



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 25.10.2016

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE Dr.JUSTICE S.VIMALA

W.P (MD) No.20401 of 2016

and

WMP (MD) Nos.14592 and 14593 of 2016

S.G.Sujin

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu
rep.by its Secretary
Department of School Education,
Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Director of School Education,
College Road, Chennai - 600 006.
3. The Chief Educational Officer,
Chief Educational Office,
Nagercoil,
Kanyakumari District.
4. The District Educational Officer,
District Educational Office,
Kuzhithurai,
Kanyakumari District - 629 163.
5. The Correspondent,
M.M.K.M.High School,
Varuthattu
Methukummal Post,
Kanyakumari District.

... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records on the files of the 4th respondent pertaining to its proceedings bearing Athi.Moo.No.4340/A4/16 dated 25.08.2016 and to quash the same and consequently direct the 4th respondent to approve the appointment of the petitioner as B.T.Assistant (Maths) with effect from the date of her appointment that is on 01.06.2015 and to grant all service and monitory benefits. The petitioner is insisting a pass in TET within a time frame that may be stipulated by this Court.



For Petitioner : Mr.S.C.Herold Singh
For Respondents 1-4 : Mr.T.S.Mohammed Mohideen
Additional Government Pleader

WEB COPY

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed seeking to quash the impugned proceedings issued by the fourth respondent dated 25.08.2016, by which the proposal has been returned for want of TET certificate and consequently direct the fourth respondent to approve the appointment of the petitioner as B.T.Assistant (Maths) with effect from the date of her appointment that is on 01.06.2015 and to grant all service and monitory benefits without insisting a pass in TET.

2.Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Government Pleader who takes notice for the respondents. By consent the writ petition itself is taken up for final disposal at the admission stage.

3.The fifth respondent is a recognised minority educational institution. One post of BT Assistant (Maths) in the fifth respondent school fell vacant on 01.06.2015 due to promotion of one T.Sathiyadas as Headmaster. In that vacancy, the fifth respondent school appointed the petitioner as BT Assistant (Maths).

4.The fifth respondent school submitted a proposal to the fourth respondent requesting to approve the appointment of the petitioner as BT Assistant (Maths) from 01.06.2015 and grant all service and monetary benefits. But the fourth respondent returned the proposal and directed to resubmit the proposal after rectifying the deficiencies pointed out therein. Despite, the fifth respondent school resubmitted the proposal to the fourth respondent, the same was not considered so far. Hence, the present Writ Petition has been filed.

5.The learned counsel for the petitioner has brought to the attention of this Court to the Judgment of the Division Bench of this Court in W.A.Nos.213 and 572 of 2016 etc. batch, dated 24.08.2016, wherein a direction was issued to the Government to release the salary of the Teachers and also to pay the arrears of salary within a period of two months.

6.Article 45 of the Constitution of India directed the States to endure to provide free and compulsory education to all children until they complete the age of 14 years and this should be secured within a period of 10 years from the commencement of the Constitution. Article 45 was amended by the 86th Constitution



Amendment Act, 2002 and it reads "the State shall endeavour to provide early childhood care and education for all children until they complete the age of 14 year". Under the very same enactment, the right to education became a fundamental right to the children between the age group of 6 to 14. Thereafter, parliament enacted the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 (hereinafter called "RTE Act") with the object of providing free education, which came into force from 01.04.2010.

6.1. With the view to improve the quality of education and to provide quality education to children, Section 23 of the RTE Act makes it mandatory for a person, who seeks appointment in the schools covered under RTE Act to possess minimum qualification as laid down by the Academic Authority. As per Section 23 (1) of RTE Act National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE) was notified as the Academic Authority. The authority, while providing for guidelines to conduct Teacher Eligibility Test indicated that the teacher should have passed Teacher Eligibility Test (in short "TET") to be conducted by the appropriate Government in accordance with the guidelines in order to get appointment as Teacher.

6.2. Accepting this recommendation, the Government of Tamil Nadu issued G.O.Ms.No.181 School Education Department dated 15.11.2011. The Government also passed G.O.Ms.25 dated 06.02.2014, under which, the minimum marks to be obtained by various categories were prescribed was also quashed by the Hon'ble Division Bench. The constitutional validity of RTE Act was under challenge before the Supreme Court in the case of **Society for Unaided Private Schools of Rajasthan vs. Union of India, 2012 (6) SCC 1**. The Apex Court while upholding the constitutional validity held that the Act is applicable to all schools, except the unaided minority schools.

6.3. In the case of **Pramati Educational and Cultural Trust vs. Union of India, 2014 (4) MLJ 486**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that under Article 31 of the Constitution of India, all minorities, whether based on religion or language shall have the right to establish and administer educational institutions of their choice and therefore, those institutions have a special constitutional right to establish and administer educational schools of their choice.

7. The Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in the case of W.A. (MD) No.213 and 572 of 2016, based on the judgment in Pramati's case, held that G.O.Ms.No.181, School Education Department, dated 15.11.2011, which was issued prior to the directions of NCET, cannot be made applicable to minority institutions. The Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in the said decision has only suggested that the minority institution may consider conducting a refresher course and also some interactive



sessions in order to ensure the quality of teachers. Therefore, it is clear that the impugned order passed is liable to be set aside in view of the legal position enunciated in W.A.(MD) No.213 and 572 of 2016.

8. Accordingly, the 4th respondent is directed to approve the appointment of the petitioner as BT Assistant (Maths) in the fifth respondent school with effect from the date of her appointment i.e., on 01.06.2015 and to grant all service and monitory benefits within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

9. With the above observation and direction, this Writ Petition is disposed of. No costs. Consequently, WMP(MD) Nos.14592 and 14593 of 2016 are closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-I)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1. The Secretary
State of Tamil Nadu
Department of School Education,
Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Director of School Education,
College Road, Chennai - 600 006.
3. The Chief Educational Officer,
Chief Educational Office,
Nagercoil, Kanyakumari District.
4. The District Educational Officer,
District Educational Office,
Kuzhithurai,
Kanyakumari District - 629 163.

+ 1 CC TO SPECIAL GOVERNMENT PLEADER IN SR No. 64241
+ 1 CC TO Mr.S.C.HEROLD SINGH, ADVOCATE IN SR No. 63389

MJ

TE/KM : 14/12/2016 : 4P/7C

W.P(MD)No.20401 of 2016

and

WMP(MD) Nos.14592 and 14593 of 2016

25.10.2016