

# News

---

## 'Humilating': Allahabad High Court Overturns a Single Judge's Order Requesting Students to Show a 'Won't Misbehave With Girls' Pin



Disgraceful: Allahabad High Court Overturns a Single Judge's Order Requesting Students to Show the Girls Placard That They Won't Misbehave

On Wednesday, the Allahabad High Court overturned a single judge's order requiring a rusticated university student to "never misbehave with any girl" while holding a banner outside the university entrance for 30 minutes (for 30 days).

A bench consisting of Chief Justice Arun Bhansali and Justice Kshitij Shailendra described the directive as unwarranted and degrading, adding that the student's character would be "permanently scarred" by the penalty.

In short, the student filed a writ case, and the bench was considering a Special Appeal against the October order of a Single Judge.

From a humanitarian perspective, the appellant's father is a poor farmer, thus after renouncing the student's rustication, the Single Judge placed restrictions on him, including the condition that is being contested.

Additional requirements included submitting a written apology within 72 hours and a notarized document promising 95% attendance and not leaving the building during class hours. Remarkably, the police authorities were also instructed by the bench to station a "anti-romeo mobile squad" at the university's entrance.

He petitioned the HC to overturn the contested decision's directive number. (II) (placard condition), arguing that it was embarrassing for the student and would permanently harm his career. As a result, it was prayed that the order be overturned.

Conversely, the University's Counsel backed the contested order. stating that the student was permitted to continue his studies in spite of the disciplinary difficulties, demonstrating that the Single Judge had already adopted a lenient stance and that the petition itself was not valid.

Given the appellant's behavior of having 50% attendance in previous academic years, the division bench observed that although other directions were reasonable, the character of direction no. (II) was never justified.

As a result, the Court reversed the aforementioned directive.

The Bench explained that if the student had been re-rusticated only for not following the placard's instructions, he must be allowed one chance to comply with the need of a written apology (Direction III) in order to prevent the litigation process from harming him.

The bench further stated that if he genuinely adheres to the attendance requirements, his rustication will be set aside upon doing so.

**Appellant's attorney:** Gopal Srivastava

**Respondent's attorneys:** Jagdish Pathak, Pratik Chandra, and Anubhav Singh

**Case Title:** XXX v. Chairman U.G.C. And Others