

Sarmila vs the Principal

Sarmila vs the Principal

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1412951

Court : Chennai

Decided On : Feb-26-2026

Judge : Honourable Mr.Justice D.Bharatha Chakravarthy

Appeal No. : WP/1017/2026

Appellant : Sarmila

Respondent : The Principal

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 26-02-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY Sarmila
..Petitioner Vs

1. The Principal, Kailash Womens Nursing College, Tharamangalam, Nangavalli Main Road, Periyasoragai, Nangavalli, Tamilnadu - 636 502.
2. The Vice - Chancellor,

..Respondents Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of Writ of Mandamus, directing the first and second respondents to return the petitioner original academic and personal certificates, including Transfer Certificate, 10th and 12th Marksheets, Statement of Marks, Community Certificate and Native Certificate within stipulated time fixed by this Court. For Petitioner: Mr.M.Muthuraja For Respondents: Mr.Hari Radhakrishnan for R2 No appearance for R1

ORDER

The writ petition is filed for a mandamus directing the first and second respondents to return the petitioners Original Academic and Personal Certificates, including the Transfer Certificate, 10th and 12th Mark Sheets, Page1 of 4 Statement of Marks, Community Certificate and Native Certificate within the time stipulated by this Court.

2. Upon hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner and perusing the

material records of the case, the grievance of the petitioner is that the petitioner was admitted into the first respondent institution for the B.Sc. Nursing course. During the admission process, she had submitted her original certificates and also paid a total sum of Rs.1,91,000/- towards admission and tuition fees. Due to unexpected health and unforeseen circumstances, she was unable to continue her studies. Therefore, she formally requested discontinuation of the course and sought the return of the original certificates and refund of the fees. The college has not done so.

3. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, the non-returning

of the certificates is illegal and even the fee refund has to be given as per the University Grants Commission fee refund policy. However, the petitioner has come before this Court only praying for return of the certificates and she is not requesting the fee.

4. Even though notice has been served, the first respondent is not appearing before this Court. This Court specifically requested the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the second respondent University to get Page2 of 4

instructions as to whether there is any bond or special condition in the prospectus. The learned counsel for the second respondent University would submit that from the end of the University, there is no bond mandated and to their knowledge they have not prescribed any prospectus condition.

5. Under the said circumstances, the writ petition is allowed as prayed for.

The first respondent is directed to return the petitioners Original Academic and Personal Certificates, including the Transfer Certificate, 10 th and 12th Mark Sheets, Statement of Marks, Community Certificate and Native Certificate, within one week from the date of production of the web copy of the

order without waiting for the certified copy of the order. No costs.

Neutral Citation: Yes/No NSL To The Vice - Chancellor, Page3 of 4

D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

NSL Page4 of 4

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com