises on rent and as per the opinion of the Advocate General it is being resolved to relax the condition 11 of the Agreement in the present case and as the condition has been relaxed it has been unanimously resolved to give the University premises through the Vice-Chancellor on rent to the political parties.
- e. As clarified by the Advocate General in para 3 of the opinion, the Vice-Chancellor is implementing the aforesaid decision of the Management Council and therefore the Management Council clearly resolves that the Vice-Chancellor has not violated the Agreement by giving the University ground on rent to the political party.
- f. By clarifying that the Management Council has accepted the opinion of the Advocate General in para 3 and as per the said opinion the condition 11 of the Agreement has been relaxed and if the Vice-Chancellor gives the University premises on rent to the political parties, it would not mean that the Vice-Chancellor has violated the Agreement and on these basis the Management Council resolved that the University premises be given to Shri Nitin Gadkari, President , BJP on rent for "National Executive Meeting" of the BJP.
- g. The Management Council also resolved that eventhough the Vice-Chancellor has mentioned that the matter has been referred back the earlier resolution for reconsideration on technical difficulty under Section 14 (6) of the Act, considering the aforesaid resolution of the Management Council on the basis of the opinion of the Advocate General and the said technical difficulty has been removed and therefore the Section 14 (6) of the Act is irrelevant in the present case.

3) After the resolutions were passed, the Vice-Chancellor who is Chairman of the Management Council ~~clarified to the members of the Management Council that as per condition 17 of the Agreement, it is necessary to take the approval of the Chancellor to the resolution of the Management Council to relax the condition 11 of the Agreement. And decision of the Chancellor will be~~

final in the present case. However, all the members of the Management Council expressed the views that there is no need to take the said action.

4) The following provisions under respective Sections and Clauses of the Act and the Contract of Service of the Vice-Chancellor, respectively, which are relevant in this matter need to take into consideration:-

a) The Section 11 (3) of the Act, reads as under :-

**“(3)** Save as otherwise provided the emoluments and terms and conditions of services of the Vice-Chancellor and Pro- Vice Chancellor shall be determined by the State Government from time to time.”

b) As per Section 28 (d) of the Act, the Management Council shall hold, control and arrange for administration of assets and properties of the University.

c) As per Section 28 (f) of the Act, the Management Council can enter into, vary, carry out and cancel contracts on behalf of the University.

d) The Clauses 11, 16 and 17 of the Agreement (Service Contract) executed by the Vice-Chancellor and Pro- Vice Chancellor of the University are as under :-

Clause **“(11)** The Vice-Chancellor shall not use or permit the use of the buildings and campus of the University or any part thereof, and the facilities of the University or any of them, for or by any political party or for the propagation, dissemination of political , religious or sectarian ideas, beliefs or views except in so far as it may be necessary for a leader or any student to explain any particular doctrine, without bias for or against , in the context of social sciences or in an academic journal or as part of a thesis to be offered for a Doctorate degree of the University , the subject thereof has been accepted by the University, without their expression any opinion thereon.

Clause **(16)** Notwithstanding anything contained in Clause (1) hereof, in the event of the Chancellor being satisfied that the Vice-Chancellor has committed a breach of any of the terms and condition hereof, or has failed to duly carry out any regulations made or deemed to have made under it, or to have acted in a manner prejudicial to the interest of the University or has conducted himself in a manner unbecoming of a Vice-Chancellor, the Chancellor may terminate the appointment as Vice-Chancellor or take such other action as he thinks fit, after giving him a

reasonable opportunity to show cause why his appointment should not be terminated or such action should not be taken.

Clause (17) If any doubt or question arises with regard to any matter under this Agreement, the decision of the Chancellor shall be final."

5) The then Chancellor prima facie observed that the decision of the Management Council to accept the request of BJP to hold its "National Executive Meeting" at University ground from 6 to 8 February 2009 is not in the best interest of the University and also its decision to relax the condition under Clause 11 of the Contract of Service of the Vice-Chancellor is not in accordance with the law and as such this is a fit case to invoke Section 9 (4) of the Maharashtra Universities Act, 1994, (hereinafter referred as the "Act"). The matter was therefore referred to the State Government in Higher & Technical Education Department on 2/02/2009 to examine it in consultation with the Advocate General and send its views. The State Government vide letter dated 22/10/2009 forwarded a copy of the legal opinion dated 5/10/2010 given to it by the Advocate General in the matter, along with its views. The Advocate General has opined that there is no provision under the Act which permits the Management Council to vary or relax the service conditions of the Vice-Chancellor. Although the service contract is executed within the University and the Vice-Chancellor, its conditions are determined by the State Government and hence without consent of the State Government, the terms and service conditions can not be changed or relaxed by the Management Council. The State Government also confirmed that the Management Council of the University has no jurisdiction to alter, relax or amend the terms and conditions of the service of the Vice-Chancellor.

6) After Scrutiny of the facts as reported by the Vice-Chancellor, the facts on record, the State Government's views & A.G.'s opinion dated 5/10/2009 given to the State Government, opinion given by the Advocate General to the Vice-Chancellor on 22 January 2009, the then Chancellor was prima-facie satisfied that the decision of the Management Council to rent out the University/premises to a political party for its activities & to relax the condition

(11) of the Contract of Service of the Vice-Chancellor was not in accordance with the law at that time in force due to the following reasons:-

a) The conditions of service of the Vice-Chancellor shall be such as may be determined by the State Government from time to time under Section 11(3) of the Act. The conditions of service are determined by the State Government which includes the power of the State Government to alter and amend the conditions of service. There is no provision under the Act which permits the Management Council to vary or relax the service conditions of the Vice-Chancellor. When the service conditions are to be determined by the State Government under the Act, the Management Council is not competent to alter or amend the service conditions of the Vice-Chancellor as determined by the State Government. If the Management Council does so, it would not be consistent with the provisions of the Act. At the most, the Management Council, if it is of the view that it is necessary to alter or to amend the service conditions of the Vice-Chancellor, the Management Council can make resolution to suggest or recommend to the State Government which is the competent to determine the service conditions of the Vice-Chancellor to amend or alter the service conditions of the Vice-Chancellor and only after the State Government considers and approves the said amendments under section 11(3) of the Act, it becomes legally valid and enforceable.

b) The Section 28 of the Act prescribes the powers and duties of the Management Council. The Section 28(f) provides for the Management Council to enter, vary, carry out and cancel the contracts on behalf of the University. However, this does not construe that the service conditions that are determined by the State Government under Section 11(3) can be subject to powers of the Management Council under Section 28(f). The Section 28(f) applies only to those contracts, the contents of which can be determined by the University and cannot cover those contracts whose contents are determined by the State Government under the Act as is the case of the service conditions of the Vice-Chancellor under Section 11(3)



of the Act. Therefore, the act of the Management Council to relax the service condition 11 of the contract signed by the Vice-Chancellor with the University is not in accordance with the law.

c) The provision in Condition 11 in the Service Contract has been to prevent not only the Vice-Chancellors but also Universities from permitting the use of premises of the Universities for the political activities of any political party. The provisions of Section 42(1) of the Act, which prevents the Students Council from engaging the political activities, are also aimed at the similar objective. Any political activity of a political party is not in the best interest of the University. Moreover, if one party is permitted to use the premises/land then the Universities can not refuse such permission to other political parties. Such political activities may spoil the atmosphere of the University and have adverse effect on the quality of the education.

7) Therefore, the then Chancellor called upon the Management Council of the University by serving a Show Cause Notice under Section 9(4) of the Act vide letter dated 22 October 2009 to explain within 15 days of the receipt of the said letter, the valid reasons, why the resolutions passed by the Management Council at its meetings held on 19 January 2009 and 24 January 2009 should not be treated as not proper.

8) My office provided the required documents including the copies of the Vice-Chancellor's letters to my office, State Government's views and this office notings etc. to the Management Council on 12/11/2009. As requested by the Management Council, an extension of 4 weeks was also given to the Management Council to submit its reply to the Show Cause Notice dated 22/11/2009.

9) On the request received from the Vice-Chancellor & the Members of the Management Council & in order to meet the principles of natural justice, the then Chancellor also gave them an opportunity of being heard personally. Accordingly, Dr. S. N. Pathan, Vice-Chancellor, RTM Nagpur

University, Dr. G. S. Parashar, Pro-Vice Chancellor & 12 Members of the Management Council met the then Chancellor on 16 December 2009 at 1200 Noon at Raj Bhavan, Nagpur, and explained circumstances under which the decisions to allow the political party to use the University premises and to relax the condition 11 of the Contract of Service of the Vice-Chancellor were taken by the Management Council. As per the record of the discussion of the said meeting, Dr. Ved Prakash Mishra, Member of the Management Council, said that the Management Council's decision was guided by the Advocate General's opinion dated 22/01/2009 and that the Management Council could not have thought that the same would be reviewed at a later date. He also said that there are grey areas in the Act especially because the Contract of Service of the Vice-Chancellor is signed by the Vice-Chancellor and Registrar on behalf of the University. The University authorities in turn, under Section 28(f) of the Act have the power to amend the conditions of the contract. Dr. Ved Prakash, on behalf of the Management Council, urged the Chancellor to review this issue as there was lot of bad publicity about the University as well as the Management Council. The Chancellor also heard the Vice-Chancellor and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor.

10) The Management Council submitted its reply to the Show Cause Notice dated 22.10.2009 on 25/12/2009 vide Vice-Chancellor's letter No. VC/C-8(iii)/R/09/298 dated 24 December 2009. In the written submission, the Management Council has stated that :-

a) The Management Council was guided by the Advocate General's opinion dated 22/01/2009. In view of this and in view of earlier precedent the Management Council have resolved to accept the request of Shri Gadkari to allow use of University premises for party meeting subject to payment of necessary charges and other conditions.

b) When the University made reference to the Higher & Technical Education Department, with reference to Shri Gadkari's request, the Government informed the University that the request letter of Shri

Gadkari was not related to the Government and the University should take appropriate decision as per rules.

c) The Management Council had passed the resolution on 24/01/2009 by relying upon the AG's opinion dated 22/01/2009 and there was no occasion for Management Council to consider the reviewed opinion of AG dated 5/10/2009 as the same was not before the Management Council. Hence it would not be appropriate to hold the decision of the Management Council to be improper.

d) The State Government has at no point of time notified the terms and conditions of the Service of the Vice-Chancellor under Section 11(3) of the Act.

e) The University has been benefited by renting out the University premises to BJP for its National Executive Meeting in many ways because the entire premises have been developed by BJP at its own cost.

f) Therefore the decision of the Management Council to rent out the University premises to BJP for its National Executive Meeting from 6<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> February 2009 and to relax Clause (11) of the Service Condition of the Vice-Chancellor may not be considered to be improper.

11) I have carefully examined the factual report received from the Vice-Chancellor, Advocate General's opinions dated 22.1.2009 and 5.10.2009, the State Government's views and the oral & written submissions made by the Vice-Chancellor, Pro-Vice-Chancellor and the members of Management Council & facts on the records, I have now come to the following conclusions:-

1. The terms and conditions of service of the Vice-Chancellor as determined by the State Government under Section 11(3) of the Act cannot come under the purview of the duties and powers of the Management Council under Section 28 of the Act. The Management Council can enter into, vary, carry out and cancel the

contracts on behalf of the University under Section 28 (f) of the Act whose contents are determined by the University and this will not cover the service conditions of the Vice-Chancellor as determined by the State Government under Section 11(3) of the Act. Therefore, the decision of the Management Council to relax the service condition 11 of the Contract of Service signed by the Vice-Chancellor with the University is not in accordance with the law and therefore not legally valid.

2. The earlier advice of the Advocate General dated 22/01/2009 given to the Vice-Chancellor that the Management Council can relax the condition under Clause 11 of the Contract of Service of the Vice-Chancellor is erroneous and not in accordance with the provisions of the Act.
3. The service conditions of the Vice-Chancellor are to be determined by the State Government under Section 11 (3) of the Act and the Management Council has no jurisdiction to alter, modify or cancel the service conditions of the Vice-Chancellor as determined by the State Government under the Act.
4. Under Section 14 (5) of the Act, the Vice-Chancellor is duty bound to implement the resolutions of the Management Council if not inconsistent with the Act. Since the Management Council has no jurisdiction to relax the service condition as determined by the State Government under Section 11 (3), the act of the Management Council to amend the Service Contract of the Vice-Chancellor is not in accordance with the provisions of the Act and therefore is not legally valid.

12) Since the decision of the Management Council taken on 19/01/2009 to rent out the University premises to a political party for its executive meeting which was held from 6<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> February 2009 has already been implemented and since the event has already taken place, the issue has now become more academic in nature. However, in order to correct the record of the proceedings of the University authorities, it is necessary to modify the said decision of the

Management Council to restore the condition under Clause 11 of the Contract of Service of the Vice-Chancellor to its original position.

13) Taking into account all the facts as above, I am satisfied that the decision of the Management Council dated 24 January 2009, to relax the condition under Clause 11 of the Contract of Service of the Vice-Chancellor is not proper, legal and valid & also not in accordance with the provisions of the Act, Contract of Service of the Vice-Chancellor, as the Management Council has no jurisdiction under Section 28 of the Act, to relax, amend or alter or cancel any of the terms and conditions of service of the Vice-Chancellor as enumerated in the Contract of Service, which are determined by the State Government under Section 11 (3) of the Act.

14) Therefore, I, K. Sankaranarayanan, Chancellor, RTM Nagpur University in exercise of the powers conferred upon me under Section 9 (4) of the Maharashtra Universities Act, 1994, hereby direct that the Resolution of the Management Council dated 24.01.2009 to relax the condition under clause (11) of the Contract of Service of the Vice-Chancellor is to be stuck off and also direct the Management Council to correct its record of proceedings of the said meeting accordingly.

4 K. Sankaranarayanan  
15.3.10

**(K. Sankaranarayanan)**  
Chancellor  
RTM Nagpur University.