

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 13.12.2018

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE T.RAJA

W.P.Nos.22111, 14637 to 14639, 25793 & 27129 of 2018
and
WMP.NO. 25918 OF 2018

1 SU.Archana
2 D.Vasundra Priyadharshini
3 R.Preetha
4 I.Indhumathy
5 M.Sathyapriya
6 G.Ramya
7 S.Geethanjali
8 C.Ramya Sekhar
9 P.B.Rajassree
10 S.Shenbaga Reethika
11 S.Sainath
12 J.Sabeeha Tabassum
13 M.Vedha Manjari
14 S.Tamilselvan
15 D.Divya Venkateshwari
16 S.Geethanjali
17 V.Reshma
18 M.Kavipriya
19 H.Juhe Sreen
20 S.Rakshana
21 V.A.Mathumitha
22 S.Sruthi
23 R.Shakthi
24 R.Mohanapriya
25 D.Deepakh Chander
26 S.Preethi
27 T.Mariyam
28 G.Ronaldo
29 B.Poovaraghavan
30 N.A.Chidambara Natarajan
31 N.Gunalan
32 R.Muthupandi
33 K.Praburajan
34 S.Kanimozhi
35 S.B.Remena Selas
36 P.Sri Elango Kannan
37 H.Kaviya
38 S.Samini

39 R.Mounika
40 V.Pavithra
41 N.S.Pratheeba
42 D.S.Nishaa
43 N.Sundarraaj
44 P.N.S.Selvapriya
45 S.Harshita Satya
46 P.Tejaswi
47 K.Kaviyarasi
48 S.Jansi Rani
49 R.R.Harini
50 S.Vaishali
51 Megha V.Kumar
52 C.Aravind Kumar
53 S.Siva
54 J.Kanimozhi
55 A.Sharmila
56 B.Kalaiarasan
57 P.Muthu Vijay Kumar
58 S.Kavya
59 Vaibhav Vedanth
60 B.Sandhiya Shree
61 M.Merlin Manisha
62 B.Mamatha
63 K.Rethika
64 T.M.Chearma Sathish Kumar
65 A.Ganesh Adithyan
66 M.Hareenath
67 S.Viswa
68 T.M.Sajjan
69 P.Kishore Kumar
70 S.Sylaja
71 A.Narmadha
72 R.Aarthy
73 R.Arunkumar
74 V.Aparna
75 R.Sivanesan
76 S.Vishnu Chander
77 S.Sindhuja
78 K.Vijaya Kandeegan
79 S.Vishnu Kumar
80 S.K.Vimal Raj
81 M.Priyadharshini
82 K.Prathula
83 V.Rajeswari
84 P.Parameshwari
85 E.Nedunchezhiyan
86 S.Nithila
87 Kifayathulla
88 K.V.Keerthana

89 P.Dinesh
90 M.Masilamani
91 V.Nayanapreethi
92 A.Gunaranjan
93 R.Haripriyadharshini
94 S.Mohammed Ibrahim
95 K.Nandhini
96 R.Keerthana
97 B.Kaviyarasan
98 V.Aishwarya
99 Afra Thapassum
100 Muzeebur Rahman
101 S.Kabilan
102 V.Arun Kumar
103 V.Pavan Sai .. Petitioners in W.P.No.22111
of 2018

Antony Prakash Raj .. Petitioner in W.P.No.14637 of
2018
V.Baskar Raja .. Petitioner in W.P.No.14638 of 2018
P.Kishorekumar .. Petitioner in W.P.No.14639 of 2018
Y.Yenatala Madhu Preethi .. Petitioner in W.P.No.25793 of
2018
L.Gurunathan .. Petitioner in W.P.No.27129 of 2018

-vs-

- 1 The Health Secretary
Ministry of Health and Family Welfare
Government of India, Nirman Bhawan
New Delhi 110 011
- 2 The Secretary to Government
Health and Family Welfare
Government of TamilNadu
St.George Fort
Chennai 600 009
- 3 The Director of Medical Education
156, Poonamallee High Road,
New Boopathy Nagar, Chetpet,
Chennai 600 031.
- 4 The Secretary
Medical Council of India
Pocket-14, Sector-8
Dwarka
New Delhi

- 5 The Registrar
TamilNadu Dr.M.G.R.Medical University
69, Anna Salai
Guindy
Chennai 600 032
- 6 Ponnaiyah Ramajayam
Institute of Medical Sciences (PRIMS)
Manamai-Nallur
East Coast Road
Chennai-603 102
Kancheepuram District

.. Respondents 1 to 6 in all the W.P's

W.P.No.22111 of 2018 is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issue of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the second respondent to take over the responsibility of the students already admitted in the sixth respondent college including the petitioners herein with the permission of the first respondent and transfer them to the colleges run by the second respondent in order to enable the petitioners to continue their MBBS course.

W.P.Nos.14637 to 14639 & 27129 of 2018 are filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issue of a Writ of Mandamus, directing all the respondents other than the sixth respondent to transfer the petitioner(s) from the sixth respondent college to any other Government medical college.

W.P.No.25793 of 2018 is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issue of a Writ of Mandamus, directing all the respondents other than the fifth respondent to transfer the petitioner from the sixth respondent college to any other Government medical college to the II year MBBS course.

For Petitioners

:: Mr.P.Wilson
Senior Counsel for
Petitioner Nos.1 to 50
Mr.S.Silambanan
Senior Counsel for
Petitioner Nos.51 to 75
Mr.S.Prabhakaran
Senior Counsel for
Petitioner Nos.76 to 103
for M/s A.M.Rahamath Ali
in W.P.No.22111 of 2018

Mr.V.Subramanian
for the petitioner(s) in

W.P.Nos.14637 to 14639,
25793 & 27129 of 2018

For Respondents

:: Mr.B.Rabu Manohar
Senior Central Government
Standing Counsel for R1
Mrs.Narmadha Sampath
Additional Advocate General
assisted by Mr.T.M.Pappiah
Special Government Pleader
for R2 & 3
Mr.V.P.Raman
Standing Counsel for R4
Mr.D.Ravichander
Standing Counsel for R5
Mr.K.K.Maheshraja for R6,
in all the writ petitions

ORDER

Since all these six writ petitions have been filed for a similar and common relief, they are tagged together and disposed of by this common order. All these 103 second year students from Ponnaiyah Ramajayam Institute of Medical Sciences (PRIMS) have jointly filed W.P.No.22111 of 2018 seeking for a mandamus directing the Secretary to Government, Health and Family Welfare Department, the second respondent herein to take over the responsibility of the students already admitted in the Ponnaiyah Ramajayam Institute of Medical Sciences (PRIMS) including the petitioners herein with the permission of the Health Secretary, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India, the first respondent herein and transfer them to the colleges run by the second respondent in order to enable them to continue their MBBS course. Five other second year students of the same college have filed W.P.Nos.14637 to 14639, 25793 & 27129 of 2018 seeking a mandamus to all the respondents other than the sixth respondent to transfer them from the sixth respondent college to any other Government medical college in the State.

2. Mr.S.Silambanan, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner Nos.51 to 75 in W.P.No.22111 of 2018 pleaded that after the approval given by the Medical Council of India (for short, "the MCI") based on the offer given by the State Government, all the petitioners-students were selected for admission to the MBBS course in the academic year 2016-17, both under the Government quota and Management quota seats, and they had also paid the respective fees to the sixth respondent college. When all of them had paid the fees for the first year, they pursued their studies and completed the first year study

and also written the examination conducted by the Tamil Nadu Dr.MGR Medical University, the fifth respondent herein. While they were continuing their study in the second year, they got information that the sixth respondent college has not established the necessary facilities and failed to provide necessary faculties for admitting the students in the academic year 2017-18. When an inspection took place, the MCI has also found number of material and significant deficiencies in the sixth respondent college. After finding that some of the major deficiencies were not complied with by the sixth respondent college, the MCI had issued notices and granted necessary time to the sixth respondent to rectify the deficiencies. Even after the grant of sufficient time, the sixth respondent college was unable to rectify the major deficiencies, namely, non establishment of blood bank, study room and hostel room for the students were not even properly airconditioned, even the space between two beds is less than 1.5 metres in some wards, bed occupancy was 30% on the day of assessment, etc., which compelled the MCI to issue notices giving more time for rectification of the other deficiencies so that conducive atmosphere would be available in the sixth respondent college to provide medical education to all the students. Again after expiry of the time limit given by the MCI, when the sixth respondent miserably failed to fulfil the deficiencies, the MCI finally recommended to the Central Government not to issue Letter of Permission to the sixth respondent medical college. However, the Central Government also gave an opportunity to the said college to comply with the defects and thereafter, a compliance verification assessment was carried out by the MCI on 10.3.2016. While analyzing the second report along with the earlier report by the executive committee, again the following deficiencies were noted, namely, (i) deficiency in faculty was 38.46% as detailed in the report, (ii) shortage of residents was 26.09% as detailed in the report, (iii) OPD attendance was 371 against the requirement of 600, (iv) bed occupancy on day of assessment was 12.66%, (v) there was NIL major operation on day of assessment, (vi) there was NIL normal delivery & nil caesarean section on the day of assessment, (vii) Histopathology & cytopathology workload on the day of assessment was only 1 each which is grossly inadequate, (viii) there was NIL patient in ICCU and all ICUs on day of assessment, (ix) blood bank license was not available, (x) casualty attendance was only 8 on the day of assessment, (xi) radiological investigation workload was inadequate. In view of the enormous deficiencies not being fulfilled, the MCI also by its letter dated 14.5.2016 recommended its disapproval to the scheme submitted by the sixth respondent college for the academic year 2016-17, that was also accepted by the Central Government.

3. Arguing further, the learned senior counsel also submitted that the oversight committee was constituted and when the compliance input dated 20.6.2017 from the sixth respondent was forwarded to the MCI, the oversight committee by its letter dated 11.8.2016 approved the scheme of establishment of the sixth respondent college with an annual intake of 150 students in the MBBS course for the academic year 2016-17, based on which the Government of India issued the Letter of Permission dated 20.8.2016 to the sixth respondent college subject to certain terms and conditions of the IMC Act. Again when the MCI conducted inspection for assessment and verification of the compliance in the sixth respondent college on 28th and 29th December 2016, once again the following deficiencies were noted, namely, (i) in medical wards, some patients did not require hospitalisation i.e., bodyache, fever, dyspepsia, giddiness, etc. (ii) blood bank utilization was suboptimal, (iii) bed occupancy (127 out of 300) 42.33% as per observation of the assessors during hospital round at 10 AM, (iv) shortage of teaching faculty was 22.72% (15 out of 66), (v) shortage of resident doctors was 28.26% (13 out of 46) etc. Although the sixth respondent college assured and undertook to rectify the said deficiencies with a further request to grant some more time, again time was granted. Thereafter, the MCI undertook inspection in the sixth respondent college on 20th and 21st November 2017 and submitted summary assessment. Finally, taking note of the factor that there is no possibility of rectifying the deficiencies pointed out by the fourth respondent in the near future and the hospital attached to the college was also closed at the relevant point of time, the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare debarred the sixth respondent college for fresh admission. Therefore, the Secretary to Government, Health and Family Welfare Department, Government of Tamil Nadu, the second respondent herein, having issued the essentiality certificate, which is a pre-condition for grant of approval by the MCI and Central Government, has to take over the responsibility of the students of the sixth respondent college and ensure that their educational career is properly safeguarded.

4. Continuing his arguments, the learned senior counsel further stated that when the Central Government has already ordered the stoppage of admission for two years, in view of the fact that the sixth respondent college had also obtained huge loans from the banks and on their failure to repay the amounts, the banks have also brought the secured property of the sixth respondent college for public auction, the sixth respondent college has closed down the college. When there are no infrastructural facilities to facilitate both the faculty and the students to come and listen to the classes in the sixth respondent college, the MCI also has rightly disapproved the continuance of the MBBS course in the sixth respondent college.

Therefore, all the petitioners, who have paid the fees for the second year and completed their first year study, are stranded without knowing their future career. In similar circumstances, when Annai Medical College also faced an identical and similar problem for closing down their college, the second year students of the said college approached this Court in W.P.Nos.25215 of 2017 etc., (Hariprasad and others v. The Health Secretary and others) seeking a mandamus to the second respondent to relocate them in the Government medical colleges on two grounds, (a) that the infrastructure as well as clinical material is extremely limited and most importantly the clinical material is not as abundant as that in the Government medical colleges which gives vast practical experience to the students and (b) that the Government medical colleges for various cogent reasons, have abundant clinical material/inflow of patients which is the most crucial aspect of the teaching and training of medical students. Accepting the case of Annai Medical College students, this Court, by order dated 22.12.2017, disposing of the writ petitions, directed the respondents to relocate all the students of Annai Medical College in the Government medical colleges. The said order also has been accepted by the State Government and no appeal was filed. Although the MCI filed an appeal before the Supreme Court, the direction issued by this Court for relocation of the second year MBBS students from Annai Medical College to the Government medical colleges in the State was accepted. In the light of the essentiality certificate issued by the State Government, the students of the sixth respondent college should be relocated in the Government medical colleges, as it was done in the Annai Medical College case. Leaving that exercise, they cannot simply force all the students to be accommodated only in the self financing and private medical colleges. It is pleaded that even in future, if any of the private medical college faces similar deficiencies including infrastructural facilities by not appointing sufficient faculty members, the college in which some of the students are going to join in the second year would be again forced to face a problem. Therefore, this Court, anticipating any future problem should not occur to the innocent students, taking note of the factor that in the private medical college, the infrastructure as well as clinical material is extremely limited and most importantly the clinical material is not as abundant as that in the Government medical colleges, shall issue a direction to accommodate/relocate all the students of the sixth respondent college in the Government medical colleges.

5. Mr.P.Wilson, learned senior counsel appearing for the Petitioner Nos.1 to 50, taking support from the essentiality certificate issued by the State Government in Form-2 of the Regulations, pleaded that in the matter of implementation of the statutory scheme for grant of permission and annual renewal, the

MCI experiencing various difficulties where the colleges despite grant of initial permission could not provide infrastructure, teaching and other facilities, as a result the students who had been admitted suffer serious prejudice and only with a view to overcome the said situation, Regulations of 1999 provided for grant of essentiality certificate in Form-2. Therefore, the MCI and the Central Government always insist upon the competent authority viz., the State Government to issue the essentiality certificate certifying that adequate clinical material as well as the norms stipulated by the MCI are being followed. In the said essentiality certificate to be provided by the State Government, they should also certify that in case the applicant medical college fails to create infrastructure for the medical college as per the MCI norms and fresh admissions are stopped by the Central Government, the State Government shall take over the responsibility of the students already admitted in the college with the permission of the Central Government. Since the issuance of essentiality certificate by the State Government is mandatory, the State Government has also issued the essentiality certificate in favour of the sixth respondent college and on the basis of the said essentiality certificate, the MCI and the Central Government came forward to give their approval. But for the essentiality certificate issued by the State Government, neither the MCI nor the Central Government would come forward to grant approval, as it is the mandatory requirement. Only on receipt of the essentiality certificate issued by the State Government, the MCI has come forward to grant approval in favour of the sixth respondent college to conduct the MBBS course presuming that the sixth respondent college would provide all sufficient infrastructural facilities. But sadly after receipt of the recommendation from the MCI, the Central Government also has issued approval. After receipt of approval, the sixth respondent, although requested for extension of time for providing various infrastructural facilities for running the college, on many occasions, defaulted. Therefore, more than three inspections had taken place from the MCI. In all the three inspections, the sixth respondent medical college miserably failed to come up to the expectation of the MCI norms. Hence, the MCI has come forward to issue the order refusing to grant permission to admit any more fresh students from 2017-18 in the sixth respondent college. In view of this set back faced by the sixth respondent college, the various financial institutions, namely, banks, unable to receive prompt payments, also finally classified their account as "NPA" and finally the auction notices bringing the college building of the sixth respondent to public auction. That shows that the sixth respondent has come to a standstill. Moreover, the direction issued to the sixth respondent not to admit any fresh students for the year 2017-18 clearly shows that the sixth respondent college failed to provide infrastructural facilities to even the existing

students. Therefore, in view of the closure of the sixth respondent college, by virtue of the essentiality certificate issued by the State Government, it is their responsibility to take care of the students who are before this Court for their relocation in the Government medical colleges.

6. When the issue has been already considered and decided by this Court in Annai Medical College case, giving a clear direction to the State Government to accommodate all the students, the State Government also, as highlighted above, has accommodated them in all the Government medical colleges. Since there has been a clear mention in the essentiality certificate that in the event of closure of a medical college, the State Government can also make use of the bank guarantee executed by the college for the expenditure to be occasioned for appointing additional faculty members and for creating infrastructural facilities, the State Government need not unnecessarily hesitate to accommodate the second year students of the sixth respondent college in the Government medical colleges. On the other hand, if the students are accommodated in the self financing medical colleges, the huge value of bank guarantee executed by the sixth respondent would be made use of by the private medical colleges. Therefore, the relocation of the students of the sixth respondent college in the Government medical colleges will only help the Government medical colleges to make use of the bank guarantee and also receive the fees. In that view of the matter, they could also improve the infrastructural facilities in the respective Government colleges. Therefore, the prayer made by the petitioners to accommodate them in the Government medical colleges be allowed. In support of his submissions, he has also relied upon a judgment of the Apex Court in the case of Government of A.P and another v. Medwin Educational Society and others, (2004) 1 SCC 86, wherein it is held clearly that by reason of clause 11(d) in the essentiality certificate, a responsibility has been cast upon the State Government to give an undertaking that in case a person who seeks to establish a medical college, fails to create infrastructure for the medical college as per the norms laid down by the Council, the State Government shall be obligated to take over the responsibility of the students already admitted in the college. Such an undertaking on the part of the State Government is unequivocal and unambiguous. Therefore, when a responsibility has been cast on the State Government to take over the students already admitted in the sixth respondent college with the permission of the Central Government in a rare occasion like this, the State Government shall not unnecessarily hesitate to relocate all the students in the Government medical colleges, as they have already done in the case of Annai Medical College students. Failure to do so will also offend Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

7. Again taking support from another judgment of the Apex Court in the case of State of Uttar Pradesh v. Dayanand Chakrawarthy and others, (2013) 7 SCC 595 for the proposition that the equality clause enshrined under Article 14 of the Constitution has to be followed, Mr. Wilson contended that the right to equality dealt with by the Apex Court in Prem Chand Somchand Shah v. Union of India, (1991) 2 SCC 48 mandates every authority to follow the equality clause. Since the right ensures equality amongst equals, its aim is to protect persons similarly placed against discriminatory treatment. When the State Government, accepting the settled legal position, has implemented the order passed by this Court in the case of Annai Medical College by relocating all the students, on the closure of Annai Medical College, in various Government medical colleges in the State, they cannot show any different treatment to the petitioners alone. This is for the reason that when the State Government, while granting essentiality certificate or permission to establish a new medical college, acts as a sovereign and discharges its constitutional obligation, in view of the above, they should come forward without contesting the issue. However, the request for relocation in the Government medical colleges has been sought for only on the ground that the sixth respondent college is incapable of providing basic infrastructural facilities to the students who were granted admission in the MBBS course. In the cases on hand, all the students got admission from the sixth respondent college in the year 2016-17 and they have also completed the first year of study. While they proceeded to the second year in the month of October, the poor sixth respondent college was unable to provide all the infrastructural facilities including the faculty members to teach various medical subjects. In view of the break down of the management in providing all these basic facilities, the sixth respondent college was closed. Therefore, the second respondent, being legally obligated to help the petitioners who are unable to pursue their second year and the rest of the medical course, should place them suitably in the Government medical colleges. Since they are shirking their responsibility, which is running contrary to the conditions mentioned in the essentiality certificate, as ordered by this Court in the case of Annai Medical College, a suitable direction be issued to the second respondent to accommodate all the petitioners before this Court to be properly placed in the Government medical colleges. Although they joined in the academic year 2016-17 and completed their first year, they should be relocated in October, 2018. It has not been done, as a result they have been put to serious prejudice for not able to study and take part in the examination for the valuable one year. Now before loss of further time, the benefit given to the students of Annai Medical College should be extended by readmitting them in the Government medical colleges

so that they can continue their second year MBBS course at least from January, 2019.

8. Referring to the position note filed by the Deputy Director of Medical Education, Paramedical Education (PME), Kilpauk, Mr. Wilson contended that filing of the position note in addition to the counter affidavit indicates that the respondents 2 & 3 have completely overlooked their obligation to take care of the students of the sixth respondent college to continue the rest of the course, as it is stated in paragraph-1 that as an one time measure, due to the directions of this Court, the students of Annai Medical College have been accommodated in Government medical colleges, therefore, accommodating all the students from the sixth respondent college also would cause heavy burden not only on the faculty members, but also on the students undergoing their course in the Government medical colleges. This is factually incorrect, he pleaded. When there is no observation or direction by this Court, treating the order dated 22.12.2017 in Annai Medical College case as an one time measure, they cannot misplace the fact, which is no way connected to the cases on hand. Again indicating one another false statement in the position note, it was stated that the Deputy Director of Medical Education in paragraph-5 has wrongly stated that if the PRIMS students are relocated to Government medical colleges, the infrastructural facilities, faculties and clinical materials are not sufficient for the existing students which in turn will affect the meritorious students who have joined the Government medical colleges with high score. The said statement cannot be accepted for the reason that in comparison with the private medical colleges and the Government medical colleges, the clinical facilities are always more only in the Government medical colleges for the reason that their locations are very close to various places, more particularly, they are all located in prime areas in the districts, as a result thousands of patients would visit the hospital and that would be convenient to the learning students to know about the various diseases suffered by the patients. Overlooking these practical issues, the position note has been wrongly filed. Therefore, it should not be taken on record, he pleaded. For all these reasons, the learned senior counsel submitted that no harm would be caused to the respondents 1 to 3 to accommodate the students of the sixth respondent college following the order passed by this Court in Annai Medical College case.

9. Mr. S. Prabhakaran, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner Nos. 76 to 103 submitted that when the State Government, accepting the order passed by this Court in Annai Medical College case, has already acted upon for relocation of those students in the Government medical colleges in the State, cannot file a wrong counter affidavit before this Court citing

certain unreasonable excuses that in view of the relocation of the students from Annai Medical College in various Government medical colleges in Tamil Nadu, sufficient infrastructural facilities cannot be made available to the incoming students from the sixth respondent college. The reason for giving a direction to relocate all the students in Government medical colleges flow from reasonable basis that the Government medical colleges are provided with sufficient infrastructural facilities by the State Government. Secondly, if the students, as presumed by the State Government, are relocated in the private medical colleges/self financing colleges, tomorrow if these self financing medical colleges are also unable to meet the basic infrastructural facilities to the additional students who are getting relocation, the same might create more problems not only to these students, but also to the existing students who are pursuing their course. Therefore, to take adequate care of the existing students, it is always fair and reasonable on the part of the second respondent not to thrust upon the private medical colleges to accept any additional burden. Again referring to the Division Bench judgment of the Madhya Pradesh High Court in W.P.Nos.11349 of 2018 etc. dated 30.8.2018 (Abhishek Tiwari and others v. Union of India and others) directing the Medical Council of India and the Director of Medical Education, Government of Madhya Pradesh to take appropriate steps for granting admission of 149 students of Modern Institute of Medical Sciences, Indore to Government medical colleges in the State, Mr.Prabakaran has also submitted that the only reason why the petitioners are insisting upon the acceptance of their prayer is that the Government medical colleges are always having abundant clinical material/inflow of patients, which is the most crucial aspect of the teaching and training of medical students. Keeping these basic principles in mind, our High Court has passed the order dated 22.12.2017 in W.P.Nos.25215 of 2017 etc., (Annai Medical College case). Accepting the said ratio as a precedent, the High Court of Andhra Pradesh also has followed the same and this also has been accepted by the Apex Court. Therefore, when various High Courts have come to the conclusion that the medical college students on closure of their college can be relocated in the Government medical colleges run by the State Government, the same cannot be brushed aside by the State Government, he pleaded.

10. Opposing the above prayer, a detailed counter affidavit has been filed by the second respondent. Mrs.Narmadha Sampath, learned Additional Advocate General for the respondents 2 & 3 heavily submitted that the prayer in the writ petitions has become infructuous, for the reason that when the State Government has come forward to take care of the interest of the students who are before this Court by relocating them in the various self financing medical colleges, taking note of the fact that they were all admitted in the sixth respondent college,

which is also a self financing college, after securing permission from the MCI, they have to accept and pursue the rest of their studies in the respective self financing medical colleges. Explaining further, the learned Additional Advocate General submitted that in every self financing medical college, the Government allots 65% of seats under the Government quota and 35% of seats under the Management quota. But for the year 2016-17, the candidates, who have been admitted in the sixth respondent college, have paid their capitation fees and the criteria for admission was just a pass in the NEET. Therefore, the students of the sixth respondent college who were allotted under the Government quota are to be relocated as students under Government quota seats only in self financing medical colleges. Similarly, the Management quota students are to be relocated as students under the management quota seats in the self financing medical colleges. Now the petitioners express their grievance to continue their course after two years of break in study to join the Government medical colleges after the second year reallocated MBBS students of Annai Medical College complete the second year. Such a request cannot be accepted, for the reason that it is not possible for the petitioners to continue the second year after two years of break in study. This is for yet another reason that they would have also completely forgot all the basic subjects which they studied during the first year course. In order to gain adequate knowledge and skill, the students should have continuity in course without any break. Considering these vital facts, the second respondent has written to the self financing medical colleges in the State and accepting the proposal and the recommendation made by the second respondent, the Deans of self financing medical colleges have given their concurrence to accommodate the students of the sixth respondent college in their respective colleges. After obtaining willingness from Raja Muthiah Medical College and Research Institute, Chidambaram, PSG Institute of Medical Sciences and Research, Coimbatore, Karpagavinayaga Institute of Medical Science and Research Centre, Kanchipuram, Karpagam Faculty of Medical Science and Research, Coimbatore, Tagore Medical College and Hospital, Vandalur, Vellammal Medical College Hospital and Research Institute, Madurai and Adhiparasakthi Medical College and Research Institute, Melmaruvathur, the State Government also have fixed the seat matrix regarding the reallocation of the students of the sixth respondent college to various self financing medical colleges subject to the grant of approval by the Board of Governors/MCI, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India for the increase of seats as per the seat matrix given in the self financing medical colleges. If the petitioners refuse to accept the offer and willingness shown by the aforesaid self financing medical colleges, they would be only losing their precious time to complete their course. Therefore, by disposing the writ petitions, the petitioners

should be directed to join the respective self financing medical colleges where they are relocated to pursue the rest of the studies.

11. Continuing her arguments, the learned Additional Advocate General also submitted that when the recommendation made by the second respondent has been accepted by various private medical colleges, if they are again directed to be admitted in the Government medical colleges, this will highly demoralize the existing students pursuing their medical college in the Government medical colleges who have put in so much of hard work to get admission in the Government medical colleges purely on merit. Moreover, the mentality of the students who have been admitted in the Government medical colleges will be affected if these candidates got reallocation in the medical colleges vis-a-vis the private medical college students' desire to get admitted in the Government medical colleges by way of litigation, cannot be espoused by a back door entry for the non meritorious candidates to get into the Government medical colleges. Explaining further, the learned Additional Advocate General also submitted that when the counseling was held during the year 2016-17, according to the rank and merit of the candidates, they secured admission in the self financing private medical colleges. Among all the self financing medical colleges, the sixth respondent college has been added at the last minute based on the letter of permission granted by the MCI/Government of India based oversight committee. Since the students who secured very lesser marks were all accommodated in the sixth respondent college, they cannot seek readmission in the Government medical colleges, which are meant for the candidates who secured higher marks than the students of the sixth respondent college. Therefore, the request of the petitioners to relocate them in the Government medical colleges shall not be accepted by this Court, she pleaded. Taking support from an interim order passed by the Apex Court in I.A.No.32096 of 2018 in W.P.(C) No.1047 of 2017 dated 3.7.2018 (Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan University and another v. Union of India and others) directing the 150 students who were admitted in RKDF Medical College Hospital and Research Centre to be admitted in six private medical colleges in the State of Madhya Pradesh for the academic year 2018-19, submitted that the students who were admitted in the sixth respondent which is a self financing college, are entitled to be readmitted, in view of the closure of the sixth respondent medical college, only in the private self financing medical colleges.

12. Mr.V.P.Raman, learned counsel appearing for the MCI submitted that based on the essentiality certificate issued by the second respondent in favour of the sixth respondent medical college, the MCI has given their clearance to the Central

Government based on the essentiality certificate to approve the establishment of the sixth respondent medical college and the approval also was granted. Subsequently, after the approval for admitting 150 students in the sixth respondent for the year 2016-17, when the sixth respondent college was opened, as a matter of discharging their obligation, when an inspection was undertaken to find out whether the sixth respondent college, as promised and undertaken in their application, have fulfilled and made available all the infrastructural facilities, surprisingly, found that even the blood bank also was not even established in the sixth respondent college. When major deficiencies were found by the inspecting team sent by the MCI, several opportunities were granted to the sixth respondent to rectify the deficiencies. Even after three opportunities were offered to the sixth respondent medical college, finding that the sixth respondent would not be able to come up to the expectation of the MCI for providing basic infrastructural facilities to the students, faculty members and also the public at large, finally, a decision has been taken not to renew permission from 2017-18 for the sixth respondent medical college. It is an admitted fact that the sixth respondent college till date has not even established even the basic infrastructural facilities. Therefore, ultimately, the closure of the sixth respondent college had taken place. However, if the second respondent, following the order passed by this Court in Annai Medical College case, sends a proposal to the Board of Governors/MCI to accommodate all the 108 students of the sixth respondent college in the Government medical colleges, the MCI, on receipt of any such proposal, shall consider the same.

13. The learned counsel for the petitioners in W.P.Nos.14637 to 14639, 25793 & 27129 of 2018 also adopted the arguments of the learned senior counsels.

14. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

15. It is not in dispute that the sixth respondent college, after getting approval from the MCI for admission of students in the MBBS course for the academic year 2016-17, on the pretext that they have satisfied all the statutory formalities in accordance with the Code of Medical Regulations 1999, admitted all the petitioners both under the Government quota and Management quota based upon the marks obtained by them in Plus Two/NEET. Before the MCI gave their clearance to the Central Government to grant approval, the State Government had issued necessary clearance certificate to establish the medical college and also for admitting the students. Only after getting the essentiality certificate in Form-2 appended to the Establishment of Medical College Regulations 1999, the MCI has given their clearance. Pursuant thereto, the Central Government also have

accorded approval to the sixth respondent medical college for starting the MBBS course for the academic year 2016-17 with 150 students. After the petitioners completed the first year course, to their shock and dismay, they came to know that various inspections were conducted by the MCI to find out the available infrastructural facilities in the sixth respondent college and after satisfying that the sixth respondent college is ineligible to continue their medical course, sent their report, based on which the MCI has sent the recommendation not to renew the permission for the academic year 2017-18. The various inspections undertaken by the MCI and the subsequent notices issued to the sixth respondent college clearly indicate that the sixth respondent medical college miserably failed to provide the basic infrastructural facilities to the students to pursue their medical course, as a result they are unable to admit fresh students for the year 2017-18, because there was no faculty for taking classes to the students of the sixth respondent college and other staff also left the services of the sixth respondent college, which has caused grave prejudice for the petitioners/students to pursue their medical course. Finally, as the sixth respondent closed the college, the petitioners have approached this Court seeking issuance of a writ of mandamus directing the second respondent to take over the responsibility of the students already admitted in the sixth respondent college including the petitioners with the permission of the first respondent and transfer them to the other colleges run by the respondents in order to enable them to continue their MBBS course.

16. As rightly canvassed before this Court by the respective learned senior counsel for the petitioners, it is necessary to reproduce the proforma of Form-2 dealing with the importance of issuing the essentiality certificate, as follows:-

Form 2

Subject:- ESSENTIALITY CERTIFICATE

No.

Government of _____

Department of Health

Dated, the _____

To

(Applicant)

Sir,

The desired certificate is as follows:-

(1) No.of institutions already existing in the State.

(2) No.of seats available or No.of doctors being

produced annually.

(3) No.of doctors registered with the State Medical Council.

(4) No.of doctors in Government service.

(5) No.of Government posts vacant and those in rural/difficult areas.

(6) No.of doctors registered with Employment Exchange.

(7) Doctor population ratio in the State.

(8) How the establishment of the college would resolve the problem of deficiencies of qualified medical personnel in the State and improve the availability of such medical manpower in the State.

(9) The restrictions imposed by the State Government, if any, on students who are not domiciled in the State from obtaining admissions in the State, be specified.

(10) Full justification for opening of the proposed college.

(11) Doctor-patient ratio proposed to be achieved.

The (Name of the person)_____has applied for establishment of a medical college at_____. On careful consideration of the proposal, the Government of _____has decided to issue an essentiality certificate to the applicant for the establishment of a Medical College with_____(no.) seats.

It is certified that:-

(a) The applicant owns and manages a 300 bedded hospital which was established in_____.

(b) It is desirable to establish a medical college in the public interest.

(c) Establishment of a medical college at_____by (the name of Society/Trust) is feasible.

(d) Adequate clinical material as per the Medical Council of India norms is available.

It is further certified that in case the applicant fails to create infrastructure for the medical college as per MCI norms and fresh admissions are stopped by the Central Government, the State Government shall take over the responsibility of the students already admitted in the College with the permission of the Central Government.

The following shall be added in terms of

Notification dated 31.01.2017 published in the Gazette of India:-

(e) The (Name of applicant_____) own and possesses____Acres of land in _____[Village Tehsil/Taluka/District] on which non agricultural use of land is permitted and a Medical College Hospital can be established on it.

(f) The building plan of the Hospital and Medical College has been approved by the competent authority, namely:_____, designated by the State Government for such purposes on_____(Copy of the approval is enclosed).

(g) The Hospital and Medical College have been granted Completion Certificate/Building Use Certificate by the competent authority, namely, _____, designated by the State Government for such purposes on_____ (Copy of the Certificate is enclosed)

Conditions (e), (f) and (g) are applicable only for non-governmental applicants.

Yours faithfully,

(Signature of the Competent Authority)

17. The Apex Court in the case of Government of A.P. and another v. Medwin Educational Society, (2004) 1 SCC 86, while dealing with the importance of the grant of essentiality certificate by the State Government, has held that by virtue of clause 11(d) of Form-2 appended to the aforesaid Regulations, a responsibility has been cast upon the State Government to give an undertaking that in case the applicant who seeks to establish the medical college, fails to create infrastructure as per the norms laid down by the MCI and in the event fresh admissions are stopped by the Central Government, the State Government shall be obligated to take over the responsibility of the students already admitted in the college. (emphasis supplied) It is also pertinent to extract paragraphs 21, 26, 28 of the said judgment, as follows:-

"21. The 1999 Regulations also prescribed a form of application being Form 1 to be filled giving particulars of the applicant seeking permission of the Central Government to establish a new medical college. Form 2 has been prescribed for grant of essentiality certificates by the State.

26. However, in the matter of implementation of the statutory scheme for

grant of permission and annual renewal, the Medical Council of India experienced difficulties and it came across cases where the colleges despite grant of initial permission could not provide the infrastructure, teaching and other facilities as a result whereof the students who had already been admitted suffered serious prejudice. Only with a view to overcome the said situation, the 1999 Regulations provided for grant of essentiality certificate...

28. By reason of clause 11(d), a responsibility has been cast upon the State Government to give an undertaking that in case the applicant who seeks to establish a medical college, fails to create infrastructure for the medical college as per the norms laid down by the Council and in the event fresh admissions are stopped by the Central Government, the State Government shall be obligated to take over the responsibility of the students already admitted in the college. Such an undertaking on the part of the State Government is unequivocal and unambiguous. The Central Government and the Medical Council of India in the aforementioned premise opined that the selection of locations for establishment of a medical college is a matter which is required to be dealt with by the respective State Governments and not by the Medical Council of India."

18. The Apex Court, while dealing with the importance of the essentiality certificate, has vividly held that it must be remembered that so far as the medical colleges are concerned, the essentiality certificate has to be obtained before the college can be set up. It has also been held that while issuing the essentiality certificate, the respective State Governments can take into account the local needs. But once the essentiality certificate is issued by the concerned State Government, it goes without saying that the State Government has to take over the responsibility of the students already admitted in the college with the permission of the Central Government, in the event of closure of the college or the closure of the session. Accepting the settled legal position, this Court also, while dealing with the case of the students of Annai Medical College in W.P.Nos.25215 of 2017 etc., by order dated 22.12.2017, rightly appreciating the comparative benefits available in both the

private medical colleges and the Government medical colleges, that the clinical materials are not generally kept abundant in the private medical colleges, which give vast practical experience to the students, allowing the writ petitions, passed the following order:-

"32. It is seen nowhere in the transaction or in the process, either in the establishment of 6th respondent College or cancellation, the students were involved. Therefore, the State Government is bound to accommodate the petitioner students in Government Medical Colleges.

33.1. It is not only the duty of the State Government to go by the undertaking but also safeguard the hapless innocent students who continue to suffer for no fault of them. They could not continue their medical studies from October 2017 till date i.e., for the past three months. That fact must also be taken into consideration sympathetically by the State Government. It is the duty of the Court to protect the interest of the students and the injustice done to them has to be set right for which this Court, as custodian of the Constitution and civil rights, is duty bound to issue remedial orders for which the Constitution confers unlimited powers on this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution.

37. In view of the above reasons, this Court issues the following directions:

1. The State Government shall send a proposal to the Medical Council of India to accommodate the students studying in the 6th respondent College, within a period of one week from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

2. The Medical Council of India, on receipt of the said proposal, shall take a decision and forward the same to the Hon'ble Apex Court monitored Oversight Committee within one week therefrom.

3. The Oversight Committee shall take a decision within a period of one week from the date of receipt of the decision of the MCI committee and forward the same to the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare.

4. The Ministry of Health and Family Welfare shall pass necessary orders increasing the number of seats in Government Medical Colleges and approve the accommodation of students studying in the 6th respondent College in the

22 Government Medical Colleges functioning in the State of Tamil Nadu.

5. Tamil Nadu Dr.MGR Medical University and the State Government shall make necessary arrangements to conduct special classes to the accommodated students from the 6th respondent Medical Collge, so that the lost attendance could be made good and the newly admitted students could be brought on par with the regular students.

6. The new trustees viz., Respondents 7 & 8 (Rajalakshmi Group) are directed to return all the certificates to the 6th respondent College students within a period of one week from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

7. The 6th respondent Medical College shall give necessary certificates as required by the Government to the individual students so that their accommodation in Government Medical Colleges will be made very easy without any problem.

8. The students are required to file an affidavit stating that they shall pay the fees fixed by the fee fixation committee applicable for private medical colleges every year."

19. Although the State Government has accepted the said order, the MCI went in appeal unsuccessfully and finally the order passed by this Court in the aforementioned writ petitions became final and this was also implemented.

20. Secondly, when the Apex Court in Medwin Educational Society case mentioned supra, has ruled intact that if any medical college fails to create infrastructure as per the MCI norms and fresh admissions are stopped by the Central Government, the State Government shall take over the responsibility of the students already admitted in the college with the permission of the Central Government, in the light of clause 11(d) of the essentiality certificate, which cast a responsibility upon the State Government to give an undertaking that they shall be obligated to take over the responsibility of the students already admitted in the college, the stand taken by the second respondent in paragraph-7 of the counter affidavit that the State Government has no role to play in permitting the admission of medical students and they do not have any role in the transfer of students from one medical college to another medical college, apparently exposes the callous attitude shown by the second respondent. It is pertinent to extract paragraph-7 of the counter affidavit as follows:-

"7. It is submitted that the State Government

has no role to play in permitting the admission of Medical students and no role in the transfer of students from one Medical College to another Medical College.”

21. A reading of the above paragraph clearly indicates that the second respondent is unaware of the responsibility cast upon the State Government, as per clause 11(d) of the essentiality certificate to give an undertaking that in case the founder of a medical college who seeks to establish the medical college, fails to create infrastructure as per the norms laid down by the MCI and in the event of stopping fresh admissions by the Central Government, the State Government shall be obligated to take over the responsibility of the students already admitted in the college, have been completely ignored.

22. Thirdly, when a similar and an identical problem arose in the State of Andhra Pradesh, following the order passed by this Court in W.P.Nos.25215 of 2017 etc., dated 22.12.2017 (Annai Medical College case) and also considering the reasonings given by this Court and the same having been accepted by the Apex Court while disposing off the Special Leave Petition filed by the MCI in the Special Leave to Appeal (C) No.702 of 2018 by order dated 25.1.2018, a learned Judge of the High Court of Andhra Pradesh issued a direction to the State Government to send the proposal to the MCI to accommodate the students in the Government medical colleges run by the State of Andhra Pradesh. One another order passed by the Division Bench of the Madhya Pradesh High Court in W.P.Nos.11349 of 2018 etc. dated 30.8.2018 (Abhishek Tiwari and others v. Union of India and others), while disposing of all the aforementioned writ petitions, also vividly shows that it is always better to relocate the students, in the event of closure of the private college made on account of want of infrastructural facilities, in the Government medical colleges, for the reason that the infrastructure as well as clinical material are extremely more in the Government medical colleges for proper teaching and coaching of the medical students. Therefore, when the order dated 22.12.2017 passed by this Court in W.P.Nos.25215 of 2017 etc., (Annai Medical College) case has been confirmed by the Supreme Court on the appeal filed by the MCI, as the State Government chose not to file appeal, and when this order was also accepted and followed by the Andhra Pradesh High Court and one another similar order has been passed by the Division Bench of the Madhya Pradesh High Court, the claim made by the petitioners/students that they should be reallocated only in the Government medical colleges, instead of self financing colleges, since abundant clinical material are made available by the State Government in the Government medical colleges, deserves to be accepted.

23. Fourthly, in the cases on hand, although a proposal was sent by the second respondent to various self financing colleges, the Registrar in-charge of Annamalai University, vide reply dated 31.10.2018 sent to the Director of Medical Education, has expressed their willingness to relocate the students of the sixth respondent college in the Rajah Muthiah Medical College, if permission is granted by the Director of Medical Education and the MCI. The letter also shows that Raja Muthiah Medical College was willing to accommodate twenty students in the second year, provided the students of the sixth respondent college are willing to pay the prescribed fee of Rs.5,54,370/- every year for four years. The letter further shows that they are not prepared to accommodate more than twenty students. That shows that they did not have sufficient infrastructural facilities. Even the PSG Institute of Medical Sciences & Research also, in their letter dated 26.10.2018, addressed to the Director of Medical Education, Kilpauk, clearly indicated that they will be in favour of accommodating the second year MBBS students of the sixth respondent college admitted in the academic year 2016-17 in their college, provided the Government and the MCI/Board of Governors do not insist upon them enhancing the bed strength and other infrastructural facilities. That also shows that the PSG Institute of Medical Sciences and Research, Coimbatore are lacking behind the infrastructural facilities, bed strength, blood bank, faculty members, etc.

24. Velammal Medical College Hospital and Research Institute, Madurai, in their letter dated 26.10.2018, has indicated their willingness to accommodate only one student. Even the so called willingness, as claimed by the second respondent, issued by the Tagore Medical College and Hospital dated 29.10.2018 also failed to indicate whether they do have sufficient infrastructural facilities including the bed strength, additional faculty strength to cater to the needs of the additional relocation in their college. Besides, the Annapoorna Medical College and Hospital also, in their letter dated 26.10.2018, expressed their willingness to accommodate only ten students in the second year MBBS course. But nowhere in the said letter, they have mentioned that they have got adequate bed strength, infrastructural facilities and faculty strength. While coming to the Melmaruvathur Adhiparasakthi Institute of Medical Sciences and Research, they have in their communication dated 26.10.2018 expressed their willingness to accommodate ten students provided necessary approval is given by the affiliating authority. Again, they have also failed to mention whether they have got sufficient infrastructural facilities, bed strength and the faculty strength not only to the existing students, but also to the incoming students from the sixth respondent college. Therefore, the reliance placed by

the learned Additional Advocate General on the interim order passed by the Apex Court in I.A.No.32096 of 2018 in W.P.(C) No.1047 of 2017 dated 3.7.2018 directing similarly placed persons from the self financing colleges to be accommodated only in the self financing private colleges, lacks any merit, as the Apex Court, while dealing with the case of the students of RKDF Medical College Hospital and Research Centre for the academic year 2017-18 seeking to continue their studies due to various reasons including the lack of infrastructural facilities, taking into account peculiar facts and circumstances, directed that 150 students, who were admitted in RKDF Medical College Hospital and Research Centre last year whose admissions were cancelled by the Apex Court, be admitted in the six private medical colleges in the State of Madhya Pradesh for the academic year 2018-19 taking note of the factor that there were sufficient vacancies to accommodate those students. That shows that all those six private colleges in the State of Madhya Pradesh were having sufficient infrastructural facilities, bed strength, faculty members.

25. Moreover, the willingness expressed by Raja Muthiah Medical College and Research Institute would show that they can accommodate twenty students only in the second year MBBS course. Whereas, the seat matrix given by the State Government in the position note shows that they have proposed to allot 32+5 students without there being any sufficient infrastructural facilities available in the said college. The reply given by Raja Muthiah Medical College and Research Institute does not show that they have adequate infrastructural facilities including bed strength and faculty to cope up with the additional intake. Similarly, PSG Institute of Medical Sciences and Research, Coimbatore have also indicated clearly that they are not prepared to enhance the infrastructural facilities, faculty strength and bed strength. That means that they have no infrastructural facilities to accommodate the students from the sixth respondent college. Similarly, Velammal Medical College Hospital and Research Institute, Madurai also have agreed to accommodate only one student, whereas the seat matrix issued by the second respondent indicates that twelve students can be accommodated, which is over and above the infrastructural facilities. If these 108 students are accommodated in the self financing colleges where they have no sufficient faculty strength, infrastructural facilities and bed strength, not only the teaching and coaching would be affected, but also the purpose of relocation would be meaningless if there are no faculty members and other infrastructural clinical facilities made available. Looking into the communications issued by the Tagore Medical College and Adhiparasakthi medical colleges, again they have not indicated that they have sufficient infrastructural facilities to cope up with the requirements of

the additional intake from the sixth respondent college. Since the State Government has asked them to accommodate, they have blindly sent their communications. Moreover, the counter affidavit filed by the second respondent also fails to indicate that all these colleges have got sufficient infrastructural facilities to cater to the future relocation of the students of the sixth respondent college.

26. Further, in the cases on hand, all the self financing colleges, who have come forward to accommodate only limited number of students from the sixth respondent college, have admittedly indicated in their reply sent to the second respondent that they did not have sufficient infrastructural facilities, bed strength and adequate faculty strength. In view of these reasons, the arguments advanced by the learned Additional Advocate General for the respondents 2 & 3 that all the 108 students of the sixth respondent college should be equally distributed in the self financing colleges, will prove fatal to their future educational career. As mentioned above, when none of the self financing colleges have come forward showing that they have sufficient infrastructural facilities including sufficient faculty, adequate clinical materials as per the MCI norms etc., this Court is unable to accept the reasons for issuing a direction to the petitioners to accept their relocation in the self financing colleges which are not having adequate infrastructural facilities as per the MCI norms.

27. For all the aforementioned reasons, falling back on the order passed by this Court in Annai Medical College case, which was confirmed by the Apex Court and moreover the above order passed by this Court has been accepted as a precedent, these writ petitions are allowed with the following directions:-

- (i) The State Government shall send a proposal to the Board of Governors in supersession of Medical Council of India, to accommodate the petitioners of the sixth respondent-Ponnaiyah Ramajayam Institute of Medical Sciences in the 22 Government medical colleges in the State, within a period of ten days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.
- (ii) The Board of Governors, on receipt of the said proposal, shall take a decision and forward the same to the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India, within one week therefrom.
- (iii) The Ministry of Health and Family Welfare shall pass necessary orders increasing the number of seats in Government Medical Colleges and approve the accommodation of students studying in the sixth respondent college in the 22 Government Medical Colleges functioning in the State of Tamil Nadu.

- (iv) The Board of Governors shall also permit the second respondent to encash the bank guarantee given by the sixth respondent college to meet out the infrastructural facilities including the additional faculty strength, etc.
- (v) The sixth respondent college shall give necessary certificates as required by the Government to the individual students so that their accommodation in Government Medical Colleges will be made very easy without any problem.
- (vi) The students are required to file an affidavit stating that they shall pay the fees fixed by the fee fixation committee every year.

Consequently, W.M.P.No.25918 of 2018 is closed. No costs.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS-VI)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

ss

To

- 1 The Health Secretary
Ministry of Health and Family Welfare
Government of India, Nirman Bhawan
New Delhi 110 011
- 2 The Secretary to Government
Health and Family Welfare
Government of TamilNadu
Fort St.George
Chennai 600 009
- 3 The Director of Medical Education
156, Poonamallee High Road,
New Boopathy Nagar, Chetpet,
Chennai 600 031.
- 4 The Secretary
Medical Council of India
Pocket-14, Sector-8
Dwarka
New Delhi

5 The Registrar
TamilNadu Dr.M.G.R.Medical University
69, Anna Salai
Guindy
Chennai 600 032

+1cc to Mr.K.K.Maheshraja, Advocate, S.R.No. 87539
+1cc to the Government Pleader, S.R.No. 87444
+1cc to Mr.V.P.Raman, Advocate, S.R.No.86513
+2cc to Mr.Rahamath Ali, Advocate, S.R.No. 86504
+1cc to Mr.Rabu Manohar, Advocate, S.R.No. 86428
+5cc to Mr.V.Subramanian, Advocate, S.R.No. 87519
+1cc to Mr.D.Ravichander, Advocate, S.R.No. 87546

W.P.Nos.22111 of 2018 etc.

PP (CO)
GN (20/12/2018)