

THE COLONIZATION
OF
A UNIVERSITY

(BIHAR UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS)

Prepared by
CITIZENS FACT-FINDING COMMITTEE
MUZAFFARPUR

P R E F A C E

HERE is the story of a university treated as a colony of the expanding frontiers of the political aggrandizement of the over-ambitious politicians. The Bihar University has, of late, suffered from unprecedented affliction. Examinations have been bungled. Results have not been announced as due. Questions have leaked out. Good teachers have been victimised and driven out of the University. Teachers of doubtful merit have been pampered on narrow instincts. Thus the standard of education has alarmingly fallen. Classes have had to be suspended. Students have gone on strikes and hunger-strikes. There have been violent demonstrations. Students have been involved or implicated in litigation. In fact, education has lost its meaning in these parts. Against this background, the Chancellor of the University appointed a probe into the affairs of the Bihar University.

This story is completely based on the facts, data and information, supplied to the Citizens' Fact-Finding Committee from the proceedings of the Bihar University Senate and Syndicate, University Statutes, the judgements of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the Hon'ble Patna High Court, the letters written by and to Dr. P. L. Srivastava, the Vice-Chancellor, and other authoritative statements and papers.

↑ P. N. Mehta
CHAIRMAN

AUGUST 22, 1964.

CITIZENS' FACT-FINDING COMMITTEE

NIEPA DC



D02389

Sub. National Systems Unit,
National Institute of Educational
Planning and Administration
17-B, SriAurobindo Marg, New Delhi-110016
DOC. No.....2372.....
Date.....25.9.80.....

CONTENTS

	PAGES
INTRODUCTION	1
RAJENDRA COLLEGE, CHAPRA	6
Causes and Remedy for Unrest and Disturbances	6
The Demolition of a Principal	6
The Liquidation of a Secretary	8
Alleged Mismanagement of the College	11
Remedy	11
QUESTION LEAKAGE OF 1963	14
Normal Procedure for Printing Question Papers	14
Procedure for Printing Questions in Reference	15
Leakage and After : Sequence of Events	17
Causes of Leakage and Persons Responsible	22
Remedy	30
GENERAL UNREST IN THE UNIVERSITY	31
Vitiated Atmosphere on account of Casteism	32
Malafide Appointments	33
Irregular Appointments	34
Manipulated Appointments	35
Hush-Hush Appointments	37
The Chancellor Slighted	39
Double Standards	42
Appointments through Intrigues	45
Readers or Academic Devaluation	46
Victimization <i>En Masse</i>	48
Proctors and Principals	52
Naked Favouritism	53
Conclusive Data and Evidence	54
Bid to Control University Bodies	56
The case of Mr. N. P. Singh	56
A Chain of Fortresses to Conquer	58
Tailor-made Appointments	58
Intrigues and Subterfuge	59
Strategic Blue Print	60
Conclusive Facts	62
The Grant of Scholarship	63
Protection to Condemned Teachers and Victimization of Good Teachers.	69
Bungling and Manipulation in Examination	74
Malafide Appointments	74
Favouritism in Examination Results	75
Mismanagement of Examinations	79
Conclusive Facts	82
Exploitation and Victimization of Students	82
Political Machination for the Control of the Office	88

INTRODUCTION

ON account of chaos reigning supreme in the University of Bihar for the last one year or so, Sri M. Anantashayanam Ayyangar, the Chancellor of the University, by virtue of the authority vested in him under Clause (2), Section 8, of the Bihar State Universities Act of 1960, as amended by the Bihar Act 2 of 1962, appointed Mr. K.S.V. Raman, Deputy Chairman of the Bihar State University Commission, as One-Man Probe Commission, hereinafter referred to as "the Raman Commission," to enquire into the affairs of the University of Bihar on the following particular terms of reference :

1. (a) affairs of Rajendra College, Chapra with particular reference to the causes and remedy for the unrest and disturbances;
- (b) alleged mismanagement of the college and its finances; and
- (c) remedies for the proper running and management of the College.
2. (a) system at present adopted by the University in getting printed the question-papers, the causes for the leakage, and person or persons responsible therefor; and
- (b) to suggest methods by which recurrence of such leakage could be avoided.
3. (a) the general unrest in the University, the causes of the last strike followed by hunger-strike, and remedy therefor; and
- (b) the disturbance created at the Convocation.
4. to make an inspection into the accounts of the University for the year 1960 to enquire into financial irregularity, if any, and to fix responsibility therefor.

In addition, the Chancellor entrusted Mr. K.S.V. Raman also with the work of studying the implications of the judgement of the Supreme Court declaring void portions of the Statutes and recommending adjustments in the Statutes called for as consequence.

Citizens interested in restoring normality in the University of Bihar which had for some time now passed through

a state of unprecedented tension, formed a fact-finding Committee, known as "CITIZENS' FACT-FINDING COMMITTEE (Bihar University Affairs)" hereinafter referred to as "the Citizens Committee," to assist the Raman Commission in its task. Mr. Pashupatinath Mehta and Mr. Radhanandan Jha were respectively elected the Chairman and the Honorary Secretary of the Citizens Committee. The first meeting of the Citizens Committee was held under the Chairmanship of Mr. Pashupatinath Mehta on the 17th of July, 1964, in the hall of the Muzaffarpur Dakbungalow. The prominent among those who attended the meeting were :—

Mr. Dip Narayan Singh, former Irrigation Minister;
Mr. Daroga Prasad Rai, former Labour Minister;
Mr. Krishna Kanta Singh, M.P., former Deputy
Minister;

Mr. Dwarikanath Tiwari, M. P.
Mr. Digvijaya Narayan Singh, M. P.
Mr. Mohan Lal Gupta, M.L.A.
Mr. Mahendra Mohan Mishra, Member,
Bihar University Senate; and
Mr. Dwarka Nath Kapoor, Advocate.

The Citizens Committee welcomed the appointment of the Raman Commission, and thanked the Chancellor for the institution of this enquiry.

The Chairman and the Honorary Secretary of the Citizens Committee were authorised and empowered to receive and collect facts, evidence and data to be submitted to the Raman Commission. To advise the Chairman in all matters pertaining to the collection of facts, evidence and data in the terms of reference determined by the Chancellor and in all matters pertaining to the submission thereof, the Citizens Committee set up a seventeen-man Advisory Committee with powers to co-opt four members. This advisory Committee consists of :

Mr. Pashupatinath Mehta, Chairman;
Mr. Dip Narayan Singh, M.L.A., Member;
Mr. Mahamaya Prasad Sinha, M.L.C., Member;
Mr. Daroga Prasad Rai, M.L.A., Member;
Mr. Bishma Prasad Yadav, M.P., Member;
Mr. Lokesh Nath Jha, M.L.C., Member;
Mr. Jagannath Swatantra, M.L.A., Member;
Mr. Shakoor Ahmad, M.L.A., Member;
Mr. Mohan Lal Gupta, M.L.A., Member;
Mr. Dwarka Nath Kapoor, Advocate, Member;
Mr. Ramjanma Ojha, Advocate, Member;
Mr. Mahendra Mohan Mishra, Advocate, Member;
Mr. H. N. Mitra, Member;
Mr. Laliteswar Prasad Sahi, Member;

Mr. Bhubaneshwar Prasad Chaudhary, Member;

Mr. Munshi Dayal Singh, Member;

Mr. Radhanandan Jha, Honorary Secretary.

The members of the Advisory Committee advised the Chairman that the Citizens Committee should carefully examine and scrutinize whatever information came its way before it was forwarded to the Raman Commission. The individual members of the Advisory Committee were also requested to collect evidence, facts and data strictly in accordance with the terms of reference determined for the Raman Commission, and submit them to the Chairman.

At the very outset, the Citizens Committee was constrained to find that efforts were being made to suppress facts, evidence and data to the detriment of justice. The Citizens Committee was, at first, reluctant to take notice of anything other than evidence, even though the efforts to suppress or lead away evidence was, in the ultimate analysis, apt to jeopardize the task of the Raman Commission. But when the Action Committee of the students of the University of Bihar forwarded a copy of its resolutions saying that attempts were being made to scare or lead away unbiased evidence or to coax the students to put up before the Raman Commission evidence that might be favourable to the Vice-Chancellor, though not true, the Citizens Committee had no option but to draw the kind attention of the appropriate authority to this conspiracy against justice. It was on the instance of this Action Committee that the citizens of Muzaffarpur earlier had sent a Delegation to the Chancellor, the Chief Minister and the Education Minister to persuade them to appoint an enquiry into the affairs of the University of Bihar. If anything, it proved that this Action Committee enjoyed the recognition of the public. Besides, the Chief Minister and the Education Minister received the Delegations nominated by this Action Committee, and the Chancellor granted audience to its nominees. This virtually meant that the Government of Bihar and the University of Bihar recognised the representative character of this Action Committee, for there is no reason nor precedent to presume that the Chancellor, the Chief Minister and the Education Minister would receive and discuss matters with the *persona non grata*. These facts, from time to time reported in the 'Indian Nation' and the 'Searchlight' and at no time contradicted, left the Citizens Committee no option but to recognize the representative character of this Action Committee, and take notice of the resolutions of this Action Committee, more so because these resolutions were passed in respect of the matters pertaining to the facts, evidence and data likely to come up before the Raman Commission.

The Suppression
of Evidence.

The Chairman of the Citizens Committee received specimen copies of the letters issued, under the authority of the University of Bihar, by a Probe Committee, appointed by the Syndicate, to a number of teachers and students. The draft of these letters, read with the resolutions of the said Action Committee, engendered probabilities prolific of many complications. The Show Cause issued by the Syndicate Probe Committee is, indeed, an unmitigated specimen of the French Law where a man is guilty until he proves his innocence—the concept of law rejected in this country. Some students were called upon to appear before the Probe Committee to explain as to why their names had appeared in some complaints about their participation in some disturbances. The name of the complainant is not disclosed. The nature of the complaint is not described. The time and place of the cause of complaint is not mentioned. Yet the students were called upon to explain as to why there should be complaints against them. The students were given the option of submitting their explanation in writing, if they chose to do so. What intrigued them as to what charges would the students defend themselves against. Yet the Syndicate Probe Committee said that if they neither appeared in person nor filed written explanations, inference would be drawn from the complaints filed against them. It was veiled threat, because the University authorities mentioned that inference would be drawn from certain unexplained complaints filed by undisclosed complainants in respect of some unidentified incidents. Yet the threat was unmistakable, for in this instance the accused were the students, and the University authorities were both the prosecution and the judge. It was clearly a coercive measure designed on the pattern of the British bureaucratic methods. The persecution continues even today. To this was added the widely publicized news of the police and administrative highhandedness against the students—the students of certain castes. Therefore, the Citizens Committee respectfully drew the attention of the Raman Commission to the possibility of facts not reaching it that easily. It may, in the ultimate analysis, affect the enquiry.

It was only after the Raman Commission announced the last date after which it might not receive evidence that the Citizens Committee drew the attention of the Commission to the dangers of unabated efforts to conceal evidence. It is not easy to believe that the Vice-Chancellor of a University would deliberately and persistently cause such cruel suffering to his students, as described in the daily newspapers. Yet, recurring hesitation must yield to complaints corroborated by circumstantial evidence, the traditional respect for the office of the Vice-Chancellor notwithstanding. In spite of all these and being so requested, the Citizens Committee has refrained from appealing to the Chancellor to remove

Dr. P.L. Srivastava from his office during the period of investigation by the Raman Commission, though the facts remain without dispute that if Dr. P. L. Srivastava had voluntarily stepped aside in the circumstances, he would indeed have set an example worthy of his office. The Citizens Committee has, however, remained deeply grieved at and apprehensive of the actions of the Vice-Chancellor, which might frustrate the purpose of his own Chancellor. But then "History unfolds itself by strange and unpredictable paths. We have little control over the future; and none over the past."

The Vice-Chancellor has continued his acts of vengeance and torture against his students, throwing them on the thorns of litigation and persecution, holding back their results to disable them from prosecuting their studies further, and thus ruin their careers. Each day, that Dr. P. L. Srivastava continues in his office, will unfold misery and gloom for those placed in his care.

I. RAJENDRA COLLEGE, CHAPRA

(A) CAUSES AND REMEDY FOR UNREST AND DISTURBANCES

RAJENDRA College, Chapra, was started in the year 1938, and since then has been run by the Governing Body of the College with the Principal as the immediate executive chief. This is an institution affiliated to and admitted by the University of Bihar—a fact very vital to remember while ascertaining the causes of the disturbances and unrest at the College. The genesis of the College, together with the long term which Mr. Manoranjan Prasad enjoyed as the Principal there, is a significant factor in the matter. Mr. Manoranjan Prasad was the Principal of the College for seventeen years during which the College came to be looked upon as their sanctuary by some persons of his caste. The episode ended when Mr. Manoranjan Prasad retired from his office.

The Demolition of a Principal

These persons, belonging to the caste of Mr. Manoranjan Prasad, took the appointment of Mr. Bhola Prasad Singh, belonging to another caste, as an encroachment upon their rights; and, in order to strengthen their agitation against the new Principal, projected their way of thought to their caste—the patent method of casteism prevalent in Bihar. A sort of tirade was organized against Mr. Bhola Prasad Singh who was reduced to a target for darts thrown on caste considerations. With the advent of Mr. Satyendra Narayan Singh on the scene of Bihar politics in 1961, unfortunately this caste onslaught was augmented with further passion and power.

Mr. Bhola Prasad Singh was appointed as the Principal of the College by the appropriate Governing Body, and this appointment was approved of by the University Syndicate, and subsequently confirmed by the Chancellor. Later, on a memorial, the Chancellor reviewed his decision, and withdrew his approval; and Mr. Bhola Prasad Singh appealed to the Hon'ble Patna High Court. The Hon'ble Patna High Court held the appointment of Mr. Bhola Prasad Singh as valid, and the Bihar University went into appeal before the Hon'ble Supreme Court against the judgment of the Hon'ble Patna High Court, where the case is pending. Therefore, as the matter is *sub judice*, we do not discuss the merits of the appointment of Mr. Bhola Prasad Singh as the Principal; but one fact is yet unmitigated that until the Hon'ble Supreme Court decides to the contrary, the appointment of Mr. Bhola Prasad Singh is lawful and valid according to the judgment of the Hon'ble Patna High Court.

The malady, afflicting Rajendra College, manifold and aggravated by the personal dislike of the Education Minister, which affected the fate of Mr. Bhola Prasad Singh, emanates from the continuous and acute difference of opinion between Mr. Satyendra Narayan Singh and Mr. Bhola Prasad Singh when both of them were the members of the University Syndicate before Mr. Satyendra Narayan Singh became the Education Minister. In the Writ Petition of 27-1-1963, filed before the Hon'ble Patna High Court, constituting Miscellaneous Judicial Case No. 86 of 1963, it is stated that the Vice-Chancellor showed Mr. Bisheshwar Dayal Singh a letter from the Education Minister telling the Vice-Chancellor that the Minister had received a complaint from fourteen members of the State Legislature that Mr. Bhola Prasad fanned casteism and groupism through his indiscreet discretionary grants and appointments, and that the Government would intervene should a law-and-order situation arise on that account. That the Education Minister should write such a letter without any enquiry into the grounds of complaints was unfortunately to act as a prompting to the Vice-Chancellor who intensified his attack on the Principal in accordance with this new blueprint sketched in the letter of the Minister. The facts of the case are that when the dismissal of Mr. Bhola Prasad Singh could not speedily be achieved through the Statutes of the University, he was forced to go on leave—a novel method to exclude the Principal from his College. The anticipated law-and-order situation did arise or was made to arise, for the Government did intervene, and Mr. Bhola Prasad Singh was externed from the College through Sections 107 and 144 of the Cr. P. C.

Mr. Phulena Prasad Singh, a lecturer of Rajendra College, was brutally assaulted with daggers and spears when he tried to defend Mr. Bhola Prasad Singh against an organized attack within the College campus. While Mr. R. S. Mishra, another lecturer of the College and friend of Mr. Bhola Prasad Singh, was away from his house, the residence was raided by an organized mob of students, and even the ladies of the family were manhandled. Several attempts were made on the lives of Mr. Bhola Prasad Singh and his friends, and their repeated requests to the district police went unheeded. Mr. Bhola Prasad Singh invoked the attention of the Inspector-General of Police who found ample reason to reprimand the then Superintendent or Police of Chapra, though without any salutary effect whatsoever. It is not a coincidence that all the assailants should invariably escape with impunity nor the fact that police protection to Mr. Bhola Prasad Singh and his friends should virtually look withdrawn—an unmixed stigma for any civilized administration.

The extent to which the Vice-Chancellor persuaded himself to stoop to remove Mr. Bhola Prasad Singh is evident

from the judgment of the Hon'ble Patna High Court in respect of Miscellaneous Judicial Case No. 1022 of 1962 : *"It is regrettable that the deponent of the counter-affidavit of the University, who himself dealt with the file on the 14th of June, 1960, and gave the note, says or is made to say in the counter-affidavit facts showing the alleged irregularity or illegality in accordance with the approval by the Syndicate, which he did not point out at the relevant time."* This indeed perhaps is the lone example when the University authorities went to the extent of causing inaccurate affidavit to be sworn before an Hon'ble High Court in order to achieve an end which they could legally achieve.

Sober and saner elements were removed from the Governing Body of the College before the completion of the normal terms of their Membership, introducing politicians without much academic reputation. For instance, Dr. H.R. Ghoshal, M.A., D.Litt., Dean of the Faculty of Arts, was, before the completion of the normal term of his Membership, replaced by one Mr. Srinarayan Singh, an advocate-politician. Some students of Jagdam College, developed as a rival to Rajendra College, were admitted into Rajendra College, and those students were subsequently found associated with all agitations organized against the Principal within the College. The University authorities did not desist from sanctioning discretionary grants to the students involved in the acts of rowdyism and violence with impunity.

Liquidation of a Secretary

This drama of tragic ethics reveals another fabric of the same texture, a part of the same design, woven by the University authorities without any moral compunction, prompted by the most imprudent neglect or the most reprehensible connivance of the Ministry of Education. Mr. Bisheshwar Dayal Singh, the lawfully continuing Secretary, was removed from his office before the completion of his term for the simple fault that he declined to advertise for the post of the Principal of the College, when the post was already held through a permanent appointment. Thus, in order to remove the Principal, it became imperative for the University authorities first to remove the Secretary and "capture" the Governing Body. The Secretary was removed in consequence of the appointment of a new Secretary, Mr. Ganga Prasad Sinha, who had, earlier, been associated with unrestrained criticism of the College and the Principal. That the Vice-Chancellor divorced all accepted codes of decorum in vilifying the College and the Principal is evident from a judgement of the Hon'ble Patna High Court, delivered in Miscellaneous Judicial Case No. 86 of 1963 : *"It appears to me that aspersions should not have been cast on the Members of the Governing Body, when even the*

Vice-Chancellor thought that the Governing Body should be reconstituted." The action of the Vice-Chancellor to exclude Mr. Bisheshwar Dayal Singh from his office and to appoint a new Secretary was annulled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court *vide* its judgement delivered in respect of the Civil Appeal No. 279 of 1964, and Mr. Bisheshwar Dayal Singh was restored to his office. Thus, in their obsession, the University authorities transgressed the accepted standards of decorum and propriety, and landed themselves into the abyss of ignominy and disrepute. The intensity of the obsession for vengeance, nursed by the University authorities and the Ministry of Education, can be fathomed by the fact that even after the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, they have not desisted from repeating their command performance. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has not only quashed a couple of sections of the University Statutes, under which these nominations were made, but has observed : "*The autonomous bodies which institute Colleges and help the progress of higher education in the country, are generally run by disinterested persons, and it is of some importance that the autonomy of such bodies should not be unduly impaired.*" The fact that emerges from this is that the Vice-Chancellor worked himself to a state of mental tension in which he was unable to act according to the rule of law, causing unrest, begetting frequent disturbances, as he circumvented rules and bypassed time—honoured conventions to get at something which he could not honestly define. With the Principal of the College demolished and the Secretary of the College liquidated, who will wonder as to why there is continuous unrest producing frequent disturbances at Rajendra College ? With the Principal of the College externed through litigation, the Secretary of the College frustrated through twists and turns, the Vice-Chancellor might as well have relented. But the students were isolated and picked up on caste analysis, prosecuted, imprisoned for lack of facilities for bail, and persecuted, creating an explosive situation. In the process of doing all these, the University authorities destroyed the very chain which binds a college to discipline, and let loose forces of disruption.

The lack of amenities for the students, in its own turn, contributes to the causes of unrest and disturbances, for the students, if they do not have balanced extra-curricular activities to engage themselves in healthy preoccupations, become highly susceptible to the temptations of clique and prompting. If the students do not have reasonably good living conditions, the unacademic environment of their residence leaves their own faculties misguided, and they are likely to carry into the College the virus of outside infection, especially when the University authorities do not desist from extending their designs outside the academic confines. But amid their manifold extra-educational activities, the University authorities had no time left to attend to these basic needs of the students.

Therefore, the Citizens' Committee catalogues the following causes for unrest and disturbances at Rajendra College, Chapra :

1. By attempting to oust Mr. Bhola Prasad Singh, the Principal of the College, in the manner they adopted, the University authorities, aided by the negligence, if not worse, of the Ministry of Education, demolished the prestige of the highest office in the College, and thus sabotaged the very source of control and discipline.
2. In his endeavour to "seize" power through the Governing Body of the College, the Vice-Chancellor removed the sober elements even before the completion of their normal terms of membership, converting the Governing Body into an arena for boxing bouts, and thus rendered the administration of the College erratic and vindictive.
3. In his campaign to liquidate the lawfully continuing Secretary of the College, the Vice-Chancellor installed Mr. Ganga Prasad Sinha who had been associated with engendering ridicule for the College in public, and thus alienated the support of the unattached citizens and publicmen who would have otherwise lent a helping hand to the management.
4. The University authorities, through discretionary grants and the unseen ties of caste affinity, employed sections of students for subterfuge and rowdyism.
5. The sordid incidents involving Mr. Phulena Prasad Singh and the family of Mr. R. S. Mishra struck terror amongst those who, inspite of all these, wanted to help the restoration of normality at the College, and compelled them to shrink away.
6. The University authorities could find no time, amid their manifold preoccupation with prolific unacademic schemes and designs, to look after even the minimum amenities for the students—a gross dereliction of duty, adding fuel to the already smouldering fire of bitterness and discontent.
7. Students, disorganised due to the absence of regulated extra-curricular activities, tempted and coerced by promptings and conspiracy, also indirectly contributed to the causes of unrest and disturbances—indirectly because they were the real victims of all these.
8. The over-ambitious politicians, relentless in their pursuit of power, did not spare the teachers, the students, and even education, mauling and mutilating all moral values.

(B) ALLEGED MISMANAGEMENT OF THE COLLEGE AND ITS FINANCES

The Citizens' Committee is not aware of any specific allegations in this respect, particularly in respect of the mismanagement of the finances of the College, because the allegations are not described in the Chancellor's notification determining the terms of reference for the enquiry. Therefore, we are unable, at this juncture, to enlist any facts, data and evidence in this connection. Yet, the basic fact remains unmitigated that the University authorities have not acted as impartial supervisory body in respect of the matter pertaining to the College. They have acted more as a partisan, a party to a dispute.

The fact to consider is that there can be two basic reasons for the mismanagement of Rajendra College and its finances. One, that the persons in charge of the immediate management are incompetent or worse; or two, that the University authorities have obstructed and thwarted the persons responsible for the immediate management. In the instance of Rajendra College, the Principal has been kept debarred from even entering into the College campus, and the lawful Secretary has been kept involved in litigation. The University authorities have not fought shy of the situation where two rival Governing Bodies have laid their claims—one upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the other born out of the fold of the Vice-Chancellor. Who then is responsible for the mismanagement of the College—the Principal or the Vice-Chancellor, the Governing Body or the University Syndicate, the helpless subordinated College or the arrogant and uncultivated University ?

The University of Bihar is perhaps the lone instance, in the whole civilized world, of a phenomenon that the Vice-Chancellor is a veritable menace to a Principal working under his authority, and not a source of strength and sober guidance during whatever turmoil that may overtake the College. Perhaps, under similar circumstances, 'Goethe' was inspired to compose :

*"Snarl not poodle ! To the sound that rises,
The sacred tones that my soul embrace,
This bestial noise is out of place."*

(C) REMEDIES FOR THE PROPER RUNNING AND MANAGEMENT OF THE COLLEGE

Remedies for the present trouble, which will ensure the proper running of the College in future, must be defined in the light of the current events and the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. There are two types of colleges : the constituent colleges and the affiliated or admitted colleges.

The purpose of the power delegated to the University authorities in respect of the affiliated colleges is to admit and recognize them, subject of course to the terms and conditions impunged at the time of affiliation. These terms and conditions must subsequently be respected by the superior authorities, more so because the subordinate party to the agreement has necessarily to abide by them. For instance, as to who should be on the Governing Body of Rajendra College should be a matter for the autonomous body to choose, and not for the University authority bully to impose. "The position is substantially different where collegiate institutions are started by other autonomous bodies and they seek admission or affiliation to the University. In regard to this class of collegiate institutions, their institution as well as their management and maintenance is not the direct concern of the University; that is the concern of the autonomous educational bodies which have sponsored them and which have undertaken the task of instituting, managing and maintaining them." (The judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in respect of the Civil Appeal No. 279 of 1964). Therefore, the first thing to do is to amend the present University Statutes so as to incorporate the recommendations of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. This done, Rajendra College will be free from the incessant push and pull of the University authorities and politicians who have, of late, manifested alarming tendency to centralize power for their personal aggrandizement.

The University Grants Commission has, *vide* its letter No. F-33/61/64(CUP) of the 19th of June, 1964, made certain recommendations which should be implemented without much ado. If implemented, these steps will form a bullwork against the mismanagement of a College. The Bihar University authorities have blatantly defied the recommendations of the Bihar State University Commission, especially recommendation No. 5, conveyed through its letter No. 2464 BSUC of the 23rd of June 1964, whereby the Commission has recommended that the University authorities should get all possible cases against the students compromised.

The Vice-Chancellor has awarded discretionary grants rather indiscreetly, a fact bolstered from the list of the beneficiaries published by the University itself. To preclude the discretionary grants from going to the undeserving, inflexible rules should be framed so that, without the prior recommendation of the Principal concerned, no student receives any discretionary grant from the University. The propriety of this suggestion is obvious. This will, on one hand, enable the Principal to have a greater control over the students of his College, and, on the other, debar the grants going to the ineligible either through error or through design.

Promotion, study-leave, etcetera, of the teachers should be decided with the prior concurrence of the Principal, and the University Service Commission. In the event of irreconciled difference of opinions, the matter should invariably be referred to the Chancellor. If this basis is established at Rajendra College immediately, much of the current troubles will cease to be before long, many legal cases in process today will automatically be withdrawn, and future will, indeed, unfold a vista of what is good.

The steps for remedy should, in view of the manifold problems afflicting Rajendra College, be calculated to eliminate the causes of the unrest and disturbances. In this respect, the question of converting the College into a constituent unit may as well be considered cautiously—cautiously because the examples set by the other constituent colleges under the direct charge of the Bihar University are neither very encouraging nor praiseworthy. What has overtaken L.S. College, the premier college of the University, situated near the University head quarters, is a tale of horror, passion and constituted authority let loose.

Therefore, in the ultimate analysis of things, it is necessary that those who are in charge of the University at the moment, or those who hold in their hands the reins of the administration of Education, should desist from injecting into the system the virus of quarrelsome and selfish politics or of individual or caste aggrandizement. Probably, Sri Aurobindo saw an unmitigated truth, when he said : *“The earliest pre-occupation of man in his awakened thought is also his ultimate—and perhaps his highest—because it survives the longest periods of scepticism and returns after every banishment.”* So those who are entrusted with the administration of the University must relinquish the early germs of individual ambitions that contradict social and community wellbeing.

II. Question-Leakage, Responsibility therefor and Remedy for future

(A) System of getting printed the Question-papers, the causes for Leakage and persons responsible.

THE wholesale leakage of questions for Masters' examinations of the University of Bihar in 1963 is an event of appalling proportions in the annals of the University education, the like of which has never been witnessed before. For months thereafter, its echoes reverberated throughout the State—in the class-rooms and at the street-corners, in the provincial and national Press, in the State Legislature, and eventually amongst the terms of reference determined for an enquiry into the affairs of the University of Bihar. That the event is one which calls for the closest scrutiny and investigation to fix up accurately the responsibility for the crime cannot be emphasized too much. The question-leakage has at once been the cause and condition, the source and expression of the complete breakdown of the administrative system, which has overtaken the University.

For a proper appraisal of the data and evidence in this respect, we divide the subject into the following categories :—

1. the method normally adopted by the University authorities to get the question-papers printed;
2. the method adopted by the University authorities to get the questions under reference printed;
3. the sequence of events relating to the leakage of the questions and allied matters; and
4. causes for the leakage, and the persons responsible therefor.

The normal procedure for printing the questions were inherited from the Patna University, and the previous Vice-Chancellor took no steps to amend the system or to introduce any new printers or agents.

1. Normal Procedure for Printing Question-Papers

The printing of question-papers has always been treated as a sacred responsibility and a matter of extreme secrecy. It was with a view to preserve the secrecy involved in the matter that the expenses relating to the printing of question-papers had been kept beyond the purview of audit and entrusted exclusively to a highly responsible officer of the University.

The normal procedure in this respect is that the press copies of the question-papers are despatched by the Board of Moderators in sealed covers to the Finance Officer. They are carried to the Finance Officer by one of the two confidential assistants of the Examination Section along with a statement as to the particulars thereof. The sealed manuscript of the questions together with a forwarding letter addressed to where they are to be sent are handed over to the confidential "*daftari*" who properly packs them and embosses the Finance Officer's seal on the packet. The Finance Officer himself fills in the acknowledgement receipt form, and the said *daftari* mails the packet, and returns the receipt to the Finance Officer.

Another significant point to note is that all the correspondence, relevant in this connection, is done with an individual who is the agent or the representative of the press concerned, and not with the press itself lest the identity of the press should be revealed inadvertently. Thus the University knows the identity of the agent or the representative only and never of the press concerned.

When the questions are printed, the agent of the press sends the railway or postal receipt to the Finance Officer. The Finance Officer hands it over to the confidential assistant of Examination Section who takes the delivery of the parcel from the Post Office or the Railway Station, as the case may be. The confidential assistant concerned has instructions to destroy all addresses that may be on the parcel at the Post Office or the Railway Station itself before the parcel is made over to the Assistant Registrar, Examinations, for safe custody. The parcel is opened in the presence of the said Assistant Registrar, and the contents are locked in the confidential almirahs in the Strong Room of the University.

2. Procedure of Printing Questions Under Reference

Before the question is taken up regarding the procedure adopted for printing the question-papers under reference, it is pertinent to examine the gross departure and difference from the normal procedure in selecting the press for the purpose. Upto the year 1954, the confidential printing for the Bihar University was done by only one press, designated "A". In 1954, press "A" declined to take up the entire workload of the University not only because the load had augmented, but also because the University authorities had delayed the supply of questions. Therefore, the then Vice-Chancellor brought another press, designated "B". The performance of press "B" was not found to be satisfactory, but it was allowed to carry on the work despite dissatisfaction expressed by the officers concerned and a part of the bill of press "B" being held up.

Dr. P.L. Srivastava took over as the Vice-Chancellor in the month of July, 1962. In August 1962, an application was received in the University from one Mr. K. D. Tiwary of Varanasi, offering to undertake the confidential printing of the University. The University authorities found the rates quoted by Mr. Tiwary to be favourable—as if the printing of question-papers was a P.W.D. contract which should be given against the lowest tender. There are evidences of protests from the Finance Officer, which were over-ruled by the Vice-Chancellor who impressed upon the officers concerned that Mr. K. D. Tiwary was Assistant Registrar, Deputy Registrar and Registrar at Banares Hindu University, Allahabad University and Lucknow University, and had done creditable jobs of printing confidential matters of various universities. It was as a result of the direct intervention of the Vice-Chancellor that orders were placed with Mr. Tiwary, and the third press was designated press “C”. This direct intervention of the Vice-Chancellor was the first gross departure from the normal procedure adopted for printing the question-papers of the Bihar University.

On the 10th of August 1962, Mr. K. D. Tiwary wrote a personal letter to Dr. P. L. Srivastava in which Mr. Tiwary disclosed the address of the press, and requested the Vice-Chancellor for the confidential printing of the University and also enclosed a schedule of the rates. On the 25th of September 1962, Mr. Tiwary wrote to Dr. P. L. Srivastava that the Finance Officer had placed orders with Mr. Tiwary on the approval of the Vice-Chancellor. That orders for confidential printing should have been placed with an agent who did not exercise the caution of maintaining the secrecy of the identity of the press is, perhaps, a gross violation of the time honoured procedure followed in the University. It was the second gross departure from the established practice.

From the two letters of Mr. K. D. Tiwary referred to hereinbefore, the copies of which are annexed hereto, it is evident that Mr. Tiwary met the Vice-Chancellor personally, and discussed with him several things which were not considered fit enough to be contained in letters. Besides, it will be evident from the Travelling Bills of the Vice-Chancellor and Railway reservation records that the Vice-Chancellor visited Varanasi during this period or after. It is for Dr. P. L. Srivastava to complete the story by stating if there were confidential palavers between him and Mr. K. D. Tiwary, and if there were, what was discussed and concluded during them.

Once the orders were placed with Mr. K. D. Tiwary, the normal procedure for printing the question-papers were followed by the University. Therefore, the departure made

from the established procedure was confined only to placing the orders for printing.

3. Leakage and After : The Sequence of Events

The Vice-Chancellor returned to Muzaffarpur on the 19th of June, 1963, from his summer holidays. The same day, some persons—students, teachers and citizens—met him and drew his attention to persistent rumours that questions for Masters' examinations had leaked out, and advised him to get the whole matter examined through appropriate authorities. But the Vice-Chancellor dismissed the whole matter with a subtle shrug of his shoulders.

On the evening of the 23rd of June, 1963, a day before the examinations were to commence, some examinees of the ensuing examinations in English sent a note to Dr. P. L. Srivastava that questions set for the examination had leaked out, and they enclosed a sheet containing specimen questions. These students sent a copy of their note, written to the Vice-Chancellor, to Mr. Amarnath Thakur, Head of the University Department of English, who received the note in the presence of Dr. D. K. Jha, Mr. Awadhbihari Jha, then a member of the Bihar University Syndicate, and Mr. R. Pathak, now Registrar at Patna Civil Court. The Vice-Chancellor took no notice of the written note and the specimen questions, and he let the examinations commence on the following day as scheduled.

In the examination hall, the examinees found that the questions, released to them by the Centre Superintendent tallied with the questions, forwarded by them to the Vice-Chancellor the previous evening. This fact was brought to the notice of the University authorities concerned. The then Head of the University Department of English, Mr. A. Thakur, wrote to the Vice-Chancellor the same afternoon, that is on the 24th of June, 1963, to say that the questions for the examinations held had evidently leaked out, and that the particular examination should be cancelled. The Vice-Chancellor, in the true tradition of Sexton Blake thrillers, treated the episode as merely as intelligent guess of an experienced Professor, and not an actual leakage of questions. The examination held was not cancelled, and further examination continued.

On the 25th of June, 1963, at the L. S. College Centre, an examinee was found to be in possession of a carbon copy of answers to the questions set for that day. He was expelled from the examination, and the matter was reported to the authorities concerned. On the 24th of June, questions of English had leaked out, and on the 25th the questions of Mathematics manifested in their answers being circulated through carbon copies. Had not the questions of Mathematics leaked

out, their answers would not have been circulated to the examinees. Even this crystal fact did not set the Vice-Chancellor thinking.

Students, in a body, waited upon the Vice-Chancellor, and related to him the entire story of the sale and purchase of the question-papers in the open market. The students offered to produce any number of questions, if so desired by the Vice-Chancellor. But Dr. P. L. Srivastava, the accomplished conversationalist that he is, jocosely told the students to buy questions and obtain high marks at the ensuing examinations. It was levity with a vengeance. The students went away dismayed, and wondering about the gross callousness of the University authorities, bewildered about the value of regular studies and hard work, if the last-minute purchase of questions—possible for those alone who could afford or manage—was as good.

On the 26th of June, 1963, some persons informed Mr. Ramdeo Sharma, the Secretary of the District Communist Party of India, that the questions for Mathematics Paper II, scheduled for the 27th of June, had leaked out, and that he should take up this matter with the Vice-Chancellor. Mr. Ramdeo Sharma expressed his doubt if the Vice-Chancellor would do anything in the matter, because Dr. P. L. Srivastava seemed in a way predetermined in the matter. That the Vice-Chancellor should not at least cancel these examinations, the questions of which had been proved to have leaked out, had prompted Mr. Sharma to express his doubts. Thereupon, these persons, accompanied by Mr. S. S. Das, a Lecturer in Economics at L.S. College, called on the Vice-Chancellor, and handed over to him, in writing, questions purported to have been set for Mathematics Paper II, scheduled for the following day. But the Vice-Chancellor did not give them the due credence. The wooden Buddha would not smile.

The following day, the 27th of June, when the examinations started, it was found that all the questions, contained in the official question-papers, tallied with the ones notified to the Vice-Chancellor the previous day. This was, perhaps, the last straw on the camel's back. Following spontaneous hue and cry, the examinations for the day were cancelled. Those held on the previous stood valid.

The same day, the Education Minister arrived at Muzaffarpur, and Dr. P. L. Srivastava and Mr. Mahendra Pratap, the Principal of L. S. College, despite all the storm raging at the L. S. College Centre, were, amongst others, at the Air Port to receive the Great Moghul of Bihar's Education. The Minister wanted to know as to the veracity of the news of question leakage, by now published in the leading daily newspapers of the State, and as to how the Vice-

Chancellor proposed to tackle the problem. The Vice-Chancellor assured Mr. Satyendra Narayan Singh that the news was highly exaggerated, and the wide publicity given it was the conspiracy of the political opponents of the Minister and the Bihar University. The Education Minister persuaded himself to believe in the easy solution of the problem presented by the Vice-Chancellor.

It is amidst the unprecedented event of an acknowledged large-scale leakage of questions of Masters' Examinations that the Vice-Chancellor left for Ranchi to attend a meeting of the State University Commission, leaving his subordinates to hold the baby and face the music. Perhaps, even a large-scale leakage of questions did not bother the Vice-Chancellor who wanted to treat it as a routine matter.

Before the Vice-Chancellor left for Ranchi, he, however, had appointed a Committee with Mr. Mahendra Pratap, the Principal of L.S. College, as the Chairman thereof to assess the situation arising out of the massive leakage of questions, and recommend steps to be taken, as if he had not had opportunity to assess the situation himself. The significant factor is that, excluding the Examination Board competent to deal with all matters pertaining to examinations, the Vice-Chancellor thought it fit to appoint another committee. Besides, the members of the Examination Board, locally available, were not included in this Committee to the bewilderment of all concerned and to the great tragedy of the relevant rules. But then the Vice-Chancellor has not hesitated to take such steps, if they have suited his plan for the time being. The students, all these days and weeks, were witness to the callous indifference of the University authorities to what was a matter of supreme importance for their career, for the prestige of the University and for the correct academic traditions. The decision of the Mahendra Pratap Committee merely to postpone the unfinished examinations and not at least to cancel the examinations already held under dubious circumstances was perhaps more than the Students were prepared to take. The students apparently treated the recommendations of the Mahendra Pratap Committee as a mere window-dressing, and an attempt to soft-cushion the impact of the public opinion for whatever step the Vice-Chancellor might propose to take in future. They formed an "Action Committee" to demand the cancellation of the whole examination, the fixation of a suitable date for the examination later and a thorough probe into the circumstances of the leakage of questions. It was the campaign, conducted by this Action Committee, and backed by numerous public bodies and political parties, that compelled the reluctant University authorities to cancel the entire examination and fix a later date. No probe was, however, instituted.

At Ranchi, where the Vice-Chancellor had gone to attend a meeting of the Bihar University Commission, when faced with the reports about the large-scale leakage of questions, he disclaimed all knowledge about the matter. He further stated to the press that there was only one Officer of the University, who had knowledge about how and where the questions were printed, the one Officer of the University obviously being the Finance Officer. The statement of the Vice-Chancellor appeared in the "Indian Nation" on the 29th or the 30th of June, 1963.

On his return from Ranchi, the Vice-Chancellor called a conference of the Principal of L. S. College, the Heads of the various University Departments and the representatives of the students at his residence in the afternoon of the 29th of June, 1963. In course of discussions, one of the students enquired if the assignment of the printing of questions had been made to any new press. The Vice-Chancellor denied the introduction of any new press and expressed his confidence in the work having been done by the old press. But when Mr. Mahendra Pratap demurred and suggested that the quality of the work done indicated a new press and uncultivated at that, the Vice-Chancellor disclaimed all knowledge in the matter, and once again said that the Finance Officer was the only person in the know of everything. The same evening, the Vice-Chancellor called a Press Conference at his residence, and repeated performance, and threw a broad hint that he was suspicious of one Officer of the University in respect of the leakage of the questions. This statement of the Vice-Chancellor was published by the "Indian Nation" on the 30th of June, 1963.

Thereafter, the Syndicate of the University appointed another committee, an enlarged one, to investigate into the circumstances of the leakage—a committee that put to shame even a snail in respect of speed. The committee of the Syndicate engrossed itself with itself, and the persons who were responsible for the leakage received ample opportunity to cover their tracks, and with impunity decamp with the booty and the guilt. During the period, the questions and the question-papers were on sale, money orders worth thousands of rupees were received by the Muzaffarpur Post Office, got by the students to be able to buy questions and compete with those who had already bought them. Time and again, this matter was reported to the University authorities who were unmoved by the pleas and protestations. That the girl-students were tempted to bargain for the questions with modesty should have goaded the University authorities to action. But the University authorities discarded all qualms, and let morbidity take its own course.

The perfunctory and the casual manner in which the Vice-Chancellor treated this episode throughout, the contradictory statements which emanated from him from time to time and the ominous hints of the involvement of persons of eminence in the racket, together with the apprehension that the entire case might eventually be hushed up, combined to unleash a popular resentment and protests which found expression in the despatches of the press and the resolutions of the students and the citizens. It was against this background that the State Education Minister felt compelled to entrust the case to the police, and advise the University authorities to file an F.I.R. so as to enable the police to conduct the enquiry. Therefore, on the 16th of August, 1963, nearly two months after the Vice-Chancellor was first told of the leakage, and about one and a half months after the cancellation of the examination due to the question leakage, the University authorities, on the direct instruction of the State Government, filed the first information report with the local police about the crime of the leakage.

The said F.I.R. filed on the statement of the Finance Officer, Bihar University, stated: "*someone who had the custody of these question-papers had deliberately, and for gain, leaked them out. Such a leakage also appears to have been conspired by some interested persons with a view to defame the University and the Vice-Chancellor.*" It was also stated, *inter alia*, in the said F.I.R. : "*printed copies of these questions were received by this University in sealed packets by insured Railway parcels.....and were kept in the custody of the Assistant Registrar (Examinations) of this University, namely, Shri Akhileshwar Prasad Sinha. These questions were sent to the Centre Superintendent, Shri Bijaya Kumar, an Assistant Professor of Hindi of the L. S. College on 23-6-1963. They were despatched to him with the seals intact—as they had been received from Shri K.D. Tiwary.*" The normal procedure of printing points out to the Finance Officer alone, and so do the various statements of the Vice-Chancellor. The statement of the Finance Officer indicates that someone, for gain and malice, who had the custody of the question-papers leaked them out. Yet, with all these specific statements, the F.I.R. is filed against unknown persons : "*It would appear that the persons, who conspired to bring about the leakage of the question-papers, as well as those, who leaked them out, along with the persons who took part in duplicating these question-papers and, selling them in the open market at Muzaffarpur, have committed an offence. In these facts to your notice with a request to investigate into this crime and to bring the criminals to book.*"

It is pertinent to note the statement made by the University authorities on matters relating to the assignment

of work to Mr. K. D. Tiwary, as embodied in a Note sent by University to the Bihar Legislative Assembly to meet the questions of Mr. Ramanand Singh, then an M.L.A. of the Praja Socialist Party, on the 17th of October, 1963. In this note, the University authorities stated that (a) *“the application come from Mr. K. D. Tiwary of Banaras for undertaking the confidential printing of this University”*, (b) that *“the University fully trusting in his honesty, integrity and ability”* added him as the third press symbolized as “C”, that (c) *“it was assumed that he was doing confidential printing for other universities also”*, and that (d) *“the press he represents is a thoroughly reliable and secure one.”*

The sequence of events come to an abrupt end at this juncture, for the enquiry entrusted to the police was supposed to be of confidential nature, and whole epoch-making scandal ebbed away, permitted to dry up, leaving mud and filth in the bed of the stream. The University authorities assumed that Mr. K. D. Tiwary carried on the confidential printing of other universities, and yet for certain stated that the press Mr. Tiwary represented was a secure and reliable one. The Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar were allowed to get away with the glaring contradiction that mere assumptions led them to definite conclusions. Glowing tributes have been paid to Mr. K. D. Tiwary in the said Note of the Bihar University, and the application said to have been filed by Mr. Tiwary hardly contains glowing self-recommendations. Therefore the question remained unsolved as to who briefed the University about the career of Mr. Tiwary and what were the sources of his definite knowledge and information.

Even after one year of active investigation, the police has not apparently arrived at any conclusion, for the conspiracy has not been made public nor have the guilty persons been brought to book as prayed in the First Information Report. The one thing that has come to the public knowledge is the attitude of the Vice-Chancellor to the episode. When asked by the “Indian Nation” representative about the morbidity of the whole thing, the Vice-Chancellor, as reported in the Press, said : *“What have you done about Gandhiji’s murder ?”*

4. Causes of Leakage and Persons Responsible

To unravel the intricate web of the mystery enshrouding the leakage, the various utterances and lack of faith in the public judgment, one has to repair to the system of getting printed the question-papers and the sequence of events time and again. There are three broad aspects of this issue : (i) *person or persons responsible for the actual leakage and sale of the questions*, (ii) *the officers of the Bihar University responsible for impropriety and irregularity involved*, and (iii) *the conduct of the Vice-Chancellor before and after the leakage*

of questions. Then alone it will be possible to locate the person or the persons responsible and liable for this hideous expression of human misconduct.

So far as the first aspect of the issue, namely, the persons responsible for the actual leakage and the sale of the questions, is concerned, there are, again, two sides to it : the University Office and the outside elements. The First Information Report states that someone who had the custody of these question-papers had deliberately, and for gain, leaked them out.

(i) Responsibility
for Actual
Leakage and
Sale.

The Officers of the University, who had, from time to time, the custody of the question-papers are : the Finance Officer before and after the printing, the Assistant Registrar (Examinations) after the printing and the Centre Superintendent on the 23rd of June 1963. That the questions did not leak out before the questions were printed is more than evident from the fact that Mr. K.D. Tiwary, when he received the packets for printing, did not complain of any tampered seals of the packet sent by the Board of Moderators, which would certainly have been damaged had the Finance Officer tried to take the contents out of these packets before they were despatched to Mr. K. D. Tiwary for printing. Any effort to smuggle in letters into the relevant files at this juncture will only be an after-thought, a sure indication of complicity and not of innocence. That the Finance Officer did not tamper with the packet after the questions were printed is apparent from the fact that the Assistant Registrar accepted the parcel from the Finance Officer without any protest. Therefore, the Finance Officer is not involved in the actual leakage and sale of question-papers. That the questions did not leak out from the possession of the Assistant Registrar of Examinations is proved from the fact that it is stated in the First Information Report that the packets were despatched to the Centre Superintendent with seals intact—as received from Mr. K. D. Tiwary. The First Information Report is signed by the Finance Officer, and not contradicted, at any time upto date, either by the Vice-Chancellor or the Registrar or the Centre Superintendent. This not only lets out the Assistant Registrar of Examinations but the Finance Officer also, for it clearly establishes that the packets with seals as received from Mr. K. D. Tiwary were despatched to and received by the Centre Superintendent, Mr. Binaya Kumar. Mr. Binaya Kumar received the packets on the 23rd of June, 1963, while there are evidences that people approached the Vice-Chancellor on the 19th of June, 1963, to say that the questions had leaked out. This should be enough evidence to free Mr. Binaya Kumar from whatever suspicion in this respect. Therefore, there is no reasonable ground to suspect the leakage of questions from these Officers of the University.

And yet, the Vice-Chancellor, time and again, stated that there was only one Officer responsible for the questions, and that he suspected one Officer of the University in this connection.

Amongst the outside elements, the name of Mr. K. D. Tiwary must inevitably come into discussions and investigation about the question leakage. The other name, frequently talked of in this respect, is one Mr. "MM" who stayed at a local hotel, claimed to have sold the questions in wholesale and retail transactions. There is yet another name, time and again, mentioned in this connection--one Srivastava Press of Bulanala, Varanasi. It is actually the C.I.D. Officers who should have a great deal to say on these aspects of the issue, and if they are true, for they are outside the purview of individual adventure. The First Information Report clearly states, and is perhaps true also, that the questions leaked out from the source which had the custody thereof. As the Officers concerned of the University, who had the custody of the questions, were not involved in the leakage or the sale thereof, the other two sources are Mr. K. D. Tiwary and the very Press where the question-papers were printed, more so because questions were sold in volumes and almost of all the papers.

Apart from the fact that there are evidences that serious departures from the norm took place in the allotment of work to the press represented by Mr. K. D. Tiwary, the very fact that Mr. K. D. Tiwary and the press he represented did not bring forth any evidence in token of their innocence in the matter makes it imperative to scrutinize the circumstances under which the work was assigned to Mr. K. D. Tiwary.

What is striking in this connection is that under circumstances, oblivious and hazy, an application was received from Mr. K. D. Tiwary, offering to undertake the confidential printing work of the University, quoting schedules of rates. The Registrar has stated in his Note referred to earlier that the work of press 'B' had been unsatisfactory. Perhaps, an impression is being sought to be created that, in view of the unsatisfactory working of press 'B', the University had already been considering to discontinue its services, and therefore, the assignment of work to Mr. K. D. Tiwary was in a natural order, and carefully brought about. In order to establish a real need for the switchover to a new press in such delicate and sensitive a matter as printing questions, it is necessary to verify and find out if there was any decision, recorded earlier, to terminate the services of Press 'B', or the impression sought to be created in the University Note is a mere second thought calculated to justify the allotment of work to Press 'C'.

The second point in this connection is that, granted that the University, dissatisfied with the work of Press 'B', was in the look out for a new Press for its confidential printing is it a mere coincidence that at that very opportune and propitious time the application from Mr. K. D. Tiwary was received? The very fact that Mr. K.D. Tiwary should have made his offer in the very period when, according to the University, the authorities concerned were on look out for a new Press and that on favourable rates, connotes that it was an inspired offer, that the tip was given by some one in the know of the things in the University and intimately known to Mr. K. D. Tiwary. The timing is very significant.

Thirdly, even if an application from Mr. K. D. Tiwary was received by the University and even if the rates quoted by him compared favourably with the rates of the other Presses, was proper consideration given to the question of the reliability and competence of the person concerned (Mr. K. D. Tiwary) or the Press "C"? For this was after all, not a P.W.D. contract on form-2 where the competitiveness of the rates is usually the determining factor in allotment of work. This was highly delicate and Confidential assignment where rates are and should be the least important consideration. But, was any thought given to find out and verify the reliability, integrity and competence of the person or the Press concerned? The University Note blandly says that :—

"The University, fully trusting in his honesty, integrity and ability, approved to do our Confidential printing..... it was assumed that he (Mr. K. D. Tiwary) was doing Confidential printing for other universities also. The Press he represents is a thoroughly secure and reliable one."

This part of the University Note is highly laconic and ambiguous. The following significant questions immediately leap up to ones mind :

- (i) Who led the University to "*fully trust*" in the ability, integrity, etc. of Mr. K.D. Tiwary?
- (ii) What were his (of the Officer concerned) grounds for giving this clean bill to Mr. K. D. Tiwary?
- (iii) What is meant by the statement that it was "*assumed*" that he was doing Confidential work for other Universities? This seems to imply that little investigation was allowed into the professional career of Mr. K. D. Tiwary. Does the term "*assumption*" denote a dependence on hearsay or oblique reference and recommendation? If the first, who is responsible

for acting on such presumptions? If the second, who was the person who could offer such information in respect of Mr. K. D. Tiwary? It goes without saying that the person concerned must have been high enough in the administrative hierarchy for his words to be taken at their face value.

- (iv) Since it is acknowledged in another part of the same University Note that the University did not know the names of the presses 'A', 'B', and 'C', how could the University reach the conclusion that the "*press he (Mr. K. D. Tiwary) represents is a thoroughly secure and reliable one.*"? What was the source of this pre-knowledge?

The admission by the University in the Note, ambiguous and self-contradictory as they are, clearly establish that there was some one in the upper most reaches of the University set-up, high enough for his mere bland assertions to have the weight that they have had, who recommended the case of Mr. K. D. Tiwary, who vouchsafed for the integrity and ability of Mr. K. D. Tiwary and the reliability of the press that he represented, and who could thus ensure the allotment of work to Mr. K. D. Tiwary. Dr. P. L. Srivastava has been in regular correspondence with Mr. K. D. Tiwary during this fateful period of the printing of questions. The Vice-Chancellor must satisfy all concerned as to why he should deny all knowledge about the printing.

Who is
John Gault?

The million dollar question is—WHO WAS THIS MAN? Before we discuss the names, let it be understood that this man, whosoever he might be, must have been holding a position of supreme importance and command in the University set-up. Secondly, he must have had opportunities of knowing Mr. K. D. Tiwary intimately or, to put it more precisely, who had the plausible background to be able to offer information about Mr. K. D. Tiwary.

As for the names, two have been mentioned in one context or the other, that of the Finance Officer Sri P. Roy Chowdhury, and that of the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. P. L. Srivastava. The confluence of Allahabad must denote the very obvious fact.

In this connection, one cannot but refer to the very thinly veiled innuendoes and insinuation directed against the Finance Officer, by a person no other than the Vice-Chancellor Dr. P. L. Srivastava himself. There are the statements that he made at Ranchi before the Pressmen as well as before the then Chief Minister, the Chancellor and other dignitaries,

before the students and various Heads of Departments and during the Press interview at Muzaffarpur—all to the clear effect that he did not know anything about the arrangements made regarding the printing and that it was the Finance Officer who exclusively dealt with this matter.

As against this, there are records that the Finance Officer had protested against the suggestion, emanating from the Vice-Chancellor Dr. P. L. Srivastava, that the work be allotted to Mr. K. D. Tiwary and that the Vice-Chancellor approved of the rates in writing and, waiving aside all the objections raised by the Finance Officer, directed him to allot the work to Mr. K. D. Tiwary.

The Citizens' Committee on its own part cannot refrain from pointing out to the following facts and data which, in its opinion, are highly poignant :—

1. that the present Vice-Chancellor took over office in the July of 1962, and that the very next month an application offering his services was received from Mr. K. D. Tiwary ;
2. that the said Mr. K. D. Tiwary was associated with various universities in U. P.; and that the new Vice-Chancellor Dr. P. L. Srivastava was himself in the very near past associated with various Universities bodies in U. P. which also happened to be his home State ;
3. that thus the Vice-Chancellor Dr. P. L. Srivastava was certainly the person in a position to offer information about Mr. K. D. Tiwary and the press that he was supposed to be representing ; and that, with his long years of association with matters related to the University life in U. P., the information that he might have offered must have carried the stamp of necessary authenticity ;
4. that there have been reports to the investigating Officers that the said Mr. K. D. Tiwary was associated with a certain Srivastava Press at Bulanala, Varanasi ;
5. that Mr. M. M., the unidentified questions salesman described himself to be an agent of Mr. K. D. Tiwary, and negotiated the sale of question-papers at Muzaffarpur, revealing that the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. P. L. Srivastava, would not cancel the examinations and, therefore, any investment of money in this direction was lucrative.

The persistent refusal of the Vice-Chancellor to cancel the examinations, is a fact circumstantially corroborating the assurance that examinations would not be cancelled. He was evasive, as also downright false, in his statements. His actions showed an obstinate refusal, in face of an increasing mass of evidence, to acknowledge the very fact of the leakage. All in all, he behaved as if he had a stake in the exposure of the fact of leakage. The mere postponement of the examinations, and not cancellation, even after the conclusive evidence of the leakage must lead one to the conclusion that the Vice-Chancellor did his best not to cancel the examinations. All matters pertaining to examinations must be dealt with by the Examinations Board. Therefore, the appointment of another Committee, when the members of the Examination Board were locally available, clearly denotes, to say the least, an extravagant action of the Vice-Chancellor.

Thus, between the 19th of June to the 27th when he left for Ranchi, the Vice-Chancellor was told about the leakage on as many as eight occasions. On the 19th of June, on his return from the hills, he was told about the current sale of question-papers. He refused to believe. On the 23rd of June, the examinees of English made a written submission to this effect to him, and the then Head of the University Department of English also wrote to him to say that the questions had leaked out. Why was not examination of that paper at least cancelled? Still the Vice-Chancellor chose to do nothing. The examination held on the first day, that is the 24th of June, showed that the official questions fully tallied with those the students had shown to the Vice-Chancellor the previous day. The next day, 25th June, there was the case of the student caught with the carbon copy of the answers.

The Vice-Chancellor was not prepared to accept that the existence of carbon copies of answers to the questions was the conclusive evidence of the questions having leaked out. Even this failed to move the Vice-Chancellor to any purposive action. On the 26th, some persons along with Sri S.S. Das of the Economics Department met the Vice-Chancellor and presented him with questions set for the examination the following day. Still the Vice-Chancellor would not shed his impassivity. Even when, the following day, the questions contained in the official question-papers were found to have tallied with those notified to the Vice-Chancellor the previous day, the Vice-Chancellor did nothing more than cancel the examination for that day alone and not of the previous days. The same day, he characterised the reports about the large scale leakage as highly exaggerated, and left for Ranchi. Before leaving for Ranchi, he appointed a Committee to collect evidence of the leakage, a fact that, in view of the crystal proofs he already had, must inevitably point out to

the desperate efforts of the Vice-Chancellor not to cancel the examinations.

At Ranchi, where he was asked about the question leakage by the Press, he disclaimed all knowledge of the matter, although only a day earlier, he had cancelled the examination and had, for the past seven days, been presented with irrefutable evidence of large scale leakage.

Again, on his return from Ranchi, during the conference with the Heads of Departments and the Students' delegation, he first affirmed that the printing of the questions was done by the old press, and not by any new one; but when Principal Mahendra Pratap demurred, he beat a hasty retreat and declaimed all knowledge in the matter. That the Vice-Chancellor should recommend Mr. K.D. Tiwary, that he should approve of the rates for printing, that he should be in correspondence with Mr. Tiwary, that Mr. Anirudh Prasad, a favourite and "Confidential Adviser" of the Vice-Chancellor, should be seen in the company of that elusive Mr. M.M. who was closely connected with the question-papers scattered in the market, and yet the Vice-Chancellor should deny, as long as he could, any information in this respect are a masterpiece of untruth and then half truth being diabolically employed to shift the blame on some one else. Or else, the Citizens' Committee submits to call the Finance Officer to prove his innocence in the episode, or alternately, share the blame with the Vice-Chancellor and Mr. K. D. Tiwary.

It is then clear that the Vice-Chancellor was obstinate in his refusal to face up to the fact of the leakage. That it was a clear case of gross dereliction of duty as the executive head of the University—a dense callousness and disregard for the career of thousands of students—is evident. But was it only this? Are not evasions and double-talk indicative of a personal involvement? The persistent inaction of the Vice-Chancellor in the face of inescapable evidence, his refusal first to acknowledge the fact of leakage, then to treat it as anything other than a limited case of ordinary leakage, then to agree to cancel the entire examination, then not to refer the matter to proper investigative agency until the Government freed his hands, all these, prove a great reluctance on the part of the Vice-Chancellor to chase and pursue the matter to its roots. If the reluctance was merely a breakdown of nerves, unworthy of a person holding the eminently responsible office of the Vice-Chancellor of a University, or if it was the reluctance of a mind shirking away at the prospects of being overtaken by the nemesis of his own sins is for the circumstance to conclude. In short, as is evident from the data and evidence, the persons responsible for the wholesale leakage of questions are the Vice-Chancellor Dr. P. L. Srivastava and

Mr. K. D. Tiwary, unless they, beyond all reasonable doubts, exonerate themselves by proofs and evidence and not simply by disclaimers. The Citizens Committee submits that the impropriety of the conduct of the Vice-Chancellor in all these matters is an evidence against him ; and above all, he must resolve what stands against him.

R E M E D Y

The remedy always lies in the elimination of the causes; and in this instance, Press "A" and "B", serving the University without blemish, should do the confidential printing in future. Alternately, a system should be evolved of getting the questions printed at places far away from Muzaffarpur as well as far away from where the reigning Vice-Chancellor comes or has in the past been closely associated with.

In the modern world, systems have been evolved to ensure against such acts of unforeseen contingencies. Amidst their manifold non-academic pre-occupations, the University authorities, particularly the Vice-Chancellor, did not consider the necessity of obtaining guarantees for the good performance of the contract, though this precaution should have been exercised when the new Press "C" was introduced into the fold. It is the accepted order of the day that sufficient security in cash is taken and kept as security for the good performance of the work, and refunded only if the work is satisfactory.

The system of the printing of questions is a matter that should actually be determined by those who have had a good deal of experience, say according to the advice of the State University Commission. The propriety of the suggestion is obvious. A sort of a pool may be formed, which should receive the questions, and from the pool the agents of the various presses may be contacted for printing. The State University Commission can easily act as such a pool, because the sanctity of examinations and the secrecy of the questions cannot be emphasized too much.

Questions, like budget, have to be prepared in total secrecy. and any method, howsoever tortuous, which reasonably guarantees their secrecy, must be adopted, and as soon as possible, for "*when wolves are about, the shepherd must guard his flock, even if he does not care for the mutton.*"

III. General Unrest in the University

THERE are, today, in view of the various Statutes and Acts controlling education and educational institutions in the manner they do, four parties to a general unrest in a University in India. The University of Bihar need not be an exception. These four parties are : the State Government, the University authorities, the teachers and the students. The State Government get involved because of the acts of omission and Commission of their Minister for Education. The University authorities are involved by the Vice-Chancellor through his conduct, bearing, attitude and approach to the University in general and the teachers and the students in particular. In the event of a general unrest, the students are always involved *en masse*, despite whatever factionalism. The teachers are involved through the force of circumstances obtaining for the time being—through their treatment by the State Government and by the University authorities. Therefore, in the event of the University of Bihar, the four parties are : the Education Minister, Mr. Satyendra Narayan Singh ; the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. P. L. Srivastava ; the teachers as a community ; and the students *en masse*. It is against this background that facts and data have to be looked into—and their evidence too—to find out the causes of the general unrest, and eventually the remedy.

From the facts and data, forwarded to the Citizens Committee to be submitted to the Raman Commission, the following factors emerge as the causes of the general unrest :

- A. vitiated atmosphere in the University on account of casteism and favouritism practised by the authorities in respect of :—
 - (i) the appointments, promotions and the transfers of teachers ;
 - (ii) appointments of the Principals and the Members of the Governing Bodies of the affiliated Colleges ; and
 - (iii) the grant of study-leave, Scholarship, etcetera.
- B. protection to the underserving teachers, victimization of the teachers on caste considerations, migration of good teachers and the falling standard of education ;

- C. mismanaged examinations, manipulated results on caste and individual considerations ;
- D. exploitation of the students by the authorities and victimization of the students on caste and political group considerations ;
- E. control of political machination over the administration of the University ; and
- F. lack of amenities for the students.

A. Vitiated Atmosphere in the University on account of Casteism and Favouritism Practised by the Authorities

From the data and evidence, forwarded to the Citizens Committee to be submitted to the Raman Commission, one is compelled to recognize the fact, may be ruefully and reluctantly, yet inevitably all the same, that the atmosphere enveloping the University of Bihar is polluted by casteism and personal favouritism practised by the Vice-Chancellor, unabated and even prompted by the Education Minister. The students feel choked in the suffocating atmosphere, the teachers bewildered under the afflicting circumstances, restless under the yoke of a punitive administration, seeking to crush their natural hopes and aspirations, scheming to victimize those who strive to exclude the virus from the University body. Who then is to blame for the general unrest ?

(i) In the appointment, promotion and transfer of the teachers.

Under normal circumstances, there is nothing easier than to maintain correct standards in respect of the appointments, promotions and the transfers of the teachers. There are the many provisions of the Statutes, rules of procedure and the time honoured conventions to guide. A consistent application of these rules and impersonal conventions is all that is required to uphold proper academic traditions. This is also the way to promote the best interests of the teachers—both as individuals and as a community. It is, therefore, truly ironic that it should not so happen during the regime of a teacher-Vice-Chancellor.

Dr. P. L. Srivastava, stringed to still superior forces, intrigued to concentrate power in his hands, and then proceeded to employ these vast executive powers, to circumstantial approach, to circumvent and traduce the rules and conventions for the benefit of his caste-favourites and the castemen of the Education Minister. The strategy employed in this respect is truly breathtaking. In certain cases, there were open violations of the written rules, while in others, the Vice-Chancellor has stormed to victory through a series of bloodless coups, twisting the letters of law beyond recognition, besmearing their beauty and spirit. In some cases, too much was read into too little, while in others, recourse was taken of evasion, subterfuge and silence.

Mala fide Appointments

There are examples galore of teachers being appointed on posts that do not exist—posts as mythical as oriental occultism. The strange fact is that all such appointments have been made in the favour of the teachers belonging to the caste of the Vice-Chancellor or of the Education Minister.

The only one sanctioned post of Class I Bihar Education Service Officer was held by Dr. Hargovind Singh, Reader in Economics, at Langat Singh College. When Dr. Hargovind Singh left the University of Bihar, Dr. P. L. Srivastava moved the State Public Service Commission to concur with the promotion of Dr. R. B. Singh on that post as Reader. At this juncture, the University Grants Commission agreed to the creation of another post of Reader in Economics at L. S. College on the express condition that the Commission would bear only 50% expenses on that account, while the balance of the 50% must be borne by the State Government and the University of Bihar. Without obtaining the consent of the State Government, the Vice-Chancellor advised the State Public Service Commission to recommend candidates for the second post of the Reader. The State Government categorically declined to make any grant for any post, and therefore, the mythical post of the second Reader was never created. But Dr. P. L. Srivastava went ahead with his scheme to appoint a second Reader without any sanctioned post in existence.

The Instance of
Dr. Ram Bihari
Singh and
Dr. S. P. Singh.

The Syndicate, at its meeting held on the 15th of December, 1964, resolved :

THAT Dr. Ram Bihari Singh and Dr. Surendra Prasad Sinha be promoted to the posts of Readers in Economics in B. U. S. from the date they have joined as Reader and they be put on probation for one year with effect from the date of their original joining as Temporary Reader, without prejudice to the seniority of other teachers of B. E. S. who may be subsequently promoted.

RESOLVED FURTHER THAT the Government of Bihar be requested to give effect to the promotion of Dr. Ram Bihari Singh retrospectively from the date the post is lying vacant. (that is, from the year 1950)

These resolutions are a masterpiece of the trespass of law and the contradiction of intentions. At this juncture, Dr. P. L. Srivastava informed the Syndicate that certain charges had been levelled against Dr. R. B. Singh, and the matter had been referred to the Government. The Chancellor had also been informed of the gravity of the charges. The Syndicate wanted the Vice-Chancellor to place this matter at

its following meeting. Many meetings of the Syndicate have been held since, but the Vice-Chancellor has not placed the matter before that august body.

The University Grants Commission had given its conditional consent to the second post only for the period of the Third Five Year Plan, therefore, conditionally agreeing to only a temporary post of Reader. Probationary appointments are, according to the rules, made in respect of the permanent incumbent. Therefore, even the Syndicate must share the blame, in the first instance, of making a permanent appointment to fill in a temporary post, if that post was at all in existence. In order to bring Dr. S. P. Sinha to L. S. College from C. M. College, Dr. P. L. Srivastava made two appointments on one post in complete contravention of the relevant rules. The two beneficiaries belong to the two privileged castes, one each.

Other Instances:

In accordance with the provisions of the Bihar State University Act and Statutes, all teaching posts are to be created on the recommendations of the Academic Council, the Syndicate and of the Finance Committee. It is only after the posts are duly created that the question of the method of the appointment is taken up. In the year 1962, several appointments were made to fill in the posts that were never lawfully created in the terms of Article (1) of the Chapter XV of the Statutes.

The trick of the trade was repeated at C. M. College for the benefit of :

Mr. Ajit Kumar Verma	...	in Hindi.
Mrs. Omna Verma	in Botany.
Mr. Ananda Shankar Prasad	...	in Law.
Mr. Maheshwar Singh	in Hindi.
Mr. Srikrishna Singh	in Law.
Mr. Rambinode Singh	in Economics.
Mr. Umashankar Prasad Singh	in Political Science.

All these teachers, in addition to the teachers appointed in 1962 at L. S. College are holding posts that do not exist in terms of the relevant rules. These are matters of records, and the Citizens Committee submits to call for the relevant records and Statutes to scrutinize the scores of appointments for posts that do not lawfully exist.

Irregular Appointments

Procedure in respect of the appointment of the teachers is laid down unambiguously. But Dr. P. L. Srivastava must have it to his credit that he has been the most powerful Vice-Chancellor who has, with impunity, violated at written laws times without number, and has yet retained the sympathy,

trust and the admiration of the Education Minister. The first step towards an appointment is the creation of a post according to the requirements of the department and teaching. The provisions regarding the service conditions of the teachers require the Vice-Chancellor, where an appointment is to be made without reference to the State Public Service Commission or to the University Service Commission, to advertise the post without any exception. All applications, received in pursuance of the advertisement referred to earlier, are to be placed before the appropriate authorities for consideration. The procedure requires the Registrar to prepare a Tabular Form cataloguing therein the qualifications of the applicants so that the appropriate authorities may choose the best candidate without error.

Dr. P. L. Srivastava has made scores and scores of appointments without advertisement, thus defeating the procedure for choosing the best candidates. It is a matter of records that this highly irregular practice has been followed in about 75% of the appointments. These gross departures from the written rules were boldly made by the Vice-Chancellor for his castemen and for the castemen of the Education Minister, fetching him the smiling gratitude of the education overlord. The recommendations of the Principals in respect of the appointment of teachers have been discarded as garbage, and the teachers have been imposed upon the Principals, severally undermining the discipline at the colleges. There are numerous examples of the teachers being appointed without requirements being ascertained from the respective colleges. For instance, at C. M. College, two persons. Mr. Ananda Shankar Prasad and Mr. Srikrishna Singh, were appointed as Lecturers in Law without any requisition from the Principal of the College, much less his consent or recommendations. These two gentlemen must have taken the Principal by surprise.

Manipulated Appointments

Tenacity of purpose is a commendable quality, provided it does not degenerate into an addiction. Dr. P. L. Srivastava is rather addicted to it. What has recently happened at M.D.D. College is an unparalleled example of manipulated appointments.

The request of the Principal of M.D.D. College for some teachers on the staff was placed before the Syndicate at its meeting held on the 23rd of June, 1963. The Syndicate, *vide* item 47 (7) of the agenda, authorized the Vice-Chancellors to refer the matter to the Government for sanction to create the necessary posts.

Sub. National Systems Unit,
National Institute of Educational
Planning and Administration
17-B, SriAurobindo Marg, New Delhi-110014
DOC. No. 299
Date: 22/11/63

The Package
Deal at
M.D.D. College,
Muzaffarpur :

In the meantime, Miss Mohini Verma, a Lecturer in Philosophy at M.D.D. College, applied for her absorption in the department to fill in a vacant post. Miss Verma's request was placed before the Syndicate at its meeting held on the 15th of September, 1963, and the Syndicate, vide item No. 29 of the agenda, authorized the Vice-Chancellor to obtain sanction of the posts which he might consider necessary after examining the requirements of additional posts. In the event of a post being sanctioned, the Vice-Chancellor was further authorized to make appointments lasting upto the 31st of January, 1964.

But what the Vice-Chancellor did was to advertise without getting any approval of the Government and the Commission, four posts locally : one for Philosophy, one for Political Science, one Hindi and one for Economics, and appointed the following teachers :

1. Srimati Ila Verma in Political Science
2. Srimati Rama Singh in Philosophy
3. Srimati Lakshmi Bose in Economics
4. Srimati Indubala Sharma ... in Hindi

The Vice-Chancellor made these appointments under Section 9(12) of the Act, and it was confirmed by the Syndicate at its meeting held on the 9th of January, 1964. The manipulations are apparent.

"The law of harvest is to reap more than you sow. Sow an act, and you reap a habit. Sow a habit, and you reap a character. Sow a character, and you reap a destiny." So, the Vice-Chancellor's tenacity goaded him further, new first to bluff the Public Service Commission, and then to short-cut its privileges. While he was pushing through his package deal, the Vice-Chancellor advertised locally for applications to fill in the vacancy on account of the absence of Srimati Asha Kishore who had gone on study-leave. On recommendations and for suddenly developed kindness, the Vice-Chancellor selected Srimati Kamala Kanodia, excluding several better candidates, particularly Srimati Indubala Sharma, holding a first Class Master's degree.

In the meantime, the State Public Service Commission advertised to fill in the vacancy caused by the absence of Srimati Asha Kishore, which the Vice-Chancellor had already filled in by appointing Srimati Kamala Kanodia. The State Public Service Commission recommended the following candidates in order of preference :—

1. Srimati Jasbir Kaur.
2. Srimati Kamala Kanodia.

The recommendations of the State Public Service Commission were placed before the Syndicate at its meeting held on the 9th of January, 1964; and *vide* item No. 18(3) and (4), Srimati Jasbir Kaur was appointed to fill in the vacancy caused by the study leave of Srimati Asha Kishore. She was directed to join her duties in July. But along with Srimati Jasbir Kaur, Srimati Kamala Kanodia too was appointed to fill in a post which had not yet been created according to the relevant rules and was therefore non-existent. M.D.D. College is a constituent College, and all new posts, when lawfully sanctioned, are to be filled in after advertisement and recommendations of the State Public Service Commission. The Commission recommended two candidates in order of merit for the only post that was vacant, and yet the Vice-Chancellor and the erratic Syndicate made appointments on two posts usurping the privileges of the State Public Service Commission, against the protests of the Principal and in complete contravention of the rules.

Hush-Hush Appointments

The illustrations of hush-hush appointments, excluding the State Public Service Commission and the University Service Commission, squandering the funds of the University for the benefit of castemen and personal favourites, are countless and persistent.

The appointments of Mr. Ajit Kumar Verma, Mr. Rash Bihari Chaudhary, Mr. Prabhunath Singh and Mr. Madan Prasad Singh are in the best of the traditions of Edgar Wallace. Out of these four gentlemen, only Mr. Madan Prasad Singh was recommended by the Commission as first in order of merit, and the others were placed near the base of the list.

Appointments
in groups:

Mr. Ajit Kumar Verma, was appointed temporarily for six months at C.M. College in December, 1962. Several posts have, since Mr. Verma joined, been advertised and filled in on the recommendations of the State Public Service Commission. But Mr. A.K. Verma could not be pushed in for anyone of them, because the Commission always placed him last in the list. The Vice-Chancellor got Mr. Verma taken in through the orders of the Syndicate, *vide* item No. 26 of the agenda (postponed), at its meeting held on the 15th of December, 1963. That some one can derive benefit from an item of agenda postponed at a meeting is the striking fact—a revelation—of this case.

The other three gentlemen, rejected by the Syndicate earlier, were appointed on temporary basis for six months by the Vice-Chancellor, for these gentlemen could bring to bear upon the Vice-Chancellor an image of their influential connec-

tions. The item of the agenda postponed at the meeting of the Syndicate on the 15th of December, 1963, was placed at the meeting of the Syndicate on the 9th of January, 1964. Mr. A.K. Verma, though recommended third by the Commission, was appointed. On being questioned about the propriety of this appointment, the naked casteism of the Vice-Chancellor dangled before everyone, including the Vice-Chancellor himself. In order to obliterate the traces and cover the nude, the Syndicate resolved to appoint Mr. Rash Bihari Chaudhary, Mr. Prabhunath Singh and Mr. Madan Prasad Singh also, and advised the Vice-Chancellor to obtain the concurrence of the Commission. The striking fact is that Srimati Kamala Kanodia and these four gentlemen were appointed at the same meeting of the Syndicate, though the procedure, followed in the case of Srimati Kamala Kanodia, and the one, adopted in the case of these four persons were mutually different.

On being requested by the Vice-Chancellor, the State Public Service Commission concurred with the appointment of these four persons on a temporary basis, making it terminable on the day summer vacation commenced. But the Vice-Chancellor would not pay any heed to the recommendations of the Commission, and goaded the Syndicate, at its meeting held on the 7th of May, 1964, *vide* the item No. 35 of the agenda, to resolve "THAT read the letter of the Bihar Public Service Commission for the continuance of the services of four temporary lecturers only till the day the colleges are to close for the ensuing summer vacation and to review resolution No. 20, dated the 9th of January, 1964, regarding their appointment : (1) Sri A. K. Verma in Hindi, (2) Sri Rash Bihari Chaudhary in History, (3) Sri Prabhunath Singh in Economics, and (4) Sri Madan Prasad Singh in Economics, and resolved that the Bihar Public Service Commission be recommended to reconsider its decision and concur in their appointments of these teachers. Meanwhile, they be allowed to continue until further orders." This has been, the Citizens Committee is constrained to state, the patent technique of the Vice-Chancellor of appointing underserving persons and retaining them in service by referring the cases time and again to the State Public Service Commission, and allowing the teachers to continue. In this instance, the Commission declined to concur in the appointments and advised the University to readvertise the posts. But, the Vice-Chancellor would not do so, for once again his prodigy would be in difficulty. These are matters of records which, if called for, will speak for themselves.

The Infiltration of
Dr. K.N. Sinha:

Mr. Amarnath Thakur joined at C. M. College, Darbhanga, on the 10th of December, 1962, as Reader in English. On the 13th of December, Mr. Amarnath Thakur wrote to the Vice-Chancellor a letter of representation,

protesting against his appointment at Darbhanga, and wanted to be transferred as Reader to L. S. College, the premier College of the University, on the ground that he was the senior-most teacher of English in the whole Bihar University. On the 19th of December, Mr. Thakur's letter of protest was treated as his letter of "resignation" and the post of Reader at C. M. College at Darbhanga was declared vacant. On the 20th of December, the very next day, Dr. K. N. Sinha was found to be present in the Office of the University of Bihar, come to appear at an interview for the post. The Selection Board too was scheduled to meet on the same day, and Dr. K. N. Sinha was interviewed, and appointed—the only business transacted by the Board at that meeting.

The sequence of events beget many facts that baffle all academic qualifications. That the post should be declared vacant on the 19th and the candidate should be present for interview on the 20th is very interesting. But more intriguing is the fact that the Selection Board should also have been scheduled to meet on the same day, and should transact only one business. To do all this, the Vice-Chancellor violated his own standards set to appoint Dr. S. P. Sinha. The fact of the case is that on the receipt of Mr. Amarnath Thakur's letter, the Vice-Chancellor got in touch with Dr. K. N. Sinha through Dr. K. S. Verma, the Registrar of the University of Bihar, with whom Dr. K. N. Sinha had worked for about ten years at Gaya. It was only when Dr. Sinha was available for interview that the Vice-Chancellor accepted the "letter of resignation" of Mr. Thakur, declared the post vacant, did not advertise for it, held the interview and appointed the incumbent. All this was done like *blitzkrieg* within twenty-four hours.

The Chancellor slighted

That the Vice-Chancellor should slight the Chancellor is an everlasting stigma attached to this University and a gross outrage of all ethics, discipline and courtesy. That the Vice-Chancellor should be able to do so, time and again, with daring and impunity is what is so bewildering. The inevitable fact must emerge that the Vice-Chancellor did so only because he had assurance bestowed upon him from the Ministry of Education—a fact entangled in its own complications.

In 1962, the Governing Body of C. M. College framed certain charges against Mr. L. N. Singh serving as a Lecturer in Economics there. The Governing Body resolved to forward the charges and Mr. Singh's explanations to a Committee, headed by the District and Sessions Judge of Darbhanga, with Mr. Nageshwar Mishra and Mr. Daya Shankar Prasad as the members.

The case of
Mr. L.N. Singh:

In the meantime, C. M. College was converted into a Constituent College, and the management of the College was transferred to the University according to an agreement under Section 4(13) of the Bihar State Universities Act. When Dr. P. L. Srivastava took over as the Vice-Chancellor, he constituted another Committee to investigate into the charges levelled against Mr. L. N. Singh. The Vice-Chancellor had, no hesitation in unceremoniously brushing aside a Committee headed by a District and Sessions Judge. But for some inexplicable reasons, the Committee appointed by Dr. P. L. Srivastava remained inactive—did nothing, undid nothing.

Consequent to the conversion of C. M. College into a Constituent College, the appointments of all the teachers, serving the College, were referred to the State Public Service Commission for absorption into the Bihar University Service. The Commission did not concur with the absorption of the appointment of Mr. L. N. Singh into the Bihar University Service on the ground that the charges against Mr. Singh had not been duly enquired into. In the meantime, Syndicate had been constituted and submerged under the domination of the lieutenants of the Education Minister. Even as the Vice-Chancellor had appointed an enquiry Committee without exhibiting the minimum courtesy to the District and Sessions Judge, the Syndicate appointed yet a third Committee to enquire into the charges levelled against Mr. L. N. Singh. The second Committee appointed by the Vice-Chancellor, vanished into thin air.

The third Committee, headed by Mr. Sri Narain Singh, completing the link in the chain of caste-affinity, called upon Mr. Radhanandan Jha, the erstwhile Secretary of C.M. College, to adduce evidence in proof of the charges levelled against Mr. L. N. Singh. Mr. Radhanandan Jha maintained that the management, with all assets and liabilities, commitments and obligations existent on the day of transfer to the University, had been handed over and that therefore, the University must accept Mr. L. N. Singh as teacher under an enquiry by a Committee headed by the District and Sessions Judge. Therefore Mr. L. N. Singh could not be accepted as teacher free of charge nor an enquiry by the University was a competent enquiry in terms of the agreement executed between the College and University bringing about the conversion. Mr. Radhanandan Jha's contentions were virtually confirmed by the State Public Service Commission when it declined to concur with the absorption of the appointment of Mr. L. N. Singh. Dr. K. S. Verma, the Registrar, denied Mr. Radhanandan Jha even the ordinary courtesy of a reply. The Srinarayan Singh Enquiry Committee exonerated Mr. L. N. Singh of the charges levelled against him, a decision made *ex-parte*.

Thereafter, Mr. Radhanandan Jha wrote a letter to the Vice-Chancellor, invoking clause 8 of the agreement, signed between the College and the University, whereby the Chancellor was to decide all matters of dispute between the University and the College. Mr. Jha advised the University authorities to relent from further action in this respect until the Chancellor called upon the University authorities to reply to the points raised by Mr. Radhanandan Jha. Instead, the University authorities have gone ahead with their plan to elevate Mr. L. N. Singh from promotion to promotion. Mr. L. N. Singh, managed to procure a degree of Ph. D., was appointed as Reader at C. M. College, and then subsequently transferred to L. S. College, the premier College of the University.

The episode of Mr. Parmanand Prasad, a lecturer in Mathematics at L. S. College, is a cock and bull story hurled at the Chancellor to mislead him and make him a party to what should not be done—a tale of trust betrayed by Dr. P.L. Srivastava.

The Episode of
Mr. Parmanand
Prasad :

Mr. Parmanand Prasad was charged with leaking out questions to students in consideration of cash that he would accept. An enquiry was instituted, and the charge was proved. He was, as a consequence, debarred for life, by the Examination Board from associating with any work pertaining to examination. Mr. Parmanand Prasad, the symbol of injured dignity, caused a suit to be filed in the Hon'ble High Court at Patna for the restoration of his sick prestige on the ground that he was not given a hearing before the Examination Board punished him. In process of that suit, Dr. P. L. Srivastava stated on affidavit before the Hon'ble High Court that Mr. Parmanand Prasad was punished after enquiry. The Hon'ble Patna High Court dismissed the prayer of Mr. Parmanand Prasad whose prestige returned in the nude from the capital.

The Vice-Chancellor appointed another Committee which unearthed certain facts for the benefit of Mr. Prasad who was promptly exonerated. The Chancellor, perhaps, felt disturbed at the fact that a teacher condemned for selling questions should continue to associate with the University and wanted to know from the Vice-Chancellor as to what action had been taken against such a teacher. The Vice-Chancellor, time and again, requested the State Public Service Commission to approve of the appointment of Mr. Parmanand Prasad as the Head of the Post-Graduate Department in view of his exoneration by the second probe. But the Commission would not agree. On the other hand, this Dr. P. L. Srivastava continued, simultaneously to tell the Chancellor that Mr. Parmanand Prasad was being kept under punishment by not being made the Head of the Department. It is why the

appointment of the Head of the Department was delayed so much so that Mr. R. L. Das Verma was appointed on the eve of the Syndicate elections. The simultaneous correspondence of the Vice-Chancellor with the Chancellor on the one hand and the State Public Service Commission on the other should be a startling technique even for those accomplished in this art.

The Induction
of Dr. U.S. Sri-
vastava :

The post on which Dr. U. S. Srivastava was appointed, had been advertised without revealing if it was permanent or temporary—a unique technique by itself. The Syndicate authorised the Vice-Chancellor to nominate the expert for this appointment. This system of appointing experts as evolved by the Syndicate under the hypnosis of the Vice-Chancellor is unlawful. The note of the Advocate General on this issue, if called for, will bear out this point. Against the background of the system enabling the Vice-Chancellor to nominate experts of his own choice for the benefits of his favourites, irrespective of their demerits, the Chancellor too disapproved of this system of nominating candidates.

But Dr. P. L. Srivastava has, time and again, demonstrated it to all those who were concerned with the affairs of the University that he could always trim the Chancellor at his will. So, in order to induct Dr. U. S. Srivastava, the Vice-Chancellor appointed the expert through the disapproved of methods.

The Finance Committee of the University, at its meeting held on the 15th of April, 1963, *vide* item No. 8(3) of the Agenda, clearly indicated that the post of the University Professor of Zoology was a temporary one as the University Grants Commission had sanctioned the post only for the third plan period. The Finance Committee categorically stated that the post would be temporary unless made permanent either by the State Government or by the University. But the appointment was made through the procedure for permanent appointment without the post being declared permanent.

In order to accommodate a favourite, the Vice-Chancellor injured the legitimate claims of far superior candidates and claimants.

Double Standards (or Double Dealing ?)

The difficulty with the rule of law is that one has to respect it. But if a man starts getting benefits, privileges and flattery, variegated by awed authority, he starts believing that an extension of all these to other spheres and to his grovelling yesmen is the expanse of his power. But no man, howsoever powerful he may be, can always flout the rule of law. So he develops the tendency to avoid it, the technique to circumvent it. From the data and evidence stated, the

Citizens' Committee is pained to conclude the fact that Dr. P. L. Srivastava feels himself big enough to treat the rule of law as a burden, and is shrewd enough to find a way to circumvent it.

For instance, as a result of serious irregularities and unfair means adopted by him, Dr. J. N. Sahay of Class II Bihar Educational Service was disqualified for seven years by the Examination Board of the Ranchi University in 1962. The Confidential character roll bearing the remarks of the Principals of the Patna Science College and Ranchi College, should be revealing.

The case of
Dr. J.N. Sahay :

Dr. P. L. Srivastava, the irritable magnet for all his caste favourites as soon as he joined as the Vice-Chancellor at Muzaffarpur, attracted the attention of the maiden in distress at Ranchi—the uneven land of forest and rocks. At this juncture, two posts : one in Physical Chemistry and the other in Inorganic Chemistry were advertised for the Bihar University by the State Public Service Commission. The Commission recommended, for the post in Physical Chemistry, two candidates in order of preference :—

1. Dr. Jagdish Sahu ;
2. Dr. J. N. Sahay.

The recommendations of the Commission were placed before the Syndicate. But certain charges were pending against Dr. Jagdish Sahu, so the matter was postponed, and Dr. Jagdish Sahu left for Lybia as the University Professor of Chemistry. On the request of Dr. P. L. Srivastava, the Chancellor of the University approved of the appointment of Dr. J. N. Sahay for a period of one year only within which, the Chancellor wanted all the proceedings to be finalised before the full concurrence of the State Public Service Commission was taken up.

Through his entreaties, the Vice-Chancellor persuaded the Education Minister to transfer the services of Dr. J. N. Sahay from Ranchi University to the Bihar University. In the mean time, Dr. Jagdish Sahu was exonerated from all pending entanglements. Thus the appointment, denied to him because of these pending matters, became due to Dr. Sahu. But the Vice-Chancellor would not do so, and intrigued to allot the third post then vacant to Dr. Sahu. The Chancellor's orders, conveyed by his Secretary's letter No. 1780 of the 3rd of April, 1963, directed the Vice-Chancellor to place the recommendations of the State Public Service Commission before the Syndicate so that Dr. Jagdish Sahu was not handicapped on his return from Lybia. But instead of obeying the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor moved the State Public Service Commission to concur in the appointments of both Dr. J. N. Sahay and Jagdish Sahu. But the

Commission declined to oblige the Vice-Chancellor who was thus compelled to place the matter before the Syndicate at its meeting held on 14-7-63. *Vide* item No. 9 of the agenda, the Syndicate decided that Dr. Jagdish Sahu be appointed as a temporary Reader in Physical Chemistry and Dr. J.N. Sahay as a temporary Reader on the other post, and that Dr. J.N. Sahay would remain senior to Dr. Jagdish Sahu. But the Commission had recommended Dr. J.N. Sahay second in order of preference for the post of the Reader in Physical Chemistry and not for Inorganic Chemistry. Yet Dr. Sahay was appointed on the post for which he was not recommended at all, and the Vice-Chancellor appealed to the State Public Service Commission to concur with the appointment of Dr. Sahay.

The Vice-Chancellor persuaded the Syndicate to commit double dealing. A precedent had already been established while giving Dr. S.P. Kishore benefit over Mr. Kameshwar Sharma that the candidate recommended as first by the Commission would be senior. Yet Dr. Jagdish Sahu was dished out double dealing, and the Vice-Chancellor contravened the convention without any moral compunction. By the precedent, Dr. S.P. Kishore, a favourite of the Vice-Chancellor had gained, but by the same precedent another casteman of Dr. P.L. Srivastava would have suffered. So the standards were altered.

The State Public Service Commission declined to concur with the suggestion of the University *vide* its letter No. 3379 of the 1st of October, 1963, and advised the University to advertise the post as laid down in the Act. But the University moved the Commission to agree to the appointment by promotion. Dr. J.N. Sahay continues in his place of vantage beyond the concurrence of the State Public Service Commission.

After Dr. J.N. Sahay was inflicted upon the Bihar University, his salary, within eight months of his service, was raised from Rs. 720/- to Rs. 790/- at the meeting of the Syndicate held on the 15th of September, 1963. The parallel was drawn with Dr. Bechan Jha, the Reader in Sanskrit. But the case of Dr. D.N. Chaudhary and Dr. Jagdish Sahu was neglected, for the standard was not applied to them. Dr. Jagdish Sahu who was placed at the top in the same interview in which Dr. J.N. Sahay was placed second, got no increment, while Dr. D.N. Chaudhary, the Senior-most teacher in the department of Chemistry, Head of the University Department of Chemistry, was given an increment of Rs. 5/- only. Dr. J.N. Sahay was given Rs. 100/- more.

Mr. Shahabuddin
and Mr. S.K. Jha.

Mr. Mohammad Shahabuddin and Mr. Sri Krishna Jha were appointed as the Lecturers in the Post-Graduate Department of Political Science at C.M. College, Darbhanga, on the

recommendations of the State Public Service Commission. Mr. Shahabuddin applied for three advanced increments. But his application was turned down *vide* item No. 4 of the agenda of the Syndicate meeting held on the 9th of January, 1964.

Mr. Sri Krishna Jha, with a brilliant academic career, always topping the list, applied for two advanced increments. But *vide* item No. 13 of the agenda for the meeting held on the 9th of January, 1964, Mr. S.K. Jha's application was rejected. Mr. S.K. Jha went away to Gorakhpur on a higher start though prepared to serve the Bihar University for much smaller salary.

Mr. Chakradhar Singh applied to be relieved to go to another University. On his application to be relieved, Mr. Chakradhar Singh was given two increments.

The cases of Mr. Mohammad Shahabuddin, Mr. Sri Krishna Jha, were apathetically dismissed because neither of them belonged to either of the privileged castes. Yet Mr. Chakradhar Singh was given two advanced increments perhaps in order to desist from leaving this University. But Mr. Chakradhar Singh would not stay on despite all these gestures and overtures.

When Dr. Ram Bihari Singh, left C.M. College to come to Muzaffarpur, Dr. S.P. Sinha was appointed in his place. A Selection Board had earlier interviewed candidates for appointment as Reader at C.M. College in Economics, and had selected Dr. S.P. Sinha, second in order of preference to Dr. R.B. Singh. The standard was set that as Dr. S.P. Sinha had already been selected as the second best candidate, and therefore, there was no need either to advertise the post or to hold fresh interview.

The Case of
Mr. Shri Krishna
Mishra :

But this standard was abandoned when Mr. Amarnath Thakur left C.M. College and Mr. Shri Krishna Mishra, at par with Dr. S.P. Sinha, was left cold. Mr. S.K. Mishra was selected by the same Selection Board at the same series of interviews as second in order of preference to Mr. Amarnath Thakur for appointment as Reader in English. But though Dr. S.P. Sinha was appointed as Reader without advertisement or fresh interview, Mr. S.K. Mishra was brushed aside in the favour of one Dr. K.N. Sinha who was smuggled in without any advertisement.

Appointment through Intrigues :

Dr. P.L. Srivastava, took recourse to gross misrepresentation of facts to all concerned, to offensive conduct to the statutory bodies, intrigues and machination for smuggling in the favourites.

The History of
Mr. Braj Kishore
Prasad :

For instance on the 29th of March, 1964, the Vice-Chancellor in his address to the Senate said that Mr. Braj Kishore Prasad was offered a particular salary in consideration of his twelve year service. The Vice-Chancellor further said that as the services of Mr. Braj Kishore Prasad was absorbed in a sister University, and therefore the State Public Service Commission had been requested to concur in the appointment of Mr. Braj Kishore Prasad.

But the facts of the case, are absolutely different. Mr. Braj Kishore Prasad was appointed for six months in 1962 at C.M. College. The State Public Service Commission advertised for some appointments. Mr. Braj Kishore Prasad applied to the Commission, but was not recommended. Having terminated the services of several other teachers not recommended by the Commission, the Vice-Chancellor retained Mr. Braj Kishore Prasad, and requested the Commission to concur with Mr. Prasad's appointment. The Commission declined. Mr. Braj Kishore Prasad's representation for absorption in the Bihar University Service was rejected, and he was allowed to continue in service upto the 31st of March, 1964. In order to accommodate Mr. Braj Kishore Prasad, the Vice-Chancellor persuaded the Syndicate at its meeting of the 16th of April, 1964, to allow to the services of all temporary teachers, already terminated, to continue upto the 11th of May, 1964. The Vice-Chancellor to keep the issue involved, wrote a personal letter to the Commission for Mr. Braj Kishore Prasad. Such methods, to say the least, are highly improper. Mr. Braj Kishore Prasad was allowed to draw his salary upto the 31st of May, 1964, when even the Syndicate had extended his services only upto the 11th of May, 1964.

Mr. Ananda
Kishore Prasad
and Mr. Sri-
krishna Singh.

The appointment of Mr. Ananda Kishore Prasad and Mr. Srikrishna Singh in the department of Law at C.M. College was virtually the finesse of black art, the black magic of a canjurer.

The Vice-Chancellor appointed a Selection Committee to select two teachers for Law at C.M. College. The Committee considered first Mr. Kusheshwar Datta, Mr. A.K. Prasad, Mr. Damankanta Jha, Mr. Srikrishna Singh, Mr. Krishnakanta Jha and Mr. Ram Bahadur Ray. Out of these, Mr. Kusheshwar Datta and Mr. Ananda Kishore Prasad were recommended by the Selection Committee. But when the Syndicate met, it appointed Mr. Ananda Kishore Prasad and Mr. Srikrishna Singh who had been rejected at the Selection.

Readers or Academic Devaluation :

The award of Readership at wholesale rates has become a standing joke in the University circles, much to the denigration of this august office. At a time, twenty-four Lecturers

were appointed Readers in the various departments. This was the major act of beneficence bestowed by the Vice-Chancellor upon the lecturers. Two facts to be considered in this respect are whether the Vice-Chancellor kept himself within the bounds of power conferred upon him, and whether the Vice-Chancellor was guided by the Standards of the efficiency and merit.

The total number of seats sanctioned for Readers at L.S. College, was twenty-three. As against this, the new wave of appointment inflated the number to thirty-one. The Syndicate can appoint Readers temporarily against posts already sanctioned, but may not make appointments against posts which may or may not be sanctioned by the Senate in future. The Vice-Chancellor arbitrarily created four posts of Readers at C.M. College in 1962 and appointed four Readers as the first step of a deeprooted plan. Thus the Vice-Chancellor transgressed the authority delegated to him.

The treatment meted out to the merits and the qualifications of the Readers appointed and the lecturers denied Readership has its own tale to tell. The criteria of promoting the teachers of Bihar Educational Service and the teachers possessing research degrees manifested in practice in a way different from what was described. Thus Dr. Purnanand Das was not promoted despite his degree because he was junior, and Mr. S.N. Dixit was left behind because he did not have a degree. Dr. Manojit Ghosal and Dr. P.K. Banerjee were dropped because for them there were no posts. Dr. Shaligram Singh was not considered because he would not accept a lower salary, while salary was increased to suit Dr. Ram Bihari Singh. Mr. Amarnath Thakur was not promoted because the State Public Service Commission had not concurred with his appointment, though for Dr. L.N. Singh the same State Service Commission was made to eat humble pie. It is all a veritable chart of the manouvers of the commands.

It is the result of a calculated application of this unnatural law that a senior teacher like Mr. S.N. Dixit should bow out to Dr. Ramakant Pathak, and Mr. Binaya Kumar Sinha, with absolutely no published work or research article to his credit, should be elevated.

Dr. S.P. Kishore perhaps is the most glaring example, of Doctorate degree achieved through extra-curricular activities. That it should so happen at the loss of a genuine case is very depressing. The irony of the fate is that Mr. Kameshwar Sharma, a Hindi critic of repute, was kept out because he was neither senior enough to be a Bihar Education Service Officer nor Scholar enough for not having a degree, and yet he should teach Mr. S.P. Kishore in M.A. Classes.

The case of
Dr. S. P. Kishore.

Mr. Kameshwar Sharma represented to the Vice-Chancellor that while his substantive appointment was unjustly advanced by more than a year, the claim of Mr. Kishore's appointment as a permanent teacher had yet to be fixed up, and until then Mr. Kishore could at best be a temporary lecturer. The least that the Vice-Chancellor should have done was to enquire into the representation before appointing Dr. S.P. Kishore as Reader. But the Vice-Chancellor dismissed this representation on the specious plea that all this was a dirty linen of the past. One whose forte is the perpetration of evermore inequities will naturally not look into an injustice if he can shirk it.

The case of
Dr. K.N. Sinha :

Dr. K.N. Sinha, was almost smuggled into the Bihar University. A low II Class M.A. in English with less than 50% marks to his credit, a deficiency which he tried to cover up with a doctoral degree from Arkansas University, a University neither recognized by the Government of Bihar nor by this University. Dr. K.N. Sinha was interviewed for Readership at Magadh University, but was found unsuitable. There is nothing more elusive and undefinable than the commodity known as "Scholarship". In a University where a text-book exercise submitted to an obscure University of one of the forty-nine States of the United States of America is a high mark of Scholarship, no amount of departure from normal procedure is considered too wide to enshrine a Scholar. In effect, the appointment of Readers, was a forerunner of academic devaluation.

Victimisation En Masse

The Vice-Chancellor led the Syndicate with a multibladed guillotine to behead the teachers because of their caste. The nearest parallel that can be drawn is from the Nazis extermination of the Jews for their ethnical stock.

Torture of
Mr. Amarnath
Thakur :

That the senior-most teacher of English in the whole University, an Officer of Bihar Educational Service, with a brilliant record of teaching, should be wasted as an Assistant Director of Text-Book Research Bureau is an unmistakable sign of unfair University management and an administration vindictive par excellence.

With the advent of Dr. P.L. Srivastava on the scene, the threads of intrigue were introduced in the texture of the University fabrics. Mr. Amarnath Thakur was denied the privilege of study-leave on the pretext of the paucity of time. Two posts of Readers in English were sanctioned for L.S. College, and as the senior-most teacher of English, he was entitled to one of them at the premier College of the University. But the Vice-Chancellor was predetermined to remove Mr. Thakur from L.S. College for the Vice-Chancellor wanted to install his favourites, of course one caste considerations, at

L.S. College. But he could not do so until he moved Mr. Amarnath Thakur away. Therefore, instead of filling the posts already sanctioned at L.S. College, the Vice-Chancellor unlawfully created the post of a Reader in English at C.M. College, Darbhanga. The Vice-Chancellor could not create any post without the prior permission of the Chancellor. Mr. Amarnath Thakur was appointed as Reader in English at C.M. College on the 9th of December, 1962, and Mr. Thakur in obedience to the Vice-Chancellor joined at Darbhanga on the 10th of December. On the 13th of December, Mr. Amarnath Thakur wrote a letter to the Vice-Chancellor protesting against his transfer to Darbhanga, and claimed that as he was already a Reader he should be transferred to L.S. College, the premier College of the University. Having filed his representation, Mr. Thakur went out with the University Cricket Team as its Manager. On the 19th of December, Mr. Thakur's letter of protest was treated as his "letter of resignation" and his "resignation" was accepted by the Vice-Chancellor. Mr. Amarnath Thakur was thus reverted to his old post at L.S. College, Muzaffarpur. In the mean time, Mr. Thakur was removed from the Presidentship of the L.S. College Athletic Club, and from his Secretaryship of the University Athletic Club was earmarked for termination.

The presence of Mr. Thakur was a source of anxiety to the Vice-Chancellor, for as long as Mr. Thakur was at L.S. College, the Vice-Chancellor could not bring in his favourites. Therefore, the Citizens Committee is constrained to recognize the fact that a conspiracy, in the unmitigated style of Professor Mariarty whom even the famous Sherlock Holmes feared the most, was set afoot. A plot for the character-assassination of Mr. Thakur was cooked up. That a University campus should witness such medieval feudal machination is startling, though painfully so.

A rumour was engendered that, in 1963 B.A. (Hons.) Examinations in English, the questions set by Mr. Thakur had leaked out. The basis of this rumour was the information imparted by two students who supplied some topics from the text-book as having leaked out. The packets of the Paper-I were opened, and the topics were compared and it was declared that the questions had leaked out, and the examination in that paper was cancelled. Mr. Amarnath Thakur was thus condemned as a teacher suffering from moral turpitude. It was all fiction, but truth is stranger than fiction. Mr. Amarnath Thakur had set questions for Paper-II and not Paper-I an elementary caution which Dr. Watson failed to exercise. The second attempt at Mr. Thakur's character-assassination was more cautious and wary. The list of paper-setters was called for to ascertain the paper entrusted to Mr. Amarnath Thakur. The packets of Paper II were opened,

and it was decided that questions had leaked out. The verdict was sanctified by Mr. Prabhunath Singh whose profound knowledge of English is no matter of envy. Two of the eight questions set by Mr. Thakur were changed. An examinee was to answer six out of eight questions set, and even after two questions were changed, a student could take full advantage of the leakage by answering the six questions set by Mr. Thakur, which were allowed to be there. The whole conspiracy should be obvious from these, for the fact guiding the conspiracy was that the world would not know that only two questions had leaked out, for cyclostyled question-papers were used.

The University authorities appointed a Committee to investigate into this question leakage. This Committee has been in existence for well over a year now, but has failed to trace out any leakage, and has not submitted any report. The Vice-Chancellor, however, hastened to report about the complicity of Mr. Thakur in the leakage to the Government and the State Public Service Commission. Naturally apprehensive of further calumny and vilification, Mr. Amarnath Thakur requested the State Government to transfer his services to administration, for he had lost all hopes of protection from the Ministry of Education, if he continued at L.S. College. Mr. Thakur represented his case to Mr. Binodanand Jha, the then Chief Minister. Strangely enough, it annoyed the Education Minister who disliked the idea of Mr. Thakur's attempts to draw the attention of the Chief Minister even after his fate had been left by the Education Minister, enmeshed in the jagged wheels of the bureaucratic education juggernaut.

When Mr. Thakur's case came up for promotion before the State Public Service Commission, the reports sent by the Vice-Chancellor, without any report from the probe Committee, had its own portents. The expert, assigned by the Vice-Chancellor in this instance did not submit his remark at all, and it was for this reason that the State Public Service Commission did not send any recommendations regarding Mr. Thakur. Thus the Vice-Chancellor stage managed the whole show, and then advised the Syndicate that Mr. Thakur should be left where he was in view of no recommendation from the Commission. The Vice-Chancellor, in his address to the Senate, as published in the 'Indian Nation', represented this fact by saying that the Commission had not recommended Mr. Thakur.

many things happen that should not, otherwise there can be no rationale for the following chart :—

1.	Sri Ram Sundar Jha	Brahmin
2.	Sri Surja Narain Jha	-do-
3.	Sri Probodh Kumar Jha	-do-
4.	Sri Ramdeo Jha	-do-
5.	Sri Krishna Jha	-do-
6.	Sri Radha Kant Mishra	-do-
7.	Sri Sudha Kant Mishra	-do-
8.	Sri Girish Chandra Jha	-do-
9.	Sri Maheshwar Jha	-do-
10.	Sri Shrutidhar Jha	-do-
11.	Sri Kameshwar Chaudhary	-do-
12.	Sri Guru Prasad Chaudhary	-do-
13.	Sri Lakshimikant Chaudhary	-do-
14.	Sri Bhogendra Narayan Thakur	-do-
15.	Sri Chandrika Chaubey	-do-
16.	Sri Shashi Sekhar Tewary	-do-
17.	Sri Bipin Bihari Sharma	-do-
18.	Sri Braj Kishore Prasad	Kayastha
19.	Sri Ramesh Prasad Verma	-do-
20.	Sri Chakradhar Singh	Rajput

It happened on one summer day, when always in the human history revolutions have been born. Teachers, numbered from 1 to 17, were removed because their temporary appointments terminated. Teachers, numbered from 18 to 20, were allowed to continue, though their temporary appointments terminated on the same day. And who should be there to be blamed for unrest ?

Mr. Braj Kishore Prasad, had already been a source of a lot of correspondence between the Vice-Chancellor and the State Public Service Commission. Mr. Prasad still continues to be in the service of the Bihar University beyond the concurrence of the Commission. Mr. Chakradhar Singh is just an illustration of repeat performance. It is for Dr. K.S. Verma the Registrar of the Bihar University, to say that he was, at that time, not negotiating the marriage of his daughter with the elder brother of Mr. Ramesh Prasad Verma.

This mass extermination on the basis of caste is indeed one of the grandest achievements of the Vice-Chancellor, and that too without causing any reaction at the Ministry of Education.

And so was even the most ancient language of the civilized world injected with the virus of favouritism manifesting into victimization. Sanskrit has been, from times immemorial, taught by the Brahmins—a convention of

Sanskrit Defiled:

privilege never grudged. But Dr. P.L. Srivastava has his own ideas roaming in the incoherent valleys of injustice and brigandage.

The Syndicate, at its meeting held on the 25th of August 1963, *vide* item No. 7 of the Agenda, considered the recommendations of the State Public Service Commission for two appointments in the department of Sanskrit. The Syndicate, like a misguided missile resolved: "*That the Commission be requested to send the entire list with qualifications and other relevant papers of all the candidates interviewed for appointments to the temporary post of lecturers in Sanskrit in B. U. S.*" In consequence hereof, the Registrar wrote to the Commission to comply with the resolution of the Syndicate. The Commission took a strong exception to the attitude of the University, and, *vide* its letter No. A/RE 301/63-3149 PSC of the 12th of September 1963, conveyed its inability in view of the fact that the records of the Commission were strictly confidential and could not be questioned. The Commission advised the University not to indulge in such letters in future.

The University retaliated. At its meeting held on the 15th of September, 1963, *vide* item No. 38 of the Agenda, the Syndicate resolved: "*That Mr. Sheo Shankar Prasad be appointed as a lecturer in Sanskrit, and the other post be advertised.*" Thus the University authorities, spurned the Commission to attach seniority to a caste favourite of the Vice-Chancellor if they could not accommodate the blessed favourites on both the posts. The poor Brahmin teacher who was recommended first in order of preference for the second post—the Brahmin being the traditional teacher in India—was pushed out. The University authorities accepted one part of the recommendation of the Commission and rejected another part, though both contained in one and the same letter.

Proctors and Principals :

The duplicity of conduct might have been a praiseworthy quality in the Machiavallian Code. But the sanctity of a University campus must not include it in its curriculum.

Proctors

The Vice-Chancellor appointed Dr. H. R. Ghosal and Dr. D.N. Chaudhary as Proctors for Post-Graduate Arts and Post-Graduate Science respectively. Thus Dr. P.L. Srivastava unknowingly set the standard of appointing the senior-most teachers in their respective sections on the 3rd of January 1963. But the Vice-Chancellor, soon after, appointed Dr. S.P. Kishore and Mr. Ram Swaroop Singh as Proctors, though they were junior teachers in their own departments. The pattern is the same, the privileged must share every purse.

Mr. Mahendra Pratap, the Principal of L.S. College, on the 5th of March 1963, represented to the Vice-Chancellor that his pay should be fixed in the scale of Rs. 850-50-1250/-, that is the scale for University Professor. At its meeting held on the 20th of May 1963, *vide* item No. 31 of the Agenda, the Syndicate resolved that Mr. Pratap's salary be fixed in the scale for University Professor, and he should continue to get other allowance. The syndicate further resolved that the Government be informed of this and be reminded of the case of Dr. L.K. Mishra of C.M. College. The fact is that the salary of Dr. L.K. Mishra of Darbhanga was fixed in that scale by the State Government; so the cases were unequal.

Dr. P.L. Srivastava, on pressure from the lieutenants of the Education Minister, fixed the salary of Mr. Mahendra Pratap at Rs. 1150/- in the scale of Rs. 850-50-1250/-, giving him increment from the date he joined. The Vice-Chancellor did so by the virtue of the authority vested in him under section 9(12) of the Bihar State Universities Act of 1960, as amended by the Bihar Act 2 of 1962. [Syndicate meeting on the 23rd of June, 1963; item No. 45(d) of the Agenda.] There seems to be no plausible explanation of this haste, for this power is to be exercised in the cases of extreme emergency only.

The impropriety of Dr. P.L. Srivastava's act in this respect is obvious. Emergency powers should not be exercised for such routine matters, more so because when the Syndicate had already taken positive steps on the representation of Mr. Pratap. The greater pity is that the Vice-Chancellor has not thought of exhibiting a similar haste in the case of the Principal of M.D.D. College, Muzaffarpur, whose similar representation is lying forlorn in the jungle of files for more than a year now.

Naked Favouritism

Favouritism, transgressing all the frontiers of ethics, is a fact one must pause to examine if it is just an error or if it is chronic mental aberration.

Prior to his appointment in the department of Zoology at L.S. College, Dr. S.N. Srivastava was a lecturer at an Intermediate College at Gorakhpur. All through his career as a student, Dr. S.N. Srivastava was of a low calibre, and worked at Gorakhpur on a small salary. The Bihar State Public Service Commission recommended him in 1961, because he had obtained a doctoral degree by then.

The case of
Dr. S. N. Sri-
vastava.

At the time of his appointment, Dr. S.N. Srivastava made no conditions for any allowance whatsoever. But after Dr. P.L. Srivastava took over as the Vice-Chancellor, the other doctor applied for a personal allowance of Rs. 50/- per

month, and an increment on the ground of his past experience. *Vide* item No. 11 of the Agenda of the Syndicate meeting held in May, 1963, Dr. S.N. Srivastava was granted the personal allowance of Rs. 50/- per month in accordance with the terms and conditions laid down by the Syndicate.

As a matter of fact, the rules adopted by the Syndicate relate to the B.E.S. Officers of Class II and to the teachers of Bihar University Service only. The rules further provide that the benefit of Research allowance should go only to those who have obtained their degrees while under the active service of the University, and that from the date of joining, whichever is later. No other teacher, in the past, of the category of Dr. S.N. Srivastava had received such facilities as extended to the Doctor. Besides, Dr. S.N. Srivastava got his degree of Ph.D. from the Allahabad University while he was in the active service of an Intermediate College at Gorakhpur and not of the University from where he got the degree. When this benefit was extended to him, Dr. S.N. Srivastava was neither a Class II Officer of Bihar Educational Service nor duly absorbed in the Bihar University Service. Thus the personal allowance of Rs. 50/- per month sanctioned to Dr. S.N. Srivastava was in contravention of the rules referred to. That he could have got this allowance in view of past experience is untenable, because the Syndicate, *vide* the same item of the Agenda through which this personal allowance was granted, rejected his plea of past experience for any advance increments. Moreover as Dr. S.N. Srivastava had accepted his appointment without any such condition, the day he joined his post on the terms and conditions advertised by the State Public Service Commission, the contract was complete. Yet, he should be given this allowance is a matter explained only by the fact that the Vice-Chancellor was guided by his instinct of personal favouritism.

Conclusive Data and Evidence

It is perhaps a veritable hysteria for personal power, aggravated by a burning desire for vengeance and extermination, that brought about :—

1. appointments for posts that did not exist;
2. appointments without proper advertisements—contrary to rules and procedures;
3. promotions and transfers through intrigue and subterfuge;
4. harassment and torture on mere caste considerations, perpetrated through malicious conspiracy and diabolical character—assassination;

5. appointments and promotions by first misinforming the State Public Service Commission, University Service Commission and the Chancellor, and then by defying them, contrary to all rules and conventions;
6. suppression of merit and service to accommodate the narrow instinct of caste and personal favouritism; and
7. waste of University funds on such malafide appointments, and encumbents, creating of psychology of fear, humiliation and resentment.

From the data and evidence, the fact shamefully persistent, stands out that, in consequence of the acts of commission and omission on the part of the University authorities, unchecked by all powerful Education Minister, an overwhelming sense of demoralization and frustration, gnawing feeling of insecurity coupled with mutual distrust and bickerings, have overtaken the community of teachers. The fact as to why and wherefor all these remains unsolved, because there are errors and errors galore, all emanating from the personal needs of the Vice-Chancellor and the Education Minister. In all the cases of irregular and malafide favours, the beneficiaries were the teachers of two castes only. And strangely enough, in all cases of suspension, humiliation and prosecution, no teacher of either of the two very privileged castes has suffered even once.

The teachers—as individuals and in community—cast very lasting impressions on the students, the massive population of the campus. There can be no doubt that this community, suffering from insecurity and humiliation, afflicted by persecution and inequity, coerced to encamp in the caste barracks of the Vice-Chancellor and the Education Minister for the personal aggrandizement of Dr. P.L. Srivastava and Mr. Satyendra Narain Singh, succumbed to the resultant insecurity and furtiveness, demoralization and neglect, affecting the students individually and *en masse*. Thus it is the University authorities, with the blessings of the unmitigated Education Minister, through their vindictiveness, unlawful favouritism and complete disregard of the written rules and unwritten conventions, who destroyed the image of ethics, discipline and decorum in the University life, breeding an epidemic of unrest, bursting out, from time to time, in demonstrations and hunger-strikes, fracas and what not. The teachers, through the force of circumstances and the treatment meted out to them by the University authorities and the Ministry of Education, were unfortunately led to contribute to the causes of general unrest in the University—

an unrest like an undercurrent, twisting like a whirlpool beneath a placid surface, if the surface was at all placid.

(ii) BID TO CAPTURE AND CONTROL UNIVERSITY BODIES

A man who has never drunk champagne never misses it; but once he acquires the taste, it is difficult for him to get rid off it. So it is with power. Bihar University, unfortunately, came under the influence of power-intoxicated politicians who were bent upon perpetuating themselves. To weave a new fabric unhindered, certain people were discarded, eliminated and purged, and others, propitious to the power-mad bossess, were installed in the positions of vantage.

Power in the University rests in the Senate and the Syndicate. Despite all manipulations, the new authorities were on unsure ground when the first Senate met in November, 1962. Therefore, elections to the Syndicate were designedly postponed till March, 1963. During the interregnum, the authorities struggled on, and meanwhile new Principals who could be depended upon, were appointed, and thus by cleverness and intrigue, inducted into the kaleidoscope of the Bihar University politics.

The case of Mr. N.P. Singh :

The merits of the Chancellor's orders are *sub judice*. But the facts of the case that are not *sub judice* are very disturbing within themselves. That the Vice-Chancellor should approve of the appointment of Mr. N.P. Singh against the orders of the Chancellor and the views of the University Service Commission counters a motive other than academic. D.B. College, Jainagar, was just a fortress to be captured in a political strategy of *Blitzkrieg*. The Citizens Committee painfully recognizes the fact that this was the motive behind the reinstatement of Mr. N.P. Singh, and none less than Chancellor himself has felt that way.

Mr. Nagendra Prasad Singh, a Lecturer in R.D.S. College, Muzaffarpur, was temporarily appointed Principal of D.B. College, Jainagar, by the Secretary of the *Ad-Hoc* Committee for till such time as a regular Governing Body was not constituted. When the regular Governing Body came into existence, it considered his appointment and terminated it on various grounds. Mr. Nagendra Prasad Singh moved the State University Service Commission for the redress of his grievance. The Commission asked for show cause from the Governing Body, and after hearing both the parties upheld the decision of the Governing Body terminating his appointment. Subsequently, the Chancellor concurred with the decision of the Commission. Mr. Nagendra Prasad Singh then left D. B. College, Jainagar, and joined R. D. S. College, Muzaffarpur, where he had worked previously.

After one year, the old Governing Body was dissolved and a new Governing Body was constituted by the Vice-Chancellor. This Governing Body was constituted exclusively with such members as were determined to rehabilitate Mr. Nagendra Prasad Singh by whatever means. The new Governing Body, at its first meeting, held on the 10th February, 1963, cancelled the previous order terminating his appointment and asked him to join his post at an early date. The matter was again referred to the Chancellor who passed the following orders :—

“From the resolution of the Governing Body, it is clear that they withdraw the earlier resolution terminating the services of Sri N.P. Singh and restored him. Therefore, it is not a new appointment which comes under the six-month rule. This is therefore against my order confirming the termination of Sri N.P. Singh’s services issued by the earlier Governing Body, which has become final. The subsequent Governing Body has no jurisdiction to recall the original order which was brought to me in appeal and which I confirmed. Shri N.P. Singh’s appointment is therefore illegal and invalid. There is no question of the Commission’s extending his term now.....The restoration of Sri N.P. Singh is illegal and his services have to be terminated.”

(Chancellor’s letter No. 284GB of 19-6-64)

The order of the Chancellor was communicated to the Vice-Chancellor and the Secretary of the Governing Body for necessary action.

It may however, be pointed out that when the matter relating to his reinstatement was raised in the meeting of the Senate held on the 31st of March, 1963, the Vice-Chancellor ruled that his appointment was temporary, which, according to him, did not require approval of the University. But the Chancellor’s orders make the whole issue manifestly clear, and there remains nothing left to explain. Incidentally, it may be mentioned that although the Vice-Chancellor ruled in the Senate meeting that approval for a temporary appointment was not necessary, yet subsequently on 20-5-63, in the second meeting of the Syndicate, he himself approved of the said appointment as would be seen from the following resolution appearing on page 35 of the Minutes of the Syndicate for 1963.

“Approved temporarily the appointment of Sri Nagendra Prasad Singh as the Principal of D.B. College, Jainagar on the recommendation of the Governing Body of the College.”

The contradiction between the two stands is apparent.

A CHAIN OF FORTRESSES TO CONQUER

From data and evidence, a very breath-taking fact comes to light—a fact that strikes of a long—range conspiracy to convert the Colleges into fortresses, and virtually “seize” them through infiltration, through sabotage, through subterfuge. The relevant facts, the Citizens Committee is indeed horrified to find, unerringly indicate that a chain of transfers and appointments was cast by the High Command of Education to install men of one caste wherever it was physically possible. The Chain links M.S. College, Motihari and Jagdam College, Chapra, consequent to the transfer of Mr. K.P. Sinha as a Registrar. It is a remarkable story even for Dr. Watson. The observations of the University Service Commission in respect of the appointment are revealing.

When it became, more or less, certain that Mr. K.P. Sinha, Principal, M.S. College, Motihari, would go way as the Registrar of Magadh University, it was planned to shift Mr. Bhola Nath Singh, the Principal of Jagdam College, as Principal, M.S. College, Motihari, a bigger fortress. It would create a void in the Jagdam College which was proposed to be filled in by another stalward of the same caste. So one Mr. Sushil Kumar Singh was appointed to a newly created post which was not advertised. All this was a premeditated plan to install Mr. Sushil Kumar Singh in the chair of Mr. Bhola Nath Singh when the latter joined M.S. College, Motihari. Eventually, Mr. Sushil Kumar Singh was appointed Principal according to the scheme. With regard to this appointment the Chancellor says that, *“Sri Sushil Kumar Singh was appointed temporarily for six months as Principal of the Jagdam College. The Vice-Chancellor does not say that his appointment was approved of by the University. On the other hand, his contention is that, for appointments for six months or less, the approval of the University is not called for. In view of the opinion that I hold all appointments for six months or less or more should have the approval of the University under clause (6) of Section 48-A, I hold Sri Sushil Kumar Singh was not a Principal on the date of the Senate meeting. His participation therefore is invalid.”* The circumstances lead to the inevitable conclusion that the Vice-Chancellor has wilfully rested and relied upon vague and shadowy frontiers to uphold candidates calculated to serve the interests of a special coterie and clique.

TAILOR-MADE APPOINTMENTS :

As planned Mr. Bhola Nath Singh joined M.S. College, Motihari, as Principal. Advertisement for the appointment of a Principal in M.S. College, Motihari, was tailored to suit Mr. Bhola Nath Singh. The inside story leading to the appointment of Mr. Bhola Nath Singh, when unfolded, would

prove more thrilling and exciting than that of the Arabian Nights tales and it would certainly beat all the plots so far thought of by even Edgar Wallace, the celebrated writer of thrillers. May be, it was the knowledge of such inside conspiracy that constrained the University Service Commission, Bihar, to make the following observations in its letter No. 3151/US dated July 7, 1964 :—

“In one case of appointment of a Principal of a College, the qualifications and experiences were indicated by the Governing Body of the College in its requisition to the Commission in such a manner that when the post was advertised, it was found that only the person actually acting in the College as Principal at the time fulfilled all the qualifications as indicated by the College authorities in their requisition. The result was that the post had to be advertised thrice.”

Regarding the appointment of Mr. Bhola Nath Singh, the Chancellor has said, *“He was originally appointed as the Principal of Jagdam College, Chapra. His appointment is said to have been approved by the old Bihar University but no such approval was given when he was appointed by the University, there is no legal appointment as Principal of the Motihari College.”*

INTRIGUES AND SUBTERFUGE :

Another intriguing appointment is that of Mr. Shatrughan Prasad Singh. He was appointed Principal of Rosera College on 21-3-1963. He joined his post on 26-3-1963. He attended the Senate meeting on 31-3-1963. He resigned his Principalship after three days and rejoined his original appointment as Lecturer in M.S. College, Motihari, where he was on leave. The above dates reveal the crude nature of the plan. There is nothing to indicate that appointment as Principal was approved of by the Vice-Chancellor or that such approval was sanctioned by the Chancellor. Therefore, there was no appointment, in fact, of Mr. Shatrughan Prasad Singh, and in law, it was not competent for him to vote in the election. Regarding this disgusting machination, the Chancellor has rightly painfully observed : *“I am sorry that this method should have been adopted by whosoever that might have been responsible only to add to the Principals' votes in the Senate.”*

(Chancellor's letter No. 284GB of 19-6-1964)

The post of the Principal of Maharajganj College was advertised and Mr. B.S. Chauhan applied. It is indeed intriguing that the requisite qualifications for the post should be a replica of the qualifications of Mr. B.S. Chauhan—the same story of tailo-made advertisements. Mr. Chauhan was

in the Court of the Education Minister of the State—Mr. Satyendra Narayan Singh—when interviews were being held for this post. But as Mr. Chauhan forgot to appear before the University Service Commission, the Governing body of the College was made to turn down all the recommendations of the Commission, and readvertise for the post so that Mr. Chauhan could be appointed.

STRATEGIC BLUE PRINT

Appointment of Principals of other affiliated Colleges went to a particular caste—the caste of the Education Minister—or to those prepared to compromise their conscience with his schemes. The appointments of Mr. Satish Singh, Principal of Parsa College, and Mr. B.S. Chauhan of Maharajganj may be cited as instances of injecting the virus of casteism into the Body of the Colleges. Such designs are unsuited to the ethics of the twentieth century. They belong to those dark ages when people resorted to machination to subjugate ideas and people of a different hue. In enlightened days, such conduct is at once obsolete and reprehensible.

The chart, hereinafter depicted, is a fascinating study in the strategy of infiltration into a chain of forts and their eventual capture to guard the frontiers of an empire ;—

Principal	Caste	College
1. Mr. M. Pratap	Rajput	L.S. College, Muzaffarpur.
2. Mr. Bhola Nath Singh	-do-	M.S. College, Motihari.
3. Mr. Sushil Kumar Singh	-do-	Jagdam College, Chapra.
4. Mr. Shatrughna Prasad Singh	-do-	Rosera College, Rosera.
5. Mr. Satish Kumar Singh	-do-	P.N. College, Parsa.
6. Mr. N.P. Singh	-do-	D.B. College, Jainagar.
7. Mr. B.S. Chauhan	-do-	Mahrajganj College, Maharajganj.
8. Mr. S.K. Jayaswall	Non-Rajput	S.P. College, Shahpur Patori.

This chart by itself is self-evident, and connotes a sort of syndicalism to usurp power—a patent technique of the dictators of the past.

The despotic process set in motion to control the Colleges was aimed to be perfected by other methods.

The effectiveness of the Chancellor's orders in respect of the votes cast in the Syndicate elections is *sub judice*, and therefore, the Citizens' Committee abstains from discussing their merits. The motive behind all these appointments, described by the Chancellor himself, conveyed through the Chancellor's letter No. 284 G.B. of the 19th of June, 1964, is as follows:—

"I am sorry that this method should have been adopted by whosoever that might have been responsible only to add to the Principals vote in the Senate".

Could a greater shame be attached to a University?

The appointment of the Principals was only a part of the whole scheme—the panzer movement of an army arrayed to overrun the domain. The chart described is indeed revealing:—

Caste	Total No. of Members in Senate	No. of Members nominated	Castes-wise percentage of benefit
Rajput	18	9	50%
Kayastha	20	8	40%
Brahmin	16	5	33%
Bhumihar	28	4	14%
Others	31	7	23%

This chart in respect of the University Representatives describes the percentage of nomination out of the total population available. It is not a chart of the percentage of the total seats filled in, but of the percentage of the population favoured.

While nominating the University Representatives, the Heads of the Post-Graduate Departments and the Deans of the various faculties, were not considered at all. The considerations were moulded into a pattern of blazing infiltration, denoting the well-known tactics of smuggling agent-saboteurs to enable the main legion to march in. These nominations were repugnant to conscience, but only if there was a conscience at all lurking somewhere in the campus.

The nomination of the Secretaries on the Governing Bodies is a dark account of a darker deed. The Hon'ble

Supreme Court has observed that it is of some importance that the autonomy of the affiliated Colleges is not unduly impaired. If the intention of the Vice-Chancellor was to do good to the Colleges, and not to serve the campaign of the Education Minister, he should have withdrawn his nominations, and allowed the former Secretaries to function. But the actual fact is that the Secretaries were appointed to usurp the institutions and not develop them, and therefore, even after the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the same set of persons were kept in office through one pretext or the other.

The Syndicate has resolved that nomination for old boys and others would be made in consultation with Mr. Prabhunath Singh. Such a resolution within itself is significantly indicative, for Mr. Prabhunath Singh is a politician attached to the faction of the Education Minister. Mr. Prabhunath Singh has neither academic qualifications nor acknowledged learning to act with objective wisdom in such matters. The comparative charts of the members of the various Governing Bodies will bring out striking facts to public light, and the blue-print of subterfuge and stealth will be exposed.

CONCLUSIVE FACTS :

The Education Minister and his lieutenants-in-Command in the Bihar University disfigured the Colleges by motivated appointments of the Principals, mauled the Governing Bodies by nominating members held by the unseen strings, mutilated the administration by inflicting Secretaries expelled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Mr. Bisheshwar Dayal Singh, exposed, in his writ petition of 27-1-63, in the Miscellaneous Judicial Case No. 86 of 1963, the pressure tactics of the Education Minister. According to the Minister's letter which the Vice-Chancellor dangled before Mr. Bisheshwar Dayal Singh, the Education Minister has admitted, though only for his personal ends, that indiscriminate grant of free-studentship and appointment of lecturers may create problems for law and order. The emergent fact is that such indiscriminate appointment of the Principals, illegal nomination of the Secretaries, such disruptive impositions on the Governing Bodies are bound to generate seething unrest and occasional explosions.

That the Colleges should not be treated as seats of learning but as a citadels of political power and personal favouritism is indeed a very distressing phenomenon in the University of Bihar. The comprehensive picture is that the Education Minister, at some undetermined moment, planned to "capture" the Bihar University through subterfuge, intrigue, unlawful acts and what not. For this, he brought Dr. P.L. Srivastava a litigant Vice-Chancellor. To strengthen the Vice-

Chancellor, it became necessary to have a Syndicate cast on the same mould, inspired by the same objective. It became imperative, in order to mould the Syndicate to ones howsoever obscure fashion, to create a majority in Senate as well. When the lieutenants of Education Minister failed to gather the desired strength in Senate through elections, it became inevitable for those who sough political power through educational institutions to enlist the support of the Secretaries and the Governing Bodies. For this, the lawfully continuing Principals and Secretaries were ousted, the Governing Bodies were mauled, "loyal persons were inducted as the Heads of the Departments" particularly at the time of voting on the 29th of March, 1963.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court, *vide* its judgement in Civil Appeal No. 279 of 1964, rejected the acts of the authorities to disturb the Secretaries and the Governing Bodies. The Hon'ble Patna High Court annulled the dismissal of Mr. Bholu Prasad Singh who had been under the constant fire from the Education Minister and the Vice-Chancellor. The Chancellor, *vide* his letter No. 284 GB of the 19th of June, 1964, categorically announced that the Principals were appointed to get their votes in the Senate. Through the same letter, the Chancellor himself has pointed out that one Lecturer of M. S. College was allowed a casual leave for seven days, during the leave he was appointed as the Principal of Rosera College, this Principal participated in the voting at the Senate meeting on the 29th of March, 1963, and then returned to his original post of lecturer at M. S. College. It is only one of the many instances of the deep insult and humiliation inflicted upon the Office of the Principal, the Colleges, and education itself.

That such blameworthy plans should be made in the Ministry of Education and executed in the jurisdiction of a University is indeed alarmingly detrimental to the wellbeing of education and to hundreds of thousands of youngmen whose careers are being sacrificed at the altar of power-seeking politicians and teachers.

(iii) IN THE GRANT OF SCHOLARSHIPS :

The facts, data and information, stated to us, describe that the first major act which Dr. P. L. Srivastava did as the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Bihar was to award scholarship for study at foreign Universities to five teachers in 1962. If called for, relevant records will show that all the teachers granted the said scholarship are of one caste—the caste to which the Vice-Chancellor belongs. This within itself may not be something singular, but visualized against the background of other data and evidence, it presents an altogether different panorama.

That the main purpose of the Vice-Chancellor in granting Scholarship seems to further his questionable end. He has misused money under this head to pamper his caste favourites, to win over opposing elements, and seldom to achieve the object for which money is allotted under this head. For instance Binod Kumar Sinha was granted Research Scholarship only three days before the summer vacation in 1963. Mr. Binod Kumar Sinha who is an M.A. in Labour and Social Welfare from the Bhagalpur University and has been a student of average merit, not normally favoured by the Vice-Chancellors for any specialized study. The father of Mr. Sinha, Mr. Gajendra Prasad is the most devoted favourite of Dr. P. L. Srivastava. This is evident from the fact that, when an occasion came for swearing an affidavit on behalf of the University in the case of Bihar University vs Newspapers and Publications, Patna, the choice of Vice-Chancellor fell upon Sri Gajendra Prasad and not on the Office-Superintendent of the University who should be the proper man to know the affairs of the University—the affidavit which the Hon'ble High Court described as inaccurate.

Mr. Sinha started his work under Dr. R. B. Singh who has no degree of Labour and Social Welfare, does not even teach the degree students in the subject. The gentleman could not conduct any research during the vacation, but he did draw the attached allowances. Besides, the gentleman did not have the basic degree in the subject in which he was granted Scholarship.

The condition prescribed for a warding research fellowship is that the candidate has to work continuously for whole of the period of at least one year. It may, however, be pointed out that Sri Sinha, after having served only for a few months, left the place abruptly and joined elsewhere. He left the work of research fellowship. By doing so, he has not only violated the rules of the award of research fellowship but also flouted one of the cardinal conditions of the terms of agreement. The award of this fellowship is a sort of a contract between the University and the man for advancement of higher studies. The University, therefore, incurs expenditure on this head only with a view to render academic guidance to talented persons for advanced knowledge and research. Therefore, some conditions are impunged before a man enters into this profession and accepts the research fellowship.

If, at any time, a research fellow wants to terminate his engagement before the expiry of one year for any reason, he has to refund the entire amount received. But surprisingly enough, Mr. Sinha abruptly left this place, applied elsewhere without informing the University and also against his own commitment, and did not refund the money, paid to him, as required under the rules of the University.

The concession given to him by the University is only an indication of the fact that his father, Sri Gajendra Prasad Verma enjoys the fullest confidence of the Vice-Chancellor. The grant of Research Scholarship to Mrs. Asha Kishore, the wife of Dr. Kishore, teacher at L.S. College, Muzaffarpur, is equally questionable. Mr. Ramswaroop Singh, now a Deputy Registrar of the University, was granted research Scholarship, but conducted no research and yet drew the consequent allowances. The Veracity of all these can easily be checked if the relevant records are called for, and the relevant records should be called for. It must be incidentally understood that the Vice-Chancellor, in order to perpetrate his casteism, had to share the booty with the caste favourites of the Education Minister.

The other circumstances are apt to lead one to the conclusion that caste considerations were the basic considerations for those selections. For instance, the recurring grant under which scholarship was awarded in 1962 to Mr. Birendra Kumar Sinha of Psychology Department, Mr. Akhauri Balram Prasad of Botany Department, Mr. Shiva Shankar Prasad of Physics Department, Mr. Drugeshwari Prasad and Mr. Dharendra Prasad of Chemistry Department, has been earmarked for the benefit of the Officers of Bihar Educational Service, serving the University of Bihar on loan. The evidence categorically states that no teacher not belonging to Bihar Educational Service has, been awarded, before 1962, scholarship under this grant. The Citizens Committee is deeply pained to submit that in view of these facts, data and evidence, the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. P.L. Srivastava, is liable for the gross misuse of the University funds. The instance of the Research Scholarship granted to Mr. Binod Kumar, son of Mr. Gajendra Prasad Verma, a favourite employee of the University and trusted lieutenant of the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar, is the key to the Vice-Chancellor's attitude and methods. That an individual should be appointed a Research Scholar only three days before the commencement of summer vacation is a gross misuse of the University funds, for during the vacation the scholar was not able to conduct any research, and yet drew the allowances.

Misuse of Funds.

It is a matter of common knowledge, and it needs no confirmation, that in the whole University, there is not one teacher of English with a degree of Ph.D. from any University of the United Kingdom. Six teachers, including two B.E.S. Officers, from the Department of English, applied in 1962 for Scholarship with study-leave for studies abroad. Therefore, when no teacher from this department was selected despite the fact that the needs of this department were far greater than the department of Chemistry, for instance, one is bound to conclude that the requirements of the various departments

Necessities Ignored.

were not objectively considered by the Vice-Chancellor. One may wonder why. The inevitable corollary is that the Vice-Chancellor did not care for the standard of teaching, for instance, in English, and the *bona fide* needs of the students studying English. The teachers of English, particularly the B.E.S. Officers, were assuredly injured by this arbitrary rejection. That the grant of Scholarship should lead to the neglect of the needs of teaching and the students and injure the legitimate interest of the teachers is unpardonable, for this is how an unrest is born.

Manipulated
Selections.

Evidence states that the selections was manipulated because the Vice-Chancellor awarded the study-leave scholarship on the pretext of the candidates being in a position to secure their enrolment into the foreign Universities immediately to use the grant. An enquiry at the appropriate quarters will reveal that those selected candidates went into correspondence for their admittance before the University even announced that Scholarship in 1962 would be awarded. This aspect of the grant of Scholarship begets several factors, which in their logical conclusion denote the intentions of the Vice-Chancellor.

1. The expenses of study at foreign Universities for teachers belonging to the middle class of the society is practically prohibitive. Therefore, one will not venture to secure ones admittance without reasonable assurance of financial assistance beforehand.

2. Foreign exchange is so scarce and restricted that even if one can manage to meet the expenses, one will not apply for enrolment in foreign Universities without an assurance for appropriate priority. Those five teachers, however, did apply for their enrolment. That these teachers might have done so in the hope of getting scholarship, and ultimately all of them got it, is to put too much premium on coincidence.

3. Lecturers in the colleges are educated gentlemen, and should know that they may not apply for scholarship when they are technically ineligible to receive the grant. Yet these five gentlemen not only corresponded for the admittance but also applied for scholarship. The patent conclusion is bound to emerge that they had private, yet authoritative, assurance that rules would be ignored to extend the benefit to them.

4. Above all, the Vice-Chancellor should not have even entertained their applications for they were ineligible for the grant under the reigning rules and conventions. When the Vice-Chancellor entertained their applications, the matter does not remain as clean as the award of scholarship to teachers. The Vice-Chancellor who subsequently boasted of his ability

(*Kabliyat*) to the correspondent of the 'Indian Nation' should have known and respected the rules and the precedents. The tentative rules for study-leave with scholarship lay down that 50% of the selection should be from Arts and only 50% from Science. But in 1962, four out of five teachers were selected from Science. This only demonstrates that the Vice-Chancellor created rules, standards and criterion to suit his questionable ends.

The chart mentioned herein under amply proves the gross violation of rules and standards :—

1. Mr. Birendra Kumar Sinha	—	Psychology	—	Arts.
2. Mr. Akauri Balram Prasad	—	Botany	—	Science.
3. Mr. Shivashankar Prasad	—	Physics	—	Science.
4. Mr. Durgeshwari Prasad	—	Chemistry	—	Science.
5. Mr. Dhirendra Prasad	—	Chemistry	—	Science.

One can imagine a person who is ineligible, and yet files his nomination for contesting in elections. One can imagine the person filing his nomination even if he does not have the requisite qualifications which he should have as a legislator in the interest of the constituency he seeks to represent. One can imagine the person filing his nomination even though he has no record of service or ability. But hardly can one appreciate a Returning Officer who accepts the nomination of an ineligible candidate who is a minor, or who is not a voter at all. Hardly can one appreciate the Returning Officer who accepts such a nomination merely on the pretext that in his opinion the candidate would win the election. The Vice-Chancellor did act like such a fanciful Returning Officer.

5. Dr. P. L. Srivastava is fully aware of the fact that sessions in the U. K. Universities commence by October. Therefore, if he were genuinely concerned about the Scholarship being utilised he should have finalised his selection as soon as he took over in July. Otherwise, he should have arranged for Scholarship for a later term so that he could select more meritorious teachers from amongst the eligible candidates, and thus serve the *bona fide* requirements of the various departments. As the Vice-Chancellor on this, and on subsequent occasions, has not taken the precaution of awarding Scholarship well before sessions commence in the foreign countries, one will inevitably conclude that the Vice-Chancellor used the pretext of ready admittance as a crack in the wall to smuggle in the caste favourites. Even then criterion was not honestly applied, which can be corroborated by the proceedings of the meeting of a Committee constituted by the Syndicate to con-

sider applications for study - leave. The note mentions the proceedings that four out of six teachers were not known to have arranged their admittance at all. Besides, Mr. Ram Kinkar Prasad was allowed to avail his opportunity one year after his selection. What then is the need of the criterion that scholarship should go only to those who have arranged their enrolment? When then is the motive behind harping on this criterion in one year and then disregarding it altogether at the very following year?

In view of the facts, it is idle to believe that all this was a *bona fide* error engendered because of haste. The Vice-Chancellor, perhaps is addicted to haste, as will be evident from the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court delivered in respect of the appeal preferred by Mr. Bisheshwar Dayal Singh consequent to some other illegal actions of the Vice-Chancellor. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has observed : "*Unfortunately in the present case the Vice-Chancellor appears to have acted with some haste and he has exercised powers under Statutes which were themselves hastily framed and which are plainly inconsistent with the provisions of the present act.*"

The strange, though consistent, fact which emerges is that every time, the Vice-Chancellor acts in a haste, considerable benefit accrues to his castemen or to the castemen of the Education Minister, or is this too a coincidence?

From these factors, the inevitable deduction will be that there is a great deal of truth in the conclusion that the Vice-Chancellor privately advised those five gentlemen of his caste to arrange their admittance into the foreign universities. That when the Vice-Chancellor was assured of the enrolment of his five caste favourites, he called for applications for Scholarship, impugning the possibility of immediate admittance in order to ignore merit, neglect the *bona fide* needs of teaching, fabricated standards and criteria to suit his designs, misused the funds, and created a sense of despair, frustration and hurt amongst the teachers, polluting the atmosphere of the University. This pattern has evidently been practised by the Vice-Chancellor in the following years, but with a greater wariness. For instance, study-leaves, granted to Mr. Ram Swarth Chaudhary and others on the terms they were granted, appear to have been a mere eye-wash. That at no time more than two teachers of the same department shall be away on study-leave is observed more in violation. For instance, Mr. Sheo Shankar Prasad was allowed leave of absence from 5-12-62 to 4-10-64 and Mr. H. N. Jha from April, 1963 to March, 1965. Thus two teachers were granted leave between April, 1963 and October, 1964. But Mr. H. N. Jha was granted leave upto March, 1965, and when the Vice-Chancellor granted study-leave to Mr. R. K. P. Sinha and Mr. C. K. Rama Verma from October, 1964 to September,

1966, he allowed the absence of three teachers from one Department from October, 1964 to March, 1965. The Vice-Chancellor cannot take the plea that one of these three is from C. M. College and the other two from L. S. College, because the list circulated by the University is department-wise and not college wise. Therefore, the fact remains unquestioned that rules are made only to be ignored where the whim of the Vice-Chancellor is confronted.

It is against this background, and augmented by the other supporting facts, data and evidence, that the selection of these teachers be token unpardonable casteism. A jerk in motion comes to stay as a sordid fact and stigma. Why should the Vice-Chancellor commit irregularities of expenditure, ignore the merit of the candidates, neglect the needs of the departments and teaching and manipulate selection to favour those five teachers who were practically mere acquaintances for him ? The only answer that meets all these questions is that the Vice-Chancellor is tied to those five teachers with the unseen bonds of caste affinity, as also in the instances of the research scholars. Such acts of gross injustice, twisting the letters of law, keeping two sets of conflicting rules about the same issue in order to accommodate favourites irrespect of their demerits, beget bickerings and uneasiness, and eventually unrest and the rest.

B—PROTECTION TO CONDEMNED TEACHERS, VICTIMIZATION OF TEACHERS OF CASTE CONSIDERATIONS, MIGRATION OF GOOD TEACHERS AND FALLING STANDARDS OF EDUCATION IN UNIVERSITY

The community of teachers has passed through a gruelling time, victimized, punished, pushed from pillar to post, demoralized and humiliated. This community, its academic solidarity torn as under by the discriminations practised by the Vice-Chancellor, its avocational spirit marred by the reign of jobbery and nepotism flourishing under him, its traditionally fine moral and intellectual senses blunted under the cruel vindictive assaults of the administration headed by the Vice-Chancellor, has become yet another breeding ground of unrest and turbulence. A dissatisfied teachers' community, a victim itself has become one of the chief sources of disaffection and unrest in the University campus.

How was it done ? From the evidence and data, two clear facts emerge : on the one hand, there are cases of undeserving and even condemned teachers given undue favours and protection by the Vice-Chancellor; on the other hand, there are numerous instances of discrimination practised against deserving and eminent teachers, discriminations

ranging from a studied neglect of and indifference to their just claims to downright victimization and harassment.

There are clear cases of undue favours shown to persons who had earned, in the very recent past, universal opprobrium for their involvement in various malpractices and acts of misdemeanours. In all these cases, either enquiries were pending or damning verdicts were already existing against persons concerned. For instance, in the case of Dr. Ram Bihari Singh, a person who was for over a decade under cloud for his reported involvement in a sordid episode of M.A. Economics examination results in Patna University and against whom a serious complaint of selling questions for consideration of money was made to the Chancellor of the Bihar University, was appointed Reader in Economics. This was done by the Syndicate which, at the same time, learnt from the Vice-Chancellor that grave charges against Dr. R.B. Singh had been referred to the Government. In spite of the express wish of the Syndicate to be enlightened on this matter by the Vice-Chancellor at the next meeting, the Vice-Chancellor refused to do so. The anomalous position is that a person, with far from satisfactory reports in his Confidential Rolls, with grave charges against him pending, was promoted with retrospective effect. This was patronage with a vengeance. The proceedings of the Syndicate meeting held on 15-12-1963 record the annals of this unabashed contradiction.

Again, against this clear directive of the Chancellor forbidding his appointment as Question Setter or Examiner pending enquiry into the charges aforesaid, Dr. Ram Bihari Singh was appointed the Examiner for M.A. and Honours Examination in Economics.

In the case of Dr. L.N. Singh, the Vice-Chancellor thought nothing of circumventing an impartial enquiry by replacing an existing Enquiry Committee with the one composed of men of his choice. And when the illegality of his action was challenged, the Vice-Chancellor, without waiting to meet the objections, as he was asked to do by the Chancellor, went ahead with his plan to grant Readership to Dr. L.N. Singh. That the Vice-Chancellor bypassed an Enquiry Committee headed by a District & Sessions Judge, and appointed another consisting of men involved in the University politics is indeed unpardonable.

Similar tactics were adopted in the case of Shri Parmanand Prasad. Against the clear verdict of the Enquiry Committee, a verdict accepted by the University, another dummy Enquiry Committee was appointed by the University, which duly exonerated Shri P. Prasad. At the same time, the Vice-Chancellor recommended to the State Public Service

Commission his name for the post of the Head of the Department. The fact that the Bihar Public Service Commission refused to concur in this suggestion, and, on the other hand, the Chancellor deplored the genuineness of the second Enquiry Committee, put the Vice-Chancellor on the horns of a dilemma. But the clever tactician that he is, Dr. P.L. Srivastava played one against the other : while he went on pestering the Bihar Public Service Commission to accept his recommendation, he assured the Chancellor that he was meting out just treatment to Shri P. Prasad for his folly by refusing to promote him as the Head of the University Department. This is how the Vice-Chancellor, in his bid to favour condemned castemen, played this trick on the Chancellor.

Another case of such patronage concerns Dr. J.N. Sahay. Here was a person who was disqualified by the Examination Board of the Ranchi University in 1962 on the charges of committing serious irregularities and of adopting unfair means. And yet, the Vice-Chancellor brought this worthy man to this University surreptitiously, and against the spirit of the advice and the clear recommendations of the State Public Service Commission, appointed him on a post for which there was no recommendation by the Bihar Public Service Commission and made him senior to Dr. Jagdish Sahu.

Lest it should be misconstrued that the generosity shown to persons mentioned earlier was indicative of the large-heartedness and a pre-eminent feeling of fellowship surging in the breast of a teacher-Vice-Chancellor, bathed in the Christian virtue of charity, the Citizens Committee cannot refrain from citing some cases, where the Vice-Chancellor went out of his way to twist and fabricate evidence to implicate innocent teachers, to suppress evidence of contrary nature to harass them and to take recourse to various stratagems to cheat them out of their due.

Dr. P. L. Srivastava, who had no moral compunction in circumventing and nullifying the adverse verdict of properly constituted impartial bodies of enquiry when the verdict tended to injure the interests of his favourites, did not fail to report to the Government the allegations of malpractice against Dr. Jagdish Sahu and Shri Amarnath Thakur. Although in the case of the former the allegation was proved to be untrue and in that of the latter, the Enquiry Committee, perhaps in the absence of valid materials, has not been able to submit any report even after more than a year of barren existence. While the Vice-Chancellor would not hesitate to circumvent and flout the decisions of the Bihar Public Service Commission, as in the cases of Dr. L.N. Singh and Dr. J.N. Sahay, he would, as

the case of Shri Amarnath Thakur shows, first try to prejudice the Bihar Public Service Commission and then cite its enforced silence as a valid reason to side-step the claims of one whom he had earmarked for harassment and humiliation. The Vice-Chancellor who would not mind swallowing the camels of corruption, as in the cases of Sri P. Prasad, Dr. R.B. Singh and Dr. J.N. Sahay etcetera, would raise a storm over the flea-bite case of hearsay and vague charges to keep out a scholar of the eminence of Dr. Ramyash Rai against the repeated recommendations of the State Public Service Commission. The Vice-Chancellor would not promote Dr. Manojit Ghosal and Dr. P.K. Banerjee on the plea that there were no posts sanctioned, but he will not shrink from appointing Dr. J.N. Sahay on a post that never existed, or from appointing five persons to the posts of Reader in Hindi as against only one sanctioned post. On the analogy of Dr. Bechan Jha, the Reader in Sanskrit, Dr. J.N. Sahay is given an increment of Rs. 70/-; but this standard is laid aside in the case of Dr. J.N. Sahu and Dr. D.N. Chaudhary. As against Dr. Sahay's Rs. 70/-, Dr. Chaudhary, the Head of the University Department of Chemistry, gets a monthly increment of Rs. 5/-. Dr. Ram Bihari Singh, a Reader is sanctioned Rs. 150/- per month as against Rs. 60/- sanctioned to Dr. Ghosal, the Dean of the Faculty of Arts. Like death, Dr. P.L. Srivastava is threatening to grow into a great leveller. The Vice-Chancellor would disregard the case of promotion of Dr. Shaligram Singh on imaginary grounds; and would put the representation of Shri Kameshwar Sharma in cold storage for, once attended to and found to be valid in its contention, it would have rendered infructuous the promotion of Shri S.P. Kishore.

The facts that emerge bring to light a veritable despot—unbridled in distributing favours, and ruthless in perpetrating inequities. It is this temper of despotism that is to-day lording over the affairs of the Bihar University. It is this which is responsible for making it difficult for a self-respecting community such as that of teachers to breathe in the free air of academic pursuit. It is this sickening atmosphere of rank favouritism and gross discrimination which is responsible for driving away eminent teachers from this University. It is no accident that since the advent of Dr. P.L. Srivastava not less than half a dozen eminent teachers, who would have been the pride of the University, chose to leave this University. Dr. R. Shukla of the Mathematics Department, a distinguished teacher if there was any, was offered Professorship by all the Universities of the State except the one where he was actually working and guiding superb research work. Similarly were Dr. Masih, Dr. Jaymant Mishra, and Sri Devendranath Sharma. In all these cases, these teachers went on higher promotion, promotion which was

offered to persons junior to them soon after they had left the Bihar University. The reason why they felt obliged to leave this University was that they expected little appreciation and no encouragement at the hands of the Vice-Chancellor who sought to turn the University into his private estate.

That they were not wrong in their estimate and apprehensions is borne out by the cases of Sri Amarnath Thakur and Dr. Ramyash Rai. In the case of the former persistent attempts were made by the Vice-Chancellor to hound him out of this University. In the case of the latter, the Vice-Chancellor, has, in face of repeated recommendations of the Public Service Commission, banged the door against the entry of an eminent Botanist to this University.

It is when one casts a glance over the kind of immigration that the Vice-Chancellor has forced—the banishment that he has meted out to the teachers—that one can comprehend the loss in academic talents that this University has suffered during the years of office of Dr. P.L. Srivastava. As against these teachers, the University had to bear with Messrs. Braj Kishore Prasad, K.N. Sinha, J.N. Sahay, S.N. Srivastava, etcetera. In each case, it appears, as if the bad coin has pushed out the good coin. This was the deficit academic balance of payment that Dr. P. L. Srivastava incurred for the University by the way he has traded in the fortunes of the students, education and citizenship.

There is, therefore, little wonder that, under the dispensations of the present Vice-Chancellor, there has been a sharp decline in the standard of education in the University. With a host of brilliant teachers of the University driven to take shelter elsewhere, their places filled by mediocre stuff, with premium put on non-academic considerations, it is no wonder that a sickening spirit of wanhope and despair, apathy and indifference, has gripped the teachers' community, made demoralized and frustrated due to the discriminatory actions of the Vice-Chancellor. And where such spirit prevails the adventure of ideas and devotion to free intellectual pursuits die. Herein lie buried the causes of uneasiness and unrest, for a University cannot function peacefully under an atmosphere vitiated by the general massacre of the good teachers. Those who sought redress from the Ministry of Education were cast into the calls of neglect and oblivion, as if punished for attempting to record their genuine grievances.

Thus, with condemned teachers installed in the posts of vantage, with good teachers driven out, with academicians replaced by politicians, with the falling standard of education caused by unconcerned teaching, with education neglected and teachers mauled, who is responsible for engineering the causes of unrest and disturbances except the self-seeking Vice-Chan-

cellor carrying out the designs of a politically over-ambitious Education Minister ? Obviously those who have deliberately begotten all these and worse are responsible and liable.

Teachers who are selected on caste considerations, on group loyalties, on qualities other than academic, are naturally inclined to encourage and depend upon casteism and factional alignments. It is such teachers who force other teachers to take shelter, in mere self-defence, under the canopy of the other side. It is such teachers who destroy the sense of fellowship amongst students, and scatter them into the divided camps of caste, faction and malice, instead of Arts, Science and Commerce. It is such teachers who plunder the mind of the students, and heap the booty at the altar of scheming politicians, leaving the impressionable youth in moral bewilderment and intellectual chaos. Who then is responsible for unrest ?

C—BUNGLINGS AND MANIPULATIONS IN EXAMINATION DEPARTMENT AND EXAMINATION RESULTS

EXAMINATIONS are the sacred responsibility of a University. On the proper and fair management of the examination wing of the University, on regular and just appointments of Centre Superintendents, Question Setters, Examiners and Tabulators, and on the secrecy of question-papers and strict impartiality and equity in examination results, depends the reputation of a University as a teaching and examination centre. On the basis of facts stated, the Citizens Committee is constrained to infer that the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. P. L. Srivastava, grossly abused his powers in these matters. The large-scale irregularities, practised in different matters concerning the examination, served the dual purpose of distributing undue favours among the teachers and students of the favoured castes and of demoralizing and denying the due to others.

MALAFIDE APPOINTMENTS

The appointment of Centre Superintendents, Examiners and Question Setters have been, in many cases, done with a view to accommodate the favourites of the Vice-Chancellor. Towards this end, the Vice-Chancellor departed from the accepted conventions of the University, and even went to the length of flouting the clear instructions of the Chancellor.

In 1963, he was appointed the Centre Superintendent of Pandaul College. But, while the examinations were still on, Sri Kedar Prasad came over to Muzaffarpur, which led to the postponement of the Examination. And yet, inspite of this gross abdication of duty, Sri Kedar Prasad was again appointed Centre Superintendent at R. D. S. College, Muzaffarpur in the following year.

(A) The case of
Sri Kedar
Prasad :

Against the accepted procedure of appointing Centre Superintendents on the basis of seniority and length of service, Sri Binoy Kumar was made the Centre Superintendent at L. S. College, Muzaffarpur in 1963, in supercession of a large number of senior teachers.

(B) The case of Sri Binoy Kumar :

Sri I. K. Verma of the Gaya College happens to be the son of the Registrar of the Bihar University, Dr. K. S. Verma. For two consecutive years he was made the External Examiner of Under-Graduate (Pass) Examinations in the Science subject. It is noteworthy in this connection, that prior to his appointment, External Examiners were appointed only in Post-Graduate and Honours Examinations. It may also be stated that Sri Verma is a junior teacher having put in about two to three years of service at Gaya College.

(C) The case of Sri I. K. Verma :

He was appointed the Question Setter and Examiner in M.A. English, although at the time of his appointment, he had hardly a few months' experience of Post-Graduate teaching, himself having a third Class Master's degree.

(D) The case of Sri Ranchi-ranji Prasad :

A serious complaint of selling questions for a consideration of money was made against Dr. Ram Bihari Singh to the Chancellor. The Chancellor had passed orders forbidding his appointment as Question Setter or Examiner pending enquiry. But in clear violation of the Chancellor's directions, he was appointed Examiner for M.A. and Honours Examinations in Economics.

(E) The case of Dr. Ram Bihari Singh :

The principle of appointing Examiners and Question Setters from other Universities is laudable in as much as it prevents the concentration of question setters and examiners at a particular place. This, among other things, mitigates the chances of nepotism in results. But the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. P.L. Srivastava abused this principle by choosing a large number of Question Setters and Examiners from the Allahabad University—the home town of the Vice-Chancellor. Thus in 1963 M.A. Examination in Economics, above 5 or 6 examiners were from the Allahabad University to the exclusion of other Universities which had in the past been associated with Bihar and Patna Universities.

(F) Examiners from the Allahabad University :

In connection with the cases referred to above, it is pertinent to note that the persons who were shown undue favours were, all but one, of the Vice-Chancellor's own caste, and that one belonged to the caste of the Education Minister. Even Allahabad came through caste.

2. FAVOURITISM AND IRREGULARITIES IN EXAMINATION RESULTS :

Everything is wrong in the State of Denmark the examination department of the Bihar University has become

under the dispensations of the present Vice-Chancellor, Dr. P.L. Srivastava. Under his orders, entire examinations are cancelled if they fail to yield desired results for his protegies; examiners are appointed under the advice of his favourite examinees; against all canons of the University, ineligible students are allowed to take University examinations; exceptional favours, against the advice of the concerned and authoritative bodies, are shown to select students who are made to succeed in examinations.

(A) The case of the M.D. Examination in Pathology :

The M.D. Examination in Pathology of the Bihar University at Darbhanga Medical College was held in October, 1963. In this examination, one Dr. A.P. Verma, a favourite of Dr. P.L. Srivastava, was one of the candidates. He reported against Dr. Hari Prasad, one of the Examiners, and the result was another person was appointed as the Internal Examiner for Dr. A.P. Verma exclusively. The examination was conducted with all the care, and necessary standards were maintained by the Board of Examiners. Before the examination results were out, Dr. Verma again approached the Vice-Chancellor with the plea that the examinations were not properly conducted. The Vice-Chancellor was so moved by the appeal of this candidate that, without any proper enquiry into the alleged irregularity, he cancelled the entire M.D. Examination of all the candidates, and ordered for fresh examination with entirely new set of examiners. Among these new examiners, two were appointed on the suggestion of the candidate, Dr. Verma himself. These two examiners were the local people of Patna and their names were not recommended by the Examination Board. Later, following the writ petition filed by one of the successful candidates in the earlier examination, the Vice-Chancellor was compelled to institute an Enquiry Committee. This Enquiry Committee reported that the October examination did not suffer from any irregularity. That they still recommended a re-examination on the ground that the tabulation records of the October examination were not available should again speak volumes for the ingenuity of the Vice-Chancellor's judgement, who appointed the Deans of the Faculty of Engineering and the Faculty of Agriculture on the Enquiry Committee who had little notion of the fact that there was no practice of the tabulation of marks in the M.D. Examination and that here the award was made on the overall performance of the candidate.

It is pertinent in this connection to go through the entire correspondence of Dr. S. D. Khanna, Professor of Pathology, Government Medical College, Patiala, and one of the examiners for the ill-fated M. D. Examination in October, 1963, and his note on the conduct of the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. P. L. Srivastava, in this matter. Dr. Khanna's note was for-

warded to the Bihar University by the All India Medical Council *vide* its letter No. MCI-8(15)/64. Med/7173 of the 16th of June, 1964. The Vice-Chancellor should be called upon to place this letter with the note before the Raman Commission. It will also be relevant to refer to the strictures passed on the University authorities by no less a person than the Chancellor, himself. The Chancellor has observed that the Vice-Chancellor acted solely in the interest of one candidate, namely Dr. A. P. Verma. The second examination was a farce arranged to make Dr. Verma pass. Dr. Gaya Prasad and Dr. Madan Prasad, the two retired hands, belonging to the caste of Dr. Verma, were appointed examiners. At this examination, no written examinations were held in written papers. This letter (D. O. No. 177 GB of April 20, 1964) of the Chancellor should be placed on record.

Two students, namely, Sri Vijay Sharan, son of Shri Tripurari Sharan, Advocate and one of the important Syndics, bearing Roll 11-E Part II Previous (Electrical) M. I. T., Muzaffarpur, and Rajan Pandit bearing Roll No. 25 B. Sc. (Engineering) Part I previous submitted their applications before the Vice-Chancellor for reconsideration of their examination results of Supplementary, 1963. These applications along with a forwarding letter from Shri A. P. Sinha, Assistant Registrar, *vide* his letter No. Gop/9052, dated the 18th September, 1963, were sent to the Principal, Muzaffarpur Institute of Technology, for his comments as desired by the Examination Board. The Principal, in reply, informed the Assistant Registrar, *vide* letter No. 5433, dated the 19th of September, 1963, that since the regulation governing such cases was not helpful to these candidates, he was unable to help in the matter.

(B) The case of
Sri Vijay
Sharan :

The Examination Board, at its meeting held on the 20th of September, 1963, adopted a resolution (Res. No.-4 of the Examination Board, dated 20-9-1963) that these two cases be referred to the Board of Moderators for their consideration. With an exemplary promptitude, the meeting of the Board of Moderators was immediately notified by the University on 21-9-63 (*vide* letter No. Gop/9154-61) to consider these cases. The Board of Moderators found themselves unable to award any extra marks to these examinees.

This led the Vice-Chancellor to ask the Examination Board to again refer back the cases to the Board of Moderators for re-examination. The Board of Moderators again showed their helplessness to change their earlier decision in the matter.

And yet, inspite of the repeated refusal of the Board of Moderators and against the express provisions of the rules, the Examination Board, under the signature of the Vice-Chancellor, passed orders awarding extra marks to these two candidates and thus enabling them to pass (*vide* the resolution of

the Examination Board of 5-10-63 and the letter of Assistant Registrar No. Gop/9782 of 5-10-63 to the Principal, Muzaffarpur Institute of Technology. The fact of the case is that the Vice-Chancellor enunciated a general rule on the representation of one examinee only—an unprecedented phenomenon.

Was it a case of deserved clemency to a couple of sufferers of strict marking ? Was it the usual case of normal promotion ? There is the identical case of one Sri Subhash Amla who appeared in the B. Sc. Part I Final (Mechanical). The basis on which the Examination Board elected to give pass marks to the two cases referred to should also have been the basis of promoting Subhash Chandra. But inspite of his representation, in which Subhash Chandra had pointed to the identical case of Vijay Sharan, the Vice-Chancellor did not choose to apply the same principle of promotion to his case and sympathy went abegging.

(C) The case of
Sri Ram
Prasad
Verma :

According to Clause 18 of B. Sc. Engineering Regulations, those students who fail to qualify in Sessional Examination in the final examination are not eligible to sit at the Supplementary Examination. Sri R. P. Verma had failed in the Sessional at the final examination. He was thus not entitled to sit at the Supplementary Examination. He made a representation to the Vice-Chancellor. The matter was referred to the Examination Board for consideration. The Principal, Muzaffarpur Institute of Technology, a member of the Examination Board, advised that the representation should be turned down in as much as the permission would go against the clear provisions of the rules. And yet, the Vice-Chancellor went against the time—honoured rules of the University and allowed Mr. Verma to sit at the examination. Again, this was a solitary exception applied to the case of the Vice-Chancellor's favourite. Many such students who could also avail of this facility were not allowed to do so.

(D) The case of
Mrs. Savita
Rani :

There are instances galore of favouritism and manipulation in the examinations and their results on caste considerations. Mrs. Savita Rani, the wife of Mr. Kedarnath Labh of Marwari College, Darbhanga, obtained only 339 marks in Economics. Her Roll No. Muz. 363 became overnight important. She had earlier obtained a III Class Master's degree, and was appointed temporarily on the express condition that if she failed to obtain a II Class Master's degree, her services would be terminated. Mrs. Savita Rani appeared at the fateful examination in 1963. The Board of Moderators allowed a general grace of 10 marks, but as it did not serve the purpose, the Vice-Chancellor persuaded the Examination Board to increase the mark to 16 so that Mrs. Savita Rani could retain her post which she did not deserve.

The Vice-Chancellor laid down General Rules to suit the individual candidates in the examinations. For instance, Miss Verma, a student of Psychology at Rajendra College, Chapra, failed in Practical Examinations. On the recommendations of Mr. Ganga Prasad Singh, the Vice-Chancellor's Secretary of Rajendra College, a general rule was promulgated that all those who had failed in Psychology Practical would be deemed to have passed. Only Miss Verma benefitted from this general amnesty.

The instances, referred to earlier, are illustrations of how general rules have been passed to suit a couple of candidates only. Dr. P. L. Srivastava has stooped to the extent of cancelling a whole examination, because his favourite candidate failed to pass. This Vice-Chancellor has appointed examiners on the recommendations of the examinees. Results have been delayed to provide for ample time and opportunity for manipulation. Even Centre Superintendents have been appointed on extra considerations. Caste considerations have been dominating factor in all these.

3. MISMANAGEMENT IN THE CONDUCT OF EXAMINATION AND THE QUESTION LEAKAGE

It is in this background of large-scale jobbery, favouritism and corruption, rampant in the examination matters in the University, thanks to the direct and indirect encouragement to irregularities and nepotism by the Vice-Chancellor, that we should judge such scandalous cases of mismanagement as the erroneous printing of question-papers (M. A. English Paper IV, 1964) and the infamous scandal of wholesale question leakage in 1963.

Due to the irregularities and favouritism practised by the Vice-Chancellor and his henchmen in the University, the sanctity of examinations conducted by the Bihar University is completely lost. The Examinations have become a breeding ground of profiteering, casteism and favouritism.

Another example of the inefficiency of the conduct of the examination is that in English Paper IV, utter confusion prevailed among the M. A. examinees of English at C. M. College centre this year. The question-papers as supplied to them did not indicate as to how many questions a candidate was to answer. The total marks indicated in the margin of each question were 190, whereas the total marks indicated in the top of the question-paper was 100. The students were put to great confusion in the examination hall. This year, there was also one peculiarity in the question-paper that in paper IV of M. A. English, there used to be 4 groups, namely, A, B, C & D. This time, group D was absent from the question-paper. At about 8-45 A. M. the Centre Superintendent

contacted the University on phone and wanted clear instructions (clarification to the prevailing state of affairs). The Deputy Registrar informed him that instructions be given to the examinees to answer compulsorily one question from group A and any 2 and 3 from group B and C, respectively. Curiously enough, after 2½ hours, another trunk call was received by the Centre Superintendent from the University, and fresh directions were given again. The new instructions were that the candidates should be asked to answer question No. 1 from group A and at least 2 from group B and C, respectively. This is how examinations are conducted. Who will wonder as to why there is a general unrest amongst the students, exploding into strikes and demonstrations? This occasional directions to the examinees brought utter confusion to them. In short, this is the efficiency of the examination Department, which is considered to be the backbone of the University.

Even this year, the printed question-papers for Masters' examinations did not arrive, and cyclostyled question-papers were distributed. If questions are cyclostyled at the Centre of the examination, who is responsible for the leakage of the question is a pertinent fact that must always be borne in mind. Examination dates have been changed at short notice to the great inconvenience of the students. Dr. P.L. Srivastava has discontinued the moderation of question with a view to plug a likely hole through which questions may leak. This step by itself is very humiliating to the teachers in general. But the intriguing aspect of this step is blatant as well. That the Vice-Chancellor should go out of his way to appoint as Head Examiners and Paper-Setters those teachers who have been punished for leaking out questions, or against whom such charges are pending, and yet deprive the students of the benefit of moderated questions is less a paradox than a hoax.

The most glaring instance of the wooden-headedness of the University authorities is the examination held on the 28th of May, 1964, the day after the passing away of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. All over India, consequent to the notification issued by the President of India, work was suspended. That the 28th of May was kept as a working day in the Bihar University campus has one parallel—China. The Education Minister has not even bothered to take suitable action against the offenders in this respect, and clear the stigma attached to the University and the people it is supposed to serve. Besides, many students, naturally believing that examinations would not be held on the 28th of May, did not attend the examination centres and were left cold to suffer for their feeling of grief for the great man and for their faith in the notification of the President of India.

All these and many more instances like an examinee acting as an invigilator at R. D. S. College centre this year are undoubtedly exasperating to the students and their guardians. Step by step the University authorities have caused and nursed general unrest and outbursts.

Dr. P. L. Srivastava has brought to shame the dignity and the value of the degrees—the doctoral degrees—of this University.

The three external examiners who examined the work of Mr. L.N. Singh did not approve of the merits of this budding genius. One of the examiners rejected the thesis outright. The other examiner advised Mr. L.N. Singh to learn more for the degree. The third examiner suggested a written test, which has its own implications. But Dr. P.L. Srivastava had his own methods to smuggle out degrees. At a hush-hush *Viva Voce* examination, Mr. L.N. Singh was managed out of the abyss. The relevant resolution of the Examination Board is remarkable :—

The Spurious
Degree of
Dr. L. N. Singh:

“Considered the case of Sri L.N. Singh, regarding his written and Viva Voce examination for the Ph.D. Degree.

Resolved—That Sri Singh be awarded the degree of Ph.D. on the report of the examiners on the Viva Voce examination alone.”

This is indeed a unique way of scattering away the doctoral degrees.

Then, there are the cases of quick degrees distributed by this Vice-Chancellor, for instance, the degree of D. Litt. awarded within a very short period of registration. The wonderful point is that the guide, Mr. Quadri in this instance, is just an M.A. himself and has never taught Post-Graduate students. That he should guide a scholar to the degree of D. Litt. is something inexplicable beyond all mental gymnastics.

Irregular
Degrees:

For instance, Dr. P.L. Srivastava himself became the guide of a Scholar registering himself for D. Sc., and drew the relevant remuneration. Mr. K.N. Srivastava, the beneficiary in this event, is a nephew of the Vice-Chancellor. In order to elevate Mr. K.N. Srivastava, Dr. P.L. Srivastava gave the candidate the benefit of ante-dated registration in some other University. It would indeed be instructive, may be with reservations, to be able to go through the saga of doctoral devaluation. Even this year, students have walked out of examination halls, because of questions not being moderated at all. It is perhaps a singular instance where questions have been handed over to the examinees without being processed

by the Board of Moderators. Therefore, irrelevant questions have been set causing deep indignation and unrest. All these data and evidence exhibit the fact that the Vice-Chancellor amid his manifold non-academic activities, has no time to devote to teaching, examinations and students.

CONCLUSIVE FACTS :

Under the management of Dr. P.L. Srivastava, questions have leaked out on wholesale rates. Examinations are not held as due. Results are not announced in time. Results are manipulated on caste and individual considerations. Students are victimized in their examinations. Spurious degrees are distributed, as if in charity. External examiners are threatened. Examinees have to resort to court of law to get restored examinations cancelled illegally for the benefit of one examinee. If this state of affairs continues for another term, degrees of the Bihar University will be available on reduced rates in the scrap market. Under the regime of Dr. P.L. Srivastava, undated certificates are issued to the graduates. All these are direct causes of general unrest, strikes and demonstrations. Education has lost its meaning under the regime of Dr. P.L. Srivastava who unfortunately enjoys the confidence and support of the Education Minister. Between the Minister and the Vice-Chancellor, education has been reduced to a course of intrigue and malpractice. Who then is responsible for general unrest, strikes and hunger-strikes ?

D—EXPLOITATION AND VICTIMIZATION OF STUDENTS

It has been our painful duty to submit before the Commission the innumerable cases of favouritism, irregularities and casteism practised by the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. P.L. Srivastava, in various spheres of the University life. The moral make-up of the students of the University, of any University, is fashioned by what they see, hear and experience, the standards of behaviour that they find operative among the authorities of their institution, the treatment that they receive at their hands, the mental image, in short, that they draw of those entrusted with the task of moulding the moral and intellectual being of the students. The evidence at the disposal of the Citizens' Committee leave no room to doubt that the present Vice-Chancellor Dr. P.L. Srivastava has, by his various acts of omission and commission, in respect of various matters pertaining to the University administration and more specially in relation to those affecting the students, tarnished this image. The genesis of students' unrest in this University has to be found in the atmosphere of gross opportunism, casteism and favouritism built by the Vice-Chancellor, of course, under the protection of the Education Minister.

There are certain norms governing the relationship of students and a high University dignitary such as the Vice-Chancellor. It is an essential part of this relationship that a proper distance must be maintained between the two, that the Vice-Chancellor who is the chief executive of the University must maintain a certain decorous aloofness. But, as the various affidavits filed by a number of students unanimously point out, Dr. P.L. Srivastava has been guilty of what can only be described as an unorthodox intimacy with them. There are evidences that a student whom the Vice-Chancellor saw for the first time in January, 1963 was, within a few months of acquaintance, allowed the intimacy and freedom to reside with him; that another student, who later on appeared as the University witness in almost all the cases against students and against whom the peon of the Vice-Chancellor had lodged a complaint with the Registrar for indecent behaviour at the Vice-Chancellor's residence, has been staying at the official quarters of the Vice-Chancellor; that the Vice-Chancellor has been in the habit of fraternising with and feasting students in a manner highly prejudicial to the maintenance of the discipline among students.

What is still more reprehensible is the purpose and manner of intimacy that the Vice-Chancellor had studiously sought to cultivate with them. The purpose, as the various evidences clearly stated, was to recruit them as his storm-troopers in his campaign of calumny and intimidation that the Vice-Chancellor was, during his early months of rule, carrying on against certain teachers and Officers of the University, particularly Principal Mahendra Pratap and Prof. Ram Bihari Singh. It is noteworthy, in this connection, that the Vice-Chancellor was during a certain period of his tenure, trying to feel his way and consolidate his personal position in the caste-ridden high politics of the State. For this reason, while he was partorizing and inciting students against Principal Mahendra Pratap and Prof. Ram Bihari Singh at Muzaffarpur, he was also enlisting support against Principal Bhola Prasad Singh of Rajendra College, Chapra, at the behest of the Education Minister.

Nothing more reveals the sordid ingenuity of the mind of the Vice-Chancellor than the Report prepared by the University for the Government in respect of the hunger-strike by the M.I.T. students. The said report very clearly reveals where the Vice-Chancellor's anger was directed: it was directed against the Principal of the M.I.T. As the sad Report conveys, the Vice-Chancellor seemed to be happy at the hunger-strike by the students and seemed to have welcomed the hunger-strike in as much as it afforded him an opportunity to intervene in the affairs of M.I.T., in the words of the Report: "*in their (i.e. students') behalf.*" The inference

is plain : the Vice-Chancellor, for reasons for his own, went to the length of welcoming an agitation of students against the Principal of the institution. It was perhaps for this reason that during the said hunger-strike of the M.I.T. students, the University authorities extended to them all facilities, such as rooms, free phone calls, and paid medical facilities, in sharp contrast to the shabby and sordid treatment meted out to the students who went on hunger strike a year later against the misdeeds of the Vice-Chancellor. In the said Report the Vice-Chancellor seems to gloat over the idea that "*the students are not happy with their Principal and the teachers. The students have no complaint against the Vice-Chancellor himself.*" The inference is plain that the Vice-Chancellor is not averse to students agitations as such, provided they are directed not against him but against the Principals, for he thought it easier to control demoralized Principals. Is there any wonder, then, that as the affidavit of Trijugi Sharma shows that the Vice-Chancellor incited students to disturb the Youth Festival in November, 1963 with a view to malign Principal Mahendra Pratap? These facts tally with the reports that it was the Vice-Chancellor himself who, with a view to defame the students who had raised their voice against the misdeeds and to divert attention away from himself, stage-managed the disturbance at the Convocation in May, 1964. In this context, it is very significant that long before the Convocation, the Vice-Chancellor had declared that he apprehended trouble during the Convocation. The reports of this statement of the Vice-Chancellor appeared in a local weekly. It is also learnt that the Vice-Chancellor had given intimation of this kind to the District authorities. The fact that the apprehensions of the Vice-Chancellor approximated so closely to what eventually happened seems to endow this preknowledge on the part of the Vice-Chancellor with a sinister significance. It is for the circumspect to judge if, in view of the many an irrefutable evidence characterising the technique of intrigue and machinations of the Vice-Chancellor, it was he who had staged the disturbance at the Convocation in such a way that the onus of guilt might be shifted to the students who agitated against him, so as to prejudice the Chancellor against these students and their demands.

It was part of the heinous modus operandi of the Vice-Chancellor to try to entice students with numerous allurements of grants, books and other facilities. In this connection, the Citizens Committee drew the attention of the Commission to the affidavits of Nand Kishore Sharma, Baidyanath Pandey, and Rajendra Prasad Singh. We have submitted that the Commission might call for the relevant files of the University and determine the propriety of the Vice-Chancellor's individual grants of this nature, grants which were not backed by any valid recommendation of appropriate

authorities. We have also submitted that the research Scholarship award to Baidya Nath Pandey, a student with low II Class Master's degree, and the extraordinary gesture of monetary help to the value of Rs. 5,000/- to Nand Kishore Sharma were intended to win them over to and reward them for the services the Vice-Chancellor wanted them to render unto him and not to fulfil any academic urge.

This systematic effort on the part of the Vice-Chancellor to cajole and corrupt the students by awarding them various facilities in irregular manner in order to use them as convenient handle to promote his own designs went a long way in polluting the atmosphere of the University.

Another factor was the Vice-Chancellor's attempt to cause division and disruption among students. In this connection, we refer to the affidavits of Baidyanath Pandey and Shyam Nandan Sharma whom the Vice-Chancellor instigated against those students who were on hunger-strike against his misrule. The discriminatory attitude shown to the students on hunger-strike in March, 1964 as against the favours heaped upon those of the M.I.T. is a measure of double-standards used by the Vice-Chancellor in order to suit his conveniences and to serve his interest.

It is part of the technique of the Vice-Chancellor that while he would not consider any favours too great to win over and engage students in his campaigns of vilification and intimidation of those who cross his path, he will not shirk from any inequity and course of victimization against those students who would dare raise their voice against his misrule or would refuse to fall in with him. In this connection, we refer to the affidavits of Nand Kishore Sharma and Dina Nath Singh who were, first, attempted to be won over, and then, implicated in police cases. The harassment caused to numerous students who had to cut their examinations in order to be able to appear in the court in connection with these cases shows how far the Vice-Chancellor has strayed from the course set for education authorities by the University Service Commission which had advised in similar cases to "approach the guardians with a view to have the offences compounded and *student saved from conviction* (D. O. No. 2464 BSUC of 23-6-1964—Point 5)".

The origin of the phenomenon of student unrest in the Bihar University can be understood only in terms of the particular contribution made by the Vice-Chancellor Dr. P. L. Srivastava to the life of this University. He projected an entirely new image of the Vice-Chancellor: not an impartial and aloof administrator, much less a venerable academician, but a person versed in the Machiavellian art of political stratagems. He courted students for doubtful ends; he encour-

aged them to indulge in unlawful acts for his own benefits; he preached casteism to them; he sought to cause division and disunity among students; he played one group of students against the other; he maligned and vilified senior teachers of the University before their students; he made indiscriminate distribution of favours and doles to his cronies; he let loose a reign of victimization and intimidation against those who raised their voice against his autocratic rule; he cooked up plots to disturb the life in the campus in such a manner as to incriminate innocent students; and above all, he destroyed the traditional sanctity due to the office of the Vice-Chancellor.

Student unrest in the Bihar University stems from the sense of deep resentment and anger, frustration and suffocation, which gripped the students of this University. It was a voice of protest against the defilement of the healthy academic traditions by one who should have been their trustee and upholder. It was therefore in the fitness of things that what the students demanded was nothing else, and nothing short of, the removal of the Vice-Chancellor Dr. P.L. Srivastava.

It is the more preponderate matter of the atmosphere of moral and psychological depravity in which the students of the Bihar University have been obliged to live and breathe, that the roots of the problem of students, peculiar to this University, have to be sought.

It has been sad experience of the students of the Bihar University that under the present Vice-Chancellor the authorities have been applying, in their case, not the time-honoured and accepted principles of fair, impartial and impersonal approach governing the relations between the authorities and the students, but those ugly levers of bureaucratic callousness, cajollery and intimidation, gross partiality and abuses of personal power incitement to violence and indecent behaviour, that constitute the worst features of Tammany Hall gangsterism. At their personal cost, the students have been the sad witness to innumerable cases of arbitrary appointments and promotions of teachers, resulting in large-scale migration of eminent teachers from this University to other places to irregular appointments of Examination Superintendents, Question-Setters and Examiners, to arbitrary dissolution and reconstitution of the Governing Bodies and Principals of the affiliated colleges. And when it is established that all such gross irregularities were committed with a view to advance unduly the carrier of the chosen favourites and caste favourites of the Vice-Chancellor and the Education Minister, the demoralising effect of these arbitrary acts of the Vice-Chancellor on the student community could be easily imagined. It gave rise to a thick atmosphere of heart-

burning, caste-animosity and rivalry among the students. Student unrest is an euphemistic description of the moral indignation felt by the students against caste-ridden politics played by the Vice-Chancellor in matters relating to the service conditions of the teachers and the management of educational bodies and institutions, both of which, in ultimate analysis, affect and afflict the students.

Not satisfied with creating dissensions and dissatisfaction by his arbitrary and motivated acts, among the teachers and staff of the University, the Vice-Chancellor sought to play one set of the students against the other, to use students as service tools in his secret designs of intimidation and vilification against those in the University set-up who had the misfortune of falling victim to the Vice-Chancellor's displeasure. Thus, be it the agitation at the time of the Youth Festival or of the students of Muzaffarpur Institute of Technology, the Vice-Chancellor tried to exploit the genuine grievances of the students—the grievances which the students had expected him soberly to examine—to settle his old score with the Principals of these institutions. In both the cases, he told the student delegation that much as he, the Vice-Chancellor, wanted to accept their demands, he was being prevented from doing so by the Principal in question. There are innumerable instances of the Vice-Chancellor egging on the students of particular castes to indulge in obscene pamphleteering against the teachers of other castes whom he wanted to humiliate.

It has been part of the strategy of the Vice-Chancellor to incite a group of students to indulge in acts of rowdyism with the sole purpose of maligning and denigrating the vast masses of students who were agitating against his foul administration. The false rumour of the ransacking of the University Office which the Vice-Chancellor spread in the March, 1963 at meeting of the Senate and the still more recent case of disturbance at the Convocation have their genesis in the ingenious mind of the Vice-Chancellor who seems to have taken the tip from the Nazi perpetrators of the false Reichstag fire. It is not accidental, therefore, that indiscriminate and irregular grants and other facilities were given to those students who were willing to act as his henchmen. There are cases of grants being given to students who were no longer on the rolls of the college, and therefore, were ineligible for such aid, as also to such students against whom prosecutions were pending in the Courts of law.

The students of the Bihar University have, thus, received a very raw deal, to put it very mildly, at the hands of the present Vice-Chancellor. In the place of an impartial and impersonal academic traditions, they have been subjected to systematic harassment and worse; in the place of academic encouragement, they have been witness to the unseemly sight

of large-scale corruption, favouritism and gross irregularities in the conduct of examinations; in the place of learning the essentials of citizenship, they have sought to be drafted into the mercenary army of the Vice-Chancellor in his unbridled campaign for power.

It is in this climate of corruption and nepotism that the genesis of the student unrest in the Bihar University has to be sought. The unrest is there because the fountainhead of mal-administration, the present Vice-Chancellor, Dr. P.L. Srivastava, rules with impunity and in utter disregard of the essential interests of his University. The unrest amongst the students is the healthy reaction of the vast masses of the Community against the rule of jungle prevalent in the University, and for the restoration of the best academic traditions worthy of the fair season of this State and the Nation.

E—CONTROL OF POLITICAL MACHINATION OVER THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE UNIVERSITY

The data and evidence recorded in the various statements unmistakably lead to the fact that concerted efforts, according to a well thought out plan, were made to break into the Office of the University, and occupy all the chairs of power, patronage and influence. There is an unmitigated method in the whole madness.

The Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar of the University being dedicated to the same cause, in the fitness of things it was necessary to capture the chair of the Deputy Registrar and control the Examination Department. The importance of Examination Department, in view of the data and evidences recorded herein elsewhere, is self-evident. The Government appointments—whether in the general administration or in the various autonomous bodies—must largely be guided by the academic degrees held by the candidates for such appointments. Therefore, the apparatus controlling the degrees—the passport to the realm of advantage and position—becomes at once vital to bolster any plan to seize the key-posts for future dividends.

The Coronation
of Mr. Ram
Swaroop Singh:

Against this background of facts, the evidence and data regarding the appointment of Mr. Ram Swaroop Singh as the Deputy Registrar, and the transfer of the Examination Section to his grips, reveal the true protests. Having drawn allowances for research, Mr. Ram Swaroop Singh, without conducting any research, applied for the advertised post of Deputy Registrar. Along with Mr. Ram Swaroop Singh, Mr. Akhileshwar Prasad Singh, Mr. R. C. P. Sinha and Dr. V. N. Ojha also applied. Mr. Akhileshwar Prasad Singh and Mr. R. C. P. Sinha were not recommended by the State Public Service Commission because of the damaging remarks

of the Vice-Chancellor who impressed upon the Commission, on the other hand, that Dr. V.N. Ojha was too highly qualified to be wasted as a Deputy Registrar. Thus to ensure the chair of the Deputy Registrar, the Vice-Chancellor damaged two Officers and praised out of promotion a third. The Syndicate, at its meeting held on the 22nd of November, 1963, appointed Mr. Chakradhar Singh, though recommended by the State Public Service Commission as second in preference because of his better academic qualifications than of the candidate recommended first. At the same meeting, the Syndicate did not appoint Dr. V.N. Ojha, though far more qualified than Mr. Ram Swaroop Singh, because Dr. Ojha was not recommended as first. Dr. Ojha is not even mentioned in the proceedings, because Mr. Ram Swaroop Singh had to control the apparatus administering examinations.

The instance of Mr. Sheo Ratan Singh, a nephew of Mr. Sri Narayan Singh, an important lieutenant of the Education Minister, a Syndic over and above, is another example of the campaign for capture. Mr. Sheo Ratan Singh was first appointed in one of the seasonal vacancies in the Examination Department for about a couple of months. Therefore, the services, *ipso facto*, terminated with the season. The Syndicate, at its meeting held on the 14th of July, 1963, *vide* item No. 20 of the Agenda, considered "*the necessity of appointing an assistant in the scale of pay of Rs. 120—8—200 temporarily against a post of a higher scale of Rs. 250—10—350*" and authorised the Vice-Chancellor to make the appointment. Thus Mr. Sheo Ratan Singh was again appointed. But the higher post on which Mr. Sheo Ratan Singh was appointed, was subsequently filled in by the appointment of one Mr. Ramji Singh as the Chief Accountant. Thus, on one post two persons have been allowed to continue. Mr. Sheo Ratan Singh was given a few increments despite a representation of the employees of the University given lest their legitimate seniority should suffer. In addition, Mr. Sheo Ratan Singh was allotted minor duties in view of his failing health. Besides, Mr. Sheo Ratan Singh happens to be the only one to get an honorarium inspite of being a temporary employee.

Mr. Sheo Ratan
Singh :

MANIPULATIONS FOR CONTROL

The impersonal standards and system set by Mr. K. K. Banerjee were the first to go, and Dr. K.S. Verma, the Registrar, was the arch lieutenant of the Vice-Chancellor in all this design. The instance of Mr. Kamaldeo Narayan Singh is just an illustration of the web woven to exclude the rightful candidates. While Mr. K.K. Banerjee was the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Bihar, every attempt used to be made to make the appointment of assistants in the University Office by advertising the post and after holding

competitive examination. Those who were successful in the examinations were appointed in order of preference as per the result of competitive examinations.

When the present Vice-Chancellor joined in July, 1962, examination for posts, previously advertised during the regime of Mr. K.K. Banerjee, was held, and the successful candidates were interviewed by a committee formed by the Vice-Chancellor. The Committee submitted its recommendations, but those recommendations were given effect to. The result was that good candidates were not appointed and those who were inferior to others were appointed in consideration of their caste. Even those who were not found fit by the Selection Committee were appointed. For instance, the University advertised two types of posts : one for filling up vacancies in Assistants cadre for which typing was not deemed to be an extra qualification, and the other for typists. Examinations were conducted, but on the basis of marks, when it was found that favourites were not eligible, additional marks were awarded for general assistants for knowing how to type, and thus many of the favourites were inducted and better candidates, securing higher marks in Assistants Examination, were eliminated. For instance, Mr. Kamaldeo Narayan Singh passed the competitive examination, but was not appointed; and a candidate who did not pass was appointed, because he happened to be a relation of the Registrar, Dr. K.S. Verma. Many appointments have been made without advertisement and without interviews, mostly on caste considerations.

Similarly, peons have also been appointed on caste considerations. Although there is no dearth of men at Muzaffarpur employees have been brought either from Gaya, where Dr. K.S. Verma was the Principal of Gaya College for a long time, or from his father-in-law's place. Peons of the choice of Dr. Verma are given all facilities in postings, emoluments, etcetera and peons having no caste-backing in the University are subjected to all kinds of harassment. For instance, Nakul Bahadur, a Nepali peon, was appointed by the old Bihar University at Patna, and he worked as orderly-peon of the Registrar. When Sri Trivikramdeo Narayan Sinha joined as Treasurer of this University, Nakul Bahadur was deputed to work as his orderly-peon, in which capacity Nakul Bahadur served for three years to the entire satisfaction of the Treasurer, and was getting a monthly allowance of Rs. 7/- (Seven) as the orderly allowance. But when Dr. D.P. Sinha assumed the office of the Treasurer, Nakul Bahadur was withdrawn from the Treasurer's office and was posted as a Night Watchman ; and in his place one Ramchandra Prasad, on caste considerations, was appointed by Dr. K.S. Verma. In doing so, Treasurer was not even consulted.

Although only 4 posts of orderly peons including one Zamadar are sanctioned for the Vice-Chancellor, 7 peons today work there. More than 4 peons are working in the house of the Registrar, though only 2 posts of orderly-peons are sanctioned for him. The result is that, for dearth of requisite number of peons in the University Office, the work of the Office suffers.

Dr. S. Sahay was appointed as a part-time doctor for the L.S. College, and as such, he was getting an allowance of Rs. 130/- a month from the Government. The old Syndicate of the Bihar University raised his allowance to Rs. 250/- per month. The present Vice-Chancellor sanctioned him an additional monthly allowance of Rs. 100/- for attending to the University staff. Thus, at present, Dr. Sahay gets Rs. 350/- per month. When this matter was referred to the Finance Committee last year, the Finance Committee resolved that Dr. Sahay might be appointed for one year from the 1st of March, 1963 to the 29th of February, 1964, and thereafter, steps should be taken to make the appointment on a permanent basis through proper advertisement. In November, 1963, the Finance Committee again resolved that immediate steps should be taken to make permanent appointment against the post of the Medical Officer. The Vice-Chancellor, instead of accepting the recommendation of the Finance Committee, got the appointment of Dr. Sahay approved of by the Syndicate. When this fact was known to the Members of the Finance Committee, the Committee took a very strong exception to the manner in which Dr. Sahay was appointed, and resolved, in the presence of the Vice-Chancellor, that the matter should be reviewed and the appointment should be made after proper advertisement. But no such action has been taken in the matter. The present Doctor attends the Health Centre for one hour only; from 12 noon to 1 P.M. and he has been given one *Chaukidar*, one attendant, one peon, one sweeper one compounder. These posts had been filled up before they were created by the Syndicate on the recommendation of the Finance Committee. The dominant consideration for all these favours is the caste affinity.

Appointment of
Dr. S. Sahay.

OMISSIONS AND COMMISSIONS IN THE BIHAR UNIVERSITY :

The technique of the Registrar, Dr. K.S. Verma, should not be to contrive to extract money for signing the degrees. It never occurred to the Registrar that it was his dereliction of duty not to sign the certificates causing hardship and harassment to the students.

The new Bihar University came into being with effect from the 12th of July, 1960. Since then the intermediate certificates of 1960 to 1963 have not been sent to the Colleges

with the result that, although many students have earned their B.A. degrees, they have not received their Intermediate certificates. Certificates are signed, first, by the Controller of Examinations or, where there is no post of Controller of Examination, by the Officer Incharge of the Examinations, and then by the Registrar. Intermediate certificates of the old Bihar University from 1956 to 1959 were not signed and sent out to the Colleges as the then Controller of Examination, Sri A. Narayan, did not sign them. When many complaints were received by the then Vice-Chancellor, Sri K.K. Banerjee, he asked two Officers, namely, the Special Officer and the Deputy Registrar, to sign and send those certificates to the colleges as quickly as possible. These Officers signed the certificates of 1956. The Deputy Registrar signed about 5000 certificates of 1957 also either as the Deputy Registrar or as Registrar, for he was acting as the Registrar of new Bihar University during that period. Dr. K.S. Verma, the Registrar, signed about 7000 certificates of 1957 and he put forward a bill at the rate of Rs. 5/- for signing 100 certificates. When the payment was refused to him, he stopped signing certificates. The Vice-Chancellor called a conference of the Officers and asked them to sign the certificates. He ordered that certificates of 1958 should be signed by the Assistant Registrar (Planning) as Controller of Examination and Sri P. Roy Chowdhury, the Finance Officer as the Registrar, and those of 1959 by Sri Akhileshwar Prasad Singh, Assistant Registrar, Incharge of Examination as Controller of Examination, and Dr. K.S. Verma as the Registrar. The certificates of 1958, numbering about 15,000, were signed by Sri R.C.P. Sinha, Assistant Registrar (Planning) and Sri P. Roy Chowdhury before March, 1963, and were sent out to the colleges. They have also signed I.A. certificates of the Annual Examination of 1960, numbering nearly 10000. During this period Dr. K.S. Verma, the Registrar, signed only a few certificates of 1959. As the certificates of a particular year are written out during the following year, the certificates of 1960 should have been written and signed in 1961. The certificates of 1961 should have been signed in 1962. The certificates of 1962 should have been signed in 1963 and the certificates of 1963 should have been signed in 1964. Dr. K.S. Verma has held the office of the Registrar since August, 1961, and so, according to the regulations of the University, he should have signed the certificates of 1960, 1961, 1962 and 1963. But he has not done so, injuring the careers of many. No action, has, however, been taken by the Vice-Chancellor to see that this is done as quickly as possible.

Efforts to dislodge Mr. P. Roy Chaudhary, the Finance Officer, have been abortive so far inspite of the snare of question leakage. The Vice-Chancellor's note that, "*Let the new Officer likely to join us soon look into this matter. Sd/- P.L.S.*"

20-11-62" is a sure evidence to the methods of the Vice-Chancellor for keeping things in suspense so that at suitable moments, he could strike. The tortuous process that the Registrar adopted for signing the cheques was calculated to humiliate the Finance Officer and to cause inconvenience at will. This deliberate method of torture was so expensive that a Vice-Chancellor, not otherwise motivated, would never approve of it.

Shri Hargovind Singh retained his quarters after he went to the Magadh University, and has not yet paid the rent; while Mr. Amarnath Thakur was denied this gesture. Sanction of Rs. 150/- per month to Dr. R.B. Singh, Reader in Economics, against Rs. 60/- sanctioned to Dr. H.R. Ghosal, the Dean of the Faculty of Arts, is but an illustration of a methodical plan of consolidation on one hand and elimination on the other. Mr. Binoy Kumar, a Reader in Hindi, the Son-in-Law of Mr. Tripurari Sharan Sahay, the eminent Lawyer and an important member of the Syndicate, and therefore, the Political Secretary of the Vice-Chancellor, the recipient of volumes of favours, is most glaring example of a politician-teacher, pampered financially and otherwise.

The victimization of Mr. S. Sen Gupta in favour of Mr. A.K. Sinha in temporary appointment of the Youth Welfare Officer is an illustration of the wide range of castes being exterminated with a method. The victimization of Mr. Ramji Sharma, one time P.A. to the Vice-Chancellor, and consideration of Mr. C.S. Labh, Mr. A.P. Srivastaya, Mr. N.P. Thakur, Mr. S.N. Prasad, Mr. Raj Nandan Singh, Mr. L.N. Prasad, Mr. Siddeshwar Singh and Mr. Suresh Chandra Verma are all tortuously calculated and carried out. Mr. D.N. Roy was let down in favour of the privileged castemen. It is just one link in the chain of a slave gang. Such acts on the part of the authority are bound to cause demoralization and bitterness in the staff.

The Vice-Chancellor has got more confidence in the stenographers than in the Officers of the University except the Registrar. The Vice-Chancellor has recently circulated, through his Registrar, that no Officer or Assistant of the University should attend the meetings of the Syndicate. And only the two Stenographers, namely, Sri Tribhuvan Prasad and Sri Surendra Prasad, bearing confidence on caste consideration are to attend the Syndicate meeting. This is highly improper, and the Officers of the University rightly feel humiliated and insulted. Shame must shrink atmosphere and choke those who dwell underneath it, for it must happen if the Chief executive thus humiliates and demoralizes his subordinate officers.

LACK OF
CONFIDENCE.

Recently, the Vice-Chancellor has reduced the rank of his P.A., Sri Ramji Sharma, without assigning any reason, to that of stenographer to the Treasurer. Sri Tribhuwan Prasad, the Stenographer to the Registrar, has been promoted as P.A. to the Vice-Chancellor, and Sri Surendra Prasad, a junior Steno of the Finance Officer, has been promoted as Registrar's Steno. All these are purely on caste merits and demerits. Sri Jhunjhundhari Singh, Steno to the Treasurer, has been asked to work under Finance Officer and Assistant Registrar. The Finance Committee has not been consulted while promoting Sri Tribhuwan Prasad, which involves extra expenditure. Sri Jhunjhundhari Singh, the Treasurer's Steno, by virtue of his seniority, should have been promoted as the Registrar's Steno, but for some obscure reason or for his obvious caste demerit, he has been denied what was due to him.

Such instances of high handedness, nepotism and victimization are numerous, and done to capture the important seats of power or vital links in the office, so that political machination can be practised without let or hinderence.

Bunglings in the appointment.

The Vice-Chancellor wants that only two castes should benefit from the University Office. With this intention, he appointed a Committee consisting of Sri Brahmdeo Narayan Chaudhary, a privileged member of the Syndicate, Sri D.P. Sinha, the Treasurer, and Dr. K.S. Verma, the Registrar, to examine the cases of all the Assistants in the Office and to recommend names for promotion to the Head Assistants. According to the seniority, the cases of the following persons should have been considered :—

1. Sri C.S. Labh.
2. Sri A.P. Srivastava.
3. Sri N.P. Thakur.
4. Sri S.N. Prasad.
5. Sri Raj Nandan Singh.
6. Sri L.N. Prasad.
7. Sri Sidheshwar Singh.
8. Sri Suresh Chandra Verma.

The Committee ignored the case of Sri Rajnandan Singh, although he is a graduate and recommended that he should be superceded by Sri Suresh Chandra Verma and Sri Sidheshwar Prasad Singh. It also ignored the case of Sri C.S. Labh, although he was allowed to function as Head Assistant in the leave vacancy. To provide Sri Sidheshwar Prasad Singh, it was recommended that one post of Assistant be upgraded to that of the Head Assistant although the volume of work did not justify it.

Earlier, through the pretext of an Officer's-meeting, Sri G.P. Verma had been given increment from the time he joined Bihar University on re-appointment. Sri K.K. Banerjee, the previous Vice-Chancellor, did not deem it fit to allow him this privilege. Sri G.P. Verma was not considered fit for increment at Bhagalpur University where he was appointed from Patna.

Even in the appointment of Work-Sarkars, peons, etcetera, caste has been the predominant consideration.

It is indeed painful to find machination being introduced into a University. And, perhaps, the instances of the victimization of those who had sought jobs in the University campus with a view to associate with an atmosphere of culture and dignity are beyond parallel. It is difficult to define the magnitude or the intensity of degradation that must necessarily cling to such deeds of manipulation, naked favouritism, sinister plotting—all designed to consolidate political power in an educational institution at the cost of many poor working men and their families.

The Vice-Chancellor incurred unnecessary expenditure for 9 consecutive months when there was no Syndicate. Even when the Syndicate was constituted and it started functioning, unwarranted expenditure continued, incurring unnecessary liabilities by way of promotions giving allowance to teachers and staff, appointing teachers against mythical posts and on matters without budgetary provisions. The indiscreet and superfluous expenditure embarrassed the position of the Finance Committee. Being fed up with this attitude and erratic behaviour, the Finance Committee, at its meeting held on the 10th of August, 1963, passed the following resolution unanimously—*“The Finance Committee observes that it notes with great concern that money regarding financial liabilities have been incurred by the Syndicate without consulting the Finance Committee. It, therefore, requests the Syndicate not to consider any proposal to the unfortunate financial liabilities in future without consulting the Finance Committee.”*

Gross mis-use of
University
Funds :

The resolution of the Finance Committee was placed before the Syndicate at its meeting held on the 15th of September, 1963, and the Syndicate vide item No. 4 (last resolution) resolved : *“The Syndicate does not accept this contention.”* The observation of the Finance Committee was made in pursuance of Section 47 of the Bihar State Universities Act 1960, Sub-Section 3, which deals with the function of the Finance Committee. But strangely enough, the Syndicate did not accept the contention of the Finance Committee even when the creation of both the Bodies is guided by the same Act, and each body has separate statutory function to perform.

FINANCIAL MATTERS

Although under the new Bihar University Act, the post of a Finance Officer in Class I has been created in the Bihar University, the Vice-Chancellor has reduced that post virtually to the post of a Chief Accountant. Consequent to the appointment of a Finance Officer in the Patna University, a new system of dealing with Cheques, Bank Drafts, Indian Postal Orders etcetera, has been introduced in that University, and accordingly, all Cheques, Bank Drafts, Postal Orders are credited in the University in the name of the Finance Officer, Patna University, and not in the name of the Registrar, Patna University. When the relevant letter of the Patna University was put up to the Bihar University authorities for taking similar action in this University, the Vice-Chancellor wrote that "*Let the new Officer likely to join us soon look into this matter. Sd/- P.L.S. 20-11-62.*"

At that time, the Vice-Chancellor with the blessings of the Education Minister, was trying to appoint one Sri Hari Ram who did not possess high reputation as an Officer of the Bihar Financial Service, as Finance Officer of the Bihar University, but could not do so as Mr. Hari Ram was not recommended by the Bihar Public Service Commission. Throughout his service, not even a single Officer has spoken well of Mr. Hari Ram. In spite of the utmost efforts of the Vice-Chancellor to ruin the career of Sri P. Roy Chowdhury, the Officiating Finance Officer, the Commission recommended the name of Sri P. Chowdhury as No. 1. This greatly upset the Vice-Chancellor, and no steps were taken to give this Finance Officer the powers which were given at the Patna University to its Finance Officer, or at other Universities of the State. From the quoted remark of the Vice-Chancellor, it is evident that he was sure of the appointment of Sri Hari Ram, and with this end in view, he passed such an order on the file. In the Patna University, cheques to a certain limit are signed by the Budget and Accounts Officer and the Finance Officer of that University, and cheques beyond that amount are jointly signed by the Finance Officer and the Registrar. In the Bhagalpur University, all cheques are jointly signed by the Finance Officer and the Registrar. As the Finance Officer did not like to take the entire responsibility in the Ranchi University, cheques upto Rs. 5000/- were resolved to be signed by the Finance Officer and cheques beyond that amount by the Finance Officer and the Registrar. According to the new Statutes of the Magadh University, all cheques upto Rs. 500/- are signed by the Finance Officer, and above that amount, the cheques are signed jointly by the Finance Officer and the Registrar. All these pieces of information were put up to the Bihar University authorities, suggesting that Finance Officer should sign the cheques upto a certain amount, and

beyond that, the cheques should be signed by the Finance Officer and Registrar jointly. But this principle has not been applied here, and all cheques are being signed by the Registrar alone. On the other hand, the Registrar proposed that the counter-foils of the cheques should be initialled by the Finance Officer. The Finance Officer objected to it. The question of signing the cheques by the Finance Officer was discussed at one of the meetings of the Syndicate, but the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar gave inaccurate information to the members of the Syndicate that in other Universities of the State where the post of Finance Officer existed, the cheques were exclusively signed by the Registrar. In the Calcutta University, where there is post of Finance Officer, cheques are signed by the Treasurer and not by the Registrar, as the Registrar has nothing to do with the accounts and finance of the University. In the several other Universities, such as Gauhati University, Burdwan University, and Rabindra Bharati University, where there are posts of Finance Officers, all cheques are signed by the Finance Officers and not by the Registrars. Here, in this University the system of signing cheques by the Registrar alone has been kept with motives best known to the Registrar and the Vice-Chancellor. Many expenses are sanctioned, and cheques issued to the parties without the knowledge of the Finance Officer, although the Finance Officer is expected to know every such transaction. Even when Dr. Verma, the present Registrar, went on earned leave from the 17th of June, 1963, to 10th of July, 1963, and left Muzaffarpur and remained at Gaya, he was allowed to sign cheques at Gaya during that leave, though it was irregular, for he was not the Registrar during that period. It was also irregular and risky to carry the written cheques from Muzaffarpur to Gaya and back, and also involved waste of public money. It is not evident why Sri P. Roy Chowdhury, the Finance Officer of the University, who was asked to perform the duties of the Registrar during that period in addition to his own duties, was not allowed to operate upon the accounts of the Bihar University. As the acting Registrar of the old Bihar University for more than three years, and again as Registrar of the new Bihar University for about three months, Mr. Roy Chowdhury had signed cheques.

Dr. Verma went on leave for the aforesaid period of 24 days. He took 2 orderly-peons with him for his personal comfort. This was irregular and while doing so, he did not take any permission of the Vice-Chancellor. Moreover, when he came back, he requested the Treasurer and the Vice-Chancellor to sanction halage allowance for both the orderly-peons for 24 days. This was sanctioned. This was highly objectionable. When it came to the notice of the Finance Officer, he strongly objected to it. The Registrar

referred the matter to the Syndicate without referring it to the Finance Committee first. At the Syndicate meeting, the Finance Officer took an objection to this and requested the Syndicate to refer the matter to the Finance Committee as it involved financial implication. The Syndicate agreed to that, and the matter came up before the Finance Committee, and the Finance Committee rejected it on the ground that this was not permissible even to the Officers of the Government.

LEGAL EXPENDITURE.

At the last Senate meeting, a member of the Senate wanted to know the total expenditure incurred by the University for conducting the cases in the law courts during the last few years. As far as it is known, the correct information was not supplied to the member. This year, an Assembly question has also been asked for the same information. The legal expenditure should also include the allowance of Rs. 75/- a month given to an assistant, Sri Suresh Chandra Verma, for supervising the cases and also the travelling allowance incurred for his journey. But that has not been done. If this is done, the expenditure will increase by nearly Rs. 3000/-. In the old Bihar University, on a number of occasions, the members of Senate, while passing the Budget, objected even to a sum of Rs. 2000/- to 5000/- under the head of Litigation, and desired the Treasurer to drop this item, as the University was not spending any sum on litigation. Even in the Patna University, and in the Bihar University right upto 1960, provision under this head in the Budget has always ranged between one to five thousand rupees. Ever since this Vice-Chancellor has joined Bihar University, the provision under this head has augmented manifold because of the numerous legal proceedings.

RANDOM IRREGULARITIES.

The allowance of Mr. Suresh Chandra Verma was sanctioned without considering the seniority of the Assistants in the Office. This was not even referred to the Finance Committee. Recently, Mr. Faruqi, Youth Welfare Officer, has been granted leave without pay, and in his place, Mr. A.K. Sinha, Head Assistant of the General Section, has been appointed to officiate as Youth Welfare Officer, although by virtue of seniority, Sri S. Sen Gupta should have been appointed as Youth Welfare Officer. He represented his case to the Vice-Chancellor, but no action was taken, and the matter has been hushed up. Recently, the Syndicate has sanctioned an allowance of Rs. 150/- to Sri Binoy Kumar of the Department of Hindi, L.S. College, for making out a case on behalf of the University for submission before the Raman Commission. This matter should have gone to the Finance Committee first for its recommendation. At the last meeting of the Syndicate, dated the 9th of August, 1964, a sum of Rs. 150/- per month was sanctioned to Dr. Ram Bihari Singh of the Department of Economics, L.S. College, for working as

Warden of the University Hostel. This too was not referred to the Finance Committee. The Warden used to get a rent-free house and nothing else. The present Warden, Dr. H.R. Ghosal, is getting only rent-free house, the rent of which may be Rs. 60/- per month only, and Dr. H.R. Ghosal is the Dean of the Faculty of Arts—the Senior-most teacher in his section in the University.

In the old Bihar University, plan preparation was entrusted to M/s. Planet Private Ltd. of Patna, and they were paid money for some of the work done. The plans for the post-graduate science block, sanctioned during the Second Plan period, was prepared by them, and the Architects had also secured the approval of the University Grants Commission. The Architects were paid over Rs. 12,000/- for this job. Due to the non-execution of the plan during the Second Plan period, and consequent upon additional area sanctioned by the Visiting Committee of the University Grants Commission, the plans had once again to be revised. M/s. Planet Ltd. were agreeable to revise their plans, and were further prepared to adjust the sum paid to them earlier against the work done by them. It is surprising how this offer of the Architects was not entertained when they were representatives of one of the leading Architects of the country, M/s. Kavinde & Rai of Delhi.

CONSTRUC-
TIONS.

Letters were written to a number of Architectural firms of all-India standing to come over to Muzaffarpur for interview. As a result of this, several firms of repute, including M/s. Balladis Thomas Matthew, M/s. Master Sathe and Kothari, M/s. G.C. Sharma and others visited Muzaffarpur. No letter was sent to M/s. Desai and Kacker; but the Vice-Chancellor apparently personally contacted M/s. Desai & Kacker in course of his visit to Delhi, and asked him to come over for interview. In the Building Committee, the Vice-Chancellor manoeuvred to get the work assigned to this Architect. This Architect does not even figure in the recognised list of all-India Institute. Mr. Kacker has been known to the Vice-Chancellor for a long time, and perhaps, therefore, an important work was entrusted to him. He is presently drawing up the plans of all the projects of the University and would be receiving nothing less than a lac of rupees. The progress of work has, however, been far from satisfactory. It is easy to find out whether this Architect is, at the moment, drawing up plans of any University of India. On verification, it would be obvious that M/s. Desai and Kacker lack in experience, and on this score, no University in India has entrusted any work to them save and except a few scattered colleges that may have asked them to draw plans worth a few thousands and not running into lacs of rupees. Most of the plans, as submitted by this Architect,

are unsatisfactory. The Heads of the Departments as well as the local P.W.D. authorities are very critical of the plans and estimates prepared in the most trivial manner. At a number of meetings of the Building Committee, some members have raised objections to the manner in which all the projects of the University have been passed on to M/s. Desai and Kacker, while actually other Architects were being interviewed. It was stated by the Vice-Chancellor that only one or two projects were being given to the Architects on a trial basis (notes of Pandit A.B. Jha, dated 19-8-63 and 23-8-63 in the minutes of the Syndicate at page 213 and 214). The result is that the University which had to face great difficulties in reviving sanctions of the Second Plan period will once again loose nothing less than 40 to 50 lacs of rupees during the Third Plan period. At the present moment, only 2 buildings have been constructed, namely, the Guest House and the University Health Centre. It is unimaginable as to how with the present pace of progress and with the favouritism shown to contractors belonging to the two privileged factions, the numerous building-schemes sanctioned can be implemented. A few buildings were speedily taken up, but then in the year 1964, some honourable members of the Syndicate, with the support of the Vice-Chancellor, decided to impose contractors. One Sri Ganga Prasad Singh has been allotted, and is being allotted, work when his capacity and experience to take up such work are limited. The confidence of all the local contractors has been shaken, and they do not even bother to send in their tenders, because it is known to all that work-allotment is a foregone decision. In the case of orders for brick supply, Sri Ganga Prasad Singh as well as others were called for negotiations at a meeting of the Building Committee. A few contractors turned up and they were agreeable to lower their rates. At the end, Sri Ganga Prasad Singh was called in and probably told the rates quoted by others, and was requested to lower his rate. When negotiations take place, it is never the practice to tell the contractors the rates quoted by others. But in the case of Sri Ganga Prasad Singh, in the complete contravention of the ethics of sealed tenders, the deal was closed by informing him of the rates of others and asking him to lower his rates. It is surprising that though Sri Ramdeo Sah, allotted part of the brick-supply, was in a position to supply larger quantity of bricks of 9" size, and yet Sri Ganga Prasad Singh who was not in a position to do so, was given advance-orders for December. This clearly amounts to favouritism and waste of money, for the rates during monsoon, are higher than those in December, and orders for December, placed during monsoon at current rates, are perhaps the most glaring instance of private beneficentiation at the cost of public exchequer. It was also known to every body at the time of the issue of tender

notices and even re-tender, that irrespective of whatever the University does, the Post-graduate hostel, roads and other jobs would be given to Sri Ganga Prasad Singh because of the backing of the lieutenants of the Education Minister. The outcome proved the truth of the foreboding. Even though Mr. Ganga Prasad Singh had not deposited earnest money, his case was entertained. All rules and regulations governing tenders are flouted in the case of favourites. Proper earnest money was not given by Sri Ganga Prasad Singh at the time of submission of his first tender, and when he did so, he wrote a letter that he was depositing earnest money on the assurance that the work would be assigned to him.

In the case of building materials, even when the Government of India have issued instructions that no diversion of cement is permissible, the University has been recklessly diverting cement to all and sundry. One can understand that, in these days of cement scarcity, if the University diverts the cement to colleges, it is pardonable. But if the University gives one thousand bags of cement to one of its members of the Syndicate, may be Sri Shri Narayan Singh, for the construction of his cold storage at Motihari, it is illegal and unpardonable. Even the so-called security deposit was gradually handed over to the University in instalments, though the Vice-Chancellor should have taken, in one lot, the entire security deposit as done in the case of even the affiliated colleges which are granted cement on loan.

The narration of how M/s. Kacker Desai and Company were brought into the camp is breathe-taking. M/s. Planet Private Limited had been paid Rs. 12,000/- for preparing a plan for the old Bihar University. But the plan was not executed, and the Visiting Committee of the University Grants Commission suggested some changes. M/s. Planet Private Limited agreed to revise the plan, supervise construction at 35% and adjust the sum of Rs. 12,000/- against bill. But Dr. P.L. Srivastava would not salvage this amount. M/s. Desai and Kacker, not included in the list of consultants, were eventually entrusted with the task. The appointment of a University Engineer was postponed after the interviews were held and the candidate selected. Now Desai Kacker & Co. have no technical supervision from the University. The amount involved is enormous and requires all checks and balances. But the University authorities have, time and again, found checks and balances, rules and conventions, irksome. The way contract was given to Mr. Ganga Prasad Singh is highly irregular and a veritable index of how things were being pushed through.

That cement from the stock of University should have been issued to Mr. Shri Narayan Singh for the construction of

his Cold Storage at Motihari is an incident that damages both the University and the Syndicate irreparably. Against the issue of about 1000 bags of cement, there is a payment of Rs. 3000/- only. Whenever the University issues cement to its affiliated colleges, the full payment is taken in advance. Whatever the predicament of a Syndic, the propriety of conduct is injured if the stocks of the institutions are thus used by individuals who bring pressure to bear upon the affairs of the University.

All this is a picture of a jungle, not a University Office, where people roam about and not work in cohesion. Good teachers are cut to pieces financially to yield benefits to those who do not deserve on their merits. That Dr. Anandi Hazari's salary for the period of his study-leave should be with-held for years is a matter of shame for the University authorities. Mr. R.C.P. Sinha, the Planning Officer, is perhaps the most glaring instance of victimization. Members of the staff are appointed and promoted on caste considerations and some are demoted and humiliated because of caste handicap ; for instance Mr. Ramji Sharma, the erstwhile P.A. to the Vice-Chancellor was demoted as the Steno of the Treasurer without any charge being levelled against him. The highly placed Officers are insulted, for instance the Finance Officer has been disallowed from attending the confidential meetings of the Syndicate, while the Steno of the Finance Officer is permitted to attend such meetings to take notes, the only cause of trust being the caste affinity with the Vice-Chancellor. Huge sums of money are being wasted or spent for the protection of the unworthy and to persecute these who are not liked.

The entire office is in a turmoil, chafing under the trammels of inequity and persecution, adding fuel to the fire of general unrest and discontentment.

The resultant fact is unimpeachable that even the University Office was not spared the punitive rod. The causes of general unrest and discontent are intertwined with the arbitrary actions of the University authorities—sometimes to serve the personal ends of the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar, and at times to strengthen the stranglehold of the Education Minister to entrench his own men in the key posts of power and patronage for the Ministerial ambitions of political power through educational institutions. If the very office of the University is thus scarred and lacerated by the authorities themselves to serve personal and group designs based on caste alignment, it is indeed the authorities themselves who constitute and nurse the causes for an unrest. That the funds of the University should be employed to bring about the success of the questionable ends connotes the depth of the abyss.

F—LACK OF AMENITIES

Education in the modern world has a certain concept to impart, certain way of teaching to introduce, certain standard of efficiency to maintain. To support these and keep them integrated through persistent application without monotony, certain extra-curricular activities and engagements are essential and provided for. But the University authorities, engrossed in other preoccupations—in achieving a majority in the Syndicate, in appointing their yesmen as the Secretaries of the colleges, in reconstituting the various Governing Bodies in the manner they should not have, in elevating their favourites by victimizing the deserving, in carrying out the political plan of the Education Minister for controlling education and learning itself—did not at all pause to consider the urgency of attending to the lack of amenities, much to the dismay and chagrin of the students. This apathy of the authorities, particularly on account of the facts scheduled, was a contributory factor to general unrest.

LAST STRIKE FOLLOWED BY HUNGER STRIKE AND THE DISTURBANCE AT THE CONVOCATION

The causes of the general unrest in the University constitute the bulk of the causes of the last strike followed by hunger-strike and the disturbances created at the Convocation in 1964. The causes of the hunger strike and the disturbances at the Convocation have to be found out amidst the facts and data contained in the various exploits. There has been an abnormal state of affairs obtaining in the University—a state of tension continuous for quite some time. This state of tension, as it concerns the impressionable and the impulsive age-group of the campus, has, from time to time, erupted, emitting the molten lava of pent-up feelings, of wounded sentiments, of excited energies.

The last hunger-strike was not the first, and if the management of the University continues in the same clutches, it will not be the last either. The Vice-Chancellor has harassed and frustrated the teachers, and thus demoralized the one community which could, in its normal healthy frame of mind, have acted as the sluice gate for the overflowing torrents of uneasiness. But as the teachers were themselves pushed down the precipice, their unenviable lot augmented the other compelling causes of the unrest instead of subduing them. Violence is not always physical, and there can hardly be a greater cause for unrest in a University than the violence of ill-treatment dished out to the teachers by the University authorities with the connivance and prompting of the Education Ministry, more so when the students are also enlisted in such a campaign. The methodically perpetrated casteism and favouritism in the appointments, promotions

**THE CAUSES
OF GENERAL
UNREST.**

and transfers of the teachers and in the award of study leave and research scholarship undoubtedly vitiated the atmosphere of the University campus, causing bickerings and uneasiness.

The attempts at appointing Principals without following the rules of procedure, as viewed by the Chancellor himself, for non-academic considerations is the greatest single factor causing the general unrest in the University. It is recorded in the Writ Petition in respect of the Miscellaneous Judicial Case No. 86 of 1963 that the Education Minister told the Vice-Chancellor that bunglings in the grant of free-studentship and appointment of teachers are likely to lead to groupism in the Office and amongst the students, and thus may engender fissiparous forces creating a law-and-order problem. The Education Minister apprehended all these because of only one Principal who was alleged to have been appointed for non-academic consideration. That about a dozen Principals are, as observed by the Chancellor, appointed for non-academic reasons is, in the logical consequence of the facts, data and evidence, bound to foster manifold preconditions of unrest, strikes and disturbances. That all data and evidence, particularly the fact that the Education Minister has, all these many months, remained in constant touch with the Vice-Chancellor in dealing with the mundane matters of the University is beyond doubt. The Vice-Chancellor has, from time to time, reported to the Minister through letters and telephone. Such persistently motivated appointments, promotions, rewards and punishments, in the Bihar University, lead to the inevitable fact that the Education Minister, through his obsession for political ambition, has contributed the major factor to the causes of general unrest in the Bihar University.

The victimization of teachers to be able to favour those who do not deserve, on their merit, what they have got, even at the cost of the standard of teaching is, beyond all reasonable doubt, an inevitable cause of unrest within itself. This calculated policy of harassment brought about a mass-migration of good teachers. Such a mass-migration of good teachers is bound to leave the students indignant, and the guardians bewildered. Naturally, those other teachers who are inducted on purely caste or personal consideration to strengthen groups and factions, in their normal gratitude for benefits thus bestowed, preach and practise all that should be a taboo in the University. Besides, those who are commissioned on such group and sectarian considerations must, in the natural corollary of facts, be well trained and accomplished in that direction, if not in teaching. The impact on the impressionable minds of the boys that caste, group and personal loyalties, destitute of public loyalty and honesty of purpose, are an easy short-cut to personal promotions must necessarily

scatter the students in various camps, recruited through the underserving incumbents imposed on the University. Therefore, it is the University authorities who generated the causes of general unrest, and that they should have been allowed to do so with impunity is where the invisible ties with the Ministry of Education are fastened. The Education Minister, on a reported representation of fourteen members of the State Legislature, emitted his supersensitive concern about the whatever actions of Mr. Bhola Prasad Singh. The same Education Minister was callous and apathetic, if not gleeful, when he turned down a delegation of the Citizens Committee which included amongst others, Mr. Digvijaya Narayan Singh, M. P., Mr. K. N. Sahay, M. L. C., Mr. Nitishwar Prasad Singh, M. L. A., Mr. C. M. P. Singh, M. L. A., Mr. Nitishwar Prasad, the Chairman of Muzaffarpur Municipality, Thakur Yadunandan Singh, the then President of Muzaffarpur District Congress Committee, Mr. Madhusudan Prasad Agrawal, the President of the District Bharat Sewak Samaj, Mr. Ramjanma Ojha Member of the Bihar University Senate, Mr. Ramdeo Sharma, the Secretary of the District Communist Party, Mr. Mahendra Mohan Mishra, Member of the Bihar University Senate, Mr. Arun Kumar Bose, Municipal Commissioner, Mr. Ramchandra Sahi, M. L. A., Mr. Bhubneshwar Chaudhary, Secretary, Muzaffarpur District Congress Committee, Mr. Prahlad Prasad Mehrotra, Vice-Chairman of Muzaffarpur Municipality—fourteen persons representing the various walks of life and political parties—and did not accept that an explosive situation had come to be which would, sooner or later, blast the whole edifice. The unmitigated truth that emerges from this is that Mr. Satyendra Narayan Singh was not prepared to appoint an impartial probe into the affairs of the Bihar University lest the explosive and dynamite, stored in the very foundation of this University, were detected, and the saboteurs apprehended. It is this attitude of the Minister, which has nursed the cause of an unrest.

That the Education Minister should choose to defend this Vice-Chancellor is a mere misconception of loyalty to a colleague—a projection of personal vanity to public affairs. That he should not hesitate to express his full confidence in this Vice-Chancellor, and that too publicly, is a fact which convinced the students of no justice and equity coming from the Minister at least in the case of the Bihar University. Those who arrogate to themselves the prerogative to bolster the evil are responsible for the resultant reaction.

The Education Minister has, however, recently at a Press Conference, stated that he would have relieved Dr. P.L. Srivastava long ago but for the agitation of the students. He has further explained that he had warned the Vice-Chancellor against "*Muzaffarpur politics*", but the Doctor did

not listen to the Minister. What a volte face ! The Minister's statement is perhaps the latest text book on how to forsake a man midstream to drown. If it is the standard set to treat a Vice-Chancellor, the head of the University, who is responsible for unrest and disturbances that ravage the University ? The Education Minister has not realized the import of his public statement judged against the retention of the Vice-Chancellor—a Vice-Chancellor who would have long been relieved of his august duties. It is only under a mounting public resentment that the Education Minister has uttered, in public, these fateful words to keep an auxiliary exit ready for his own escape should the situation so demand. But, enshrouded in the oblivion of suppressed facts, here lie buried many such factors in the token of a mental process which has caused and nursed the rape of ethics.

The Vice-Chancellor defiled the sanctity of examinations, manipulated results to reward his personal favourites, and ruined many a promising career. This Vice-Chancellor cancelled a whole examination, because one of his favourites had failed, and elevated his caste-favourites under the camouflage of general good. This Vice-Chancellor failed to safeguard the sacred secrecy of questions, and unfortunately, involved the prestige of his office in a scandal not less shameful than the Profume episode which put to blush the most impassive bronze statues. Obviously the Vice-Chancellor who commits such acts, causes not only a general unrest but also violent disturbances.

The Vice-Chancellor schemes to extend his machination to the very office of the University must bear upon himself the burden of being himself the single greatest cause of disaffection, indignation, frustration and even anger.

Data and evidence, recorded in the memorandum, unerringly point out to the blue-print of a campaign to conquer the University of Bihar, and hold it as a colony virtually to establish an empire, yielding power, patronage and self-aggrandizement. This blue-print of campaign, chartered in some chamber of the Patna Secretariat, when projected to the University, is another very vital cause of the general unrest and occasional revolts. The first target was the office of the Vice-Chancellor. Dr. P.L. Srivastava was installed in the high office. This done, the next target on the firing line was the Syndicate, to achieve which concerted steps were taken—steps which were subsequently condemned by the Chancellor and outlawed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

Obviously, the affiliated colleges—the fortresses on the frontiers of the domain—were assaulted through the appointment of various Principals. These fortresses were to fall through the infiltration of the Governing Bodies, the

Members and Secretaries of which were nominated by the Vice-Chancellor in the complete contravention of all rules and conventions. The Education Minister thus used the Vice-Chancellor as a demolition Engineer to undermine the well-established time—honoured conventions. This, within itself, clouded the atmosphere of the University, apprehension looming large, a sense of impending disaster biting into the teachers, a feeling of helpless resentment gnawing at the guardians. The Education Minister, in view of these facts, is a constant cause for the state of turmoil, indecorum and disturbances, mauling the University.

That the Vice-Chancellor should entice, or alternately coerce, the students to organise resentment against the Principals is an outstanding cause for many a disturbance. That he should support one group of students against another, that he should privately approach the Press to support the various moves of some students against the rest, that he should indirectly support a hunger-strike to run down a Principal, are the causes of one strike after another, evoking hunger-strike and rowdy demonstrations. That the Vice-Chancellor should be a party to methodical persecution of students through cases instituted against them is the most grotesque connotation of ruthlessness, and therefore the most provocative, regime.

Therefore, the causes of the general unrest in the University of Bihar are :—

- (i) the Vice-Chancellor's humiliating and punitive treatment meted out to the teachers, laying bare their self-respect and the dignity of their status, forcing them to live in a state of continuous apprehension for themselves and their family ;
- (ii) random leakage of questions, postponed and bungled examinations, delayed and manipulated results, affecting the students—all perpetrated by the Vice-Chancellor and his aides-de-camp ;
- (iii) a sort of general massacre of the Officers and the staff of the University by slaughtering the normal hopes and aspirations of a working man at the altar of machination and intrigue—thus involving the staff too ;
- (iv) the projection of the Education Minister's political aggrandizement and impatient ambition to the administration of the colleges and the University and his obstinate support to this unfamiliar image of a Vice-Chancellor,

not a teacher Vice-Chancellor, not an administrator Vice-Chancellor, but a politician Vice-Chancellor, and at that a litigant politician.

LAST STRIKE FOLLOWED BY HUNGER-STRIKE :

The causes of the last strike followed by hunger-strike emerge from the embryo of the general unrest. General unrest, if allowed to continue over a length of period, must inevitably result in strikes, hunger strikes and demonstrations. The students of the University drew the attention of the Vice-Chancellor to the many problems afflicting them, but no response came from the otherwise preoccupied University authorities. The students knocked at the door of the Minister. But no redress was promised. The students, thus harassed by the Vice-Chancellor, spurned by the Minister, in deference to their natural restlessness of youth and impulsive immaturity, went on hunger-strike to focus the attention of the authorities.

This hunger-strike was withdrawn at the instance of the Citizens of Muzaffarpur, who assured the students that the Committee, convened by Mr. K.N. Sahaya, M.L.C. would persuade the Government to appoint an enquiry into the affairs of the University.

THE DISTURBANCE AT THE CONVOCATION :

The delegation led by Mr. K.N. Sahaya, M.L.C., Mr. Nitishwar Prasad Singh, M.L.A., and Mr. C.M.P. Singh, M.L.A. met the Education Minister only to be told off. The Minister went on to support and applaud the Vice-Chancellor, and let his political vendetta blind his vision. The Chancellor, not fully made aware of what happened in one of his Universities, did not give this matter the attention due to it. On the top of it, the Vice-Chancellor, in that new famous meeting of the Senate, which the Vice-Chancellor broke up by raising a false alarm about an imaginary raid on the University office to malign the students, created a parallel with the historical Reichstag Fire. This was the single most immediate cause of the disturbances at the Convocation. Students, torn into groups by the Vice-Chancellor, persecuted and harassed through many machinations, mauled and mutilated by the various contrivances of inflicting agony and despair, unrestrained by the teachers who were themselves benumbed, were ripe for any precipitate action which would draw the attention of the Chancellor. This explosive state of mental tension was exploited by the University authorities to trap the students, through agent-provocateurs, to this precipitate action of disturbances—a fact evidenced by the numerous instances of a certain group

of students being very intimate with the Vice-Chancellor, living in house and enjoying riotous liberty.

To throw a man into water to swim and then to warn him against getting wet is a patent paradox employed by the tacticians. But there is little honesty in this purpose. When a whole University goes wrong—wrong because of the joint conspiracy of the Vice-Chancellor and the Education Minister—it is the students who suffer beyond human endurance. The guardians who generally come from the middle class, including many Government servants, cannot, for the very obvious reasons, rise against such methodical contamination. And when the chosen representatives of the people also fail to evoke any moral compunction amongst those who held power by the teeth of their greed, the students have no recourse left but to rise in revolt to seek redress. They are not responsible for unrest and disturbances who suffer from it and then seek its mitigation. They are responsible for all that is violent, that is ignoble, that is reprehensible, who cause the mischief and inflict injustice. Dr. P.L. Srivastava and Mr. Satyendra Narayan Singh must, between themselves, retain the responsibility and liability for all untoward incidents rocking the Bihar University, throwing only an occasional piece to their lieutenants and associates.

IV. Financial Irregularity, if any, in the Accounts for 1960

IN view of the fact that the financial irregularities, if any, in respect of the University accounts for 1960 are confined to the books of account, the Citizens Committee is not in a position, at this juncture, to submit any data and evidence. The Citizens Committee, however, has offered the services of its member-experts to assist the Raman Commission in this regard, if the Commission so desire.

The Judgement of Supreme Court and Consequential Changes

THE judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, delivered in respect of the Civil Appeal No. 279 of 1964, has clearly decided not only the invalidity of the present Statutes concerning the constitution of the Governing Bodies, but also the propriety of the manner in which they should be formed anew. The Statutes should be amended accordingly.

In the said judgement, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has observed :—

1. *“It will be recalled that the Act proceeds on a broad and well recognised distinction between two categories of collegiate institutions, one instituted by the University and the other admitted to the University or affiliated to it.”*
 2. *“The position is substantially different where collegiate institutions are started by other autonomous bodies and they seek admission or affiliation to the University. In regard to this class of collegiate institutions, their institution as well as their management and maintenance is not the direct concern of the University ; that is the concern of the University ; that is the concern of the autonomous educational bodies which have sponsored them and which have undertaken the task of instituting, managing and maintaining them.”*
 3. *“Who should constitute the Governing Bodies, is a matter for the autonomous educational bodies, which sponsor the collegiate institutions, to decide.”*
 4. *“The autonomous bodies which institute colleges and help the progress of higher education in the country, are generally run by disinterested persons, and it is of some importance that the autonomy of such bodies should not be unduly impaired.”*
-

CONCLUSION

THE evidences of the Education Minister being kept fully aware of the developments in the University campus and of the persistent political exploration of the Vice-Chancellor have together demolished all standards and code of conduct. The Vice-Chancellor broke new grounds by corresponding with various political parties of the State.

The Vice-Chancellor went to the extent of congratulating Mr. Rajendra Mishra on his election as the President of the State Congress Committee, and did not miss to convey his thankfulness to the Education Minister. These and many more incidents, small by themselves, yet assuming disproportionate significance against the whole background are the clues to the mystery, if the causes of all what has happened are mysterious.

The Citizens Committee regrets the length of this memorandum incorporating the statements of facts, data and evidence, forwarded to it by persons who have personal knowledge and information of whatever recorded herein before. These statements, integrated with this memorandum on facts, data and evidence, as desired by those who have forwarded it, have been submitted to the Raman Commission for consideration.

These facts and evidences, the Citizens Committee is compelled to submit, has come despite persistent attempts to scatter them, and speak for themselves. In view of this unfortunate factor, the Citizens Committee has further submitted to the Raman Commission to call for the records, files, letters, documents and papers, from time to time referred to herein elsewhere, lest they should be tempered with for any reason whatsoever. The propriety of this step is obvious.

Mediocrity is exposed when honesty is attached to mala fide acts. The greatest menace to citizenship and liberty comes from the predominance of monopolistic instincts and prejudices over education. Under the obtaining circumstances created by the controlling acts and statutes, there can be no other outcome if the Minister and the Vice-Chancellor run amuck; and that too according to a premeditated plan. In democracy, fixed standards must guide those who are in the positions of authority, and no resting place should be given to the political adventurers.

A new technique is being developed to treat all institutions, running on the support of public exchequer, as legitimate ground for political intrigues and machination. The entire concept of democracy, rule of law, basic ethical values and honesty of purpose seem to have gone wrong. Nothing is settled unless it is settled right :

*“Then to side with truth is noble
 when we share her noble crust,
 Ere her cause bring fame and profit
 and it's properous to be just ;
 Then 'tis the brave man chooses,
 while coward stands aside,
 Doubting in his object spirit
 till Lord is cricified,
 And the multitude make of the faith
 they had denied.”*

ANNEXURES

IN

The Court of the Magistrate First Class,
MUZAFFARPUR

A F F I D A V I T

I, Nand Kishore Sharma, son of Shri Nageshwar Prasad Sharma, aged about 24 years, by profession a student, resident of "*Srinivas Sadnam*" near Home for the Homeless in the town of Muzaffarpur, P.S. Town Muzaffarpur, Munsifi and district Muzaffarpur do hereby solemnly declare and affirm as follows :—

1. That Pt. Binodanand Jha visited Muzaffarpur in March, 1963 in connection with a bye-election campaign. He addressed a meeting in Tilak Maidan, Muzaffarpur. At this meeting I drew his attention to the state of affairs obtaining in the University of Bihar, and appealed to him to pull it out of morass.
2. That by this incident I may have caught the eye of Dr. P.L. Srivastava, Vice-Chancellor, University of Bihar. Thereafter his emissaries, principally Shri Anirudh Prasad, began visiting me with the said Vice-Chancellor's message that I should meet him. Such messages continued to pour. Sometime in December, 1963 Serva Shri Anirudh Prasad, Dhrub Ojha and Ram Krishna Singh met me. They said that it was the fervent desire of the said Vice-Chancellor that I should meet him at Ramdayalunagar Railway Station at the time of 67 Up: Muzaffarpur-Allahabad passenger train. This was sometime about the latter half of December, 1963.
3. That the said Dr. P.L. Srivastava got into the said train at Muzaffarpur and was going to Allahabad. I was carried into his compartment and introduced to him by Shri Ram Krishna Singh. The said Vice-Chancellor expressed great joy at meeting me and said, "*Aau Beta, tum mere Hanuman mil gai*". He asked me to sit on his own quilt which was folded fourfold. I travelled with him upto Sonapur. During conversation he always addressed me as "*Beta*", and was very demonstrative in his affections.
4. That he tried to impress upon me that he was very keen on just and fair administration, but the Rajputs were not allowing him free hand in the discharge of duties, more so Principal Mahendra Pratap and Dr. Ram Behari Singh.

5. That I wanted to know from him about the ugly state of affairs prevailing in Rajendra College, Chapra. He silenced me with the observation that the said College was the preserve of Shri S.N. Sihna, Education Minister and that he was following and abiding by his instructions in the matter. It was better, therefore, that we did not discuss the affairs of that College.
6. That thereafter I wanted to know his views about Dr. Ram Behari Singh. He observed that he had favoured Chakradhar Singh, a Rajput, and thus spoiled the career of Pramod. He also said that the demonstration of the girl students was organised by him in league with Principal Mahendra Pratap.
7. That thereafter he switched on to Principal Mahendra Pratap. He said that he had misplaced answer-books of M.A. English Examination. The result was getting delayed. The students were holding threats that they would take recourse to the court of law. To avoid such unpleasantness marks for the lost copies were worked out on the basis of the average of marks obtained in other papers. He continued that in spite of such gross neglect on the part of Principal Mahendra Pratap no steps were being taken by the Education Department of the Government of Bihar. He added that he had doubts about the character of Principal Mahendra Pratap as he was keen on visiting S.R.C. Lady Hostel at odd hours in the night. He also said that he had been admonished by appropriate authorities not to visit S.R.C. Lady Hostel. He mentioned that Principal Rehman had made some adverse entries in his C.C. Roll.
8. That after this invective against Rajputs in general and the said teachers in particulars, he asked me to organise the students in such a way as to render him assistance. I promised to do so provided he dealt out even handed justice. Both us gripped the iron bars of the windows of the first class compartment and affirmed to be together in the dispensation of justice.
9. That when we were parting company at Sonepur he asked me to arrange for him a grand reception when he returned to Muzaffarpur on 1-1-64 by 68 Dn.
10. That I organised a reception for him. On the night of 31-12-63, I myself went to Sonepur and escorted him to Muzaffarpur where about 400 students accorded him reception by garlanding him and raising slogans. Lallan Behari Singh, Gorakh Singh, Srikanta Shukla,

Ramnath Sharma, Panchdeo Singh, Dhrub Ojha, Ram Krishna Singh, Akhtar Pandey, and Shyam Karan Singh etc., participated in the reception. The Vice-Chancellor addressed the students from his bogie and exhorted students to strengthen his hands in the administration of the University in a just and fair manner.

11. That when he was leaving for his residence, he called me close and said, "*Beta, kal subah tahalne ke wakat anaa.*"
12. That I went to him at the time of morning walk on 2-1-1964. This programme of morning walk continued till 8-3-64 whenever he was in Muzaffarpur.
13. That during such morning walks he discussed with me University politics. His tirade was mainly confined to the Rajput community, and Principal Mahendra Pratap and Dr. Ram Behari Singh in particular. He said that he was forced to stoop low for the benefit of the Rajput community under instructions from the Education Minister. He said that even then this community proved ungrateful to him. He referred to the performance of Shri Ramanand Singh, M.L.A. on the floor of the Assembly. This was flashed in the newspapers as "*Bihar Vishwavidyalaya me Saraswati ka chir haran*". He continued in a repentant mood that he had done great injustice to the Bhumihars, and that he must recompense for the same. He mentioned that Chief Minister K.B. Sahaya had telephoned to him that he should bestow special favours on the Bhumihars. I remonstrated that the Chief Minister should not have talked in such strain and that he also should not act in a manner which was likely to poison the atmosphere of the University.
14. That I left with the Vice-Chancellor for Patna in the afternoon of 19-1-64. On 20-1-1964 we went to the residence of Shri L.P. Sahi in Patna. He discussed the affairs of Bihar University with him. He also gave him a note regarding the irregularities committed by certain individuals of the University. He requested Sri L.P. Sahi that the irregularities be given the widest publicity through "*Bharat Mail*".
15. That there was disturbance in Rajendra College, Chapra on or about the 24th of January 1964. The Vice-Chancellor referred to the incident and said that Rajput students had badly manhandled a Bhumihar student. The latter went to the police but he got no justice. This encouraged Rajput students and there was a

regular warfare against Bhumihar teachers and students. The Vice-Chancellor continued, “*Dekho Beta, Chapra men bhumihaaron par ketna atyachar ho raha hai. Mera dil rota hai. You are a rising luminary in the firmament of students. Can you tolerate all these injustices?*” I replied that “*I did not believe in casteism and that a student had no caste. He was primarily a votary at the altar of Goddess Saraswati*”. The Vice-Chancellor quipped, “*Beta, aise adarshoon se kam chalne wala nahen hai. Pathar ka jawab pathar se dena hai. Muzaffarpur men rajput vidyarthiaon aur adhyapkon ko kuchal dalna hai*”. I protested that, “*kichar se kichar nahen dhoya ja sakta hai.*” I suggested that both us should go to Chapra to bridge the gap so as to restore normality. He replied, “*Sharma Saheb, main tumko jindadil samajhata tha lekin tum darpok nikle. Agar tum mukadma se darte ho to tumku yeh samajhana chahiya ke samucha sashan mere hath men hai. S.P., S.D.O. aur dusre afsar log mere jat ke hain. Itna hi nahin, Lal Bahadur Shastri mere bahu ke mama lagte hain. Woh mere samdhi huye. Beta, tumku yeh samachana chahiye ke Lal Bahadur Jawaharlal ke kaleja hain. Jawaharlal ke baad woh Prime Minister banne wale hain. Main es rajaya ke Governor aur es University ka Chancellor hone wala hon. Yeh naksa pahela he se taiyar hai. U.P. men main M.L.C. reh chuka hun. U.P. men mere nam ko har adme janta hai. main politics ke chal ko khub janta hon.*” He further said, “*Beta, Education Minister meri puja aise hi nahin karte hain. main ne unko bataya hai ke Lal Bahadur ke Prime Minister ho jane par main unke adhik se adhik admiyon ko ticket dilaonga jisse wah Chief Minister ban saken. Beta, ab tum samach gai ke main kaya hon? Tumku yeh bhi samach lena chahiya ke mere kahe mutabik kam karne men tumhara kitna phaida hai*”.

16. That while listening mutely to the exposition of his “*Birat roop*” by the Vice-Chancellor I kept on musing over the thirty-second and thirty-third shlokas of the Bhagvad-Gita which are reproduced below :—

कालोऽस्मि लोकक्षयकृत्प्रवृद्धो
 लोकान् समाहर्तुमिह प्रवृत्तः
 ऋतेऽपि त्वां न भविष्यन्ति सर्वे
 येऽवस्थिताः प्रत्यनीकेषु योधाः ॥ ३२ ॥

तस्मात्त्रमुत्तिष्ठ यशो लभस्व
 जित्वा शत्रून् भुङ्क्ष्व राज्यं समृद्धम्
 मयैवैते निहिताः पूर्वमेव
 निमित्तमात्रं भव सव्यसाचिन् ॥ ३३ ॥

17. That on return from walk I invariably had my breakfast with the Vice-Chancellor. Sometimes I joined him at lunch time too.
18. That after return from one of such walks there was a telephone from the Commissioner, Tirhut Division, Muzaffarpur for Dr. P.L. Srivastava. From his end the Vice-Chancellor gave a picture of trouble at Rajendra College, Chapra as mentioned in para 15 above. He added that there need be no apprehension about Muzaffarpur as the students here were quite peaceful.
19. That when I was taking leave of the Vice-Chancellor, he said, "*Dekho Beta, Main Bahar ja raha hon. Mere kahe mutabik mere gair hajiri men yahan badla le lena jaruri hai. Main chahta hun ke taj tumhari sir par bandhe, laken agar tum aisa nahen kar sakoge to mere aur log aisa karne ko taiyar hain*". His parting advice to me is enshrined in the following persian couplets which he not only read out to me but explained as well :—

*“Man nami goam jiyan kun ya vafikrey sood vas,
Aije phursat we khabar darhar chi vasi zudvas”.*
20. That after the Vice-Chancellor had left I carried a delegation of about twelve students to the Commissioner, Tirhut Division, sometime in the last week of January 1964. I requested him to order an impartial enquiry into the incidents at Rajendra College, Chapra. I also requested him to be alert so that nothing unpleasant happened in Muzaffarpur.
21. That the students formed a Peace Committee of which I was appointed as as "*Nirdeshak*".
22. That while a delegation of the Peace Committee was on way to Patna, we acquainted Shri Ram-gulam Chaudhary and Dandekarji with the said state of affairs obtaining in the University of Bihar, and leaflets distributed by the said Committee were handed over to the said gentlemen.
23. That in Patna the Peace Committee delegation met the Chancellor, Pt. Binodanand Jha, Chief Minister, Sri Ram Lakhan Singh Yadava and Shrimati Sumitra Devi.
24. That this interview was reported in the different English and Hindi dailies of Patna.
25. That the reporting of the said interview as appearing in the 'Indian Nation' dated 29-1-64 is reproduced below :—

*“A delegation of Students Peace Committee (Muzaffarpur)
headed by Mr. Nand Kishore Sharma met Bihar*

Governor and Pandit B.N. Jha, former Chief Minister, today (28-1-64) and expressed concern at the ugly incidents at Chapra and Gaya.

“They said that the students were by and large peace loving and some outside elements were out to pollute the atmosphere of educational institutions for selfish ends.

“The Governor and Pandit Jha are learnt to have assured that the Government would take firm steps to check the trouble with an iron hand. They also commended the efforts of the Committee in restoring peace in educational institutions.

“Other members of the delegation were Messrs Gorakh Nath Singh, Lallan Bihari Singh, Rampriya Singh and Srikanth Shukla”.

26. That the Vice-Chancellor had returned to Muzaffarpur before the return of the said delegation from Patna.
27. That when I met the Vice-Chancellor on my return from Patna, he talked very derisively about the activities of the Peace Committee.
28. That so far the Vice-Chancellor had been appealing to my caste instincts to win me over to his side. Finding that he had failed to hit the bull's eye, he now began to extend to me the promise of material temptations. He obtained books for me from the Bihar University Library. The books that he placed at my disposal are detailed below :—
 - (a) English Grammar by MacMordie.
 - (b) Sanskrit Sahitya Ka Itihas by Vachaspati Gairola.
 - (c) Sanskrit Sahitya Ka Itihas by A.B. Keith.
 - (d) Abhilekhamala by Ramakanta Jha and Harihar Jha.
 - (e) 108 Upnishad (Bramhavidya-khand) by Sriram Sharma.
 - (f) Anuvad Chandrika by Chakradhar Nautiyal “Hans” Shastri.
29. That the Vice-Chancellor now wanted to break me through monetary temptations.
30. That I have about two and a half katha of land near Home for the Homeless with a pucca-kutchha structure over it known as “Srinivas Sadnam.”

31. That the said 2½ kathas of land along with all its appurtenances is being acquired by the Government of Bihar for L.S. College, Muzaffarpur.
32. That the Vice-Chancellor dictated to me an application purporting to state that the University of Bihar advance to me a sum of Rs. 5,000/- (five thousand) only and reimburse itself from the award money of the land acquisition proceedings. Though the Vice-Chancellor sanctioned the advance of the said amount to me I have not withdrawn it from the University of Bihar.
33. That being disgusted with the ways of the Vice-Chancellor, and his attempts to draw into the mud and slush of the Bihar University politics, I weaned myself away from him as he was tarnishing my concept of a University where students go to "*breathe the pure and clear atmosphere of thought.*"
34. That I submitted to him a charter of demands of the students as well as a list of irregularities committed by him.
35. That when I had declared my resolve to go on hunger-strike with effect from 28-3-1964 in support of the joint memorandum of demand, I came across Dr. Ram Behari Singh. He told me that the Vice-Chancellor was vewing him unnecessarily and that he was pleased at the move of the students. As a token of his blessings, he was the first individual to give a subscription of Rs. 50/- (fifty) only.
36. That I went on hunger-strike from 28-3-1964.
37. That I broke the hunger-strike on 5-4-1964 following an assurance by the Citizens Committee that the latter would pursue the matter regarding the appointment of a judicial probe body to go into the affairs of the Bihar University and press Government for it.
38. That due to disturbed condition in the University campus the students demanded that the examination dates be extended which was supported by the Citizens Committee. The Vice Chancellor refused to concede this demand in the beginning. But due to mounting unrest, agitation, and other pressures, the Vice-Chancellor conceded this eventually.
39. That on receipt of information that my brother-in-law, Shri Ramapati Sharma, M.A. in philosophy who is Professor in Shri Raghvendra Sanskrit College, Taret Asthan, P.O. Naubatpur, district—Patna, was ill, I left for the said place on the morning of 24-5-1964,

the day on which the Bihar University annual convocation was held in the Langat Singh College campus in the evening.

40. That my name does not find place in the show-cause notices issued by the S.D.O., Sadar, Muzaffarpur on two teachers and fifteen students of the L.S. College, Muzaffarpur and C.M. College, Darbhanga as to why they should not be bound down under Section 107 Cr. P.C. for breach of public peace during the last convocation of the University of Bihar held on May, 1964.
41. That on 9-6-1964 I was arrested in "Alka" by Sri K.D. Karan under Defence of India Rules.
42. That when I was enlarged on bail in connection with the proceedings under Defence of India Rules, fresh proceedings under sections 107 and 117 were initiated against me.
43. That when I was enlarged on bail under the said sections 107 and 117, fresh proceedings under section 110 were initiated.
44. That all these proceedings are false, baseless, malicious and intended to vex and harass me.
45. That these statement of facts are required to be submitted before the K.S.V. Raman Enquiry Commission through the Citizens Fact Finding Committee (University of Bihar).

Hence this affidavit.

(Nand Kishore Sharma)
Signature of the Deponent.

I know the deponent, Nand Kishore Sharma, who has signed in my presence.

.....

The above named deponent, Nand Kishore Sharma, who has been identified by Shri.....has solemnly affirmed before me today, the.....day of August 1964 atA.M./P.M. in my Ijlas that the contents of this affidavit have been understood by him and are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

MAGISTRATE 1st CLASS
MUZAFFARPUR.

IN

The Court of the Magistrate 1st Class,
Muzaffarpur

A F F I D A V I T

I, Dina Nath Singh, son of Shri Shyam Narayan Singh, aged about 23 years, by profession a student, resident of Mohalla Amgola near Maiastha in the town of Muzaffarpur, P.S. Town Thana Muzaffarpur, Munsifi and district Muzaffarpur, do hereby most solemnly declare and affirm as follows :—

1. That sometime in December 1963, Dr. P.L. Srivastava, Vice-Chancellor, University of Bihar, Muzaffarpur called me through Shri Lallan Behari Singh. He referred to the strike by the inmates of the S.R.C. Lady Hostel. He said, "*Dekho Beta, yeh Principal Mahendra Pratap aur Dr. Ram Behari Singh ka hamko tange karne ka chal hai*". He concluded that the strike should not succeed. He dangled allurements to win me over to his side.
2. That at the time of hunger-strike by students in March 1964, he called me to help organise the students against the hunger-strikers.
3. That being disgusted with the constant promptings by the said Vice-Chancellor, I remonstrated that such under-hands moves did not befit his high office.
4. That angered at all this he sent me words through the said Shri Lallan Behari Singh that if I did not co-operate with the Vice-Chancellor I would have to suffer for the same.
5. That he carried out his threat and has falsely implicated me in cases in connection with the disturbances at the last convocation of the University.
6. That being bent upon having the last pound of flesh, my brother, Sri Chandrashekhar Sharma, a Clerk in the University, has been suspended without rhyme or reason.
7. That this statement of facts is required to be submitted to the K.S.V. Raman Enquiry Commission through the Citizens Fact Finding Committee (University of Bihar).

Hence this affidavit.

(Dina Nath Singh)
SIGNATURE OF THE DEPONENT

I know the deponent, Dina Nath Singh, who has signed in my presence.

.....

The above named deponent, Dina Nath Singh, who has been identified by Sri has solemnly affirmed before me today, the day of August, 1964 at A.M./P.M. in my Ijlas that the contents of this affidavit have been understood by him and are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

MAGISTRATE 1st CLASS
MUZAFFARPUR

IN

The Court of the Magistrate 1st Class,
Muzaffarpur.

A F F I D A V I T

I, Trijugi Nath Sharma, son of Shri Laladhar Sharma, aged about 23 years, by profession a student, resident of Shrinivas Sadnam near Home for the Homeless, P.S. Town Muzaffarpur Munsifi and district Muzaffarpur, do hereby solemnly affirm and declare as follows :—

1. That sometime in August 1963, on behalf of the students, I approached Dr. P. L. Srivastava, Vice-Chancellor, University of Bihar, Muzaffarpur in connection with the Union for post-graduate students. I met him off and on regarding the formation of Union. To entice me away from such a demand, he promised to me temptations in the form of grants, good result in examination, and decent employment thereafter.
2. That Youth Festival was organised sometime in November 1963. He instigated me to disturb the said Festival on the plea that Principal Mahendra Pratap, the Chief Convenor of the said Festival, was the main source of trouble to him in his designs.
3. That there was a strike by the inmates of the S.R.C. Lady Hostel sometime in December 1963. Since the strike was against the Vice-Chancellor himself, he called me. He asked me to so arrange that the said strike fizzled out. He again held out allurements.
4. That he urged upon me to instigate students to use violence against Principal Mahendra Pratap, Dr. Ram Behari Singh and other teachers.
5. That this statement is required to be submitted to the K.S.V. Raman Enquiry Commission through the Citizens Fact Finding Committee (University of Bihar).

Hence this affidavit.

(Trijugi Nath Sharma)
Signature of the Deponent.

I know the deponent, Trijugi Nath Sharma, who has signed in my presence.

.....
The above named deponent, Trijugi Nath Sharma, who has been identified by Sri.....has solemnly affirmed before me today, the..... day of August 1964 at.....A.M./P.M. in my Ijlas that the contents of this affidavit are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

Magistrate 1st Class,
MUZAFFARPUR

IN

The Court of the Magistrate 1st Class,
MUZAFFARPUR.

A F F I D A V I T

I, Chandresvar Prasad Singh, son of Shri Ram Lakhan Singh, aged about 21 years by profession a student, resident of Anand Bhavan, Naya Tola, P.S. town Muzaffarpur, Munsifi and district Muzaffarpur, do hereby, solemnly declare and affirm as follows :—

1. That Dr. P.L. Srivastava, Vice-Chancellor, University of Bihar, Muzaffarpur asked me to spyon the students and teachers of the University. He further said that the Rajput students should combine to root out Bhumihars who were the main obstacles in the path of their advancements. He promised to award grant to me for which no recommendation from any source was necessary.
2. That this statement is required to be submitted to the K. S. V. Raman Enquiry Commission through the Citizens Fact Finding Committee (University of Bihar).

HENCE THIS AFFIDAVIT.

(Chandresvar Prasad Singh)
Signature of the Deponent.

I know the deponent, Chandresvar Prasad Singh, who has signed in my presence.

.....

The above named deponent, Chandresvar Prasad Singh, who has been identified by Shri..... has solemnly affirmed before me today, the..... day of August 1964 at.....A.M./P.M. in my Ijlas that the contents of this affidavit have been understood by him and are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

Magistrate 1st Class,
Muzaffarpur.

IN

The Court of the Magistrate First Class,
MUZAFFARPUR.

A F F I D A V I T

I, Baidya Nath Pandey, son of Shri Suraj Pandey, aged about 24 years, by profession a student, at present a Research Scholar in History in L.S. College, Muzaffarpur, P.S. Town Thana Muzaffarpur, Munsifi and district—Muzaffarpur, do hereby solemnly declare and affirm as follows :—

1. That in December 1962, I was falsely implicated in a case under 9 B.M.P. Act on the allegation of participation in a procession.
2. That Saraswati Puja was celebrated in Ramjyoti Chatravas, Muzaffarpur on 30-1-1963.
3. That Dr. P.L. Srivastava, Vice-Chancellor, University of Bihar, Muzaffarpur came to the said Saraswati Puja function.
4. That while going away from the said puja celebration, the said Vice-Chancellor picked me up in his car and carried me to his residence.
5. That the said Vice-Chancellor alluded to the case mentioned in para one above. He said that if I associated with him faithfully, it would be beneficial to him.
6. That in subsequent meetings between us, the said Vice-Chancellor flung baits and said that he would award me grants, and would help me secure good result in examinations.
7. That the police case, referred to in para one above, against me was withdrawn.
8. That I was awarded Rs. 40/- (forty) only out of the Vice-Chancellor's discretionary grant during 1963-64.
9. That during 1963-64, I was given a loan of Rs. 200/- (two hundred) only to be refunded in eight instalments.
10. That regarding the repayment of the said loan of Rs. 200/- the Vice-Chancellor told me that it would be written off if I deposed against Shri Bhola Prasad Singh, and Dr. Ramjas Rai before the Raman Enquiry Commission.
11. That I have commenced repaying instalments of the said loan of Rs. 200/- only.

12. That the said Vice-Chancellor asked me to suggest names of students who could be profitably awarded money out of his discretionary grant.
13. That awards were granted to such students whose names are given below :—
- | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------|
| (a) Lalan Prasad Singh | — | Rajendra College,
Chapra. | Rs. 30/- |
| (b) Ajoy Kumar Singh | — | Rajendra College,
Chapra. | Rs. 30/- |
| (c) Panchdeo Singh | — | L.S. College,
Muzaffarpur. | Rs. 40/- |
| (d) Ram Nath Sharma | — | L.S. College,
Muzaffarpur. | Rs. 50/- |
| (e) Phulendra Pd.
Chaudhary | — | L.S. College,
Muzaffarpur. | |
- was granted two awards of Rs. 50/- and Rs. 40/- only.
13. That I visited the said Vice-Chancellor very frequently on and from the 30th of January 1963.
14. That after finishing my M.A. Examination in 1963, I left the said Ramjyoti Chatravas and used to put up mostly with the said Vice-Chancellor as and when I stayed in Muzaffarpur.
15. That the said Vice-Chancellor was persistently pressing me to arrange demonstrations and representations adverse to Shri Bhola Prasad Singh, Dr. Anandi Hazari, Principal Mahendra Pratap and Deputy Registrar Akhileshwar Pd. Sinha.
16. That the said Vice-Chancellor also asked me to arrange demonstrations against Dr. Ramjas Rai with the slogan that he was a politician and that there were several charges against him.
17. That the said Vice-Chancellor gave me pamphlets full of accusations against Dr. Ramjas Rai and advised me to have the same distributed widely, specially amongst the Syndics of the University of Bihar.
18. That in close proximity to the meetings of the Governing Body of Rajendra College, Chapra, the said Vice-Chancellor used to talk to Shri Sri Narain Singh of Motihari on telephone that it was the desire of Shri S.N. Sinha, Education Minister, that under no circumstance Shri Bhola Prasad Singh should be allowed to function peacefully as Principal, Rajendra College, Chapra.

19. That on the eve of the Senate meeting in March, 1964, the said Vice-Chancellor rang up Chapra : 61, P.P. Baidya Nath Pandey. Since the P.P. was not available, the Vice-Chancellor left a message with my uncle-in-law, Sri Janaki Raman Sahi, that I should return to Muzaffarpur immediately.
20. That I reached Muzaffarpur on 28-3-1964 and met the Vice-Chancellor. He asked me to disturb the hunger-strikers, specially Nand Kishore Sharma. He also asked me to give in writing that Nand Kishore Sharma was a goonda so that he could forward the same to the authorities concerned for proper action. He also asked me to add that the advertised demands were a smoke-screen, and the real issue was the appointment of Dr. Ramjas Rai and the matter of Sri Bhola Pd. Singh.
21. That he asked me to go to Jaya Prakash Mahila College, Rajendra College, and Jagdam College, all of Chapra, and to organise meetings of students so as to pass resolutions that they had confidence in Dr. P. L. Srivastava, Vice-Chancellor, University of Bihar and that they were not only against the hunger-strikers only but their demands as well.
22. That he used many other students as his tool in obtaining fabricated statements about students and others, and in arranging demonstrations and disturbances, and used them as witnesses in cases. Principal among such students are (1) Lalan Behari Singh, (2) Kedar Nath Tulsyan, (3) Markandey Sahay, B.N. Pandey, and (4) Sanwalia Behari Singh.
23. That soon after the last annual convocation of the University of Bihar in May 1964, the said Vice-Chancellor duped me to allege in writing that certain students namely, Trijugi Nath Sharma, Dina Nath Singh and Gorakh Nath Singh created disturbance in the convocation and pelted stones.
24. That this statement of facts is required to be submitted before the K.S.V. Raman Enquiry Commission through the Citizens Fact Finding Committee (University of Bihar).

Hence this affidavit.

Sd/- Baidya Nath Pandey
14-8-64

(Baidya Nath Pandey)
SIGNATURE OF DEPONENT.

I know the deponent, Baidya Nath Pandey, who has signed in my presence.

Sd/- Umakant Prasad

Advocate 14-8-64

The above named deponent, Baidya Nath Pandey, who has been identified by Shri Umakant Prasad, Advocate has solemnly affirmed before me today, the 14th day of August 1964 at 3 P.M. in my Ijlas that the contents of this affidavit have been understood by him and are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

Sd/- Illegible

14/8

MAGISTRATE 1st Class

MUZAFFARPUR.

7, Lajpat Rai Road, Allahabad
Dated the 5-11-1963.

From

Dr. P.L. Srivastava,
Vice-Chancellor,
BIHAR UNIVERSITY.

To

Sri Karpuri Thakur, M.L.A.,
Leader P.S.P. Legislature Party,
Vidhan Sabha Road/M.L.A.'s Flat,
Patna.

Dear Sir,

Please permit me to bring to your kind notice the speech delivered by a Member of your party Sri Rama Nand Singh, M.L.A. in the Legislative Assembly on October, 11, 1963 against the Vice-Chancellor Bihar and his administration of the University of Bihar.

A University is to be run on certain well accepted principles of fairness and justice to all.

A Vice-Chancellor hailing from another State who has no local friends and no Press to support him can achieve no success worth the name if he ever departs from principles of absolute impartiality and justice between man and man.

As Vice-Chancellor it is my duty to treat all political parties on par, and I am sure your party can have no grievance on that score. Several eminent members of your party are holding responsible positions in the various Governing Bodies of the affiliated Colleges of the University of Bihar.

I am sorry I have offended Sri Rama Nand Singh in the first place nominated Sri Devendra Jha, M.L., to the Governing Body of R.K. Goenka College, Sitamarhi in preference to Sri Rama Nand Singh. In the second place my interpretation of certain statutes of the University went against his wishes. Sri Rama Nand Singh has challenged my interpretation in a Court of law, and it is for the Court to decide whether my interpretation is correct or not. In the mean time the various courts have rejected the position of Sri Rama Nand Singh for staying the operation of my order regarding the functioning of the Governing Body of the R.K. Goenka College, Sitamarhi.

Being angry with me Sri Rama Nand Singh utilised the forum of the Assembly to say all sorts of things against me and my administration for which there was not the slightest justification.

I am approaching you with the request that your party may be pleased to study the speech of Sri Rama Nand Singh and appoint an impartial member preferably not belonging to the State of Bihar who should enquire into the truth of the various allegations made by Sri Rama Nand Singh against the University.

Your nominee will receive the fullest co-operation from the University of Bihar for determining which of the allegations of Sri Rama Nand Singh is correct and which is false.

The issue that I have raised is a moral one. Whether the opposition political parties are to treat a University in the manner in which they treat the Government party, or whether these opposition parties are to treat the University as an autonomous body anxious to run the administration on principles of justice and fair-play, and therefore, entitled to their fullest co-operation and support.

You will kindly appreciate that while fair and honest criticism of the administration of the University will always be most welcome and helpful, the levelling of wild and baseless charges against a Vice-Chancellor and his administration is the surest way to indicate teachers and students to violence and indiscipline.

I hope you will very kindly place my letter before your party and take such steps as may in future avoid unpleasant controversies of this nature between a University and a member of the party.

Yours faithfully,
 Sd/-
 (P.L. Srivastava)
 VICE-CHANCELLOR,
 BIHAR UNIVERSITY,
 MUZAFFARPUR.

The 6th April, 1964.

My dear Shri Ramanandji,

I am exceedingly grateful to you for your very kind letter received just now. It is so kind of you to stand by my side in facing opposition from certain section of the people.

I am sorry to say that the whole trouble is due to the two main reasons—(1) that I have refused to cancel the resolution of the Governing Body of Rajendra College, Chapra according to which Principal Bholu Prasad Singh was given 4 months' special leave on full allowance, and (2) I did not persuade the Syndicate to appoint Dr. Ram Yash Roy as Professor of Botany in this University. The hunger-strike was intended to coerce me into submission in regard to these two matters and I am happy that I have withstood this pressure.

With kind regards, and thanking you for your kindness.

Yours Sincerely,

Sd/- (P.L. Srivastava)

Sri Ramanand Singh, M.L.A.,
7/8, R. Block, Patna.

D.O. No. 2840/VC.

The 20th April, 1964.

PERSONAL

My dear Shri Sinha Saheb,

Yesterday's election of Pandit Rajendra Mishra as President, B.P.C.C. is an event of considerable importance for the future progress and prosperity of this State. May I offer my respectful felicitations on this unique occasion? As the Office is closed from the 23rd, I am going to Allahabad for a few days and will be back here on April 27.

With kind regards,

Yours Sincerely,

Sd/-

(P.L. Srivastava)

Sri Satyendra Narayan Sinha,
Education Minister,
Government of Bihar/Patna.

Dr. P.L. Srivastava,
D.O. 2608/VC

24th October, 63

PERSONAL & CONFIDENTIAL

My dear Sri Sinha Saheb,

I am sorry that I have not been able to contact you on the telephone for the last 2 days. Today, I am going to Allahabad and would meet you in Delhi on November 10. The meeting of the Syndicate held on the 22nd November, 1963 passed off nicely and the Syndicate did what it thought best in the circumstances. When I meet you, I shall let you know everything in detail.

With kind regards,

Yours Sincerely,

Sd/-

(P.L. Srivastava)

Sri S.N. Sinha,
Education Minister,
Government of Bihar/Patna.

The 20th April, 1964.

PERSONAL

D.O. No. 2841/VC

My dear Panditji,

I offer you my most respectful felicitations on your well-deserved election to the Presidentship of the B.P.C.C. God has chosen you to guide the destiny of this State for the next three years. I was extremely anxious to know the result of your election last evening and when it came, it brought along with it the message of hope for the future progress of the State.

With kind regards and renewed felicitations,

I am,
Yours Sincerely,Sd/- P.L. Srivastava
(P.L. Srivastava)Pandit Rajendra Mishra,
President, B.P.C.C.,
Sadaquat Ashram/Patna.

F.I.R.

Copy of letter No. 25 F.O. dated the 28th August, 1963 from the Finance Officer, Bihar University, Muzaffarpur to the address of the Officer-in-Charge, Town Police Station, MUZAFFARPUR

I am to inform you that the question papers of the M.A. and M.Sc. examinations of the Bihar University for 1963 were entrusted to Sri K.D. Tewary of 32/7, Raja Darwaja, Varanasi, for printing. The manuscripts of these question papers were despatched to him in 6 instalments by insured registered postal parcels during the period 25th January, 1963 to the 27th May, 1963. The printed copies of these question papers were received by this University in sealed packets by insured Railway Parcels from Sri K.D. Tewary during the period from the 5th to the 18th June, 1963 and were kept in the custody of the Assistant Registrar (Examination) of this University, namely, Sri Akleshwar Prasad Sinha.

2. Those question-papers were sent to the Centre Superintendent Sri Vijoy Kumar, an Assistant Professor of Hindi of the L.S. College on 23-6-63. They were despatched to him with the seals intact—as they had been received from Sri K.D. Tewary. The M.A. & M.Sc examinations commenced from the 24th June, 1963 and continued till 27th June 1963 when it was brought to the notice of the University that copies of most of the question papers, whose examinations were yet to commence on the following days, were being sold in the market to the M.A. & M. Sc. examinees. It appeared that some one who had the custody of these question papers had deliberately, and for gain, leaked them out. Such a leakage also appears to have been conspired by some interested persons with a view to defame the University and the Vice-Chancellor. It was also learnt that copies of the question papers were printed and duplicated by other means, and sold openly in the Muzaffarpur market. The examinations, therefore, were called off on the 27th June, 1963 and they were postponed to 21st October 1963.

3. It would appear that the persons, who conspired to bring about the leakage of the question papers, as well as those, who actually leaked them out, along with the persons who took part in duplicating these question papers and selling them in the open market at Muzaffarpur, have committed an offence. I bring these facts to your notice with a request to investigate into this crime and to bring the criminals to book.

UNIVERSITY NOTE

Sri Ramanand Singh M.L.A. has sought a discussion on casteism, corruption, nepotism etc. prevailing in the University of Bihar. A debate will be held on October 17. You will have to be present in the gallery to help the Government to meet the various charges which may be levelled by the speakers in the Assembly. The likely subjects figuring in the debate are :

1. Leakage of question papers ;
2. Casteism ;
3. Favouritism ;
4. Corruption ;
5. Hunger strike of M.I.T. students ; and
6. 2-3 demonstrations of students ; and
7. Old accounts not yet reconciled.

The University case has to be prepared on each one of these points. We take up the reply in the following orders :—

(1) Leakage of
Question-
Papers :

The present Vice-Chancellor took over office on July 4, 1962. He was asked in the first week of August, 1962 to settle certain claims of Press "B" to which the University had taken serious objection on the ground of thoroughly unsatisfactory work of this Press. Till 1954, the confidential printing of the University was done by only one Press called "A". In 1954, the then Vice-Chancellor had to add another Press called "B" for printing confidential work as Press "A" was unable to take up our entire work and also because the University was not able to supply the question papers to this Press before June 30 for the following years Annual Examination and before September 30 for succeeding years supplementary examination. The work of the second Press was found unsatisfactory and it created certain embarrassing situation for the University. So when the application came from Mr. K.D. Tewary of Banaras for undertaking the Confidential printing of this University as he was doing this work for the other institutions and the Universities, the University considered his application in the normal course and his rates, having been found comparatively better with those Presses "A" and "B", were approved. Sri K.D. Tewary, M.A., LL.B. served B.H.U. as Assistant Registrar, Allahabad University as Deputy Registrar and Lucknow University as Registrar for a number of years. After his retirement, he set himself up in the printing line and the University, fully trusting in his honesty, integrity and ability, approved him to do our Confidential printing and added him as the third Press called "C". The University deals with agents of Presses

“A”, “B” and “C” and not with the Presses nor the University knows the names of these Presses. All our correspondences take place with Sri K. D. Tewary (without any reference to the Press) and it was assumed that he was doing confidential printing for other Universities also. The Press he represents is a thoroughly secure and reliable one. The matter has been handed over to the C.I.D. Police and it is expected that they will be able to trace out the source of leakage and the criminals responsible for it. It would not be proper at this stage to throw blame on any person. We leave this topic by quoting the last paragraph of the F.I.R. filed with the Police by the Finance Officer of this University :

“3. It would appear that the persons, who conspired to bring about the leakage of the question papers, as well as those, who actually leaked them out, along with the persons who took part in duplicating these question papers and selling them in the open market at Muzaffarpur have committed an offence. I bring these facts to your notice with a request to investigate into this crime and to bring the criminals to book.”

N.B.—The above is the extract of the note sent to the Registrar by the Vice-Chancellor for preparing a reply to be sent to the Minister of Education.

D.O. No. 177 G.B.

My dear Mr. Vice-Chancellor,

Please refer to your letter dated the 3rd April 1964 enclosing therewith a copy of the report of the Committee of enquiry into the charges of irregularity at the M.D. (Path) Examination of October 1963 together with the extracts from the minutes of the Examination Board both of the 12th March 1964 and the 28th March 1964. I have read through the report carefully. In the report the members of the Committee observe in the concluding portion that "*It is not possible for the Committee to detect any irregularity in the conduct of the examination*". After examination of this report, the Examination Board recorded the following minutes of the 28th of March 1964.

"That the report of the Committee appointed by the Examination Board was read, and the Board feels that due to the destruction of certain relevant papers the Committee was unable to fix the responsibility for irregularity. The Members of the Committee however felt that a fresh examination in the circumstances of the case was called."

The Board interpreted the report that the Committee of enquiry was unable to fix the responsibility for irregularity due to destruction of the certain relevant papers. These are wrong readings of the report. The Investigating Committee was not able to detect any irregularity in the conduct of the examination. The question of responsibility did not therefore arise nor was it referred to them nor have they said that on account of the absence of the tabulation sheet they could not detect any irregularity. They only say that as some mark did not appear in the answer papers of Dr. A.P. Verma and the tabulation sheet was not available, it may be desirable to hold the examination afresh. In the absence of specific findings that the examinations were irregular the examination ought not to be held invalid merely on the complaint of one failed candidate Dr. Verma, supported by two others during the course of evidence. The candidate Dr. Verma wanted to have a change of his examiners and therefore an external examiner Dr. Modi, the Professor of Pathology in the Patna Medical College, was appointed. Even then Dr. Verma did not secure the pass marks. Then he seems to have complained of irregularity in the conduct of the oral and practical examinations, as is clear from the resolution of the Examination Board passed at their meeting held on the 17th December, 1963. The resolutions read as under :—

"28. Considered the representation of the students of M.D. Pathology alleging irregularities in conducting the

Practical and Clinical examination at the Darbhanga Medical College Centre.

Resolved—that the M. D. Pathology Practical and Oral examination be cancelled and a fresh examination be held.

Resolved further that the following persons are appointed to conduct the Practical and Oral examination.

- (1) Dr. Gaya Prasad, Retired Principal of P.W. Medical College, Patna.
- (2) Dr. Indu Mohan Gupta, Professor of Pathology, Medical College, B.H.U., Varanasi.
- (3) Internal—Dr. R. P. Agrawal, Professor of Pathology, Darbhanga Medical College, Laheriasarai.

Also resolved—That Sri D. P. Sinha, Principal, Muzaffarpur Institute of Technology and Dr. C. Thakur, Principal, Tirhut College of Agriculture (Dholi) are appointed to enquire into the alleged irregularity in M.D. Pathology Practical and Oral examinations of 1963 and to submit their report at an early date.

From these three resolutions it is clear that the Examination Board acted merely on the allegation of the irregularity, made by a failed candidate but never made any enquiry themselves nor found that the allegations were true. All the same, they cancelled the examination and ordered a fresh examination and appointed fresh examiners. This view is strengthened by the fact that the Board appointed, a Committee to enquire into the irregularities and the Practical and Oral examination. They thus put the cart before the horse. They must have first got an enquiry made into the truth of the alleged irregularities, waited for the report and taken action thereafter. The Committee has noticed already, as the report says that it is not possible to detect any irregularity in the conduct of the examination. The resolution passed in the meeting of the Examination Board that the Committee was unable to fix the responsibility for irregularity is evidently to explain away the inconsistency in the action taken by the Examination Board in cancelling the examination first and then appointing the Committee stating that the Committee was intended to fix the responsibility for irregularity and not to find if any irregularity was committed at all. The language is clear. The Enquiry Committee was appointed to find out if there was any irregularity in the conduct of the examinations and they understood the reference accordingly and have said that it was not possible to detect any irregularity in the conduct of the examination and not as to who was responsible for any irregularity. The interpretations

sought to be put by the Examination Board on the report is far fetched and also on their resolution appointing a Committee to enquire into the alleged irregularity as one intended to fix the responsibility is an after thought. They themselves did not examine the truth of the allegations regarding irregularities but acted arbitrarily and illegally in cancelling the examinations first and then possibly to satisfy the public and the University authorities, they appointed a Committee to look into the irregularities specifically. But the Committee could not yet detect any irregularity. I feel that the cancellation was arbitrary and illegal and the candidates have been put to unnecessary hardship on account of one candidate who wanted to avoid being examined by his Professor at Darbhanga, got a different Professor appointed from Patna and when he failed even then to secure pass marks made the allegations of irregularity which even the Committee was not able to detect inspite of an elaborate enquiry. The Committee did not say that they were not able to do so for want of tabulation sheet. So long as the answer papers themselves are available with the mark thereon, tabulation could not be made. It will be noticed that even with respect to alleged irregularity, there has been a change of case from time to time. In the original resolution on the Examination Board of the 17th December it is clearly stated that the complaint of irregularity related to the conduct of the Practical and clinical examinations and accordingly fresh examiners were appointed to conduct only the Practical and Oral examinations. When some other candidate made representations that the examination should not be cancelled the Examination Board was evidently put out and resolved further on 23rd January 1964, that the written answer book of all the candidates should also be reassessed by the fresh set of Examiners appointed by the Examination Board on 17-12-63. In the original order of reference to the Committee re-examination of answer paper was neither contemplated nor called for as there was no complaint regarding them. This kind of probe as an after thought with charges added at the instance of one student who failed does not appear to be just and proper. It is strange that the Board should have added to the charges after they received representation from some candidates complaining of cancellation of examination.

Above all, passing of M.D. Examination is not a step for entry into any higher course in a college. Therefore, the decision to cancel the examination might have been taken after due enquiry by the Committee and after receipts of report thereof. Confidence of students ought not to be shaken in any manner. Before the Committee made its report, fresh examinations have been held. It is clear that the Board acted on a mere complaint by a failed candidate and did not wait to see even the recommendation of the Committee appointed

then. The Board in any case cannot justify their precipitate and hasty action on a recommendation of the Committee made after the examinations were held. Besides the Committee's suggestion to hold fresh examinations is not based on any decision of theirs that the examination was irregular. But it is only a piece of advice and not a recommendation.

I would, therefore, request you to ask the Examination Board to show cause why I should not set aside their resolutions dated 17-12-63 and 23-1-64 cancelling the examination and directing a fresh examination to be held for reason that the order was not made after enquiry and finding of irregularities but on some interested and one sided allegations and consequently illegal. Please do not publish the result of the examination pending my final decision on this matter,

Yours Sincerely,

Sd/- M.A. Ayyanger.

To
Sri P.L. Srivastava,
Vice-Chancellor,
Bihar University,
MUZAFFARPUR.

K.D. Tewari, M.A.LL.B.,
REGISTRAR,
LUCKNOW UNIVERSITY (RETIRED)

57/7 Raja Darwaza,
Varanasi.
25-9-62

My dear Dr. Srivastava,

I am writing to thank you most cordially for the opportunity you have given me to co-operate with you. I have just received a letter from Mr. Roy Chowdhury intimating your approval for some work in connection with the supplementaries.

I shall, however, be grateful if some regular work also can be turned out to us. I can assure you of their expeditious and prompt compliance.

I wonder whether I can have the pleasure to meeting you during the next two or three weeks. I shall be at Patna from October 2 to 16 and I shall stay with my Son-in-Law, Sri A.P. Mishra, I.P.S., Senior Superintendent of Police, Patna. I shall make it a point to meet you at Muzaffarpur between October 4 and 8. Kindly let me know your programme so that I may meet you without causing any inconvenience.

I trust this finds you in excellent health.

With regards,

I am,

Sincerely yours,
Sd/- K.D. Tewari.

57/7, Raja Darwaza,
Varanasi,
10-8-1962

K.D. Tewari, M.A., LL.B.,
Retired Registrar,
University of Lucknow.

Dear Sri Srivastava,

I apologize for writing to you on a personal matter. I may take an early opportunity to meeting you and discussing things further.

As you perhaps know, I returned from my office in September, 1961 and I have settled down in Varanasi. I have entrusted myself in publication work and I am actually staying in the Press building and supervising the work of a responsible and confidential nature. All the incidental processes are executed under my direct care. I have also in hand a plan for publication of books of University standard. I am glad to inform that advantage has already been taken of my services in this connection and I have so far executed considerable amount of work of confidential nature from the brief period since retirement.

I have experience of the printing of documents of confidential nature and I hold myself responsible for all processes and security measures necessary for the purpose. As this place is on direct air and rail routes, there are obvious facilities for speedy delivery.

I am taking the opportunity of enclosing herewith for your consideration, a schedule of rates for 1962-63. I shall be grateful if you can give me chance to meet your needs for work of a responsible nature.

Assuring you of my co-operation and with warmest regards,

NIEPA DC



D02399

I am,
Sincerely yours,
Sd/- K.D. Tewari.

Lt. Col. Dr. P.L. Srivastava,
Vice-Chancellor,
Bihar University, Muzaffarpur.

Sub. National Systems Unit,
National Institute of Educational
Planning and Administration
17-B, SriAurobindo Marg, New Delhi-110016
DOC. No... 2.399
Date..... 27.4.65