

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.MUHAMED MUSTAQUE

TUESDAY, THE 24TH DAY OF MARCH 2015/3RD CHAITHRA, 1937

WP(C).No. 3797 of 2015 (Y)

PETITIONER(S):

1. **RESHMA R.,
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR IN ENGLISH
S.N.COLLEGE, CHATHANNOOR**
2. **DEEPTHI P.S.,
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR IN ENGLISH
S.N.COLLEGE, PUNALUR.**
3. **ANISHA N.,
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR IN ENGLISH
S.N.COLLEGE, VARKALA, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**
4. **RESHMI RAVINDRAN,
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR IN ENGLISH,
S.N.COLLEGE, PUNALUR
KOLLAM.**
5. **SHIBI K.P.S.,
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR IN ENGLISH
S.N.COLLEGE, VARKALA, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**

BY ADV. SRI.M.S.RADHAKRISHNAN NAIR

RESPONDENT(S) :

1. **THE MANAGER
S.N.COLLEGE, KOLLAM.**
2. **UNIVERSITY OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR, UNIVERSITY CAMPUS
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 034.**
3. **DIRECTOR OF COLLEGIATE EDUCATION,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 001.**

4. DEPUTY DIRECTOR
COLLEGIATE EDUCATION,
KOLLAM - 691 001.

5. STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY
HIGHER EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM- 695001.

R1 BY ADV. SRI.A.N.RAJAN BABU
R2 BY ADV. SRI.BECHU KURIAN THOMAS, SC
R3 TO R5 BY SR. GOVT. PLEADER SRI.M.A.FAYAZ

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 24-03-2015, ALONG WITH WP(C) NO. 17737/2014 & CONNECTED CASES,
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

Mn

...3/-

APPENDIX

PETITIONERS' EXHIBITS :

- EXT. P1- TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER OF THE 1ST PETITIONER.
- EXT. P2- TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER OF THE 2ND PETITIONER.
- EXT. P3- TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER OF THE 3RD PETITIONER.
- EXT. P4- TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER OF THE 4TH PETITIONER.
- EXT. P5- TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER OF THE 5TH PETITIONER.
- EXT. P6- TRUE COPY OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SELECTION COMMITTEE HELD ON 22ND AND 23RD OF AUGUST 2012.
- EXT. P7- TRUE COPY OF THE WORK LOAD ASSESSMENT OF S.N.COLLEGE, CHATHANNOOR.
- EXT. P8- TRUE COPY OF HTE WORK LOAD ASSESSMENT OF S.N.COLLEGE.
- EXT. P9- TRUE COPY OF THE WORK LOAD ASSESSMENT APPROVED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT OF S.N.COLLEGE VARKALA.
- EXT. P10- TRUE COPY OF THE APPROVAL ORDER DATED 25.4.2014.
- EXT. P11- TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN WP(C) NO. 1485/2014 DATED 7.3.2014.

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS : NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.S. TO JUDGE

Mn

A.MUHAMED MUSTAQUE, J.

**W.P.(C) Nos. 17737,
17887,17889,18136**

&

22568 of 2014

and

**W.P.(C) Nos. 3797,3967,4002,4257,
4290,4311**

4370,4850,5321,

5322 ,5329, 5426,5680,6190,

6356,6619,7496,7989,

8316,8561 ,9284of 2015

Dated this the 24th day of March, 2015

JUDGMENT

The above writ petitions are filed by the Assistant Professors, who were appointed in various colleges under the Corporate Management of S.N.Trusts. These petitioners were appointed after the selection made by the duly constituted Selection Committee which includes a representative of the Government. Their appointments have been approved by the University concerned. They approached this Court on account of non disbursal of salary with effect from the date of appointment. In some of the writ petitions, this Court by

interim order directed the Government to pay the current salary onwards. The main issue in these writ petitions is regarding the work load and non sanctioning of the post.

2. The learned Government Pleader highlighted that S.N.Trusts being a Corporate Management, it is for the want of details regarding the excess teachers in their various colleges coming under the different Universities and also on account of non sanctioning of the posts in those colleges, they are unable to disburse the salary. It is further submitted that in most of the appointments made in the colleges coming under the S.N.Trust Corporate Management, the management had not obtained sanction from the Government to appoint teachers.

3. The case of the Standing counsel for the S.N.Trust is that even though there are sufficient work load in the colleges, post is not sanctioned.

4. It appears that there is practical difficulty in identifying the details regarding the excess teachers and to sanction the post for the reason that S.N.Trust is having around 14 aided colleges in Kerala under their Management and there is no coordination to find out excess teachers in those colleges.

5. It is to be noted that the petitioners are appointed after selection process made by a duly constituted Selection Committee. Petitioners cannot be denied their salary, once approval is granted, on account of doubt arisen in relation to the work load and sanctioning of the post, which are all matters exclusively coming under the domain of the University and Collegiate Education. The moment, the University approved the petitioners' appointment by taking note of the work load and the qualifications of the Assistant Professor, necessarily they are entitled for salary. However, objections raised by the Directorate of Collegiate Education cannot be ignored, for the reason that it is their duty to supervise the approval granted by the University and to find out whether the University while granting approval has adverted to the Rules and Regulations coming under the Universities Act and whether the appointment has been made to the admissible post. I am of the view that, the interest of the State to conduct an enquiry into this matter has to be safeguarded.

6. In view of the above facts and circumstances, these

writ petitions can be disposed of as follows:

a). The interim order to pay the current month salary onwards will continue and the writ petitions, in which there are no such interim orders, the petitioners shall be paid the current month salary onwards.

b). The Directorate of Collegiate Education shall, after consulting with the Government, the Principals and the Universities concerned, complete the entire exercise regarding the concurrence for the approval of appointment of the writ petitioners within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

c). The salary already paid or payable to the petitioners will be subject to the decision being taken by the Directorate of College Education, after completing such exercise.

d). On completion of such enquiry, if it is found that all the petitioners are entitled for approval, the entire arrears shall be paid to the writ petitioners with effect from the date of appointment or from the date on which the claim is admissible, within a further period of three months thereafter.

e). Direction to pay the current month salary onwards will be subject to the satisfaction of the Deputy Director of

Collegiate Education that the petitioners' appointment has been approved by the University concerned.

The writ petitions are disposed of with the above directions.

**Sd/
A.MUHAMED MUSTAQUE,
Judge.**

dpk

/True copy/ PS to Judge.

A.MUHAMED MUSTAQUE, J.

**W.P.(C) Nos. 3797,3967,4257,4290,4311,
4370& 5322 OF 2015**

Dated this the 2nd day of March, 2015

O R D E R

The respondent-University has approved the appointment of the petitioners. However, the Director of Collegiate Education objected the petitioners' approval on citing that

there are no sufficient work load.

2. Considering the approval of the petitioners, I am of the view that salary shall be paid to the petitioners from the current month onwards.

Post the matter on 24/3/2015.

**A.MUHAMED MUSTAQUE,
Judge.**

dpk

dpk