

**FIRST REPORT**  
**COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS**  
**(EIGHTEENTH LOK SABHA)**

**MINISTRY OF INFORMATION & BROADCASTING**

**(Presented to Lok Sabha on 02.04.2025)**



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT**  
**NEW DELHI**

***March, 2025/Chaitra, 1947 (Saka)***

**CPB No. 1 Vol I**

**© 2025 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT**

**Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Seventeenth Edition).**

## **CONTENTS**

	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS .....</b>	<b>(ii)</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>(iii)</b>

### **REPORT**

Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations made by the Committee on Petitions (Seventeenth Lok Sabha) in their Sixty-Second Report on the representation of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee requesting for fair inquiry into the matter of his suspension from the services of Film and Television Institute of India (FTII) and expediting its resolution.	1
---	---

### **ANNEXURE**

Minutes of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> sitting of the Committee on Petitions held on 28.03.2025.	18
--	----

## **COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS**

Shri Chandra Prakash Joshi - Chairperson

### **MEMBERS**

2. Shri Anto Antony
3. Shri Mitesh Patel Bakabhai
4. Shri Sukhdeo Bhagat
5. Shri Raju Bista
6. Shri Gurmeet Singh Meet Hayer
7. Shri Bastipati Nagaraju
8. Dr. Rajkumar Sangwan
9. Smt. Kamaljeet Sehwari
10. Shri Devesh Shakya
11. Smt. Manju Sharma
12. Shri Vishnu Datt Sharma
13. Shri Abhay Kumar Sinha
14. Shri Rajmohan Unnithan
15. Vacant

### **SECRETARIAT**

- |                             |   |                  |
|-----------------------------|---|------------------|
| 1. Shri Rajesh Ranjan Kumar | - | Joint Secretary  |
| 2. Shri Sujay Kumar         | - | Deputy Secretary |
| 3. Shri Jayanta Kumar Ruje  | - | Under Secretary  |

# **FIRST REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS (EIGHTEENTH LOK SABHA)**

## **INTRODUCTION**

I, the Chairperson, Committee on Petitions, having been authorised by the Committee to present on their behalf, this First Report (Eighteenth Lok Sabha) of the Committee to the House on the Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations made by the Committee on Petitions (Seventeenth Lok Sabha) in their Sixty-Second Report on the representation of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee requesting for fair inquiry into the matter of his suspension from the services of Film and Television Institute of India (FTII) and expediting its resolution.

2. The Committee considered and adopted the draft First Report at their sitting held on 28 March, 2025.

3. The observations/recommendations of the Committee on the above matters have been included in the Report.

**NEW DELHI;**

**CHANDRA PRAKASH JOSHI**  
*Chairperson,*  
*Committee on Petitions*

**28 March, 2025**

**07 Chaitra, 1947 (Saka)**

## REPORT

### **ACTION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS (SEVENTEENTH LOK SABHA) IN THEIR SIXTY-SECOND REPORT ON THE REPRESENTATION OF PROF. SANDEEP CHATTERJEE REQUESTING FOR FAIR INQUIRY INTO THE MATTER OF HIS SUSPENSION FROM THE SERVICES OF FILM AND TELEVISION INSTITUTE OF INDIA (FTII) AND EXPEDITING ITS RESOLUTION.**

The Committee on Petitions (Seventeenth Lok Sabha) presented their Sixty-Second Report to Lok Sabha on 05 February, 2024 which had dealt with a representation of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee addressed to Hon'ble Chairperson, Committee on Petitions requesting for fair inquiry into the matter of his suspension from the services of Film and Television Institute of India (FTII) and expediting its resolution.

2. The Committee made certain observations/recommendations in the matter and the Ministry of Information & Broadcasting were asked to implement the recommendations and requested to furnish their action taken replies thereon for further consideration of the Committee.

3. Action Taken Replies have been received from the Ministry of Information & Broadcasting in respect of all the observations/ recommendations contained in the aforesaid Report. The recommendations made by the Committee and the replies furnished thereto by the Ministry of Information & Broadcasting are detailed in the succeeding paragraphs.

4. In para 11 of the 62<sup>nd</sup> Report (Seventeenth Lok Sabha), the Committee had observed/recommended as follows:-

#### **Observation/ Recommendation Para No. 11 of the Original Report :**

*The Committee after undertaking a detailed examination of the issues/points raised by the representationist, Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee in the light of the comments received from the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting and the Film and Television Institute of India (FTII) note that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee had served the Film and Television Institute of India (FTII), Pune and Satyajit Ray Film and Television Institute (SRFTI), Kolkata for 25 years where he worked dedicatedly and contributed substantially to the reputation and growth of these Institutes. Further, several students who were mentored by him brought honour and accolades to the country through their artistic endeavours. The Committee further note that he was suspended and issued a charge sheet on various counts during October, 2020 and despite the completion of the inquiry process and passage of considerable period of time, no amicable resolution was put forth which*

consequently led to his suspension. With no relief in sight and having waited patiently for the FTII to address the case, he had to resign from his position in FTII due to such prevailing circumstances. It further appears that despite his multiple requests, he has been denied the opportunity to meet the Chairman or the Director of FTII to discuss a swift and amicable resolution of his case and the matter of suspension, which per se is against the relevant 'Service Rules' and 'Orders'. In nutshell, he has been left in a state of distress and uncertainty despite the conclusion of the investigation in June, 2022 since, all his request for obtaining the said inquiry report have also been strangely ignored. More specifically, the Committee also note that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee was issued charge sheet on 28 October, 2020 on 8 counts, of which 3 counts of charges had been proved and 1 was partially proved, while 4 counts of charges could not be proved. Further, the crux of all the charges against him was that he took classes in Kaladham Noida (i.e., outside of FTII) without the permission of the concerned Authority in FTII, which was allegedly a violation of employer-employee relationship.

5. The Ministry of Information & Broadcasting, in their action taken replies, have submitted as under:-

*"As per Para 11 of Report, the count of proved charges is 3, partially proved charge is 1 and four charges could not be proved. However, as per Inquiry Report the count of proved charges is 5, partially proved charge is 1 and on 2 counts the charges could not be proved."*

6. In paras 12 to 22 of the 62<sup>nd</sup> Report (Seventeenth Lok Sabha), the Committee had observed/recommended as follows:-

*Charges regarding designing, conducting, curating and teaching an intensive short course on Cinema outside FTII without prior permission of Employer in violation of Service Rules as an act of misconduct under Rule 3(1)(iii) of the CCS (Conduct) Rules, 1964.*

**Observation/ Recommendation Para No. 12 of the Original Report :**

*The Committee note that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee is charged with designing, conducting, curating and teaching an intensive short course on Cinema outside FTII without prior permission of the employer in violation of service rules as an act of misconduct under Rule 3(1)(iii) of the CCS (Conduct) Rules, 1964, which inter-alia states that Every Government servant shall at the times, do nothing which is unbecoming of a government servant. Further the relevant CCS (Conduct) Rules, 1964, Rule 15(1)(a) states that (1) Subject to the provisions of sub-Rule (2), no Government servant shall, except with the previous sanction of the Government (a) engage directly or indirectly in any trade or business. The Committee note that the relevant provisions*

of Sub-rule 2 stating, A Government servant may, without the previous sanction of the Government. (a) Undertake honorary work of a social or charitable nature, or (b) Undertake occasional work of a literary, artistic or scientific character. Further, the relevant text of the Government of India, Ministry of Finance O.M. No. F10(94)-E.II (B)/58 dated 13.09.1958 as incorporated in Government of India's Decisions (2) below Rule 15 of CCS (Conduct) Rules, 1964 states that the powers delegated under S.R. 11 should only be exercised in cases where a Government servant undertakes to perform some work of a casual or occasional nature but where the work done is of the nature of a regular remunerative occupation, Conduct Rule 12 (now Rule 15) will be attracted and the sanction of Government will be necessary. The Committee observe that, as is evident from sub-Rule 2, exceptions are provided for honorary work of a social or charitable nature, or occasional work of a literary, artistic or scientific character, and therefore, the Committee are of the view that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee's participation in Ctrl-Alt-Cinema fits this definition precisely and it is similarly established that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee did not benefit financially from this work. Also, the Committee note from the information provided by the representationist that the prosecution provided no evidence to support the said insinuation of accrual of financial benefit in this regard.

#### **Observation/ Recommendation Para No. 13 of the Original Report :**

From the foregoing, it appears that the prosecution has merely attempted to use publicly available material to suggest Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee's involvement with Ctrl-Alt-Cinema was commercial in nature. The Committee, in this connection, observe that an insinuation is different from a charge and the latter carries the 'burden of proof'. This inquiry, through the testimonies and documents that have come on record makes it well evident that no proof was provided and no one has shown that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee was engaged in a trade or business. In sum, the words 'engaged' and 'trade or business' are specific and therefore the allegation does not amount to 'engaging' nor 'engaging in a trade or business'. The Committee note that the workshop was of an artistic nature and the charge sheet does not allege that the work was devoid of artistic and literary merit. Further, the testimony of the prosecution witnesses does not cast any doubt on the artistic nature of the workshop. In fact, the renowned filmmaker and teacher, Shri Kumar Shahani testified that other teachers of the course included, "some of the best artists, like Ranbir Singh Keleka, there were some of the best writers like Arvind Mehrotra related to pioneering efforts in our Country". Further, "we had the best to offer these students". The Committee also observe that like the other renowned Artists and Performers who participated in the course, Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee also offered his expertise as a Teacher and the Students who attended the course benefited greatly from the guidance they received from him including other artists. The Committee after due perusal of such instances, opine that the above statements demonstrate that the workshop was of an artistic and literary nature, along with the course which was



*also of a charitable nature in that at least four students received a full fee waiver. Therefore, the provisions of sub-Rule 2(a) and (b) of Rule 15 are applicable and Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee does not stand in violation of Rule 15(1)(a).*

**Observation/ Recommendation Para No. 14 of the Original Report :**

*The Committee note that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee has been employed in FTII and SRFTII for a period of 25 years. During this period, the prosecution has proffered that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee curated a workshop outside FTII (Ctrl-Alt-Cinema) on at least one and at most two occasions, on which the then serving Director of FTII, Shri Bhupendra Kainthola clearly stated that “we have information of at least two occasions when such courses were conducted”. Therefore, in 25 years of service, participating in an artistic and charitable workshop on at most two occasions, cannot be characterized as a regular employment and therefore, these statements are at best, mere ‘conjecture’ due to repeated use of the words indicating uncertainty, viz., assume, probably and apparently, which suggest that FTII has not come across any evidence indicating that such a work was performed more than twice. The Committee, therefore, are of the opinion that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee’s participation in the workshop amounted to a rare or occasional engagement and not a regular employment as stated in the Government of India, Ministry of Finance O.M. No. F10(94)-E.II(B)/58 dated 13.09.1958 as incorporated in the Government of India’s decisions (2) below Rule 15 of CCS (Conduct) Rules, 1964 and as a consequence, Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee does not stand in violation of Rule 15(1)(a). The Committee further note that regarding the issue of remuneration received, Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee has maintained that he did not receive any remuneration for his participation in the workshop and his participation was voluntary and free of charge. The evidence presented consists of only a poster stating that the workshop fee was Rs. 35,000 and the same does not imply anything as to whether Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee was compensated. In the absence of any evidence, the prosecution had asked Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee to provide evidence of absence, that is, anevidence that he did not get remunerated for his participation. The Committee feel that having failed to discharge its burden by furnishing proof, the prosecution has strangely asked the impossible from the defence, i.e., to prove a ‘negative’. Therefore, no solid evidence supporting the allegation that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee received remuneration for his participation in any outside/extended workshop is established. Further, it appears that the Authorities insinuated wrong-doing (alleging that the Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee made money) while possessing no evidence. If this was indeed the case, allegations of ‘graft’ are scurrilous attacks on Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee’s reputation and must be treated as such. In sum, the Committee opine that the Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee was neither regularly employed nor remunerated and as a consequence, Conduct Rule 12 (now Rule 15) cannot be attracted. Therefore, it clearly shows that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee has not violated the ‘Employment Rules’ and his*

actions were well within what his immediate Supervisor considered appropriate and desirable.

Charges regarding sending a copy of representation directly to the Joint Secretary, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting at the higher level, without routing through proper channel and also without first seeking redressal from the immediate superior(s)

**Observation/ Recommendation Para No. 15 of the Original Report :**

The Committee note that as per the publicly-available organization chart on the FTII website, Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee's immediate official superior would have been the Dean (Films) and before sending a representation, Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee first approached his immediate official superior, namely, Shri Amit Tyagi, the then Dean (Films). Shri Tyagi, in his testimony, clearly states, "If Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee had any objection to an appointment he could only comment on it by informing his superior Authority. He did come to me as Dean asking what he should do". Therefore, the claim that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee did not approach his immediate superior officer stands falsified. Further, continuing from the previous quote by Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee's immediate superior at the time, Shri Tyagi, stating that "I (Shri Tyagi referring to himself) only advised him to write to the Director and the Chairman of Governing Council stating his opinion". The Committee, therefore, observe that not only did Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee approach his immediate superior, he also followed Shri Tyagi's advice and sent his representation to the Director and the Chairman of the Governing Council, FTII and the Joint Secretary, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting (in his capacity as a member of the Governing Council). Notwithstanding this, as per the information provided by the representationist, the matter of the representation that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee sent to the Director and the Governing Council was deemed to be an urgent one and therefore, any delay in sending the representation to the concerned Authorities came with a risk of hiring a potentially unsuitable candidate and further legal issues/complications that would cost Institutional resources. Therefore, the Committee are of the considered opinion that in sending his representation to the concerned Authorities, Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee did not subvert the established chain of command and the testimony of his immediate superior, the then Dean (Films), Shri Amit Tyagi, clearly tells us that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee informed him of his concerns and acted on his advice. Also, Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee did not stand to gain personally from the representation that he sent to the concerned Authorities. The Committee, in sum, opine that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee's observations were not a surreptitious attempt to tell on his seniors or stand against FTII, since, an advance copy of the representation was sent to the Chairman, FTII, and to the member of the Governing Council, namely, the Joint Secretary of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting and copied to the then Dean, the Director and Heads of all Departments. Therefore, the evidence from the documents

*on record and the testimonies show that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee has not committed any act subversive of discipline or unbecoming of an employee and therefore, he is not in violation of Rule 3(1)(iii) of the CCS (Conduct) Rules, 1964, or of any other Government orders mentioned in the charge sheet.*

*Charges regarding making unwarranted allegations against a superior Authority in derogatory language and questioning the decisions of superior Authorities in his representation addressed to Government Officials/Authorities at higher levels.*

**Observation/ Recommendation Para No. 16 of the Original Report :**

*The Committee note that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee did not question the decision of the superior Authorities in his representation and the resolution of the Governing Council, alleging that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee made direct representations to Higher Officials/Authorities without seeking redressal, first at the Institute level and violating the Service Rules is thoroughly misplaced. The Committee after perusal of information provided by the representationist observed that agenda item placed before the Governing Council did not concern Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee at all since he first sought redressal at the Institute level from his immediate superior, Dean (Films), Shri Amit Tyagi and consequently, acting upon the advice from Shri Tyagi, sent his representation to the concerned Authorities. The Committee are of the opinion that following the due procedure, Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee took his concerns regarding an issue to the then Dean (Films), Shri Amit Tyagi, who advised Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee to write to the Director, FTII and the concerned authorities "stating his opinion". The Committee note that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee followed his superior's advice, and wrote a candid note, all the while keeping the best interest of FTII in mind to the concerned Authorities, wherein he pointed out the lack of transparency regarding a particular matter stating his opinion (as advised by his superior), and his observations were based on facts without any profanity or defamatory statement, etc. The Committee opine that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee offered a honest opinion and did not violate the resolution of the Governing Council as alleged because he first sought redressal from his immediate supervising officer within the Institute. Further, he complied with his superior officer in sending his observations to the Director and other concerned Authorities. In conclusion, the evidence shows that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee has maintained absolute integrity by keeping the institute's interests before his along with following the service rules, Rules 3(1)(i) and (iii) of the CCS (Conduct) Rules, 1964.*

*Charges with respect to failure to submit leave applications of a contractual faculty member to the Authorities in time thereby causing over-payment of salary on her resignation*

**Observation/ Recommendation Para No. 17 of the Original Report :**

*The Committee note that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee is charged with failing to forward certain leave application due to which contractual employee was allegedly overpaid. The Committee are constrained to note such rudimentary charge pertaining to day-to-day administrative matter has been added in the charge sheet. Such instances across Organizations/Institutes in the country are of regular nature and could have been preferably avoided or amicably worked out.*

*Charges with respect to inordinate delay in submitting the marks of student resulting in delay in final results and keeping the Authority in the dark about a large number of students failing from his Department.*

**Observation/ Recommendation Para No. 18 of the Original Report :**

*The Committee note that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee is charged with delaying the submission of marks which appear to be somewhat misplaced, since the first submission of marks were made in a timely manner which had consequently led to the Authorities being aware of a large number of students failing in the Department. Furthermore, the Committee note from the information provided by the representationist that due to personal extenuating circumstances, i.e., death of his uncle, Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee had already discussed and worked out Departmental responsibilities (since he would be on planned leave) with Shri Tuhinaba and Shri Ganesh to ensure that there are no disruptions in the academic activities. The prosecution has conveniently ignored this extenuating circumstance of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee in the charge-sheet to cast the case in a sinister light. The Committee, therefore, opine that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee did not violate Rule 3(1)(ii) and (iii) of the CCS (Conduct) Rules, 1964 leading to any inordinate delay in the submission of marks of the students, which allegedly resulted in delay in final results. Also, the charge of keeping the Authority in dark with regard to a large number of students failing from his Department also does not stand in light of the aforementioned assertions.*

*Charges with respect to negligence in monitoring the activities by the Department of Direction and Screenplay Writing compelling the Academic Council with no option but to condone the delayed clearance of Attendance Taken and Kept for classes (ATKC) in the 6<sup>th</sup> semester with a risk of setting wrong precedent.*

**Observation/ Recommendation Para No. 19 of the Original Report :**

*The Committee note from the information provided by the representationist that the Department of Direction and Screen Play Writing (SPW) had issued several warnings to*

the students giving them adequate notice about their assignments. As Shri Ramesh Holbole a student who carried an ATKC from his 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> semester testified that “I personally received e-mail from the Direction and Screenplay writing Department to submit assignments regarding ATKC and personally many times from HoD and Tuhinaba Sir informed us to submit our assignments”. Further, Shri Ramesh Holbole was not the only one to receive these/such warnings as this information was sent to all others. The Committee feel that what the prosecution has attempted to do is to transfer the negligence of others (most probably the students who apparently had already received several warning before hand) on to Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee. Further, the second act of transference of responsibility on to Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee occurs with respect to the alleged negligence of the Academic Office, since it is their responsibility to keep records of all the students who hold ATKC as established by the testimony of Shri Prasad Thorat “that it is the Academic Office which posses the information regarding which students had ATKC in earlier semesters”. The Committee note that there is good merit as to why the Academic Council found the Academic Office of FTII negligent and named it first while expressing its displeasure at the events surrounding the issue at hand. However, when asked basic questions regarding direct communications with students, the representatives of the Academic Office could supply no definite answer. Therefore, the facts at hand establish that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee did not neglect his duties rather took an assertive action so that any previous unpleasant experience was not repeated. The Committee also learn from Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee that he also made significant structural changes to the course so as to ease the work load leading to all the students of 2016 batch graduating, as also the subsequent batches. Furthermore, Prof Sandeep Chatterjee took censure of the Academic Council seriously and took action that achieved positive results that are on record. The Committee are of the considered opinion that the case here appears to be of dual transference of responsibility as Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee is held responsible for the non-compliance of students along with the failure of the Academic Office to discharge its own, very specific, responsibility of communicating with students and providing oversight. The Committee are of the considered opinion that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee was monitoring the work of his Department diligently and was involved in the day-to-day activities of his Department even when on planned leave, therefore, the allegations of negligence is annulled by Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee’s repeated and persistent monitoring of the activities of the student who had fallen behind on their work, which is evident from the positive result of the students of 2016 and subsequent batches.

Charges with regard to insubordination and action in a manner unbecoming of an employee

**Observation/ Recommendation Para No. 20 of the Original Report :**

*The Committee note that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee is charged with an act of insubordination for purportedly describing the setting up of an inquiry into the dispute between two students as futile and using derogatory language. The Committee feel that this charge is bought merely to increase the volume of the charge sheet while adding nothing to its value. Furthermore, as per the information provided by the representationist, several witnesses testified that the said inquiry made no difference at all regarding the eventual outcome. The said dispute had already been resolved mutually through Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee and his colleagues through their good offices and intervention. Further, on the topic of derogatory language the individual against whom it was allegedly used effectively established through his own words that the supposed numerous interactions between Prof Sandeep Chatterjee and him over such a period of time could not have taken place since Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee was on leave and not on the campus during the said period. The Committee, therefore, note that the charge of insubordination made by the prosecution is unsound and without any locus-standi, which squarely falls flat at the very first step of any reasonable court of inquiry. The Committee observe that any document or testimony that the prosecution relies upon to establish its case must first be put on record. In sum, lack of any reliable document or testimony on record demolishes the respective charge which at first instance appears to be frivolous and lacking maturity along with being highly subjective.*

Charges alleging unauthorised intervention in Scrutiny Committee

**Observation/ Recommendation Para No. 21 of the Original Report :**

*The Committee note that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee is charged with interfering in the Scrutiny Committee. The Committee is of the considered opinion that such a charge is a entirely without merit along with being false and unfounded since Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee was only ensuring that the Scrutiny Committee was functioning in a manner consistent with the existing Guidelines. To this extent, Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee's immediate superior at the time had clearly mentioned that professor was discharging his duties and ensuring that certain mistakes which were made in the past with regard to an administrative process were not repeated, thereby negatively affecting the Institute. The Committee are of the considered opinion that such a charge could have been easily avoided or amicably resolved at local level and the same does not stand in violation of Rule 3(1)(iii) of the CCS(Conduct) Rules, 1964.*

## **Observation/ Recommendation Para No. 22 of the Original Report :**

*The Committee examined the instant representation at length in the light of the pleas of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee and brief information provided by the Ministry of Information & Broadcasting as well as the deposition made by their representatives as also by the representationist, Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee during the course of the discussion held on 8 August, 2023. The Committee through systematic perusal of the facts gathered therein, are constrained to note that it was unprofessional on the part of the FTII, to suspend the representationist, not only in such a manner exhibiting a lack of careful thought and consideration, but also on various rudimentary grounds/charges without any proper locus-standi. Also, keeping in view the excellent performance of the representationist in the capacity of a Professor, the Committee feel that an equitable and reasonable course of action would have been to 'warn' or 'censure' him before initiating such hostile disciplinary proceedings invoking suspension against Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee, if any unreasonable conduct by him had been observed by the Authorities. The Committee are further constrained to observe that the entire fiasco of initiating disciplinary proceedings and imposing a harsh punishment of suspension from service was motivated, lop-sided and pre-meditated, primarily, on the grounds that the representationist certain actions were considered to be against that conduct rules without any proper thought process. It also appears to the Committee that the FTII Authorities had first drawn a conclusion that the representationist would be suspended from service and thereafter the entire case of misconduct, framing of charge sheet, initiation of disciplinary proceedings, etc., were made out. The Committee are also of the considered opinion that the quantum of punishment imposed upon Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee, i.e., suspension from the services of FTII, smacks of prejudicial attitude of the FTII Authorities and infringes upon the principal of 'Proportionality of Punishment'. In the considered view of the Committee, imposition of Major Penalty, that too, in the form of suspension from service' is justified and unquestionable only on the grounds when an employee is found to be yielding to the instances connected with misappropriation of Government funds, financial irregularities, moral turpitude or some criminal conduct and/or intimidation. Considering the present employment scenario, wherein a person had to fight tooth and nail to get a Government job, the Committee feel that any case of suspension from service, which would deprive an employee of the financial benefits as well as his family responsibilities needs a very careful and sympathetic consideration. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting to re-visit the decision taken by the Disciplinary Authorities of the FTII and to reconsider the case of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee for an amicable resolution, nothing less. The various other contours of his minor misconduct connected with day-to-day functioning of the FTII and other such related and unprofound affairs, etc., should be sorted out, in a time bound manner, by way of one-to-one meeting between the representationist and the concerned Authorities in a time bound and conclusive manner*

*The Committee would like to be apprised of the final and favourable conclusive action taken by the Authorities concerned in this regard within three months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House.*

7. The Ministry of Information & Broadcasting, in their action taken replies to the above Observations/Recommendations of the Committee, have submitted as under:-

*"Ministry of Information & Broadcasting nominated the Additional Secretary, Ministry of Information & Broadcasting as the ad-hoc Disciplinary Authority and communicated vide Ministry's letter dated 06.09.2023. On receipt of the Ministry's letter, FTII sent the Report of Inquiry dated 08.10.2022 to the ad-hoc Disciplinary Authority vide letter dated 18.09.2023 for acceptance of the report or otherwise under Rule 15(1) and (2) of CCS (CCA) Rules, 1965.*

*The ad-hoc Disciplinary Authority accepted the Inquiry Report on 19.10.2023 and sent the same to FTII vide letter dated 19.10.2023. The letter dated 19.10.2023 from the ad-hoc Disciplinary Authority was sent to Professor Sandeep Chatterjee with covering letter dated 20.10.2023 with a request to send his representation, if any, within 15 days for consideration by the ad-hoc Disciplinary Authority under Rule 15(2) of CCS(CCA) Rules, 1965.*

*Shri Chatterjee acknowledged the receipt of the Inquiry Report and assured to submit his written representation by 03.11.2023. He submitted his written representation addressed to the ad-hoc Disciplinary Authority and sent the same to FTII through his e-mail dated 07.11.2023.*

*Written representation of Shri Chatterjee was forwarded to the ad-hoc Disciplinary Authority, through FTII's letter dated 17.11.2023 for necessary action under Rule 15(4), (5) and (6) of CCS (CCA) Rules, 1965 for passing final orders on the basis of Report of Inquiry.*

*After examining the written representation of Professor Sandeep Chatterjee on the Inquiry Report, the ad-hoc Disciplinary Authority provided an opportunity of personal hearing the Applicant on 18.01.2024.*

*It is noteworthy that the ad-hoc Disciplinary Authority considered and examined the Inquiry report, written and oral submissions of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee and vide Order No. Vig.-30/1/2024-O/o AS dated 24.01.2024, awarded the penalty of 'CENSURE' with his entire period of suspension to be treated as duty and allowing full pay and allowances for the period of his suspension.*



*Pursuant to the Order dated 24.01.2024 of ad-hoc Disciplinary Authority, Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee was reinstated to join duty w.e.f. 01.02.2024 vide Order dated 29.01.2024 of FTII.*

*The period of suspension of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee is being treated as duty allowing full pay and allowances vide Order dated 14.02.2024 of FTII.*

*Further, Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee has joined the Institute on 01.02.2024 and has also been designated as the HoD that he was holding prior to his suspension vide Order dated 19.02.2024 of FTII."*

## **OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Background of the recommendations on issues which existed leading to suspension of Professor Sandeep Chatterjee.**

8. The Committee in its original report while examining the instant representation and in light of the submissions made by the Ministry of Information & Broadcasting and the Film and Television Institute of India (FTII) noted that Professor Sandeep Chatterjee was suspended and issued a charge sheet on various counts during October, 2020. The Committee observed that despite the completion of the inquiry process and passage of considerable period of time, no amicable resolution was put forth which consequently led to his suspension and he had to resign from his position in FTII. Further, despite his multiple requests, he was denied the opportunity to meet the Chairman or the Director of FTII to discuss a swift and amicable resolution of his case and the matter of suspension, which *per se* appeared to be against the relevant 'Service Rules' and 'Orders'. Consequently, he was left in a state of distress and uncertainty despite the conclusion of the investigation in June, 2022.

9. The Committee, therefore, took up the representation of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee for thorough examination and noted that, the crux of all the charges against him was that he took classes in Kaladham Noida (*i.e., outside of FTII*) without the permission of the concerned Authority in FTII, which was allegedly a violation of employer-employee relationship. The Committee in its report observed that as per rules, exceptions are provided for honorary work of a social or charitable nature, or occasional work of a literary, artistic or scientific character, and therefore, Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee's participation in Ctrl-Alt-Cinema comes under this definition. Further, after due perusal of instances the Committee opined that the workshop was of an artistic and literary nature, along with the course which was also of a charitable nature. Therefore, Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee did not stand in violation of any rule [especially Rule 15(1)(a)].

10. The Committee after thorough perusal of the representation and facts of the case, had noted that the prosecution had merely attempted to use publicly available material to suggest Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee's involvement with Ctrl-Alt-Cinema was commercial in nature and the consequent insinuation was different from a charge since the latter carried the 'burden of proof'. The Committee after due perusal of prevailing instances, opined that regarding the issue of remuneration received by Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee, no solid evidence supporting the same in any outside or extended workshop was established. The Committee further noted that the Authorities insinuated wrongdoing(*alleging that the Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee made money*) while providing no evidence and the cases viz. allegations of 'graft' etc. were an attempt on Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee's reputation and should have been treated as such. Consequently, the Committee opined that the Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee was neither regularly employed nor remunerated and, therefore, his actions were well within what his immediate Supervisor considered appropriate and desirable.

11. Further, with regard to the charges of directly sending a copy of representation to the Joint Secretary, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting without first seeking redressal from the immediate superior(s), the Committee were of the considered opinion that in sending his representation to the concerned Authorities, Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee did not subvert the established chain of command. As per the testimony of his immediate superior the then Dean (Films), Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee informed him of his concerns and acted on his advice and he did not stand to gain personally from the said representation. The Committee, therefore, concluded that there was no attempt on part of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee to tell on his seniors or stand against FTII. Further, an advance copy of the representation was sent to the Chairman, FTII, and to the member of the Governing Council, namely, the Joint Secretary of the Ministry and copied to the

then Dean, the Director and Heads of all Departments. Therefore, the evidence from the documents on record and the testimonies showed that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee did not commit any act subversive of the discipline or unbecoming of an employee and therefore, he is not in violation of any rule or Government orders mentioned in the charge sheet.

12. The Committee expressed their constraint that the entire matter of initiating disciplinary proceedings and imposing a harsh punishment of suspension from service was motivated, lop-sided and pre-meditated along with being primarily on the grounds that certain actions of the representationist were considered to be against the conduct rules without any proper thought process. The Committee finally concluded that the FTII Authorities had first drawn a conclusion that the representationist would be suspended from service and thereafter the entire case of misconduct, framing of charge sheet, initiation of disciplinary proceedings, etc., were made out.

**Time bound and conclusive resolution of administrative issues within the FTII and such institutions through reforms and improvements etc.**

13. The Committee observed in its original report that the quantum of punishment imposed upon Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee, i.e., suspension from the services of FTII, showed prejudicial attitude of the FTII authorities and infringed upon the principle of 'Proportionality of Punishment'. In the considered view of the Committee, imposition of major penalty, that too, in form of suspension from service' would have been justified and unquestionable only on the grounds and instances connected with misappropriation of Government funds, financial irregularities, moral turpitude or some criminal conduct and/or intimidation.

14. The Committee further noted that various contours of his minor misconduct connected with day-to-day functioning of the FTII and other such related and unprofound affairs, etc., should have been sorted out by way of one-to-one meeting between the representationist and the concerned Authorities in a time bound and conclusive manner.

15. The Committee would also like to reiterate that various local issues in similar cases viz. charges regarding making unwarranted allegations against a superior Authority in derogatory language, questioning the decisions of superior Authorities, failure to submit leave applications of a contractual faculty member to the Authorities in time, inordinate delay in submitting the marks of student resulting in delay in final results, negligence in monitoring the activities by the Department of Direction and Screenplay Writing thus setting wrong precedent, insubordination and action in a manner unbecoming of an employee along with charges alleging unauthorized intervention in Scrutiny Committee etc. should have been internally resolved within the institution. The Committee feel that escalating such issues unnecessarily with higher authorities and upper hierarchy results in wastage of time and resources of the institution and thereby seriously affecting the performance of the college, faculty and future of the students. The Committee reiterate their recommendation that resolution of such minor issues in a time bound manner would save time, resources and efforts of the institute/ administration etc.

**Decision taken by the Disciplinary Authorities of the FTII and reconsidering the case of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee**

16. The Committee while examining the representation on the issue of suspension of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee had presented a comprehensive picture of the case and

several related charges on the representationist. The Committee while dealing with various allegations had presented a point-by-point response and recommended elucidating the reasoning as to why the averments had no locus standi.

17. Further, the Committee had observed in the original report that *"Considering the present employment scenario, wherein a person had to fight tooth and nail to get a Government job, the Committee feel that any case of suspension from service, which would deprive an employee of the financial benefits as well as his family responsibilities, needs a very careful and sympathetic consideration."* The Committee had, therefore, strongly recommended that "the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting to re-visit the decision taken by the Disciplinary Authorities of the FTII and to reconsider the case of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee for an amicable resolution, nothing less."

18. The Committee expresses their satisfaction on the steps taken by the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting towards ensuring quick and timely resolution of the issue of suspension of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee. Further, the Committee are happy to note that the Ministry has ensured that the representationist has been reinstated to join the duty along with ensuring that the period of his suspension shall be treated as duty allowing full pay and allowances.

NEW DELHI;

CHANDRA PRAKASH JOSHI,  
Chairperson,  
Committee on Petitions.

28 March, 2025

07 Chaitra, 1947 (Saka)

**MINUTES OF THE SECOND SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS  
(EIGHTEENTH LOK SABHA)**

The Committee met on Friday, 28 March, 2025 from 1500 hrs. to 1545 hrs. in "Committee Room B", Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Chandra Prakash Joshi - Chairperson

MEMBERS

02. Shri Anto Antony
03. Shri Mitesh Patel Bakabhai
04. Shri Raju Bista
05. Shri Bastipati Nagaraju
06. Dr. Rajkumar Sangwan
07. Shri Devesh Shakya
08. Smt. Manju Sharma
09. Shri Vishnu Datt Sharma
10. Shri Abhay Kumar Sinha
11. Shri Rajmohan Unnithan

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Rajesh Ranjan Kumar - Joint Secretary
2. Shri Sujay Kumar - Deputy Secretary

WITNESSES

**MINISTRY OF EDUCATION  
(DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION)**

1. Shri P.K. Banerjee - Joint Secretary
2. Prof. Deepak Kumar Srivastava - Chairman ICPR
3. Prof. Sachchidanand Mishra - Member- Secretary, ICPR

2. At the outset, the Hon'ble Chairperson welcomed the Members to the Sitting of the Committee. XX XX XX XX



3. XX XX XX XX

4. The Committee, thereafter, took up for consideration the following Draft Reports:-

(i) XX XX XX XX

(ii) Draft Action Taken Report on the action taken by the Government on the recommendations made by the Committee on Petitions (Seventeenth Lok Sabha) in their Sixty-Second Report on the representation of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee requesting for fair inquiry into the matter of his suspension from the services of Film and Television Institute of India (FTII) and expediting its resolution.

5. XX XX XX XX

6. The Committee adopted the Draft Action Taken Report on the action taken by the Government on the recommendations made by the Committee on Petitions (Seventeenth Lok Sabha) in their Sixty-Second Report on the representation of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee requesting for fair inquiry into the matter of his suspension from the services of Film and Television Institute of India (FTII) and expediting its resolution. The Committee also authorised the Chairperson to finalise the draft Report and present the same to the House.

The Committee, then, adjourned.

....