

**SIXTY-SECOND REPORT  
COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS  
(SEVENTEENTH LOK SABHA)**

**MINISTRY OF INFORMATION & BROADCASTING**

**(Presented to Lok Sabha on 05.02.2024)**



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

***February, 2024/Magha, 1945 (Saka)***

**CPB No. 1 Vol. LXII**

**© 2024 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT**

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

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS .....	(ii)
INTRODUCTION.....	(iii)

### REPORT

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

Representation of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee dated 15.06.2023	25
---	----

### APPENDICES

(i) Minutes of the 29 <sup>th</sup> sitting of the Committee on Petitions held on 08.08.2023.	29
(ii) Minutes of the 31 <sup>st</sup> sitting of the Committee on Petitions held on 02.02.2024.	34

## COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS

Shri Harish Dwivedi - *Chairperson*

### MEMBERS

2. Shri Anto Antony
3. Prof. Sanjay Sadashivrao Mandlik
4. Shri P. Ravindhranath
5. Dr. Jayanta Kumar Roy
6. Shri Brijendra Singh
7. Shri Sunil Kumar Singh
8. Shri Sushil Kumar Singh
9. Shri Manoj Kumar Tiwari
10. Shri Prabhubhai Nagarbhai Vasava
11. Shri Rajan Baburao Vichare
12. Shri Bharat Ram Margani
13. Vacant
14. Vacant
15. Vacant

### SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Raju Srivastava - Joint Secretary
2. Shri Tenzin Gyaltzen - Deputy Secretary
3. Shri Harish Kumar Sethi - Under Secretary

**SIXTY-SECOND REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS  
(SEVENTEENTH LOK SABHA)**

**INTRODUCTION**

I, the Chairperson, Committee on Petitions, having been authorised by the Committee to present on their behalf, this Sixty-Second Report (Seventeenth Lok Sabha) of the Committee to the House 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 Sixty-Second Report at their sitting held on 02 February, 2024.

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

**NEW DELHI;**

**HARISH DWIVEDI,  
Chairperson,  
Committee on Petitions.**

**02 February, 2024  
13 Magha, 1945 (Saka)**

## REPORT

### **REPRESENTATION RECEIVED FROM 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.**

Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee had submitted a representation dated 15.06.2023 before the 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 (Annexure-I).

2. The representationist, Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee, in his representation *inter-alia* submitted a brief history of his case to the Committee, as follows:-

- (i) He has dedicatedly and honestly served, the Film & Television Institute of India FTII, Pune and Satyajit Ray Film and Television Institute (SRFTI) Kolkata for 25 more than years. He has contributed substantially to the well being and reputation of these esteemed Institutes and several students mentored by him sought honour and accolades to the country through their artistic endeavours.
- (ii) He was, however, unfortunately suspended and issued a chargesheet in October, 2020 and despite the passage of more than two years and completion of the inquiry process in the matter, no resolution has been put forward leading to his continuous suspension.
- (iii) He had to resign from his position in the FTII due to above stated circumstances and have been waiting patiently for the FTII administration to address his case. Further, despite multiple requests, he has been denied the opportunity to meet the Chairman or the Director of FTII to discuss a swift resolution to his suspension and the case, which is per se also against the relevant service rules and orders.

- (iv) He has been left in a state of uncertainty since the investigation was though already concluded in June, 2022, all his requests for obtaining in the inquiry report have been ignored.

3. While listing out the key points, facts and sequence of events in relation to his case as to how he has been targeted by the way of suspension and consequent charge sheet issued against him leading to a prolonged inquiry without any action or orders thereon and a conclusive, swift and amicable resolution of his case, despite his full cooperation during the inquiry process, the representationist, Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee, in his representation further submitted as under:-

- (i) Despite his suspension and consequent charge sheet issued in October 2020, he has given full cooperation during the prolonged online inquiry process, defending each of the eight charges leveled against him to the best of his ability.
- (ii) He is of the view that there appears to be a clear sense of hostility in the charges presented throughout his suspension, along with being treated as a criminal.
- (iii) He has alleged that since his suspension in October, 2020, he has been barred from entering the FTII Campus and the FTII Authorities refused to clarify under whose orders or which regulations he is being denied access, even a year after the completion of his inquiry.
- (iv) He has further alleged that no higher Authorities at FTII granted him the opportunity to present his perspective or to explain the vindictive treatment experienced for exposing corrupt practices and advocating for the Institute's welfare. He was even denied a meeting with his 'Disciplinary Authority' before the inquiry was ordered (a provision which is permitted under the CCS Rules).
- (v) Despite his full cooperation during the inquiry process, which concluded in June, 2022, there has been no action or order by the FTII based on the inquiry. It has been more than eight months since the Inquiry Officer submitted his report in September, 2022.

- (vi) The relevant rules Department of Personnel and Training (DOPT) of the indicate that orders should be passed within a maximum period of three months, but the FTII has offered no explanation for their delay in due process.
- (vii) Although the enquiry against him has been concluded since long, the findings have not been shared with him, resulting in unnecessary delay along with the continued hardship and lack of transparency.
- (viii) FTII has advertised, selected and might has employed a replacement for him role, while extending his suspension indefinitely despite the completion of the inquiry almost a year ago.
- (ix) He has further stated that sustaining his family and child's educational needs along with his senior citizen mother's medical treatment on reduced pay for nearly three years has taken a toll on his health and well-being.
- (x) Further, desiring to extricate himself from such hostile environment, he informed the Authorities concerned of his intention to retire voluntarily upon the completion of the inquiry in August, 2022.
- (xi) His application for voluntary retirement was denied by the Authorities concerned on the grounds that his service was not continuous from SRFTI to FTII despite the fact that his long term service, spanning over 12 years at SRFTI from 1997 to 2009, followed by 14 years at FTII.
- (xii) Finally, after exhausting all available channels and failing to secure an in person meeting with the FTII authorities, he submitted his resignation in February, 2023. Unfortunately, his resignation letter has not been acknowledged since then, stifling any opportunity for me to progress in my carrier or secure employment elsewhere stagnating his carrier for nearly three years at a crucial stage alongwith his professional life as a teacher, while their continued inaction only furthers this stagnation.
- (xiii) He has also stated that at this juncture, his primary aim is to extricate himself from an increasingly hostile environment. He seeks to depart



from FTII while receiving all his legitimate and statutory dues, including provident fund, gratuity, leave encashment and pending arrears for a higher scale that has been due to me since February, 2019.

- (xiv) He has made sincere efforts to engage with the Authorities and seek a sensible resolution. However, for a considerable period, no one has acknowledged his e-mails, answered calls or granted an in-person hearing.
- (xv) He has further stated that an expedited settlement would not only alleviate the severe distress been endured for over two years but also curd the unnecessary expenditure on behalf of the Government.
- (xvi) With all this injustice from the Authorities of FTII, he has therefore, requested considerate attention to his case, hoping for a swift and amicable resolution from FTII.

4. The Committee on Petitions took up the representation for examination under Direction 95 of the Directions by the Speaker, Lok Sabha. Accordingly, the representation received from Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee was referred to the Ministry of Information & Broadcasting and the Film and Television Institute of India (FTII) on 23 June, 2023 for eliciting their comments on the issues/points raised therein.

5. In response thereto, the Ministry of information and Broadcasting vide their Office Memorandum dated 21 July, 2023 had forwarded the comments of FTII in the matter as under:-

*"Film and television Institute of India (FTII) is an Autonomous Society registered under the Societies Registration Act, 1860, which is fully funded by the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, having its own Bye-Laws. Further, FTII is listed under the jurisdiction of the Central Administrative Tribunal (CAT) for adjudication of all service-related matters. The term of the previous Chairman, FTII was till 3<sup>rd</sup> March, 2023 and the position was vacant till 28<sup>th</sup> June, 2023 when the new Chairman (Secretary, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting) has joined. The meeting of the Governing Council of FTII under the Chairmanship of Secretary Information*

*and Broadcasting is expected to be convened shortly and the case of Shri Sandeep Chatterjee is slated to be placed before the Governing Council for a decision. The matter is expected to be resolved within a period of two months. The Committee is further informed that detailed comments on the petition will be submitted after the final decision is taken by the Governing Council in its next meeting."*

6. Upon examination of the aforesaid comments received from the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting/FTII, the Committee on Petitions decided to take up the instant representation for a comprehensive examination.

7. For the purpose, the Committee, in their sitting held on 8 August, 2023 heard the views of the representationist, Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee, on the issues/points in his representation and held a brief discussion with the representatives of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting and FTII in the matter.

8. During the said sitting, Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee *inter-alia* put forth some of the important aspects of his case, before the Committee as given under:-

- (i) He worked in FTII, Kolkata from 1997 to February 2009 and then in FTII, Pune till date, as a Professor. During his entire tenure, he had been raising various issues regarding irregularities in the FTII with the then Director and Chairman of the Institution.
- (ii) In September, 2020, he was issued charge sheet on 8 counts such as, insubordination, inaction on the leave application of a contractual employee, etc. However, before that, he was also served with various Show Cause Notice(s) which were duly replied to by him.
- (iii) He was charge sheeted for violation of Rule 3.1(iii) of the CCS (Conduct) Rules stipulating that "Every Government servant shall at all times do nothing which is unbecoming of a Government servant".
- (iv) He tried to seek appointment with the Disciplinary Authority which happens to be the Chairman of the Governing Council and also with the Director with his grievances as well as for his defense, but to no avail.

- (v) He had also approached the Division Bench of Central Administrative Tribunal (CAT), Bombay with his service grievances. However, even after a lapse of one year, no hearing was held in the matter. In the meantime, Departmental Inquiry against him already started to which he cooperated with due diligence. In May, 2020, although the inquiry was completed, no report/findings thereon was communicated to him and orders were also not passed in the matter. Neither his suspension was revoked nor was he reinstated into the services of FTII. He therefore, requested for an immediate resolution of the matter.

9. The representatives of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting and the FTII, thereafter, deposed before the Committee as under:-

- (i) Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee was issued charge sheet on 28 October, 2020 on 8 counts. On 3 counts, charges had been proved, 1 was partially proved and on 4 counts, charges could not be proved. One of the major charges against him was that he took classes in Kaladham, Noida without the permission of the Authority concerned which was a violation of employer-employee relationship.
- (ii) The delay in inquiry process in the case of Prof. Chatterjee was due to the fact that he had approached the CAT and later on, the High Court for resolution of his grievances. However, after completion of the inquiry, the report in the matter was submitted on 8 October, 2022. As per the extant Disciplinary Rules, the Authority for taking action lies with the Chairman, FTII. However, the then Chairman, FTII did not take interest in the matter. In the meantime, the relevant Rules were changed and the Authority thereafter, lies with the Director. However, presently, the post of the Director is lying vacant and has already been advertised for filling up the post.
- (iii) The Secretary, Ministry of Information & Broadcasting, who has been additionally looking after the post of Chairman, FTII, assured that the instant case would be considered for expediting a decision thereon.

10. Subsequently, the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting/FTII *vide* there O.M. dated 17.01.2024 forwarded their latest comments on the chronological statement/status report with regard to the disciplinary case of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee, FTII, as under:-

- (i) This is with reference to the disciplinary case of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee, Professor FTII. Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee was placed under suspension followed by issue of a charge-sheet containing 8 number of charges against him *vide* Memorandum of charge-sheet dated 28.10.2020. Upon his denial of all the Charges, an inquiry was conducted through an Inquiry Officer empanelled in the Inquiry Officers of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. The Inquiry Officer submitted his report dated 08.10.2022 to FTII, which could not be processed for further necessary action as the incumbent of the post of Director having the power of disciplinary authority was not holding the post on regular basis, and was unable to exercised the statutory powers as disciplinary authority as per GOI decisions under Rule 12(2) of CCS (CCA) Rules, 1965 'Officers performing current duties of a post cannot exercise statutory powers'. Further, Shri Sandeep Shahare was junior to Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee in the hierarchy of FTII.
- (ii) Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee submitted a petition addresses to the Hon'ble Committee on Petitions, Lok Sabha complaining delay for resolution of his disciplinary case. The Hon'ble Committee in Petitions heard the matter in the presence of Secretary, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting besides FTII representatives on 08.08.2023. During the hearing, it was assured that the disciplinary case of Prof. Chatterjee would be settled in two months time.
- (iii) To expedite the matter, FTII requested the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting *vide* letter dated 24.08.2023 for nominating as ad-hoc disciplinary authority to take decision in the report of inquiry, which was pending for non-availability of appropriate disciplinary authority. It is to highlight that interview for selection of a regular Director was held on 11.07.2023, however as the final appointment is done after approval of Appointments Committee of Cabinet (ACC) and it may take time, it was decided to nominate ad-hoc disciplinary authority. In the instant case,

the appointing authority/disciplinary authority at the time of appointment of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee was Chairman, Governing Council whereas the present appointing and disciplinary authority is Director, FTII who is lower in rank than the Chairman, Governing Council of FTII. Therefore, it was imperative that an ad-hoc disciplinary authority should be appointed in the instant case who is higher in rank than Director, FTII.

- (iv) Accordingly, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting nominated the Additional Secretary, Ministry of Information and 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.
- (v) 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 Prof. 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 disciplinary authority under Rule 15(2) of CCS (CCA) Rules, 1965.
- (vi) Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee acknowledge 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 disciplinary authority and sent the same to FTII through his email dated 07.11.2023.
- (vii) Written representation of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee was forward 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.
- (viii) After examining the written representation of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee on the Inquiry Report, the ad-hoc disciplinary authority has provided an opportunity of personal hearing to the applicant on 18.01. 2024. The case will be finalized shortly and the Committee will be informed.

### Observations/Recommendations

11. 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. The different set of charges are listed as under:-

*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.*

12. 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 causal 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.

13. 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).

14. 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, an evidence 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)

15. 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.

16. 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

17. 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.

18. 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.**

19. 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*

20. 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 brought 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

21. 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 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.

22. 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.

NEW DELHI;

HARISH DWIVEDI,  
Chairperson,  
Committee on Petitions.

02 February, 2024

13 Magha, 1945 (Saka)

The Hon'ble Chairman,  
Committee on Petitions,  
Parliament House Annexe,  
New Delhi – 110 001.

15<sup>th</sup> June 2023

**Subject: Petition requesting kind intervention of Parliamentary Committee on Petitions (Lok Sabha) ordering fair and expedited resolution to the suspension & inquiry undertaken by the Film and Television Institute of India (FTII).**

Dear Sir,

1. I am reaching out to appeal to you, having encountered a lack of responsiveness from the administration at my workplace, the Film and Television Institute of India (FTII). Even my 'Disciplinary Authority', the esteemed Chairman of FTII, has not responded to my numerous letters over the past several months.
2. For more than 25 years, I have dedicatedly and honestly served, both Film & Television Institute of India (FTII, Pune) and Satyajit Ray Film and Television Institute (SRFTI, Kolkata). In my capacity, I have contributed substantially to the well-being and reputation of these esteemed Institutes. The generations of students I have mentored have brought honour and accolades to our country through their artistic endeavours. However, I was unfortunately suspended and issued a chargesheet in October 2020. Despite more than two years passing and the completion of my inquiry process, no resolution has been put forward, and my suspension continues.
3. Upon resigning from my role due to these circumstances, I have been waiting patiently for the FTII administration to address my case. Despite multiple requests, I have been denied the opportunity to meet with the Chairman or the Director of FTII to discuss a swift resolution to my suspension, which is per se also against the relevant rules and orders on the subject. I have been left in a state of uncertainty since the investigation concluded almost a year ago in June 2022, and all my attempts to gain an inquiry report have been ignored. My detailed 'Defence Brief', which I have attached in this email as a PDF, outlines a comprehensive response to all the charges levied against me.

4. For the sake of brevity, below are the key points emphasizing the undue delay by the FTII Authorities:-

- 1. Despite the suspension and chargesheet issued in October 2020, I fully cooperated with the prolonged online inquiry process, defending each of the eight charges to the best of my ability.

- 2. There was a clear sense of hostility in the charges presented. Throughout my suspension, I felt as though I was being treated as a criminal.

- 3. Since my suspension in October 2020, I have been barred from entering the Campus. The FTII Authorities refuse to clarify under whose orders or which regulations I am being denied access, even a year after the completion of my inquiry.

- 4. No higher Authorities at FTII granted me the opportunity to present my perspective or explain the vindictive treatment I have experienced for exposing corrupt practices and advocating for the Institute's welfare. I was even denied a meeting with my 'Disciplinary Authority' before the inquiry was ordered (a provision which is permitted under the CCS Rules).

- 5. Despite my full cooperation during the inquiry process, which concluded in June 2022, there has been no action or order from FTII based on the inquiry. It has been more than eight months since the Inquiry Officer submitted his report in September 2022.

- 6. The Department of Personnel and Training (DOPT) relevant rules indicate that orders should be passed within a maximum period of three months, but FTII has offered no explanation for their delay in due process.

- 7. Although my inquiry concluded some time ago, the findings have not been shared with me, resulting in unnecessary delay, continued hardship and lack of transparency.

- 8. FTII has advertised, selected, and likely employed a replacement for my role, while extending my suspension indefinitely despite the completion of the inquiry almost a year ago.

- 9. Sustaining my family, my child's educational needs, and

my senior citizen mother's medical treatment on reduced pay for nearly three years has taken a toll on my health and well-being.

- 10. Desiring to extricate myself from this hostile environment, I informed the Authorities of my intention to retire voluntarily upon the completion of the inquiry in August 2022.

- 11. My application for voluntary retirement was denied by the Authorities on the grounds that my service was not continuous from SRFTI to FTII. This is despite my long-term service, spanning 12 years at SRFTI from 1997 to 2009, followed by 14 years at FTII.

- 12. After exhausting all available channels and failing to secure an in-person meeting with the FTII authorities, I felt compelled to submit my resignation in February 2023. Unfortunately, my resignation letter has not been acknowledged since then, stifling any opportunity for me to progress in my career or secure employment elsewhere to support my family. The Authorities have allowed my career to stagnate for nearly three years at this crucial stage in my professional life as a teacher, and their continued inaction only furthers this stagnation.

- 13. At this juncture, my primary aim is to extricate myself from an increasingly hostile environment. I seek to depart from FTII while receiving all my legitimate and statutory dues, including provident fund, gratuity, leave encashment, and pending arrears for a higher scale that has been due to me since February 2019.

- 14. I have made sincere efforts to engage with the Authorities and seek a sensible resolution. However, for a considerable period, no one has acknowledged my e-mails, answered my calls, or granted me an in-person hearing. An expedited settlement would not only alleviate the severe distress I have endured for over two years but also curb unnecessary expenditure on behalf of the Government.

5. Since I am not able to get justice from the Authorities of FTII, I humbly request your considerate attention to my case, hoping for a swift and amicable resolution from FTII.



6. Despite the current circumstances, my love for these Government-run film schools remains un-wavered. Having dedicated more than 25 years of my life in service to these institutions, I hold the belief that FTII is among the world's top film schools, boasting some of the country's finest students. I remain open to contributing to these Institutions' welfare and success in any capacity, should such an opportunity present itself in the future.

With Sincere Regards,



**Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee**

A 81 Kaladham Society,  
Vashisht Marg, Knowledge Park II,  
Greater Noida 201306

e-mail: [sundarjeebon@gmail.com](mailto:sundarjeebon@gmail.com)

Phone: 9823895245

**MINUTES OF THE TWENTY NINTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS  
(SEVENTEENTH LOK SABHA)**

The Committee met on Tuesday, 8 August, 2023 from 1500 hrs. to 1715 hrs. in Committee Room No. 3, Parliament House Annexe Extension, New Delhi.

**PRESENT**

Shri Harish Dwivedi - Chairperson

**MEMBERS**

2. Shri Hanuman Beniwal
3. Shri Brijendra Singh
4. Shri Sushil Kumar Singh
5. Shri Sunil Kumar Singh
6. Dr. Jayanta Kumar Roy
7. Shri Rajan Vichare

**SECRETARIAT**

1. Shri Raju Srivastava - Joint Secretary
2. Shri Tenzin Gyaltzen - Deputy Secretary

**WITNESSES**

**SPECIAL INVITEE  
(Representationist)**

Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

**MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING**

1. Shri Apurva Chandra - Secretary and Chairman, Governing Council, of Film and Television Institute of India (FTII)

- |    |                          |   |                            |
|----|--------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| 2. | Shri Prithul Kumar       | - | Joint Secretary (Films)    |
| 3. | Prof. Sandeep K. Shahare | - | Director (I/C), FTII, Pune |
| 4. | Shri Sayyid Rabeehashmi  | - | Registrar, FTII, Pune      |

2. At the outset, the Hon'ble Chairperson welcomed the Members to the sitting of the Committee. \*\*\*

3. \*\*\*

4. \*\*\*

5. \*\*\*

6. \*\*\*

7. \*\*\*

8. \*\*\*

9. \*\*\*

10. \*\*\*

11. \*\*\*

12. \*\*\*

13. \*\*\*

14. \*\*\*

15. \*\*\*

16. The Committee then took up the next item on the agenda, i.e., Hearing the views of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee, on his representation, 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.

*[Thereafter, the Special Invitee, Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee was ushered in]*

17. After welcoming the Special Invitee, Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee, the Hon'ble Chairperson read out Direction 55(1) of the Directions by the Speaker regarding confidentiality of the

proceedings of the Committee. The Committee then afforded an opportunity to hear the views of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee on his representation submitted to the Committee 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. However, before hearing his views, the Committee sought factual information from him on the following points:-

- (i) A brief background of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee, including his stint in FTII.
- (ii) Nature of duties performed by him in the FTII.
- (iii) Details of charges leveled against him and the reasons as to why he thinks that action initiated by the FTII Authorities against him are malicious.

18. The representationist, Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee expressed his views on the matter, as under:-

- (i) He worked in FTII, Kolkata from 1997 to February 2009 and then in FTII, Pune till date, as a Professor. During his entire tenure, he had been raising various issues regarding irregularities in the FTII with the then Director and Chairman of the Institution.
- (ii) In September, 2020, he was issued charge sheet on 8 counts such as, insubordination, inaction on the leave application of a contractual employee, etc. However, before that, he was also served with various Show Cause Notice(s) which were duly replied to by him.
- (iii) He was charge sheeted for violation of Rule 3.1(iii) of the CCS (Conduct) Rules stipulating that "Every Government servant shall at all times do nothing which is unbecoming of a Government servant".
- (iv) He tried to seek appointment with the Disciplinary Authority which happens to be the Chairman of the Governing Council and also with the Director with his grievances as well as for his defense, but to no avail.
- (v) He had also approached the Division Bench of Central Administrative Tribunal (CAT), Bombay with his service grievances. However, even after a lapse of one year, no hearing was held in the matter. In the meantime, Departmental Inquiry against him already started to which he cooperated with due diligence. In May, 2020, although the inquiry was completed, no report/findings thereon was communicated to him and orders were also not passed in the matter. Neither his suspension was revoked nor was he reinstated into the services of FTII. He therefore, requested for an immediate resolution of the matter.

*[The Special Invitee, Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee then withdrew]*

*[Thereafter, the representatives of the Ministry of Information & Broadcasting were ushered in]*

19. After welcoming the representatives of the Ministry of Information & Broadcasting, the Chairperson read out Direction 55(1) of the Directions by the Speaker regarding confidentiality of the proceedings of the Committee. The Committee, then, sought clarifications from the representatives of the Ministry on various aspects relating to the representation of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee requesting for fair inquiry on his suspension from the services of Film and Television Institute of India (FTII) and expediting its resolution, as under:-

- (i) As far as the issue of disciplinary action against Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee is concerned, what is the most serious offence committed by him. Whether he is found to be involved in any kind of financial impropriety, negligence in discharge of duties, misbehaviour, etc.
- (ii) Whether in the past, disciplinary action has been initiated against any other senior officer/employee of the FTII, which is an Institution of Excellence in the Country?
- (iii) After initiation of disciplinary proceedings against Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee, why no further consequential action(s) has been taken in the matter.
- (iv) In spite of the fact that Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee had tendered his resignation, what were the reason(s) for not accepting his resignation.

20. The representatives of the Ministry of Information & Broadcasting, thereafter, put forth their comments/views, as under:-

- (i) Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee was issued charge sheet on 28 October, 2020 on 8 counts. On 3 counts, charges had been proved, 1 was partially proved and on 4 counts, charges could not be proved. One of the major charges against him was that he took classes in Kaladham, Noida without the permission of the Authority concerned which was a violation of employer-employee relationship.
- (ii) The delay in inquiry process in the case of Prof. Chatterjee was due to the fact that he had approached the CAT and later on, the High Court for resolution of his grievances. However, after completion of the inquiry, the report in the matter was submitted on 8 October, 2022. As per the extant Disciplinary Rules, the Authority for taking action lies with the Chairman, FTII. However, the then Chairman, FTII did not take interest in the matter. In the meantime, the relevant Rules were

changed and the Authority thereafter, lies with the Director. However, presently, the post of the Director is lying vacant and has already been advertised for filling up the post.

- (iii) The Secretary, Ministry of Information & Broadcasting, who has been additionally looking after the post of Chairman, FTII, assured that the instant case would be considered for expediting a decision thereon.

21. After hearing the views of the representatives of the Ministry of Information & Broadcasting, the Committee expressed their views, as follows:-

- (i) The inquiry report/findings on the disciplinary proceedings against Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee should be shared with him.
- (ii) The case of Prof. Sandeep Chatterjee should reach its finality at the earliest taking into account his sufferings and on sympathetic grounds.

*[The representatives of the Ministry of Information & Broadcasting then,  
withdrew]*

22.	***	***	***	***	***
23.	***	***	***	***	***
24.	***	***	***	***	***
25.	***	***	***	***	***

The Committee, then, adjourned.

---

\*\*\* Does not pertain to this Report.

**MINUTES OF THE THIRTY-FIRST SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS  
(SEVENTEENTH LOK SABHA)**

The Committee met on Friday, 2 February, 2024 from 1500 hrs. to 1630 hrs. in Room No.117, 'B' Block, (Chairperson's Chamber), Parliament House Annexe Extension, New Delhi.

**PRESENT**

Shri Harish Dwivedi - Chairperson

**MEMBERS**

2. Prof. Sanjay Sadashivrao Mandlik
3. Shri P. Rabindhranath
4. Shri Brijendra Singh
5. Shri Sushil Kumar Singh
6. Shri Prabhubhai Nagarbhai Vasava
7. Shri Rajan Vichare

**SECRETARIAT**

1. Shri Raju Srivastava - Joint Secretary
2. Shri Tenzin Gyaltzen - Deputy Secretary

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

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

(i) 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;

(ii)	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
(iii)	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
(iv)	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
(v)	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX

4. After discussing the above mentioned Draft Reports (3 Original Report and 2 Action Taken Report) in detail, the Committee adopted all the five Reports without any modification. The Committee also authorised the Chairperson to finalise the Draft Reports and present the same to the House.

5. XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX

The Committee, then, adjourned.

\*\*\*

---

XXXX Not related to Report.