

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 19.07.2018

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.VAIDYANATHAN

W.P.No.28352 of 2017

and

W.P.No.3241 of 2018

W.P.No.28352 of 2017:

Dr.S.Diraviam Dinesh

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Director of School Education,
DPI Campus, College Road,
Opp. Sankara Nethralaya Hospital,
Chennai-600 006.
2. The Director of Matriculation Schools,
DPI Campus, College Road,
Opp. Sankara Nethralaya Hospital,
Chennai-600 006.
3. The Inspector of Matriculation Schools-Kancheepuram,
DPI Campus, College Road,
Opp. Sankara Nethralaya Hospital,
Chennai-600 006.
4. Holy Queen Matriculation School,
No.25, Thiruvalluvar Street,
Gandhi Nagar, Nagalkeni,
Chennai-600 044
Rep. by its Correspondent
Jeya Sagaya Sathish

5. Dr.K.N.Lakshmy

.. Respondents

(R5 suo-motu impleaded as per order dated 08.11.2017 in
W.P.No.28352 of 2017)

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus to direct the respondents 1 to 3 to consider the petitioner's representation dated 24.10.2017 to initiate stringent action against the 4th respondent - Holy Queen Matriculation School, Nagelkeni, Chennai

for issuing bogus TC with Community misrepresentation as Scheduled Caste.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Diraviam Dinesh,
Party-in-Person

For Respondents 1 to 3 : Mr.A.Rajaperumal,
Addl. Government Pleader

For Respondents 4 & 5 : Mr.S.Gomathinayagam,
Senior Counsel
for Mr.K.A.Dhanasekaran

W.P.No.3241 of 2018:

Dr.S.Diraviam Dinesh

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Regional Officer-Chennai,
CBSE, New No.3, Old No.1630 A, "J" Block,
16th Main Road, Anna Nagar (West),
Chennai-600 040.
2. The Deputy Secretary (AFF),
CBSE, Shiksha Kendra, Community Centre,
Preet Vihar, Delhi-110 092.
3. The Public Grievances Redressal Officer &
Deputy Secretary,
CBSE, New No.3, Old No.1630 A, "J" Block,
16th Main Road, Anna Nagar (West),
Chennai-600 040.
4. Silicon City Public School,
Silicon City Academy of Secondary Education,
Kumar Nursery, New Bank Colony,
Konanakunte, Bengaluru-560 062.
Rep. by its Chairman Dr.K.S.Sameera Simha
5. The Principal,
Silicon City Public School,
Kumar Nursery, New Bank Colony,
Konanakunte, Bengaluru-560 062.
6. Dr. K.N.Lakshmy

7. Holy Queen Matriculation School,
No.25, Thiruvalluvar Street,
Gandhi Nagar, Nagelkeni,
Chennai-600 044,
Rep. by its Correspondent
Mr.Jeya Sagaya Sathish

.. Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for entire records of the order vide CBSE/RO(M)/DS/PG/2018, dated 13.01.2018 passed by the third respondent on the petitioner's representation dated 26.12.2017 to the first respondent and quash the same and direct the respondents 1 and 2 to consider the petitioner's representation, dated 26.12.2017 afresh to initiate appropriate action as against the fourth respondent, Silicon City Public School, Bengaluru for malpractice in admission and subsequent fraudulent cover-up acts.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Diraviam Dinesh,
Party-in-Person
For Respondents 1 to 3 : Mr.G.Nagarajan
For Respondents 4 & 5 : Mr.D.Bennington
For Respondents 6 & 7 : Mr.S.Gomathinayagam,
Senior Counsel
for Mr.K.A.Dhanasekaran

C O M M O N O R D E R

As the issue involved in both the Writ Petitions is one and the same, the cases are taken up for disposal by a common order. In both the above Writ Petitions, the Petitioner is one and the same.

2. Initially, the Petitioner has filed W.P.No.28352 of 2017 seeking a direction to Respondents 1 to 3 to consider his representation dated 24.10.2017 to initiate stringent action against the 4th Respondent/Holy Queen Matriculation School, Nagelkeni, Chennai for issuing bogus Transfer Certificate to his daughter and for misrepresentation of her Community as 'Scheduled Caste' in the same.

3. Thereafter, the Petitioner has filed W.P.No.3241 of 2018 seeking to quash the order dated 13.01.2018 passed by the third respondent on his representation dated 26.12.2017 to the first respondent and for a consequential direction to respondents 1 and 2 to consider his representation, dated 26.12.2017 afresh, to initiate appropriate action against the 4th Respondent/Silicon City Public School, Bengaluru, for

malpractice in admission and subsequent fraudulent cover-up acts.

4. The case of the Petitioner, in detail, is as under:

4.1. The Petitioner is a Medical Research Scientist with International recognition in the field of Bacterial Infections and Cancer Research and is presently practicing as an Advocate in Chennai. His daughter viz. Keerthana Dinesh was pursuing education at St. Raphael's Cathedral School (CBSE), Palakkad, Kerala, since her Class I. Amidst marital issues, prioritizing the overall welfare of the child, the Petitioner wanted his daughter to continue her studies in the above-said School under his care and supervision. However, his estranged wife, viz. Dr.K.N.Lakshmy, who is also a party to the above Writ Petitions took away his daughter from him to a different place after completion of her II Standard in 2012. Thereafter, he came to know that his daughter was admitted by his wife in one Silicon City Public School, Konanakunte, Bengaluru.

4.2. From the admission information obtained from Silicon City Public School, Bengaluru through the RTI, the Petitioner learnt that the T.C. Submitted for his daughter towards admission in the said School was issued by an unrelated School, viz. Holy Queen Matriculation School, Nagelkeni, Chennai and that his estranged wife had used a fabricated T.C. to seek admission for his daughter in the III Standard for the second time, due to which, his daughter lost one year of her Schooling for no good reason.

4.3. As per the dates mentioned in the fabricated T.C., the Petitioner's daughter seemed to have attended two Schools in two States (Kerala and Tamil Nadu) at the same time, which is unrealistic. In the above said fake T.C., the Petitioner had also noticed misrepresentation of the Community of his daughter, as 'Scheduled Caste' by his wife, with an ill-intention of misusing the benefits that are meant for people belonging to Scheduled Caste category. Unlike as mentioned in the fabricated T.C. Obtained from Holy Queen Matriculation School, Chennai, the Petitioner's daughter Keerthana belongs to Backward Class and not Scheduled Caste.

4.4. When the Petitioner raised this issue with the Principal of Silicon City Public School, Bengaluru, one of the relatives of his wife, viz. Shantaram tried to obtain T.C. of the Petitioner's daughter from St. Raphael's Cathedral School, Palakkad, Kerala through the Director of Public Instructions, Kerala, knowing well that the DPI of the State has no authority over CBSE-affiliated Schools in such matters. However, the DPI, Kerala had issued an ultra vires order directing St. Raphael's Cathedral School to issue T.C. of his daughter. Upon filing W.P.No.26673 of 2013 before the High Court of Kerala, Ernakulam

Bench, the order of DPI, Kerala was stayed and the said Writ Petition was disposed of, as St.Raphael's Cathedral School, Palakkad, undertook that the School did not oblige to the order of the DPI, Kerala and also undertook to maintain status quo that T.C. will not be issued without the Petitioner's consent.

4.5. After the Petitioner raised the issue of bogus T.C., Silicon City Public School, Bengaluru had issued a communication to Holy Queen Matriculation School, Chennai seeking clarification regarding the authenticity of the T.C. issued by them. Towards the above clarification, Holy Queen Matriculation School, Chennai had replied vide letter dated 24.09.2013 that the said T.C. issued in the name of Keerthana Dinesh was indeed issued by their School and that the same was genuine.

4.6. Thereafter, the Petitioner contacted the Correspondent of Holy Queen Matriculation School, Chennai and confronted them as to how they had issued a T.C. to his daughter, who studied at Palakkad, Kerala. Since there was no feedback from the said School in spite of several follow-up communications, the Petitioner lodged a criminal complaint against the Principal and Correspondent of Holy Queen Matriculation School, Chennai and also against his estranged wife, Lakshmy, in C.C.No.257 of 2014 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Tambaram, Chennai. During the stage of trial, all the accused in C.C.No.257 of 2014 filed Crl.O.P.No.23407 of 2016 before this Court seeking to quash the said complaint, and obtained an order of stay.

4.7. On 25.06.2013, the Petitioner sent an inquiry e-mail to Silicon City Public School, Bengaluru regarding admission of his daughter. As there was no response to his email, the Petitioner visited the said School on 11.07.2013 and enquired with the Principal about the admission of his daughter. Though the Principal refused to answer, she asked the Petitioner to give a written request. On 16.07.2013, Silicon City Public School, Bengaluru sent a letter to the Petitioner stating that his daughter was admitted in III Standard and all the documents required for admission, are in order, including the T.C. from the previous School. On 22.07.2013, the Petitioner sent an RTI application to Silicon City Public School, Bengaluru, requesting admission details of his daughter including T.C. from the previous School. Thereafter, vide communication dated 20.08.2013, the Petitioner received the admission details of Keerthana, including a copy of fake T.C. On 26.08.2013, the Petitioner communicated the information regarding the fake T.C. issued by Holy Queen Matriculation School, Chennai and misrepresentation of caste, to Silicon City Public School, Bengaluru along with a copy of his Community Certificate (Backward Class).

4.8. Aggrieved by the fact that his daughter Keerthana was admitted to III Standard for the second time in Silicon Public School, Bengaluru, the Petitioner requested the School authorities to rectify the mistake in the admission, so that he could find a way to admit his daughter in the right Class. Since the Bengaluru School authorities became un-cooperative, the Petitioner, having no other option, sent a letter dated 05.09.2013 to the CBSE lodging a complaint against Silicon City Public School, Bengaluru. In response to the letter dated 13.11.2013 sent by the CBSE, the Petitioner provided all necessary evidence on 19.11.2013. Despite several communications to the CBSE, as no action was taken against the said School, the Petitioner sent a communication to the Vigilance Department of CBSE, which took the matter for enquiry only in 2016.

4.9. From the investigation by the CBSE-Vigilance Department, the Petitioner learnt that Silicon City Public School, Bengaluru has been giving misleading replies to the letters sent by the CBSE-Vigilance and neither sent specific reply/information nor submitted copies of the documents sought by the Department. The CBSE-Vigilance also came to the conclusion that Silicon City Public School, Bengaluru has been suppressing the facts and could be involved in giving admission to his daughter on the basis of fake T.C. Later, when the cover-up actions were narrowed down, Silicon City Public School, Bengaluru changed its stand by stating that the said admission was not based on the T.C., but based on the Right to Information Act.

4.10. More strikingly, the said fake T.C. was issued by Holy Queen Matriculation School, Chennai on 19.04.2013, in which, it was mentioned that the Petitioner's daughter Keerthana last attended the School on 19.04.2013. The said T.C. was submitted by his wife to Silicon City Public School, Bengaluru during the admission of Keerthana on 12.01.2013 and it was returned to her by the said School on the same day.

4.11. The Petitioner, thereafter, made representations to the Regional Officer, CBSE, Chennai and the Deputy Secretary (AFF), CBSE, Delhi, vide Letters dated 26.12.2017 to initiate proper action against Silicon City Public School, Bengaluru. The Petitioner received a reply dated 11.01.2018 from the Public Grievances Redressal Officer & Deputy Secretary, CBSE, which reads as under:

"With reference to your complaint with regard to Transfer Certificate of Keerthana Dinesh, the Principal, Silicon City Academy of Secondary Education has intimated in her reply that they have not deviated from the

procedure for admission laid down by the CBSE.

They have already submitted explanation and documentary evidences related to the admission of Keerthana to the concerned Authorities. The DDPI has personally visited the School and spoken to Keerthana and verified all the facts related to her father. She has requested that the School should not be disturbed because of parental dispute. Therefore, your grievance is disposed of."

4.12. According to the Petitioner, Respondents/CBSE, with the sole intention of safeguarding Silicon City Public School, Bengaluru, from any departmental action for the malpractices committed by them, in collusion with his estranged wife and Holy Queen Matriculation School, Chennai, have closed his complaint on the pretext that they have enquired his minor daughter with regard to all facts about him.

5. Respondents/CBSE have filed counter affidavit, wherein, it is stated that the Petitioner's representation dated 26.12.2017 has already been disposed of by the CBSE Regional Office and as such, there is no question of reconsidering the representation of the Petitioner. It is further stated that the Petitioner's wife, Lakshmy has addressed to the Deputy Director of Public Instructions, Bengaluru South, explaining the entire issue in detail and a copy of the letter dated 16.06.2017 was also enclosed. The Public Grievances Redressal Officer & Deputy Secretary, CBSE, after going through all the above facts, vide impugned letter dated 13.01.2018, disposed of the Petitioner's representation dated 26.12.2017. Hence, according to Respondents/CBSE, there is no illegality in the impugned order that requires re-consideration.

6. On behalf of Silicon City Public School, Bengaluru, the Principal of the said School has filed counter affidavit to the following effect:

6.1. On 12.01.2013, the Petitioner's wife approached Silicon City Public School, Bengaluru for admission of her child Keerthana in III Standard. She informed them that she was separated from her husband, i.e. the Petitioner herein for personal reasons and also informed them that her daughter studied III Standard earlier in Holy Queen Matriculation School, Chennai. However, since she had not been to School properly, she requested them to admit her child in III Standard and she also produced the Transfer Certificate obtained from Holy Queen Matriculation School, Chennai. Further, she requested them to

hand over the Transfer Certificate on the same day, for legal purposes and requested them to admit the child based on her Birth Certificate. Since the provisions of the Right to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 permits the School to admit a child even without the Transfer Certificate, the School admitted the Petitioner's daughter based on her Birth Certificate, without insisting upon Transfer Certificate and handed over the original Transfer Certificate to his wife and retained the photocopy of it.

6.2. During the month of June 2013, Silicon City Public School, Bengaluru received e-mails and phone calls from the Petitioner contending that he is the father of the child 'Keerthana' and sought for her admission details. The School asked him to give a letter to that effect and accordingly, the Petitioner gave a letter on 11.07.2013 and the School replied for the same giving the admission details of Keerthana. However, after receiving the details about the admission of Keerthana, the Petitioner raised the allegation that the T.C. obtained by his wife is a bogus one and the admission of his daughter in their School is void, since it was done on the basis of bogus T.C.

6.3. Immediately, Silicon City Public School sent a letter to Holy Queen Matriculation School, Chennai on 18.09.2013 to confirm the genuineness of the Transfer Certificate issued by them in favour of Keerthana and vide reply letter dated 24.09.2013, Holy Queen Matriculation School, Chennai, informed the Petitioner that Transfer Certificate issued by them is genuine and informed the same to the Petitioner, whenever he sought information under RTI Act. Subsequently, the Petitioner raised the question of Keerthana's caste. Immediately, Silicon City Public School approached the Petitioner's wife Lakshmy and she gave an affidavit stating that her daughter's caste is wrongly mentioned and asked the School to correct the caste of Keerthana and accordingly, the School has corrected her caste, based on the Affidavit and Community Certificate submitted by the Petitioner's wife, Lakshmy.

6.4. Based on the Petitioner's representation dated 26.12.2017, the officials of the DPI, Karnataka personally visited Silicon City Public School, Bengaluru and the child Keerthana, and submitted a Report to the CBSE and based on the same, the representation of the Petitioner has been closed. According to Silicon City Public School, Bengaluru, the CBSE has clearly stated valid reasons in their letter dated 13.01.2018 for closure of the Petitioner's representation. It is further stated by them, that the said Keerthana was admitted in their School for III Standard in the year 2013 and presently, she is studying VII Standard and she is academically good both in

education and sports and that she is actively participating in all the events of the School and they are giving her good education, in spite of all the harassments caused to them by the Petitioner.

7. Heard the Petitioner-in-Person, learned counsel appearing for the respective Respondents and perused the material documents placed on record.

8. Admittedly, the Petitioner's daughter Keerthana was born in Palakkad, Kerala and her Birth Certificate has been issued in Palakkad, Kerala. Several litigations are pending between the Petitioner and his wife, Lakshmy and the present one on hand is with regard to the disposal of the Petitioner's representation dated 26.12.2017 by the Public Grievances Redressal Officer & Deputy Secretary, CBSE vide impugned letter dated 13.01.2018. The impugned letter is very clear that the Petitioner's representation dated 26.12.2017 has been disposed of only after consideration and necessary enquiry. But the reasons assigned in the impugned letter are cryptic and certainly, it is not a speaking order. In any event, the Management of Silicon City Public School, Bengaluru, has categorically stated in their counter that they have admitted the Petitioner's daughter Keerthana only based on her Birth Certificate without insisting upon her Transfer Certificate.

9. It is seen that the Petitioner's daughter, viz. Keerthana pursued III Standard in the academic year 2012-2013 in St. Raphael's Cathedral School, Palakkad, Kerala. Thereafter, she was admitted in Silicon City Public School, Bengaluru in the same III Standard for the academic year 2013-2014, by her mother, Lakshmy. It is further seen that the Petitioner was particular that the School in which his daughter was pursuing education in Palakkad, should not issue Transfer Certificate to her, without his knowledge. However, one of the relatives of his wife, Lakshmy had tried to obtain T.C. for his daughter from the School at Palakkad, through the Director of Public Instructions, Kerala. In this regard, the Petitioner had approached High Court of Kerala in W.P.(C) No.26673 of 2013 and the Kerala High Court, vide order dated 19.03.2015, has observed as under:

"The petitioner has come up before this Court challenging the authority of the 4th respondent to direct the 3rd respondent to issue a transfer certificate in the name of one Shantharam.

2. The learned counsel for the 3rd respondent submitted that they have not responded to Ext.P9 direction and no

transfer certificate has been issued. However, it was submitted that Keerthana.D. is not attending the class since June 2013.

3. Recording the said submission, the Writ Petition is closed."

10. On a reading of the above order of the Kerala High Court, it is clear that the Petitioner's daughter was studying in St. Raphael's Cathedral School at Palakkad, Kerala till May 2013. While so, the Petitioner's wife has produced the Transfer Certificate for the child Keerthana, as if she had studied III Standard for the academic year 2012-13 in Holy Queen Matriculation School, Nagelkeni, Chromepet, Chennai from 03.06.2012 to 19.04.2013. When the Petitioner's daughter was pursuing her education in Palakkad, Kerala for the academic year 2012-2013 under the care and custody of her mother, and there is an observation by the Kerala High Court in the order dated 19.03.2015 made in W.P.(C) No.26673 of 2013, that the child Keerthana had not attended Classes in the School at Palakkad, since June 2013, it is crystal clear that the Transfer Certificate issued by Holy Queen Matriculation School, Chennai, is fake.

11. Prima-facie, on the documentary evidence available before this Court, it is crystal clear that since the Petitioner had represented to St. Raphael's Cathedral School at Palakkad that the Management should not issue Transfer Certificate to his daughter Keerthana without his knowledge, his wife Lakshmy has managed to get a fake Transfer Certificate for her child Keerthana by influencing the Management of Holy Queen Matriculation School, Chennai, to seek admission in Silicon City Public School, Bengaluru for the academic year 2013-2014, when the fact remains that the child has not studied in the said School at Chennai. Furthermore, on a perusal of the fake Transfer Certificate issued by Holy Queen Matriculation School, Chennai, it is seen that it has been issued only at the instance of the Petitioner's wife, Lakshmy.

12. In this regard, the Petitioner represented before this Court that he belongs to Chettiar Community and that his estranged wife/Lakshmy belongs to Naidu Community and that her grandfather's name is Ramanathan Naidu. It is shocking to note that the Petitioner's wife has even gone to the extent of mentioning the Community of her daughter as 'Scheduled Caste', when the child actually belongs to 'Backward Class', as could be seen from the Community Certificate of her father, the Petitioner herein. The Petitioner's wife Lakshmy cannot contend that the Caste of her daughter had been wrongly mentioned, as

such facts, can never be wrongly mentioned by an educated parent.

13. Even though there is conflict of interest, it is seen that a Senior Counsel is engaged by the wife of the Petitioner, to represent both herself and Holy Queen Matriculation School at Chennai, for reasons best known to her. It is represented by the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the Petitioner's wife, Lakshmy and Holy Queen Matriculation School, Chennai, that a criminal case has already been filed against the said School and the Petitioner's wife, and the proceedings in respect of the offence under Section 420 IPC is pending. Whether the offence under Section 420 I.P.C. is made out or not, is for the Criminal Court to decide. That apart, when the Criminal Court is seized of the matter, it is not preponderance of probability, but, it is the prosecution, which has to prove its case beyond reasonable doubt.

14. The contention of the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the Petitioner's wife, Lakshmy that the Caste of the child mentioned as 'Scheduled Caste' in the Transfer Certificate obtained from Holy Queen Matriculation School, Chennai, has no value, cannot be accepted, as the Petitioner's wife may use the said fake Transfer Certificate at a later point of time, for getting Community Certificate for the child as 'Scheduled Caste', and thereby deprive reservation of a seat to a genuine Scheduled Caste candidate in education, employment, etc.

15. Though this Court is of the view that for issuance of fake Transfer Certificate, Holy Queen Matriculation School at Nagelkeni, Chennai, has to be closed down, taking into account the welfare of the children studying in that School, such a direction is not issued. However, the Management of Holy Queen Matriculation School, Nagelkeni, Chennai is directed to place the official concerned under suspension and proceed with disciplinary action against the official, who issued fake Transfer Certificate to the Petitioner's daughter, Keerthana, conduct enquiry on a day-to-day basis, without adjourning the matter beyond seven working days at any point of time, and pass an order of dismissal from service, if the guilt is established. Such exercise shall be completed, as expeditiously as possible. The official may be given an option to submit his/her resignation from service, before commencement of disciplinary proceedings.

16. It is made clear that Silicon City Public School, Bengaluru, in which the Petitioner's daughter, Keerthana is presently pursuing her studies, cannot be blamed for the fake Transfer Certificate issued by Holy Queen Matriculation School, Chennai at the instance of the child's mother, as the said

School at Bengaluru, had admitted the child Keerthana, only based on her Birth Certificate and that the fake Transfer Certificate produced by the Petitioner's wife to the School at Bengaluru, had been returned to her.

17. Though, the Petitioner's wife has committed an act of fraud by managing to produce a fake Transfer Certificate by influencing a School at Chennai, the entire School cannot be blamed for the act of a black sheep in the Management of the School and by initiating stringent action on the School, the children studying there cannot be left in lurch. This Court warns the Respondent/Lakshmy, the wife of the Petitioner not to indulge in any such fraud activities, which will ultimately affect the future of her children. This observation does not mean that she is absolved of the charges in the Criminal case, as applying the principles of preponderance of probability, the mother of the child is guilty of obtaining fake Certificate.

18. At the same time, this Court records its displeasure in the act of the Petitioner, as he is ruining the life of his children, by not allowing them to pursue their education peacefully. It is high time, the Petitioner realizes that it is not only the spouse who is affected in a matrimonial dispute, but the children too. If a separated parent, who takes care of the child, is mentally tormented by his/her spouse, he/she will not be able to guide the child properly, thereby, the child will become a spoilt one. Family should be built up with love and affection and it is disheartening to note that the family in the case on hand, is built up with endless litigations, which is eventually destroying the peace and prosperity of the children. This Court expects the Petitioner to discharge his obligation towards his children, at least with regard to payment of fees towards their education, which can be paid by Demand Draft/Pay Order/NEFT/RTGS to the Educational Institution, where his children are studying and the same can be informed to the mother of the children.

19. Last, but not the least, from the narration of events, this Court makes it clear that the Petitioner's daughter, viz. Keerthana does not belong to Scheduled Caste.

20. With the above direction and observations, W.P.No.28352 of 2017 is disposed of and W.P.No.3241 of 2018 stands dismissed. No costs.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CO)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

(aeb)

To:

1. The Regional Officer-Chennai,
CBSE, New No.3, Old No.1630 A, "J" Block,
16th Main Road, Anna Nagar (West),
Chennai-600 040.
2. The Deputy Secretary (AFF),
CBSE, Shiksha Kendra, Community Centre,
Preet Vihar, Delhi-110 092.
3. The Public Grievances Redressal Officer &
Deputy Secretary,
CBSE, New No.3, Old No.1630 A, "J" Block,
16th Main Road, Anna Nagar (West),
Chennai-600 040.
4. The Director of School Education,
DPI Campus, College Road,
Opp. Sankara Nethralaya Hospital,
Chennai-600 006.
5. The Director of Matriculation Schools,
DPI Campus, College Road,
Opp. Sankara Nethralaya Hospital,
Chennai-600 006.
6. The Inspector of Matriculation Schools-Kancheepuram,
DPI Campus, College Road,
Opp. Sankara Nethralaya Hospital,
Chennai-600 006.

+2cc to Mr.S.Diraviam Dinesh, Advocate, S.R.No.47991 & 47992

+1cc to Mr.K.A.Dhana Sekaran, Advocate, S.R.No.47914

+1cc to Mr.G.Nagarajan, Advocate, S.R.No.47968

+2cc to Mr.D.Bennington, Advocate, S.R.No.48201

W.P.No.28352 of 2017
and

W.P. No.3241 of 2018

GMR (CO)
GSP (20/08/2018)