

**BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT****DATED: 23.02.2017****CORAM:****THE HON'BLE Mr.JUSTICE S.VAIDYANATHAN****W.P. (MD) No.1049 of 2017
and W.M.P. (MD) Nos.885 and 886 of 2017**

The Correspondent,
Holy Family High School,
Arukani 629 101,
Kanyakumari District.

... 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,
Kanyakumari at Nagercoil,
Kanyakumari District.

4.The District Educational Officer,
Kuzhithurai, Kanyakumari District.

... Respondents

Prayer: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records relating to the impugned proceedings issued by the 4th respondent in Na.Ka.No.5095/Aa2/2015 dated 16.11.2015 refusing approval to the appointment of R.Shaila Kumari as Watchmen in the petitioner's school, quash the same and direct the 4th respondent to give approval forthwith to the appointment of R.Shaila Kumari as Watchmen and disburse the grant in aid towards her salary and allowances with all attendant benefits w.e.f.the date of her appointment viz., 01.08.2014.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Cibi Chakraborty

For Respondents : Mr.M.Rajarajan, G.A.



O R D E R

This writ petition has been filed, seeking to quash the order of the 4th respondent dated 16.11.2015 vide which, the 4th respondent has returned the proposal, on the ground that prior permission for appointment of R.Shaila Kumari as Watchmen was not obtained by the petitioner / school.

2.The petitioner also sought a direction to the respondent concerned to approve the appointment of R.Shaila Kumari as Watchmen in the petitioner / school from the date of appointment with all consequential monetary benefits and arrears of salary as per proposal submitted by the school.

3.Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents / Department.

4.The petitioner / school has appointed R.Shaila Kumari as Watchmen in the petitioner / school, which is an Educational Institution. The petitioner / school herein forwarded the proposal of approval of appointment. The eligibility of the petitioner to the said post is not in dispute. By the said impugned order, the proposal has been rejected by the respondent concerned.

5.The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the school is governed by the Tamil Nadu Recognized Private Schools (Regulation) Act, 1973 and the Rules 1974 framed thereunder. Section 19 stipulates the qualifications and the conditions of service of employees in private schools. Section 20 speaks about the conditions of appointment. In addition to that, the Tamil Nadu Minority Aided Schools (Recognition and Payment of Grant) Rules, 1977 also stipulates the rules in respect of **Administration of Aided Minority School**. Annexure - III of Rule 8 provides for the **sanctioning and appointment of** Library Clerk, Record Clerk and Laboratory and Library Assistants, Peons, Watchman, Waterman, Gardener, Sweeper and Scavenger in the Minority Aided Schools.

6. It is seen that the Government of Tamil Nadu vide G.O.Ms.212 dated 29.11.2001 imposed ban on appointment of different categories of post, excepting Police, Doctors and Teachers. The ban was lifted vide G.O.14 dated 07.02.2006 enabling the fulfillment of non-teaching staff. G.O.Ms.115 dated 30.05.2007, directed filling up of certain categories of non-teaching staff by appointment and the remaining categories of non-teaching staff by outsourcing. Vide G.O.Ms.No.189 dated 29.07.2009, the vacancies of Record Clerk and Office Assistant are to be filled upon on a priority basis. Subsequently, G.O.203 dated



23.07.2010 mandated that certain categories of non-teaching staff like Junior Assistant, Librarian, Laboratory Assistant, Record Clerk and Office Assistant are to be approved from the date of appointment.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that once the post is sanctioned by the Director under Rule 15(1) of the Rules, the 4th respondent is bound to sanction grant as per Rule 11(2) of the Rules and there is no need to get prior permission from any authority to fill the vacancies that would arise in the sanctioned post. Unless the State Government suitably amends the provisions of the Act and the Rules making it mandatory

7.1. This Court is in entire agreement with the said submission. Since there is no such provision in the Act and the Rules to seek prior permission, the respondent concerned could not rely on the impugned Government Orders/Government Letters imposing condition seeking permission of the State Government or the Director or any authority to fill up the sanctioned posts for approving of the same for the purpose of grant and therefore, the impugned Government Orders and the consequential proceedings refusing to approve of the non-teaching posts for the purpose of grant are issued in gross violation of the provisions of Sections 19 and 20 of the Act read with Rule 15 of the Rules.

7.2. The Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in ***The Manager, Concordia High and Higher Secondary Schools V. Tmt.S.Christy and Others***, reported in ***2013 Writ L.R. 691*** held as under:

"4. In considering the contentions as put forth in the writ petition, learned single Judge pointed out to the judgment passed by this Court in W.A.Nos.93 and 94 of 2009 decided on 06.01.2010 that for any sanctioned post, no prior approval is necessary. In respect of proceedings noting the availability of posts, the learned single Judge pointed out that there is no necessity for prior approval. In any event, the appointment without getting approval could not be a ground for not considering the writ petitioner's plea".

7.3. A similar question arose for consideration in the case of ***S.Rasheetha Banu V. State of Tamil Nadu, rep. by its Secretary to Government, Chennai and others***, reported in ***(2012) 4 MLJ 198*** wherein this Court has categorically held that "if a person is appointed in a sanctioned post in the Private Aided Minority School, the approval cannot be rejected for the purpose of grant on the ground that no prior permission was obtained before appointment". It is useful to extract paragraph 7 of the said order in this regard :

"7. The issue involved in this Writ Petition was already considered by a Division Bench of this Court in W.A.No.1263 of 2001, dated 22.1.2004. In the said



Judgment, it is held that if a person is appointed in a sanctioned post, the approval of appointment cannot be rejected and if there is fall in strength and the post become surplus, after granting approval of the post, the said teacher along with post could be transferred/deployed to a needy school. The said Judgment of the Division Bench was followed in W.P.(MD)No.11353 of 2008, dated 11.9.2009. As against the said order dated 11.9.2009, the department preferred W.A.(MD)No.703 of 2009. A Division Bench of this Court, by Judgment dated 1.2.2011, dismissed the said Writ Appeal."

8.The question of approval to the appointment of non-teaching staff in the sanctioned post after the introduction of G.O.Ms.No.115 and G.O.203 came to be considered by this Court and the Madurai Bench of Madras High Court quashed G.O.Ms.115 dated 30.05.2007 and G.O.203 dated 23.07.2010 vide order dated 15.03.2016 passed in W.P.(MD) Nos.11481 of 2008, etc. batch. It will be appropriate to extract the operative portion of the order as under:

"38. In the result, for the details reasons mentioned above,

(i) All these writ petitions are allowed.

(ii) Impugned G.Os., namely, G.O.Ms.No.115, School Education Department, dated 30.05.2007 and G.O.Ms.No.203, School Education Department, dated 23.07.2010 and Government Letter No.8884/D1/2011-2, dated 09.07.2012, are quashed.

(iii) The impugned orders of the DEOs/DEEOs refusing to approve of the appointments of various non-teaching posts in these writ petitions are set aside and the official respondents are directed to approve of those appointments of the non-teaching staff in the Private Aided Schools concerned in these writ petitions and to sanction grant."

9.In view of the above stated position and also in the light of the judgment of this Court in W.P.(MD) Nos.11481 of 2008, etc. batch (stated supra), this Court is of the view that the impugned order of the 4th respondent is liable to be set aside.

10.Accordingly, this Writ Petition is allowed. The impugned order of the 4th respondent, returning the proposal of the petitioner / school, amounting to refusal to approve the appointment of R.Shaila Kumari as Watchmen is set aside and the 4th respondent is directed to accord approval to the appointment of R.Shaila Kumari as Watchmen in the petitioner / school from the date of appointment with all monetary and other service benefits, including arrears of salary and allowances, within a period of two



weeks from the date on which the proposal is submitted / re-submitted by the respondent / School. No costs. Consequently, connected W.M.Ps are closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(P&A)

WEB COPY

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1.The Secretary to the 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,
Kanyakumari at Nagercoil,
Kanyakumari District.

4.The District Educational Officer,
Kuzhithurai, Kanyakumari District.

+1cc to Mr.T.Cibi Chakraborty, Advocate in SR.No:10765

nbg

AE/RR/SAR3/27.04.2017/5P/6C

W.P. (MD) No.1049 of 2017
23.02.2017