MINUTE OF THE 25th MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF RABINDRANATH THAKUR VISHWAVIDYALAYA

Date: 4th November 2026
Time: 12.30 PM
Venue: Gitobitan Conference Hall, Sir J. C. Bose Campus, RTV, Hojai

Agenda:

1. Confirmation of Minute of 24th meeting of EC
2. Discussion on matter related to Enquiry Report and 2nd Show Cause Notice.
3. Misc.

Members Present:

1. Prof. Manabendra Dutta Choudhury:	Chairman
2. Sjt. Shiladitya Dev:	Hon'ble MLA, Hojai LAC
3. Prof. Dolly Phukon:	Hon'ble Chancellor's Nominee (Online)
4. Dr. Navajyoti Borah:	Nominee of Govt. of Assam (Online)
5. Prof. Rezina Ahmed:	Member
6. Prof. Kaushik Chanda:	Member
7. Mr. Kamal Dutta:	Nominee of Hon'ble Vice Chancellor
8. Mrs. Jayanti Chakraborty:	Nominee of Hon'ble Vice Chancellor
9. Dr. Satyajeet Kumar:	President Teachers' Association
10. Dr. Akshya Jyoti Sarma:	Secretary Teachers' Association
11. Dr. Manoj Kr. Swami:	Member (Online)
12. Dr. Sandip Ratna:	Registrar i/c & Member Secretary

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

Agenda No. 1

Minute of the 24th meeting of EC was placed before the members and action taken report was read out.

Resolution No. - RTV/EC/25/01/04.11.2026

The members confirmed the minute after making necessary language modification and rearrangement of resolution numbers etc proposed by Prof. Dolly Phukon.

Agenda No. 2

Discussion on matter related to Enquiry Report and 2nd Show Cause Notice.

Registrar in Charge Dr. Sandip Ratna informed the house that as per resolution of 24th meeting of Executive Council held on 12th October 2nd show cause notice was served to the Charged officer Dr. Shekhar Kanti Sarkar, Dy Registrar (Now Under Suspension) along with the copy of enquiry report on 14th October 2026. He has submitted his reply which was received by the office of the Registrar on 29th October 2026. The reply to 2nd show cause notice, copy of Enquiry Report, draft review of the reply of the Charged Officer were sent to all EC members through e mails. The same was also placed before the House for discission.

The members discussed the reply of the Charged Officer against 2nd show cause notice point by point with reference to the enquiry report submitted by the Enquiry Officer and also discussed the legal opinion obtained on the matter. The detailed observation of the Council on reply to 2nd Show Cause notice submitted by the Charged Officer has been recorded as follows.....

In Conclusion of the report of the enquiry the Enquiry Officer concluded that all the 6 (six) charges brought against the Charged Officer Dr. Shekhar Kanti Sarkar, Deputy Registrar (Under Suspension), Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya (RTV) are proved.

The report submitted by the Enquiry Officer was placed before the 24th Meeting of the Executive Council held on 12th October 2026. The Members of the Executive Council examined the report submitted by the Enquiry officer and noted that all the six charges against Charged Officer mentioned in the Memorandum of Charges dated 24/03/2026 stands proved.

The members of the Executive Council unanimously resolved to accept the report submitted by the Enquiry Officer and decided to issue 2nd Show Cause notice asking the Charged Officer to submit reply if any about the report of the Enquiry Officer giving him 15-day time.

The Charged Officer was served 2nd Show Cause notice giving 15 days' time to submit reply if any, about the report of the Enquiry Officer to the Registrar i/c w,e.f. 14th October 2026 as per law. The reply to2nd Show Cause notice was received by the office of the Registrar i/c on 29th October 2026 and the same was placed before the 25th meeting of the Executive Council held on 4th November 2026. The members discussed the reply submitted by the Charged Officer point by point with reference to the Enquiry Report submitted by the Enquiry Officer and noted that in the reply to 2nd show cause notice the Charged Officer raised certain issued against each of the six charges as follows.

- **When defending the Articles of Charge-I**, the Charged Officer has given stress on the following point:

The Enquiry Officer treated the difference of one digit in the registration number appearing only on the second semester LL.M. marksheet as evidence against the qualification.

The Enquiry Officer failed to properly consider the Karnataka High Court judgments dated 27.06.2016 and 17.08.2022, relied upon by the Charged Officer, while placing

Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya, Hajipur ★ Estd.-2019 ★ Date.....

reliance upon the judgment passed in Purnendu Shekhar Debnath-Vs-State of Assam without adequately distinguishing it's factual and regulatory context.

The Enquiry Officer relied upon the Bar Council of India Notification dated 28.6.2025 without examining it's applicability to the LL.M. course pursued during 2012-14.

PW1 Dr. Nageswar Yadav, a member of the Screening Committee, admitted during cross-examination that the qualifications of the Charged Officer had been scrutinized, no certificate was found fake or fraudulent during screening and his candidature was recommended without dissent.

The Enquiry Officer failed to properly appreciate the disclosure of another equivalent qualification of the Charged Officer i.e. M.Sc. (IT).

Disciplinary Authority has recorded it's observations on each of the above points as follows for

Charges of Article -I

The Charged Officer himself stated in his reply dated 30.01.2026 to the 1st Show Cause Notice that corrective action would be initiated. But he failed to produce any such document showing the steps taken for correction.

In the judgments of the High Court of Karnataka relied on by the Charged Officer i.e. the judgment dated 27.06.2016 passed in Karnataka State Open University-Vs-The State of Karnataka & Ors., the judgment dated 13.06.2017 passed in Sri Manoj M.-Vs-The Deputy Commissioner & Anr., judgment dated 03.03.2016 passed in Smt. Snehalatha P.-Vs-The State of Karnataka & Ors., **the issue does not pertain to degree obtained through off-campus distance mode and degree obtained from outside the territorial jurisdiction of the state of Karnataka. This issue has not been decided in all the said judgments which are relied on by the charged officer.**

On the other hand, the Charged Officer obtained his LL.M. degree through online/off-campus mode in collaborative institution of Karnataka State Open University which is outside the territorial jurisdiction of the State of Karnataka. Therefore, the said judgments of the High Court of Karnataka are not similar in facts as well as law with the matter of the Charged Officer and does not help the Charged Officer for establishing his case that his LL.M. degree is a valid degree as per the judgment of the Karnataka High Court as shown by him.

In Paragraph No.14 of the judgment dated 13.02.2019 passed by the Hon'ble Gauhati High Court in Purnendu Shekhar Debnath-Vs-The State of Assam & Ors., it is observed that "In fact learned counsel refers to the communication dated 09.08.2001, wherein the UGC had instructed the Registrars of all Universities **to stop franchising and that no student were to be permitted in such centres**. A repetition of the said direction was given vide communication dated 13.05.2003 and 16.04.2009. The learned counsel has submitted that following the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Professor Yashpal and to meet the object of the UGC which is to maintain a high standard in the Higher Education, such communications have been issued from time to time".

Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya, Hojai ★ Estd.-2019 ★ Date.....

As per the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court passed in Prof. Yashpal &Anr.-Vs-State of Chhattisgarh & Ors. reported in (2005) 5 SCC 420, State Universities are not authorized to open Study centres/off-campus centres beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the state.

As per the letter dated 03.01.2026 of Karnataka State Open University (Exhibit-PO-05), the Charged Officer has pursued his Masters of Law (LL.M.) from erstwhile academic collaborative institution of the University. The said erstwhile academic collaborative institution has not obtained the recognition of the concerned regulatory authorities for the programme offered by them, as undertaken by them in their respective Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) executed by them in favour of the University.

It is also stated in the said letter dated 03.01.2026 (Exhibit No.-PO-05) that University is not in a position to issue verification of marks cards of the Charged Officer since the concerned authorities has directed to issue degrees for duly recognised programmes and period in which norms of territorial jurisdiction were complied and other conditions such as period of recognition, degree completed under non-collaborative arrangement and directives by the authorities etc.

When perused the Exhibit No.-PO-06 i.e. the letter dated 02.01.2026 of the University Grant Commission (UGC), Distance Education Bureau, it is reflected in the said letter that UGC has not granted any approval to Karnataka State Open University to open off campus/study centre anywhere. It is also mentioned that being a state university, it can operate within it's state only. As per the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Prof. Yashpal & Another-Vs-State of Chhattisgarh & Ors. reported in (2005) 5 SCC 420, the State Universities are not authorized to open study centre/off campus centre(s) beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the state.

It is reflected in Paragraph No.3 of the letter dated 28.06.2025 i.e. Exhibit No.-PO-07 that "Such practices contravene the Advocates Act 1961, the Legal Education Rules, 2008 and 2020 and the binding rulings of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Vinit Garg-Vs-UGC and Odisha Lift Irrigation Corporation-Vs-Patro, which prohibits offering professional programmes via online or distance mode without approval of the concerned statutory regulation.

The Charged Officer has done his LL.M. degree through off campus online mode and beyond the territory of the State of Karnataka.

Under the above facts and circumstances, the charge against the Charged Officer that his LL.M. degree is not valid has been clearly established.

This cannot relieve the Charged Officer from the charge framed under Articles of Charge-I. There are sufficient documents which clearly proves that the LL.M. degree obtained by the Charged Officer is invalid.

It is important to note that the Charged Officer admitted the existence of the Screening Committee Report. The statement that the Screening Committee did not find any document fake or fraudulent during screening, cannot establish the validity of the LL.M. degree of the Charged Officer. Because, the said LL.M. degree is done through off campus online mode and beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the State of Karnataka.



The Screening Committee Report dated 28.06.2023 (Exhibit No.-PO-01) recorded the LL.M. qualification as the only qualification of the Charged Officer. It does not record the M.Sc. (IT) qualification as the postgraduate qualification. The PW1, in his statement, clearly stated that all the documents that were available were considered for screening of the candidate.

The Screening Committee had gone through the document including mark sheet and experience certificate which were available before them along with the application for the post of Deputy Registrar of the University. The Charged Officer admitted the existence of report of the Screening Committee where LL.M. was his only postgraduate qualification.

The Charged Officer claimed and submitted in his defense that he has another Master Degree and when he applied for the post of Deputy Registrar of the University, the same was mentioned in his application dated 08.06.2023 and he also enclosed the mark sheet of the said Master Degree i.e. M.Sc. (IT) with his application. He submitted photocopy of his application for Deputy Registrar which also includes the photocopies of duplicate mark sheet of M.Sc. (IT) Examination submitted by the Charged Officer. In the said mark sheet, the date of issue is reflected as 26.12.2025 and the date of issue of provisional certificate is 13.11.2025. Whereas the Charged Officer has applied for the post of Deputy Registrar on 08.06.2023. This clearly indicates that the Charged Officer tried to mislead the Enquiry Officer by submitting photocopy of fake mark sheet.

The Enquiry Report rightly observed that the photocopy of the said application for the post of Deputy Registrar as claimed by the Charged Officer which was produced by the Charged Officer subsequently cannot establish that he had mentioned the M.Sc. (IT) degree at that point of submission of the application for the said post of Deputy Registrar of Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya. Further the same cannot disprove and discredit the credibility of the original Screening Committee Report. It is also rightly indicated in the Enquiry Report that there is another charge framed under Article-III of the Memorandum of Charges, wherein it is mentioned categorically that the Charged Officer has taken away his original application for the post of Deputy Registrar, Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya from his personal file and has not returned the same. The Charged Officer himself admitted the existence of the Screening Committee Report in his Reply to the 2nd Show Cause Notice. Further, the Charged Officer in his application dated 29.08.2025 for the post of Registrar, Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya, application for the post of Assistant Registrar, Mahapurusha Srimanta Sankardeva Viswavidyalaya submitted on 08.06.2017, application for the post of Deputy Registrar, Mahapurusha Srimanta Sankardeva Viswavidyalaya on 11.11.2019 as well as 15.03.2021, nowhere mentioned about the M.Sc. (IT) degree as Master Degree.

- **While defending the Articles of Charge-II**, the Charged Officer has given stress on the following point:

The letter dated 25.05.2026 from former Vice Chancellor Prof. K. K. Deka was rejected without properly examining it's evidentiary value.

Disciplinary Authority has recorded its observations on the above point as follows for **Charges of Article –II**

In the Enquiry Report, it is reflected in Exhibit No.-PO-08 vide letter No.-MSSV/R/27(AM)/2017/32/70 dated 19.12.2025 that two certificates dated 20.04.2022 (Exhibit

No.-PO-09) and certificate dated nil (Exhibit No.-PO-10) were not issued by the Mahapurusha Srimanta Sankardeva Viswavidyalaya. Those two certificates Exhibit No. P.O.-09 and Exhibit No. P.O.-10 were submitted by the Charged Officer to Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya in support of his claim for pay protection. From the plain reading of Exhbit No.-PO-09 dated 20.04.2022, it is seen that the said certificate dated 20.4.2022 was certified a period beyond the date of issuance i.e. up to 13.07.2022 and 14.07.2022 till date.

The letter issued by the former Vice Chancellor of Mahapurusha Srimanta Sankardeva Viswavidyalaya was not proved before the Enquiry Officer. The Charged Officer has not brought the former Vice Chancellor, Mahapurusha Srimanta Sankardeva Viswavidyalaya to prove the said letter/certificate. The official communication of the Registrar, Mahapurusha Srimanta Sankardeva Viswavidyalaya is considered by the Enquiry Officer which constitutes a specific institutional statement disputing the official issuance of the said two documents relied upon by the Charged Officer. As such, said letter/certificate cannot be treated as letter/certificate issued by the former Vice Chancellor. There is no evidential value of the said letter/certificate.

While defending the Articles of Charge-III, the Charged Officer has given stress on the following point:

The Enquiry Officer to properly consider the delay of approximately five months in reporting the alleged incident and the subsequent introduction of the alleged time of occurrence, namely 11.00 AM which had not appeared in the earlier written statement

Disciplinary Authority has recorded its observations on the above point as follows for **Charges of Article -III**

The question of delay in reporting the incident does not arise at all. The question is whether the Charged Officer has taken his original application for the post of Deputy Registrar from the custody of the P.W. No.2 and same is proved or not. From the evidence of P.W.2 and his cross examination, it is clear and proved that the Charged Officer has taken his original application for the post of Deputy Registrar from the custodian i.e. from the P.W. No.2. It is also established that the Charged Officer has not returned the same despite issuance of the notice dated 8.1.2026 (Exhibit No.- PO-12) from the office of the Registrar, Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya. It is also well established in the examination in chief as well as in cross examination of the P.W.2 that the said application was taken by the Charged Officer and the same has not been returned to the office of the Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya. The Charged Officer in his defense as well as in his show cause reply, is not able to establish that he had not taken the original application for the post of Deputy Registrar from the custody of P.W. No.2.

While defending the Articles of Charge-IV, the Charged Officer has given stress on the following point:

The Enquiry Officer held that the charged officer had obtained appointment through concealment of his earlier dismissal from APRO without properly examining the judicial proceedings culminating in the order dated 17.05.2023 in Review Petition No.13/2023. The charged officer was not a dismissed employee even for a single day from APRO vide the said order.

Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya, Hojai ★ Estd.-2019 ★ Date.....

The observation of the Disciplinary Authority for this point is recorded as follows-

The Hon'ble High Court in Paragraph No.8 of the order dated 17.05.2023 passed in Review Petition No.13/2023 held that "It is ordered accordingly ..... the order dated 30.05.2016 of the Superintendent of Police (Commn.) HQ-II, APRO HQ, Guwahati, Assam **is now to be read** to be a punishment of removal from service, meaning thereby that the petitioner would remain eligible for employment in any other organization, if so advised."

From perusal of the said order, it becomes clear that the earlier punishment ceased to exist w.e.f. the date of the order i.e. 17.5.2023. It is established that during the tenure of his dismissal from service, he was appointed in Mahapurusha Srimanta Sankardeva Viswavidyalaya, where he never disclosed that he was dismissed from service. It is a well settled law that a dismissed employee cannot get appointment against Government post and such employee is not entitled to get any Government grant. Further experiences of any service of that particular point cannot be counted for further employment in any Government service. It is established that the Charged Officer, by concealing the fact about his dismissal, took appointment in Mahapurusha Srimanta Sankardeva Viswavidyalaya and thereafter on the basis of the said appointment in Mahapurusha Srimanta Sankardeva Viswavidyalaya, and experiences of that particular time of appointment, he got appointed as Deputy Registrar of Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya.

The Enquiry Officer failed to identify the specific statutory provision or recruitment condition imposing an automatic disqualification from appointment at MSSV or Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya.

The observation of the Disciplinary Authority for this point is recorded as follows-

The issue pertains to Charge-IV is whether the Charged Officer disclosed the material fact of his earlier dismissal when applying for and obtaining appointment at Mahapurusha Srimanta Sankardeva Viswavidyalaya and whether he subsequently disclosed the same fact while seeking appointment at Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya that he was appointed in Mahapurusha Srimanta Sankardeva Viswavidyalaya during the period of his dismissal from service. Mere absence of any statutory provision cannot relieve the charged officer from the said charge.

It is therefore, we come to the conclusion that at that point of filing application for the post of Deputy Registrar, Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya, the Charged Officer has not required valid experiences as required in the advertisement for the post in question. The Charged Officer has suppressed the material fact of his appointment as Deputy Registrar of Mahapurusha Srimanta Sankardeva Viswavidyalaya and using the said experience he obtained appointment as Deputy Registrar of Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya.

Therefore, such act of the Charged Officer, it is established that he applied fraudulently and misleading way to get appointed in the post of Deputy Registrar, Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya, Hojai.

While defending the Articles of Charge-V, the Charged Officer has given stress on the following point:

Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya, Hojai Date..... Estd.-2019

The Enquiry Officer treated the absence of the Charged Officer's name from the Office Order dated 05.06.2025 deputing supporting staff for the selection exercise at IIT Guwahati on 24.06.2025 and 25.06.2025 as conclusive proof that his participation was unauthorized.

The observation of the Disciplinary Authority for this point is recorded as follows-

The name of the Charged Officer does not appear in the Office Order dated 05.06.2025 which assigned duties in connection with the selection process and the Charged Officer admitted that he was present at IIT Guwahati on 24.06.2025 and 25.06.2025 in spite of having knowledge that his wife Dr. Jhumpa Dey was a candidate for the post of Associate Professor on the particular date of interview i.e. 25.06.2025. The Disciplinary Authority also considered the Enquiry Report wherein it is stated that the Charged Officer during his presence in the interview venue at IIT Guwahati on the particular date i.e. on 24.06.2025 and 25.06.2025 put symbolic mark on the document verification report of the candidates which are exhibited. It is also stated in the Enquiry Report that no evidence has been produced on record to corroborate the claim of the Charged Officer that Hon'ble Vice Chancellor has instructed him to place such symbolic marks on the verification report. As such, Charge-V against the Charged Officer is clearly established.

It is also established that on 25.06.2025, the wife of the Charged Officer namely Jhumpa Dey was present before the interview board as a candidate.

While defending the Articles of Charge-VI, the Charged Officer has given stress on the following point:

The Enquiry Officer relied upon discrepancies in the Speed Post consignment, postal address, PIN particulars and inward register to conclude that the RTI application was fabricated, without even establishing that the charged officer had personally created or procured it's fabrication.

The observation of the Disciplinary Authority for this point is recorded as follows-

While functioning as Public Information Officer (PIO) of the Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya, in addition to his other responsibilities, the Charged Officer issued an RTI reply dated 04.11.2025 (Exhibit No.-PO-18) in respect of an RTI application which, according to his own noting, had been received on 22.10.2025 (Exhibit No.-PO-19), although the University's official inward records do not show receipt of such application.

The report on which the RTI reply was prepared was dated 30.08.2025 (Exhibit-PO-21), i.e. almost two months prior to the alleged receipt of the RTI application, and the said report was prepared by a person who was not authorised to issue it and was prepared under the direction of the Charged Officer.

The postal verification shows that the Speed Post consignment number appearing on the envelope was not booked from Guwahati GPO and that was not received by the University. The Department has also relied upon discrepancies in the address, PIN Code and email particulars of the alleged RTI applicant.

Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya, Hojai ★ Estd.-2019 ★ Date.....

The Exhibit No.-PO-22, read with the deposition of P.W. No.3, Mrs. Maya Rani Daulaguphu, establishes that, under the Charged Officer's instructions, she entered the names and receipt dates of five candidates in a format prepared by him and signed it. This evidence assumes significance in view of the absence of a corresponding entry in the official Inward Receipt Register and the postal authority's clarification regarding the Speed Post consignment number (Exhibit PO-23).

Exhibit PO-24 reveals that the envelope purportedly containing the RTI application bears the seal and signature of the Charged Officer, a circumstance that raises questions regarding the manner in which the said envelope was handled and processed.

The alleged RTI application was stated to have been received on 22.10.2025, whereas no corresponding entry is available in the official Inward Receipt Register. The Charged Officer failed to prove the official receipt of the RTI application. Because, when the Charged Officer made an endorsement as a Public Information Officer under RTI Act, there must be some receipt in the official record of the University. But, no such official record of receipt of the said RTI application is reflected in the documents exhibited before the Enquiry Officer. Therefore, the Presenting Officer has been able to prove his case and charge has been proved as per the Enquiry Report.

The Summary of the Observation of the Disciplinary Authority in case of all the major points raised by the Charged Officer in his defense during reply to 2nd show cause is as follows.-

(1) (a) The online off-campus LL.M. degree which is pursued from beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the State of Karnataka by the charged officer is not valid and the same is proved in the Enquiry Report. The Charged Officer, nowhere, was able to establish that his online off campus LL.M. degree is a valid degree. He also could not produce the original pass certificate of his LL.M. degree.

(b) LL.M. degree was the only Master Degree when the Charged Officer submitted his application for the post of Deputy Registrar of Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya and the same is proved in Screening Committee Report. The Charged Officer also himself admitted the existence of the Screening Committee Report in his reply to the 2nd Show Cause Notice.

(2) The charge that the experience certificates are not issued by Mahapurusha Srimanta Sankardeva Viswavidyalaya is proved.

(3) The charge that original application for the post of the Deputy Registrar, Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya was taken by the Charged Officer is also proved as the same is reflected in the cross examination of the P.W.2.

(4) The charge that the Charged Officer, by concealing the fact about his dismissal, took appointment in Mahapurusha Srimanta Sankardeva Viswavidyalaya and thereafter on the basis of the said appointment and experience, he was appointed in Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya, is also proved.

(5) The charge that the charged officer while functioning as the Deputy Registrar of Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya remained present at the venue of the

Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya, Hajo ★ Estd.-2009 ★ Date.....

Selection Committee meeting held at IIT Guwahati on 24.06.2026 and 25.06.2026 despite not being assigned duty in connection with the said Selection Committee is proved as the Charged Officer himself admitted the same where in the interview dated 25.06.2025, the wife of the Charged Officer was a candidate for the post of Associate Professor of the University.

(6) The charge that the charged officer manufactured an RTI application for his personal gain, is proved as there is no official record/entry of receipt of the said RTI application which was submitted in his Court case in W.P.(C) No.6700/2025 as Annexure-11 in his affidavit-in-reply filed against the RTV for his personal benefit.

(7) The Charge No. I, II, III and IV are the serious charges and the same offences are already proved in the Enquiry Report. The other two charges i.e. V & VI are also proved. The Charged Officer in his reply to the 2nd Show Cause Notice could not give a satisfactory reply to reject the Enquiry Report.

On careful scrutiny and examination of Enquiry Report with reference to the Reply of the Charged Officer to 2nd show cause notice and also on verification of all exhibits and documents submitted by Presenting Officer, Charged Officer PWs, and cross examination records, the members are of unanimous opinion that as all the six charges against the Charged Officer including the charge of invalid L.LM degree pursued online off campus and from beyond the territory of the state of Karnataka from a collaborative institute of KSOU without approval of regulatory authorities remained established and the said L.LM degree was only Master degree of the Charged Officer at the time of his recruitment to the post of Deputy Registrar of Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya in 2023.

Further, his requisite experience for the post of Deputy Registrar, Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya, cannot be counted on the basis of the appointment of Mahapurusha Srimanta Sankardeva Viswavidyalaya which was made during the period of the dismissal of his service. It is also established that the original application for the post of Deputy Registrar, Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya was taken by the Charged Officer where the LL.M. was reflected as Master degree.

While considering the 2nd Show Cause Reply dated 28.10.2026 and the Enquiry Report, it was also examined that whether fair and reasonable opportunity was given to the Charged Officer during the enquiry proceeding and also examined the violation of natural justice if any to the charged officer during the departmental proceeding. From the Enquiry Report as well as from the day to day proceeding it is reflected that sufficient opportunity was given to the charged officer and no violation of natural justice was there in the proceedings.

Resolution No. RTV/EC/25/02/04.11.2026

On the basis of the above facts the Disciplinary Authority unanimously resolved to dismiss the Charged Officer from the post of Deputy Registrar of Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya, Hojai, Assam, as per Rule 7(vii) of Assam Services (Discipline & Appeal) Rule 1964 adopted by the University as Ordinance on Services (Discipline & Appeal) Rules for the Employees of the University. It is also resolved that the LL.M. degree pursued by the Charged Officer online and off campus from beyond territory of the State of Karnataka from an erstwhile collaborative

Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya, Hojai Date..... Estd.-2019

institute of KSOU without approval of the regulatory authorities was considered as eligibility of the Charged Officer during selection to the post of Deputy Registrar of Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya, Hojai, Assam. As the said LLM degree of Charged Officer is established to be invalid, his service in Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya, Hojai, Assam as Deputy Registrar is to be considered as ***void ab initio***.

The Council authorised the Member-Secretary of the Executive Council and the Registrar i/c to issue the order of dismissal, with the approval of the Chairman of the Executive Council, within seven (07) days from the date of the meeting.

Agenda No. 3(a):

Service Confirmation of Service of Academic Registrar

Dr. Sandeep Ratra, Academic Registrar, completed one year of probation in September, 2026. His Police Verification Report has also been received by the University. Accordingly, the matter relating to the confirmation of his services is placed before the Executive Council.

Resolution No. RTV/EC/25/03a/04.11.2026

The House Unanimously resolved to confirm the service of Academic Registrar Dr. Sandip Ratna w.e.f. completion of one year service from date of his joining.

Agenda No. 3(b):

Fresh DPR for Phase -II Construction

The DPR for Phase-II construction at Sir J. C. Bose Campus was approved by the Executive Council.

The DPR was prepared by M/s. K.S. Design, Guwahati. Subsequently, the Office of the Chief Engineer engaged an architectural consultant for further collaboration in preparing the said DPR.

A draft DPR was submitted by the concerned organisation. The draft was discussed in the meeting of the Heads, Deans and Officers held on 24th September, 2026. The meeting suggested the following modifications to the DPR prepared in consultation with the architectural consultant:

(i) **Academic Building:** The Academic Building should be designed as per the requirements of the University, with adequate provisions for classrooms and faculty/staff rooms.

(ii) **Girls' Hostel and Other Infrastructure:** The Girls' Hostel should be shifted to Phase-III construction. In lieu of the same, the Central Library, Amenity Centre and an additional four 2-BHK staff quarters should be constructed under Phase-II.

(iii) **Servant Quarters and Boundary Wall:** Servant quarters and the boundary wall surrounding the VC's residence should be constructed.

(iv) **Guest House:** The proposed Guest House design has been found to be satisfactory.

Resolution no RTV/EC/25/03b/04.11.2026

The Members perused the proposal and approved it.

Agenda No. 3(c):

Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya, Hojai ★ Estd.-2019 ★ Date.....

Appointment of DSW (I/C)

Dr. Satyajit Kumar is going to superannuate in mid-2027. He has expressed his desire not to continue with the responsibility of DSW (i/c). Accordingly, Dr. Monjit Saikia, Associate Professor, Department of Botany, RTV, Hojai, has been entrusted with the responsibility of the Dean of Students' Welfare (DSW), In-Charge. The matter is placed before the Executive Council for ratification.

Resolution No. RTV/EC/25/03c/04.11.2026

Members resolved to ratify the action taken by the Vice Chancellor to appoint Dr. Mojit Saikia as DSW, i/c.

The meeting ended with vote of thanks to and from the Chair.

Prepared by:

Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya, Hojai ★ Estd.-2019 ★ Date.....

SRatna 04/11/26

Registrar, i/c
Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya,
Hojai, Assam

Registrar I/C
Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya
Hojai (Assam)

Signed by:

4/11/2026

Vice Chancellor
Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya,
Hojai, Assam

Vice Chancellor
Rabindranath Thakur Vishwavidyalaya
Hojai (Assam)