

## News

---

**Disgraceful: Allahabad High Court overturns student's order to display a banner pledging "not to misbehave with girls."**



*When the Court lifted the restriction that a single judge had placed on the student, it stated that the public humiliation requirement was unnecessary under the circumstances.*

A single-judge's ruling ordering a university student to stand at the campus gate for 30 minutes every day for a month while holding a poster that vowed "**not to misbehave with girls**" was recently reversed by the Allahabad High Court [Harsh Awana v. Chairman U.G.C.

Bahadurshah Zafar Road & Ors.].

Chief Justice Arun Bhansali and Justice Kshitij Shailendra made up the bench, which ruled that the condition was unwarranted and ordered its removal while maintaining other disciplinary orders. Such a directive, which would require the appellant to stand at the university's gate for 30 minutes for 30 days while holding a placard that read, "I will never misbehave with any girl," is not only degrading, but it would also permanently damage the appellant's reputation, which is not necessary under the circumstances of the case, the court said.

Justice Kshitij Shailendra and Chief Justice Arun Bhansali  
Chief Justice Arun Bhansali and Justice Kshitij Shailendra

***The appeal stemmed from a single-judge's October 29, 2025, ruling in a petition the student filed against the university's rustication of him.***

The solitary judge noted the student's background while dismissing the rustication, noting that his father was a poor farmer who had worked hard to pay for his education.

***The student was also subject to a number of requirements set by the single judge, including maintaining a 95 percent attendance rate in the remaining classes, applying for leave for any absences, staying on campus during class hours, submitting a written apology within 72 hours, and the contentious placard requirement.***

Additionally, the order directed the police to station an anti-Roma mobile squad at the university gates during opening and closing hours and warned that he may be rusticated again without warning if any fresh complaints were made.

The student subsequently went to the High Court, claiming that the placard punishment was degrading and might have a negative impact on his future.

***The university supported the single-judge's ruling, claiming that the criteria were intended to be humanitarian and corrective and that the original petition should never have been considered.***

On February 4, the Court ruled that, given the student's behavior and prior attendance history, the orders regarding attendance, a written apology, and police deployment were appropriate.

They did, however, make it apparent that it was never permissible to force him to make a public exhibition with a placard.

***Therefore, it revoked the placard condition and stipulated that the student should be given another opportunity to offer a written apology if he had been rusticated again only for failing to fulfill that need.***

The rustication would be revoked upon compliance, and he would be required to abide by the court's attendance-related regulations.

Advocate Gopal Srivastava defended the student.

***The respondents were represented by Senior Counsel Jagdish Pathak, Anubhav Singh, and Pratik Chandra.***