

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on : 21.03.2018

Delivered on : 17.04.2018

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE THIRU JUSTICE V. PARTHIBAN

W.P.Nos.31021 to 31027 of 2015, 16272 of 2012 and
31212 to 31218, 29788 of 2015

T.Devaraj Samuvel .. Petitioner in WP.No.31021/15
K.Paulmuthu .. Petitioner in WP.No.31022/15
M.Lalitha .. Petitioner in WP.No.31023/15
V.Thiravia Rajesh .. Petitioner in WP.No.31024/15
S.Vijila Santhakumari .. Petitioner in WP.No.31025/15
M.Janaki .. Petitioner in WP.No.31026/15
S.Anand .. Petitioner in WP.No.31022/15

TamilNadu Higher Secondary School
Vocational Instructors Association
Rep.by its State General Secretary
V.Sakthivel Pandian .. Petitioner in WP.No.16272/12

D.RajaMohan .. Petitioner in WP.No.31212/15
D.Thilakam .. Petitioner in WP.No.31213/15
P.Parameswari .. Petitioner in WP.No.31214/15
G.Daisy .. Petitioner in WP.No.31215/15
V.Santhi .. Petitioner in WP.No.31216/15
D.Rajaselvi .. Petitioner in WP.No.31217/15
S.Suthan .. Petitioner in WP.No.31218/15
I.Antony Ruban Xavier Donald .. Petitioner in WP.No.29788/15

versus

1. The Government of Tamil Nadu,
rep. by the Secretary,
School Education Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai-600 009.

2. The Director of School Education,
D.P.I Compound,
Nungambakkam, College Road,
Chennai-600 006.

3. The Joint Director of School Education,
(Vocational),
D.P.I Compound,
Nungambakkam, College Road,
Chennai-600 006. ...Respondents 1-3 in all WPs

4. The Chief Education Officer,
Thoothukudi District.
Thoothukudi.

...4th Respondent in WP.Nos.31021,31022,
31024,31025

The Chief Education Officer, Chennai

...4th Respondent in WP.Nos.31023/15,
31213/15, 31215/15

The Chief Education Officer,
Virudhunagar District,
Virudhunagar

...4th Respondent in WP.Nos.31026/15,
31027,31214,31217/15

The Chief Education Officer,
Coimbatore District, Coimbatore

...4th Respondent in WP.Nos.31212/15,
31216/15

The Chief Education Officer,
Dindigul District, Dindigul

...4th Respondent in WP.No.31218/15

The District Educational Officer

Thallakulam, Madurai-625 002...4th Respondent in WP.No.29788/15

The Correspondent

Tucker Higher Secondary School
Pannaivilai, Thoothukudi District

...5th Respondent in WP.No.31022,31024/15

The Correspondent

St.Antony's Girls Higher Secondary
School, Chennai

...5th Respondent in WP.No.31023/15

The Correspondent,

St.Mary's Higher Secondary School,
Sawyerpuram,

Thoothukudi District 628 251 ...5th Respondent in WP.No.31025/15

The Secretary

S.S.Hindu Nadar Higher Secondary School
Muhavur- 626 111,

Virudhunagar District

...5th Respondent in WP.No.31026/15

The Secretary

V.N.U.P.Kaleeswari Higher Secondary
School, Vanniampatty- 626 154

Virudhunagar District

...5th Respondent in WP.No.31027/15

The Correspondent
C.S.I.Higher Secondary School
Coimbatore ...5th Respondent in WP.No.31212/15

The Secretary
N.K.T.National Girls Higher Secondary
School, Triplicane,
Chennai 600 005 ...5th Respondent in WP.No.31213/15

The Secretary
S.B.K.Girls Higher Secondary School,
Aruppukkottai 626 101 ...5th Respondent in WP.No.31214/15

The Headmistress & Correspondent,
Apostolic Carmel,
Christ King Girls Higher Secondary
School, Tambaram East,
Chennai 600 059 ...5th Respondent in WP.No.31215/15

The Secretary
Sri K.Rangaswamy Naidu
Higher Secondary School
Periyannackpalayam,
Coimbatore ...5th Respondent in WP.No.31216/15

The Secretary
C.S.I.V.V.Higher Secondary School
Iraniarpuram,
Kanyakumari District ...5th Respondent in WP.No.31217/15

The Correspondent,
N.S.V.V.Boys Higher Secondary School
Pattiveeranpatti,
Dindigul District ...5th Respondent in WP.No.31218/15

The Correspondent,
Madurai Nadar Uravinmurai
Jayaraj Nadar Hr.Sec.School,
Nagamalai Pudukottai,
Madurai 625 019 ...5th Respondent in WP.No.29788/15

5. The Headmaster,
Pope Memorial Higher Secondary School,
Sawyerpuram,
Thoothukudi District. .. Respondents

Prayer in WP.Nos.31021 to 31027/15, 31212 to 31218/15: This Writ
Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of
India, praying for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus,
to call for all the relevant records pertaining to the order
passed by the 2nd respondent herein vide his proceedings in

Na.Ka.No.99236/VI/E1/2013 dated 9.7.2015, quash the same as illegal, arbitrary, unreasonable, being violative of principles of natural justice and thereby direct the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioner as Vocational Instructor under the 5th respondent school, in terms of G.O.Ms.No.35 Education Department dated 9.2.2007 with due seniority with all the monetary and service benefits.

Prayer in WP.No.16272/2012:The Writ petition is filed u/A 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for issuance of certiorarified mandamus, calling all the records culminated in letter No. 5190/VE/2009-7 dt 8.6.2012 of the 1st respondent and quash the same and to direct the respondents 1 to 3 to regularize the appointments of the members of the petitioner Association in terms of G.O.Ms.No.35 Education Department dt 9.2.2007 with due seniority and all attendant benefits.

Prayer in WP.No.29788/2015:The Writ petition is filed u/A 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for issuance of certiorarified mandamus, calling all the records culminated in proceeding Na. Ka. No.99236/VI/E1/2013 dt 9.7.2015 of the 2nd respondent pursuant to the letter of the 1st respondent and quash the same and direct the respondents 1 to 5 to regularize the appointments of the petitioner in terms of G.O.Ms.No.35 Education Department dated 9.2.2007 with due seniority and all attendant benefits.

For Petitioners in
WP Nos.31021 to 31027
of 2015 & 31212 to 31218
of 2015 : Mr.A.R.Suresh

For Petitioners in
WP Nos.16272 of 2012 &
29788 of 2015 : Mr.C.Johnson

For Respondents: Mr.S.T.S.Murthy, Addl.A.G.,for
1 to 4 assisted by Mr.C.Munusamy, Spl.GP
in all WPs.

COMMON ORDER

Being aggrieved by the impugned orders dated 8.6.2012 and 9.7.2015 passed by the first and second respondents respectively, rejecting the regularization of the petitioners in the post of Vocational Teachers, the petitioners herein have come forward with the present Writ Petitions, seeking to quash the same and consequently, to direct the respondents to regularize their services as Vocational Instructors in terms of G.O.Ms.No.35 Education Department dated 9.2.2007 with due seniority and all the monetary and service benefits.

2. Since all the Writ Petitions raised identical grounds and issues, they are taken up together and being disposed of vide this common order.

3. The petitioners were all appointed as Vocational Instructors on various dates after 1.4.1992 and all of them have been employed in various schools in the vocational stream. All of them have been duly qualified for appointment to the post of Vocational Instructors and they have been employed continuously since their date of appointment. After introduction of 10+2 pattern of education in the higher secondary level, vocational education was introduced in order to train the higher secondary grade schools students in various vocational courses and to equip themselves for eventual employment. Imparting of vocational education at the higher secondary level was centrally sponsored programme introduced in various schools in the State of Tamil Nadu and in this regard, several thousands crores of rupees were sanctioned by the Government by various Government Orders from time to time. They were originally paid a consolidated amount which was revised from time to time, but subsequently vide G.O.Ms.No.712 Education Department dated 28.5.1990 and G.O.Ms.No.967 Education Department dated 16.10.1992, they were brought on regular pay scale of Rs.1400-2600 in respect of full time Vocational Instructors.

4. Vocational Course Teachers, like the petitioners herein were either appointed by the School Managements or by the Parent-Teacher Association with the prior approval of the Government. This was the scenario before 1992. After 1.4.1992, no private schools were permitted to open new aided management schools and no private or aided schools were permitted to start any fresh vocational courses from the said date. It was the policy decision of the Government not to grant any aid to any private schools, however, they were permitted to establish schools without seeking any aid from the Government.

5. Originally, hundreds of Vocational Course Instructors were brought under regular time scale who were appointed prior to 1.4.1992 and their services have been regularized. Following its earlier decision, the Government had issued yet another order in G.O.Ms.No.74 (Vocational) Department, dated 13.6.2002 in and by which, 235 regular part time Vocational Teachers were brought into regular time scale in the existing vacancies as Vocational Teachers Grade II in the time scale of pay applicable to the post of Secondary Grade Teacher. Similarly, the Government passed a G.O.Ms.No.35 School Education (Vocational) Department dated 9.2.2007 in and by which, 201 Vocational Teachers Grade II posts were directed to be filled up from the list of Vocational Teachers based on seniority.

6. The names of the petitioners herein find place in the said seniority list. However, except 34 Vocational Teachers, all others were granted the benefit of regularization under the

G.O.Ms.No.35, dated 9.2.2007. The reason for denial of such benefit to 34 Vocational Instructors including the petitioners herein, was that the post in which these petitioners are working were created after 1.4.1992. According to the Government as per Section 14(A) of the Tamil Nadu Recognized Private Schools (Regulation) Act, 34 vocational teachers cannot be regularized in service since there was no grant for those posts after introduction of above Section in the Act.

7. Since the reasons assigned for not granting the benefit of G.O.Ms.No.35, dated 9.2.2007, were incorrect and invalid, the petitioners along with other similarly placed persons approached this Court in WP Nos.2423 of 2009 etc. batch, seeking a direction to second and third respondents to appoint them in regular post in terms of G.O.Ms.No.35 dated 9.2.2007. This Court by a common order dated 21.3.2011 has disposed of the Writ Petitions by concluding as such in paragraph 9 which is extracted below:

"9. In the light of the said undisputed facts, namely the grant of relief to the persons appointment even after 1.4.1992 numbering about 61, the respondents cannot discriminate the petitioners/34 Vocational Instructors. Hence, the Writ Petition is disposed of with a direction to the 1st respondent to consider the representation submitted by the association dated 17.01.1999, in the light of the earlier order which was also implemented and as per the proposal submitted by the 2nd respondent dated 23.10.2008. Necessary order is directed to be passed by the 1st respondent within period of 3 months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. However, no order to costs."

8. However, even after the lapse of time stipulated by this Court in the aforesaid order, no orders were passed and therefore, a contempt petition was filed. During the course of hearing in the contempt petition, a letter was produced dated 8.6.2012 stating that the petitioner's claim was rejected on the ground that no sanctioned post was available after 1.4.1992. Recording the submissions made on behalf of the respondents therein, the Contempt Petition came to be closed by giving liberty to the petitioners to work out their remedy in the manner known to law.

9. In the meanwhile, the respondents have also filed a writ appeal against the common order dated 21.3.2011 with a petition to condone delay in filing the appeal. Though delay was condoned, no further steps have been taken to have the appeal heard, to the knowledge of the petitioners herein. Since the rejection of the claim of the petitioners was contrary to the

specific finding of this Court in its order dated 21.3.2011 in a batch of writ petitions, viz., W.P.Nos.2423 of 2009 etc., the petitioners are once again constrained to approach this Court in the present writ petitions, challenging the rejection orders.

10. Except W.P.No.16272 of 2012, all other writ petitions are filed by individual teachers. W.P.No.16272 of 2012 is filed by the Tamil Nadu Higher Secondary School Vocational Instructors Association. In fact, some of the petitioners herein also happened to be the members of the association and their grievances were, in fact, covered under the said Writ Petition also.

11. The main grounds of attack on behalf of the petitioners herein, as contended by the learned counsel, are

i) that the rejection of the claim as conveyed in the impugned order dated 9.7.2015 runs contrary to the specific findings given by this Court in its order dated 21.03.2011 in the above said batch of writ petitions;

ii) that the learned Judge as he then was, had in fact, recorded both the submissions of the learned counsels appearing for the petitioners as well as respondents therein and finally concluded in favour of the petitioners in the paragraph 9 which is extracted supra. But the basis on such conclusion as found in the order in paragraph 4 to 8 extracted below, which would unequivocally demonstrate that no discretion was left to the authorities concerned for taking a different view as the Court has merely directed the authorities to pass consequential orders granting regularization of the petitioners.

"4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that only 34 candidates are left out and they must also be treated on par with similarly placed persons totaling 201 and the action of the respondents in not granting the relief to the petitioners in the said 34 persons are discriminatory and violation of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

5. The learned counsel also submitted that the name of the petitioners in W.P.Nos.2423 to 2426 of 2009 are found in Sl.Nos.155, 104, 146 and 173 respectively of the list annexed to G.O.ms.No.35 Education (VE) Department dated 09.02.2007.

6. Based on the counter affidavit, the learned government Advocate appearing for the respondents submitted that those 34 persons were appointed after the introduction of Section 14(A) of the Tamil

Nadu Recognized Private School (Regulation) Act, 1973, i.e., after 01.04.1992 and therefore they are not entitled to get the relief in terms of G.O.Ms.No.35 Education (VE) Department dtd 9.2.2007. The said G.O.Ms.No.35 itself was issued after introduction of Section 14 (A) of the Tamil Nadu Recognized Private School (Regulation) Act, 1973.

7. However, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners pointed out that several persons appointed after 01.04.1992, whose names were included in G.O.Ms.No.35 have been granted relief. The names of those persons are also furnished before this Court in Page No.45 of the Type Set of papers filed along with W.P.No.2423 of 2009.

8. In the typed set of papers in W.P.No.4667 of 2009, the association has enclosed a report sent by the Director of School Education to the Secretary to the Government in proceedings Na.Ka.No.101568 / V//E1/04 dated 23.10.2008, wherein it is stated that 62 persons appointed in private schools after 01.04.1992 were granted approval, even though they were appointed in the schools where the posts were not sanctioned, based on G.O.Ms.No.35 Education (VE) Department dated 9.2.2007 and the previous G.O.'s issued in G.O.Ms.967 Education dated 16.10.1992, G.O.Ms.No.834. Education dated 23.09.1994, G.O.Ms.No.790 Education dated 06.11.1996, G.O.Ms.No.358 Education dated 18.08.1997, G.O.Ms.No.39 Education dated 12.02.1999 and G.O.Ms.No.74 Education dated 10.05.2002 and they are also given regular time scale of pay. It is further made clear in the said order that only for vocational subjects, posts are sanctioned to the aided schools after 01.04.1992 and the Director of School Education also recommended to extend the benefits to 34 persons whose names, qualification and date of appointment were mentioned in the G.O. The said communication is found at Page 61 of the typed set of papers.

9. In the light of the said undisputed facts, namely the grant of relief to the persons appointed even after 01.04.1992 numbering 61, the respondents cannot discriminate the petitioners / 34 Vocational

Instructors. Hence, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the first respondent to consider the representation submitted by the association dated 17.01.2009, in the light of the earlier order which was also implemented and as per proposal submitted by the second respondent dated 23.10.2008. Necessary order is directed to be passed by the first respondent within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. However, no order as to costs."

iii) that from the above orders, it could be seen that number of Government Orders have been passed over a period of time wherein, Vocational Teachers who were appointed after 1.4.1992 had been granted the benefit of regularization and these petitioners were also covered under the G.O.Ms.No.35 dated 9.2.2007 and in which case, there cannot be any differential treatment to the petitioners alone in the matter of regularization and the attempt by the department to treat the petitioners alone with different treatment would tantamount to discrimination and the same is violative of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.

iv) that the reasoning of the Government as stated in the impugned order dated 9.7.2015 that after introduction of Section 14(A) of the Act, no grant-in-aid was available to any private schools and therefore, any courses which were continued after the said date and any appointment which taken place, cannot be bestowed thereafter with the benefit of regularization, cannot also be countenanced both on law and on facts for the simple reason that since admittedly more than 200 teachers have been regularized after 1.4.1992 and this fact was also recorded by this Court in the earlier aforesaid batch of writ petitions.

v) that grant-in-aid as contemplated in Section 14(A) of the Act would only mean that the general academic subjects at higher secondary level, are not vocational courses since the vocational courses are centrally sponsored scheme and this fact cannot be disputed by the Government.

vi) that moreover, the appointment of Vocational Course instructor is personal to the

individual concerned and once a person retires or resigns, the post will revert back to the department and the department recycles the vacancies and accommodates eligible vocational teachers on regular basis. The posts therefore, do not belong to the institution. Such being the case, the question of any cut off date, namely, 1.4.1992 cannot arise and can be applied in the case of appointment of Vocational Training Instructors.

vi) In any event, G.O.Ms.No.35, dated 9.2.1997 provided for regularization of about 213 teachers, of which, 201 were found eligible and qualified to be regularized and they were indeed regularized under the said G.O. Admittedly, the names of these petitioners also found place in the said list, however, unfortunately, for some strange and invalid reasons, 34 names were left out only on suspicious grounds that they were appointed after 1.4.1992 when the fact of the matter is that several persons appointed after 1.4.1992 had been accommodated and appointed as Vocational Teachers on regular basis. For the above said reasons, the learned counsel would pray for quashing the impugned order, rejecting the claim of the petitioners and allow the writ petitions as prayed for.

12. Upon notice, Mr.C.Munusamy, learned Special Government Pleader entered appearance and filed a detailed counter affidavit.

13. Shri S.T.S.Murthy, learned Addl.Advocate General appearing for the respondents would submit that after introduction of Section 14(A) of the Tamil Nadu Recognized Private Schools (Regulation) Act, the question of regularization of the petitioners does not arise at all. He would premise his

argument primarily on the ground that originally there were number of vocational courses started in the schools at the higher secondary level in the state of Tamil Nadu, however, over a period of time, vocational courses came to be restructured on the basis of higher level Committee's recommendation and reduced number of vocational courses to 9 instead of 66 courses which were initially introduced at the time of introduction of 10+2 pattern of education in higher secondary schools in the state of Tamil Nadu in 1978. This was done by the Government Order in G.O.Ms.No.277 Education Department dated 26.10.2009 and subsequently vide G.O.Ms.No.78 School Education Department dated 28.04.2011, additional three courses were added to the then 9 vocational courses. In view of the drastic reduction from original 66 vocational courses to that of mere 12 courses, the

man power requirement for vocational training had also been correspondingly reduced. Therefore, it is not possible for the Government to regularize the service of all existing vocational part-time teachers and bring them to regular scale of pay. Further, according to the learned Addl. Advocate General, many of the vocational courses had no response from the students and therefore, the said courses had been done away with.

14. The learned Addl. Advocate General, in order to resist the claim of the petitioners herein, would also rely on a decision reported in 2006 (5) CTC 193 (Maria Grace Rural Middle School, rep. by its Correspondent, Rev. Fr. A. Antony Raj versus The Government of Tamil Nadu, rep. by its Secretary, Education Science and Technology Department) wherein, the Division of this Court has upheld the provision, i.e. Section 14(A) of the Tamil Nadu Recognized Private Schools (Regulation) Act, 1972 on the ground that it was a policy decision of the Government and it does not violate any of the provisions of the Constitution and the scheme is constitutionally valid. He would therefore, submit that the petitioner's case is different and hence, the Government decided not to regularize these petitioners and they cannot compare themselves with other Vocational Teachers who were covered under G.O. Ms. No. 35 School Education Department dated 9.2.2007.

15. This Court has given its anxious consideration to the rival submissions of the learned counsels appearing for the petitioners and the learned Addl. Advocate General on behalf of the respondents and perused the entire materials available on record.

16. The contentions raised on behalf of the petitioners deserve a serious consideration for more one than reason. When these petitioners approached this Court in a batch of Writ Petitions in W.P. No. 2423 of 2009 etc., this Court has considered the claim of the petitioners and passed orders on 21.3.2011 by directing the respondents therein to consider the claim of the petitioners along with similarly placed persons whose services were regularized under various Government Orders. From the detailed orders passed by the learned Judge, as he then was, has held that since the similarly placed Vocational Teachers who were appointed after 1.4.1992 had been appointed on regular basis, the respondents cannot discriminate the petitioners namely, 34 Vocational Instructors, which clearly meant that there was no discretion accorded to the Government to take any other view except to pass similar orders and grant regularization to the 34 Vocational Instructors including the petitioners herein. However, unfortunately, it appears that the Government had misconstrued the conclusion as if the entire decision was left open to the Government to take a call on the subject and rejected the claim of the petitioners. Such action on the part of the Government cannot be appreciated by this Court since the Government wittingly or unwittingly failed to

read the entire order passed by this Court in the batch of Writ Petitions in W.P.Nos.2423 of 2009 etc., dated 21.3.2011 in proper perspective. Once this Court has come to the categorical conclusion that the petitioners cannot be discriminated in the matter of regularization and such a direction was issued on the basis that the persons who were appointed after 1.4.1992 were regularized, there was practically left nothing to the Government to decide except to pass a consequential order of regularization. Unfortunately, in this case, the Government has chosen to reject the claim of the petitioners on untenable grounds once again and driven the petitioners to approach this Court seeking for the above said reliefs.

17. Moreover, as rightly contended by the learned counsel for the petitioners, that the introduction of Section 14(A) of the Tamil Nadu Private Schools (Regulation) Act has no bearing on the issue of regularization of Vocational Teachers, since the grant in aid was stopped only in respect of regular academic subjects and the Vocational Training Programme is admittedly a centrally sponsored scheme. Further, the posts of Vocational Training Instructors pertain to the individuals concerned and not attached to the institution in which the person is working and once the person retires or resigns for any other reason, the post is kept vacant and it reverted back to the department and it is recycled with other incumbents on the basis of seniority. This fact is also admitted in various letters and instructions by the Government. Moreover, it is also to be seen that the fact that all these petitioners have been fully qualified and have been engaged as Vocational Training Instructors uninterruptedly since their initial appointment has not been disputed and the only reasons for their non-regularization is because of introduction of Section 14(A) in the Tamil Nadu Private Schools (Regulation) Act which reason, was discountenanced by this Court on the basis of the admitted fact that the persons who were appointed even after 1.4.1992 had been accommodated and regularized under various G.Os. Therefore, the reason given in the impugned order, per se, is arbitrary, unjust and unreasonable and the same cannot be countenanced either in law or on facts.

18. Once the Government thought fit to regularize all similarly placed Vocational Teachers under G.O.Ms.No.35, dated 9.2.2007 and the names of the petitioners found place in the list annexed to the said G.O., this Court does not see any iota of justification as to how these petitioners can alone be singled out from the benefit of regularization. The plea of the Government as conveyed through the learned Addl. Advocate General that after introduction of Section 14(A) of the Tamil Nadu Private Schools (Regulation) Act, the question of regularization of these petitioners does not arise, is nothing but a flimsy and specious argument and has to be rejected outright. Even assuming the argument can be advanced for the sake of resisting the claim of the petitioners, such argument deserves to be

brushed aside, since that would only result in flagrant violation of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India as there cannot be any differential treatment in respect of same set of employees. In this case, it is more than demonstrated that the petitioners have been similarly placed as that of other Vocational Teachers covered under G.O.Ms.No.35, dated 9.2.2007. Therefore, this Court does not see any semblance of legal basis for denying them the benefit of regularization.

19. For the aforesaid reasons, this Court is of the considered view that these petitioners have made out a clear case for grant of relief as sought for. Accordingly, the Writ Petitions are allowed and the respective orders passed by the authorities, impugned in the Writ Petitions, are hereby set aside. The respondents/competent authorities are directed to pass orders regularizing the service of the petitioners as Vocational Teachers as provided for under G.O.Ms.No.35, dated 9.2.2007 and grant all attendant benefits, viz., seniority and other monetary benefits. The direction of this Court shall be complied with, within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order. No costs. Consequently all connected MPs are closed.

suk

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS VIII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1. The Secretary,
The Government of Tamil Nadu,
School Education Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai-600 009.

2. The Director of School Education,
D.P.I Compound,
Nungambakkam, College Road,
Chennai-600 006.

3. The Joint Director of School Education,
(Vocational),
D.P.I Compound,
Nungambakkam, College Road,
Chennai-600 006.

4. The Chief Education Officer,
Thoothukudi District.
Thoothukudi.

- 5.The Chief Education Officer,
Chennai
- 6.The Chief Education Officer
Virudhunagar District, Virudhunagar
- 7.The Chief Education Officer,
Coimbatore District, Coimbatore
- 8.The Chief Education Officer,
Dindigul District, Dindigul
- 9.The District Educational Officer,
Thallakulam, Madurai 625 002.

+2cc to Mr.C.Johnson, Advocate, SR.no.28911
+1cc to Government Pleader SR.no.29179
+7cc to Mr.A.R.Suresh, Advocate Sr.no.28324
+7cc to Mr.A.R.Suresh, Advocate Sr.No.28323

SSD(CO)
EU-SM:10.5.2018

Common Order in
W.P.No.31021 of 2012 etc.



WEB COPY