

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 17.11.2016

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.SURESH KUMAR

W.P.No.20911 of 2009

N.Yasodha

...Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Chief Educational Officer,
Kancheepuram.
2. The Head Master,
Government High School,
Veerankunnam, Kancheepuram District,
3. The Director of School Education,
College Road, Chennai - 6.

...Respondents

Prayer:- Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ of Certiorari to call for the records on the file of the third respondent in proceedings Na.Ka.61060/C5/E5/09 and dated 01.10.2009 and quash the same as illegal, incompetent and without jurisdiction.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Lakshminarayanan

For Respondents : Mr.V.Jaya Prakash Narayanan
Special Government Pleader.

O R D E R

The prayer in the writ petition is for a writ of certiorari to call for the records on the file of the third respondent in proceedings Na.Ka.61060/C5/E5/09 dated 01.10.2009 and quash the same as illegal, incompetent and without jurisdiction.

2. The short facts leading to the filing of this case are as follows :

The petitioner had completed S.S.L.C. course, from Karnataka Secondary Education Examination Board in April, 1985, where she had taken Tamil as first language, English as second

language and Kannada as third language, apart from the subjects Maths, Science and Social Studies. Thereafter, the petitioner had joined in PUC (pre-university course) in the academic year 1985-86 and she had completed Government of Karnataka Board of Pre-University Education Course in 1987. The petitioner had also simultaneously, undergone the Government of Karnataka Board of Pre-University Education Internship Course in Teaching Course and she had completed the same in the year 1987-88. The said PUC course is of two years duration which includes regular PUC subjects along with the Teaching Education subjects. In other words, we can call it as Internship Course in Teaching which includes Pre-University Education in Teaching also. Thereafter, the petitioner had completed her Bachelor of Arts in the year 1990 from the Bangalore University and Master of Arts in the year 1993 from the Bangalore University and Bachelor of Literature in May 2002 from the Annamalai University and Bachelor of Education in November, 2009 from the Bharathidasan University.

3. The petitioner who is having qualification in the said PUC Internship Course in Teaching has been appointed on 07.10.1996, as secondary grade teacher at the Government High School, Veeranakunnam, Kancheepuram District by the proceedings of the first respondent. Thereafter, from 1996, the petitioner had been working as secondary grade teacher. However, subsequently in the year 1999, the same first respondent has passed an order dated 28.04.1999, cancelling the appointment made to the petitioner as secondary grade teacher for the reason that the PUC Internship course in teachers education obtained by the petitioner cannot be a equivalent qualification with the two years diploma course in teachers education from the state of Tamil Nadu. As against the said order dated 28.04.1999, the petitioner had approached the Tamil Nadu Administrative Tribunal, Chennai and filed the original application in O.A.No. 3613 of 1999, wherein by order dated 01.07.1999 the Tribunal stayed the cancellation of appointment of the petitioner. By the said stay granted by the Tribunal and during the pendency of the original application, the petitioner was permitted to continue and being a secondary grade teacher, she transferred on her own willingness, to the Government Higher Secondary School, Sadurangapattinam by the proceedings of the first respondent dated 13.11.2003.

4. On the abolition of Tribunal, the said original application in OA.No.3613 of 1999 was transferred to this Court and re-numbered as W.P.No. 42260 of 2006. The said writ petition came to be decided by this Court on 15.06.2009, wherein this Court, while dismissing the writ petition, had stated that the said dismissal of the writ petition will not preclude the

petitioner from approaching the appropriate authority in the event of the petitioner passing the required tests, subsequent to the filing of the original application and before the dismissal of the writ petition.

5. As against the said order of dismissal of this Court, the petitioner preferred an intra-Court appeal in W.A.No. 1047 of 2009 and the said writ appeal also was decided by a Division Bench of this Court on 13.07.2009, wherein the Division Bench has held as under:

" 3. Mr.Raghavachari, learned counsel appearing for the appellant submits that the appellant did not have any opportunity to place such submission before the authorities concerned. In view of these facts, the appellant may place a representation with all her submission before the Director of School Education, the third respondent herein. She will do it within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and the Director will take necessary decision thereon on merits within four weeks from the date of receipt of the representation after hearing the appellant. During the interregnum, the appellant will continue in service. She will abide by the decision that is rendered by the authorities concerned. In the event no application is made within two weeks, the order of the learned Single Judge will remain as it is.

4. The writ appeal stands dismissed with the aforesaid observations. However, there will be no order as to costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is also dismissed."

6. As directed by the Division Bench of this Court, the petitioner had submitted a detailed representation to the first respondent on 03.08.2009. In view of the said order passed by the Division Bench of this Court, as referred above, though the petitioner was one time disturbed by the respondents, subsequently on her representation that order was recalled and she was taken back for joining and thereafter she was continuing. Ultimately, on considering the representation submitted by the petitioner, and pursuant to the order of the Division Bench of this Court referred to above the third respondent has passed the impugned order dated 01.10.2009. Challenging the same the present writ petition has been filed.

7. Heard both sides.

8. Mr.V.Lakshminarayanan, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner had completed S.S.L.C. in the year 1985 and joined immediately in the PUC course at Karnataka. It is two years course which is an integrated two years course with a combination of subject of Languages, History, Economics as well as Education of teaching. The petitioner has passed the said integrated Course in the year 1986-87 & 1987-88. For passing the said integrated PUC course, the Government of Karnataka Board of Pre-university Education had given two certificates. One is called as "Board of Pre-university Education Certificate", and another one is called as "Board of Pre-university Education Internship Course in Teaching" . In the first certificate, the subject-wise marks were given, wherein part I has language subjects and in Part II the petitioner has undergone Education I and Education II subjects and she obtained 49 and 59 marks out of 100 respectively. Whereas, in the second certificate, it has been mentioned that the candidate has completed Pre-university Education Internship Course in Teaching securing second class. The foot note of the second certificate shows that 60% and above is the first class; 50% and above but less than 60% is the second class; 40% and above but less than 50% is the pass class.

9. In the first certificate, since the petitioner secures 49 and 59 marks in Education I and II papers aggregated, i.e., 108 marks out of 200 which comes 54% and in the second certificate, since the petitioner has secured second class, which is between 50% and 60%, the petitioner is fully entitled and eligible to get the job of secondary grade teacher in the State of Tamil Nadu and admittedly, by evaluating the said certificate obtained by the petitioner, she was given a job and was appointed as secondary grade teacher, by order dated 07.10.1996.

10. And for the reasons stated in the order of the first respondent that they have had treated the petitioner's qualification as not equivalent to the teaching education certificate of the State of Tamil Nadu and ultimately they passed the order of termination which was interfered with, in the Original Application by the Tribunal and subsequent order of this Court. Pursuant to the order of this Court, the petitioner had been continuing in the job and even after the filing of writ petition in the first round of litigation, especially after the order of the Division Bench of this Court dated 30.07.2009, the petitioner was continuing in service. Only by evaluating the certificate, the third respondent passed the impugned order

dated 01.10.2009, by which the petitioner was made to become jobless and she has been removed from service.

11. The learned counsel for the petitioner would further contend that the one and only reason stated by the third respondent in the impugned order is that from the year 1987, the Government of Tamil Nadu has prescribed a minimum educational qualification for the admission in the teaching course, which is required for the appointment to the post of secondary grade teacher. According to the respondents, in the State of Taminadu plus two is the minimum qualification for entering into the teachers diploma course. Since plus two is equivalent to PUC i.e., Pre-university Course, and the petitioner has obtained only that certificate from the State of Karnataka the same cannot be treated as equivalent to the Diploma in Teaching Education Certificate given by the State of Tamil Nadu therefore the qualification of the petitioner was not treated as the required qualification and the order of removal was issued.

12. The learned counsel for the petitioner would further contend that even in the earlier order dated 28.04.1999 itself, passed by the first respondent, the very same reasons were given and after litigation, as referred above, ultimately the mater was directed to be decided by the third respondent and the third respondent by considering the request of the petitioner and taking into account the educational qualification acquired by the petitioner, passed the impugned order citing the very same reason which is totally unjustifiable and unlawful hence the interference of this Court is very much required, the learned counsel contended.

13. This Court has carefully considered the rival submissions made by the respective counsel for both sides and perused the documents filed before this Court. Before going into the merits of the rival claims made by the parties herein, it is pertinent to go back some decades as to know the law which governed the appointment of the secondary grade teachers and the minimum qualification for such appointment. Initially, the State of Tamil Nadu had issued Government Order in G.O.Ms.No.1667, Education Department, dated 05.08.1981, whereby the Teachers Education Certificate obtained by a candidate from other State than Tamil Nadu it was stoped the evaluation of these certificates with immediate effect. Challenging the said G.O.Ms.No.1667, dated 05.08.1981, writ petitions were filed before this Court and a Division Bench of this Court in the reported Judgment in 1985 W.L.R.178 in the matter of "K.Anthony Savarimuthu Vs. The Director of School Education, Madras-6 and another" after having considered the issue in depth ultimately quashed the said Government Order. During the pendency of the

said writ petitions, the Government had come forward to issue another Government Order namely G.O.Ms.No.1236, Education (U) Department, dated 17.09.1984, just two months prior to the decision made in the Division Bench order referred as above.

14. According to the said G.O.Ms.No.1236, the unfortunate case of the candidates who obtained the certificates from the other State have been considered and ultimately, the G.O. has been issued with some clarifications and conditions for continuation of evaluation of teacher training certificates of other states. Paragraph No.2 of the said G.O.Ms.No.1236 dated 17.09.1984, can be usefully referred hereunder:-

"2. In view of the above developments, the Director of School Education, Sought modifications to the G.O. first read above. The Government have examined the matter carefully and have decided to approve the modifications suggested by the Director of School Education, Madras. Accordingly the Govt. now permit the Director of School Education, Madras to evaluate the Karnataka State Teacher's Training Certificates subject to the following conditions :

- i. Teachers Training Certificate holder of Karnataka State should have passed their SSLC in Tamil medium with Tamil as I language or should have taken Tamil as I language in SSLC if they have studied in English medium.
- ii. They should have obtained 50% of marks in aggregate in their SSLC as in the case of Teachers Training Certificate holders of Tamil Nadu.
- iii. They should have obtained 50% marks in each subject in their Teacher Training Certificate as in the case of Teacher Training certificate holders of Tamil Nadu.
- iv. If they studied other than Tamil medium in their SSLC as well as Teacher Training Certificate and satisfy the conditions 2&3, their certificates may be evaluated with conditions that they are eligible for appointment as Secondary Grade Teachers in Tamil Nadu only in Schools where medium of instruction is other than Tamil.

The Govt. also permit the Director of School Education to apply the above conditions while evaluating the Teachers Training Certificates of all other States in order to ensure uniformity and consistency."

15. Since the said G.O. was issued during the pendency of the writ petitions before the Division Bench, the said Division Bench have also taken note of the import of the said G.O. and given its findings about the validity of the G.O. also. Paragraph No.30 of the said Judgement has been observed as under:

"30. All these three considerations appear to be eminently proper, which have now been considered, and while laying down the criteria it is obvious that the second and third criteria, by insisting upon 50% of marks in the aggregate in the S.S.L.C. and 50% of marks in each subject in the Teachers Training Certificate examination, were intended bring on par such teachers with the teachers who were issued certificate from the Tamil Nadu institutes. The emphasis on Tamil has also been achieved by Clauses 1 and 4 in the criteria, which while giving effect to the concept of equivalence provide that the Karnataka certificate holders who have passed their S.S.L.C. in Tamil medium with Tamil as the first language or have taken Tamil as first language in T.S.L.C. if they have studied in English medium, will be recognised in schools, where the medium of instruction is Tamil. Under Clause 4 it is provided that if such teachers holding the Karnataka certificate have studied in the medium other than Tamil in their S.S.L.C. as well as Teachers Training certificates they satisfy second and third conditions, namely securing 50% marks in the aggregate and 50% of the marks in each of the subjects in Teacher Training certificate examination; and then their recognition will be restricted only as regards eligibility for appointment as Secondary Grade teachers in Tamil Nadu only in schools limited to instructional needs of other than Tamil students and as such each one of these four criteria has clear nexus with the equivalence of the certificates issued by the Tamil Nadu institutes."

16. Therefore the very same conditions imposed and clarifications issued in paragraph two of the said G.O.Ms.No.1236, Education(U) Department dated 17.09.1984, have been put on note for legal scrutiny of this Court and ultimately, findings were given about the validity of the said conditions. Subsequently, the State Government has come out with another G.O.Ms.No. 906, Education (U-I) Department, dated 16.06.1987, in and by which, the G.O. has introduced certain further minimum qualification for the candidates to be admitted in the Teachers training institutes for studying the diploma in Teachers Education Course which is the essential qualification for the appointment to the post of secondary grade teachers. According to the said G.O.Ms.No.906, the revised minimum qualification for entering to the diploma in teaching education course was introduced for the students to be admitted from the academic year 1987-88. In the said G.O. under the heading "Qualification of candidates", the following has been prescribed:

"Qualification of candidates:

The minimum Education Qualification required for admission to the Diploma in Teacher Education Course shall be as follows: A pass in Plus Two (High Secondary) Examination both under General and Vocational Streams other than Secondary Grade Teacher's Training under Vocational Course".

17. Thereafter, in the year 2009, the Government has come out with another G.O.(3D)No.118, School Education (UI) Department, dated 03.12.2009, where the Government has brought a ban for evaluating the teacher education certificate obtained by the candidates from the other states. According to the said G.O. (3D).No.118, the evaluation of other States D.TEd. course certificates can be done only to the candidates who obtained the D.TEd. course certificate in other States in the year 2007-08 or before. The certificate of those candidates who joined in other States in the year 2008 or after need not be taken up for evaluation. The import of the said G.O. as mentioned in paragraph 7, are produced here under.

"7. After carefully examining the above proposal of the Director of Teacher Education, Research and Training, Government accept the same and it is ordered that evaluation certificates can be issued only to the candidates who obtained the D.TEd. Course Certificate in other states in the year 2007-08 or before, the certificates in respect of the candidates in other State makes a request to Government of Tamil Nadu

seeking to evaluate the certificates of students who studied in that State, the syllabus as prescribed by that State shall be scrutinized by the Tamil Nadu State Resource Group and only when it is certified that the syllabus is equivalent to that of Tamil Nadu the Certificates issued by that State can be evaluated in term of G.O.(ID).No.26, School Education (U1) Department dated 21.02.2003 as equivalent to the Diploma in Teacher Education Course Certificate awarded by Tamil Nadu.

8. The Director of Teacher Education Research and Training is instructed to communicate a copy of this order to all the field officers, immediately."

18. In fact, as stated supra, the G.O.Ms.1667, dated 05.08.1981 was put under challenge and validity of the same was dealt in the judgment by the Division Bench in 1985 in the matter of K.Anthony Savarimuthu Vs. The Director of School Education, Madras-6 and another". In the very same judgment the import of G.O.Ms.No. 1236, dated 17.09.1984 have been approved. Therefore, the G.O.Ms.No.1236 dated 17.09.1984 was in the field at least from 1984 for the purpose of evaluation of teachers education certificate of other states.

19. The minimum qualification for entering into the Diploma in Education Course was made as plus two only from the academic year 1987-88 by G.O.Ms.No.906, Education (U-1) Department dated 16.06.1987. By the latest G.O. in G.O.(3D). No.118, dated 03.12.2009 as referred to above, the Government wants to stop the evaluation of other State certificates, especially from Karnataka State, beyond 2007 that the students who under gone the course in 2008-09 would not be entitled for evaluation of their certificates.

20. Interestingly, the said G.O.(3D)No.118, dated 03.12.2009 was also put under challenge before this Court in a batch of writ petitions in W.P.Nos.18627 to 18629 of 2010, by the students who have either joined the course in 2007-2008 or completed the same. The learned Judge of this Court by order dated 30.04.2014, though upheld the validity of the said G.O. has shown sympathy for the students especially, the petitioners therein who had either joined the course or undergone the course during the relevant period i.e., 2007-08. As the Diploma in Teacher Education Course is of two years duration, the students who joined in the year 2007-08, would be in the second year in the year 2008-09. While so, wherein the G.O. was issued only in

December, i.e., on 03.12.2009, the students of 2008-09 would be in the first year. The learned Judge passed the following orders in W.P.Nos.18627 to 18629 of 2010 dated 30.04.2014:

"8. In that view of the matter, this Court, finding that the impugned G.O. has been issued with retrospective effect, while upholding the G.O., in view of the peculiar situation discussed as above, this Court hereby directs the respondent 1 and 2 to consider whether the certificates of D.Ed. Course, obtained by the petitioners herein, from the 4th to 6th respondents, Sri Ganesh D.Ed. College, Diganth Teachers' Training Institute and Dr. Davidraja D.Ed. College, as equivalent or not, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this Order.

9. With the above direction, the writ petitioners are disposed of. Consequently, the connected M.Ps are closed. No costs."

21. All the above said Government Orders and various verdicts of this Court as discussed above, are the basis for the decision to be taken in the present writ petition. It is the fact that originally G.O.Ms.No.1667, dated 05.08.1981 was issued to stop the evaluation process of other States teachers education certificates and the same was quashed by this Court. Subsequently, and in fact, during pendency of such batch of cases, the Government issued another Government Order in G.O.Ms.No.1236 dated 17.09.1984 and the import of the said G.O. have been approved by the said Division Bench itself, cited supra. Only thereafter, in the year 1987 i.e., from the academic year 1987-88 the minimum educational qualification of plus two for admission of Diploma in Teacher Education was introduced in G.O.Ms.906, dated 16.06.1987 and ultimately, the evaluation of teacher education certificate from other States Teacher Education Course from the year 2008-09 was stopped by the import of G.O.(3D)No.118, dated 03.12.2009. These G.Os. referred to above as well as the orders made by this Court continue to hold the field under which the evaluation can be made of certificate/diploma in teachers education issued by various other State Boards. However, from 2008-09 onwards even the certificate in diplomas issued by the other State Boards shall not be evaluated by virtue of the import of G.O.(3D).No. 118, dated 03.12.2009.

22. If we take up the case of the petitioner, who had completed S.S.L.C. course in the year 1985 and immediately, she joined in the integrated pre-university course i.e., PUC which

includes teacher education certificate also in the year 1985-86 and she has completed the same in the year 1987-88. Therefore, even before the issuance of G.O(3D).No.118, dated 03.12.2009, the petitioner had completed her integrated PUC course with Teacher Educational Certificate long back. In so far as the certificate obtained by the petitioner is concerned, it should have been evaluated only on the basis of the criteria or the conditions prescribed in G.O.Ms.No.1236, dated 17.09.1984 only. As extracted above, four conditions were imposed in paragraph two of the said Government order, according to which, the students of other states who obtained Teachers Education Certificate and have passed the S.S.L.C in Tamil medium and obtained 50% aggregated marks in the S.S.L.C and obtained 50% marks in each subject in the Teacher Training certificate and if they studied other than Tamil medium in their S.S.L.C as well as Teacher Training certificate and satisfy the conditions 2 & 3, their certificates may be evaluated with conditions that they are eligible for appointment as Secondary Grade Teachers in Tamil Nadu only in schools where medium of instruction is other than Tamil. As the petitioner satisfied these conditions imposed in paragraph two of the said Government Order, the certificate of the petitioner had been evaluated and ultimately, the qualification was accepted and she was appointed as secondary grade teacher in the year 1996.

23. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would vehemently contend that since the petitioner has selected Tamil as one of the languages and she obtained 50% marks aggregate in S.S.L.C. and as according to the learned counsel, the petitioner has obtained 275 marks out of 550, which is exactly 50%, she has also cleared the second condition. In so far as the third condition of obtaining 50% of marks in each subject in the teacher training certificate, the learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that in Education subject for both papers 1 and 2 the petitioner got 49 and 59 marks out of 100 each and in total the petitioner obtained 108 marks, which is 54%. Therefore, she has fulfilled the third condition also. In so far as the fourth condition is concerned, only in case where not fulfilled the conditions of Tamil study and also fulfill conditions 2 and 3, however shall be considered only in the school where Tamil is not the medium of instruction.

24. Therefore, the learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that since the petitioner has fulfilled the conditions Nos. 1,2 as well as 3, there is no further difficulty for the respondents to evaluate the certificate of the petitioner and the same was done in fact, even prior to the appointment made in the year 1996. However, for the reasons best known, the respondents adamantly passed an order citing the

reasons as has been reflected in the impugned order, therefore, it cannot be sustained, the learned counsel for the petitioner contends.

25. As has been rightly pointed out by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner had joined the course ie., integrated PUC with teacher education subject of two years duration in the year 1985-86 itself and she has completed the course in the year 1987-88, only based on that certificate, and after having considered the same, the appointment was made to the petitioner. However, ultimately the third respondent came to the conclusion that the certificate obtained by the petitioner is not equivalent for the appointment to the post of secondary grade teacher. Then the evaluation should have been done by the Evaluating Committee or any other Authority subsequently named for this purpose by thoroughly evaluating the subjects as well as the marks obtained by the candidates strictly in accordance with the Government order which was holding the field. In so far as the petitioner's qualification is concerned, it should be evaluated as per the conditions imposed as per G.O.Ms. 1236, dated 17.09.1984 as referred to above. If these conditions are applied by verifying the certificates produced by the petitioner, there is every possibility to hold that the petitioner has fulfilled the conditions numbers 1 to 3 and the certificates could be evaluated and accepted by the respondents. But the respondents, especially the third respondent, even in the present impugned order, had cited the reasons for rejecting the representation of the petitioner and ultimately removal of service, that since 1987 the minimum educational qualification for joining the diploma course in teaching had fixed as plus two and therefore the PUC is not equal to that and the same cannot be treated as equivalent to diploma awarded in the State of Tamil Nadu. More over, in that of view, the third respondent has come to the conclusion that the petitioner had not acquired qualification for appointment to the post of secondary grade teacher in this State therefore, the impugned order was passed.

26. This Court does not agree with the reason given by the third respondent in the impugned order for the simple reason that the minimum educational qualification for joining the Diploma in Teachers Education was introduced in the year 1987 and before which the petitioner had joined and completed the course ie. 1985-86, 1986-87. In a similar case in the judgement referred to, the learned Judge of this Court in W.P.No. 18627 of 2010 in the matter of A.Sumia and others Vs. State of Tamil Nadu rep. By its Secretary to Government, School Education Department, Chennai and others dated 30.04.2014, had given the direction for evaluation of certificate for the students who had

either joined the course or were under going the course at the time of introduction of the Government Order namely

G.O.(3D).No.118 dated 03.12.2009. The said principle can very well applied herein in the case of the petitioner as she had joined the course in 1985-86 and well before the introduction of the plus two as the basic qualification for entering into the diploma course in teacher education, the petitioner had completed the said PUC course. Therefore, the very same reason given by the third respondent in the impugned order is wholly un-justifiable and totally un-sustainable. Therefore, this Court has no hesitation to quash the said impugned order passed by the third respondent.

27. Pursuant to the impugned order dated 01.10.2009, the petitioner was removed from service and for all these years between 2009-2016 she was out of service. However, even though the issue was initiated by the first respondent in the year 1996 by the earlier order of cancellation of the appointment of the petitioner made on 07.10.1996, by the interference of the Administrative Tribunal subsequently by this Court, the petitioner was continuing her service till the impugned order is passed. Therefore, it is the fact that the petitioner had been in service in the years 1996 to 2009.

28. Since the reason cited in the impugned order is unsustainable and the impugned order is quashed, the respondents should take into account the certificate obtained by the petitioner namely, "Board of Pre-University Education Certificate" and "Board of Pre-University Internship Course in Teaching Certificate", issued by the Government of Karnataka dated 03.11.1988 as equalvalent qualification for the diploma in teacher education or other equivalent course certificate issued by the State of Tamil Nadu during the relevant period ie. prior to 1987-88.

29. Therefore, this Court instead of merely passing the order of remanding the matter for re-considering the issue once again to the third respondent, is inclined to direct the third respondent to accept the certificate of the petitioner as referred to above and based on which suitable order can be passed for reinstating the petitioner into service. Since the petitioner is out of service from 2009 till date, the petitioner shall not be entitled for any back wages during this period. However, her service continuity shall be maintained for the purpose of other service benefits.

30. With the above directions, the writ petition is allowed. No costs.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

rts

To

1. The Chief Educational Officer,
Kancheepuram.
2. The Head Master,
Government High School,
Veerankunnam, Kancheepuram District,
3. The Director of School Education,
College Road, Chennai - 6.

+1cc to Mr.Raghavachari, Advocate, S.R.No.66627
+1cc to the Government Pleader, S.R.No.67119

KS (CO)
RS (12/01/2017)

W.P.No.20911 of 2009

सत्यमेव जयते

WEB COPY