

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 31.01.2018

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.V.MURALIDARAN

Writ Petition Nos.25703 of 2012, 26356 of 2013  
and Contempt Petition No.1962 of 2013

W.P.No.25703 of 2012:

Tamil Nadu Agricultural University  
SC/ST Employees' Welfare Association,  
(Reg.No.212 of 2007),  
Rep. by its President, Dr.R.Chandrasekaran,  
No.1, Chinnasamynagar,  
P.N.Pudur, Coimbatore - 41. ... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The Registrar,  
Tamil Nadu Agricultural University,  
Coimbatore - 641 003.
- 2.The Vice Chancellor,  
Tamil Nadu Agricultural University,  
Coimbatore - 641 003.
- 3.The State of Tamil Nadu,  
Rep. by the Principal Secretary and  
Agricultural Production Commissioner,  
Agriculture Department, Secretariat,  
Chennai. .. Respondents

PRAYER in W.P.No.25703 of 2012: Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records relating to the impugned notification No.R3/2903/2012, dated 27.8.2012 issued by the first respondent, to quash the same and to issue fresh notification indicating the adoption of reservation policy of Government of Tamil Nadu based upon the representation of the Association dated 4.9.2012.

W.P.No.26356 of 2013:

1.Tamil Nadu Agricultural University  
SC/ST Employees' Welfare Association,  
(Reg.No.212 of 2007),  
Rep. by its President, Dr.R.Chandrasekaran,  
No.1, Chinnsamynagar,  
P.N.Pudur, Coimbatore - 41.

2.J.Krishnan

.. Petitioners

Vs.

1.The Registrar,  
Tamil Nadu Agricultural University,  
Coimbatore - 641 003.  
2.The Vice Chancellor,  
Tamil Nadu Agricultural University,  
Coimbatore - 641 003.  
3.The State of Tamil Nadu,  
Rep. by the Principal Secretary and  
Agricultural Production Commissioner,  
Agriculture Department, Secretariat,  
Chennai.

.. Respondents

PRAYER in W.P.No.26356 of 2013: Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records on the file of the respondent University Advertisement No.R/3/01 (Regular Vacancies)/2013, dated 9.9.2013, to quash the same and direct the respondents to fill up the shortfall vacancies in the second respondent University.

Contempt Petition No.1962 of 2013:

Tamil Nadu Agricultural University  
SC/ST Employees' Welfare Association,  
(Reg.No.212 of 2007),  
Rep. by its President, Dr.R.Chandrasekaran,  
No.1, Chinnsamynagar,  
P.N.Pudur, Coimbatore - 41.

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.Mr.R.Rabindran, Registrar,  
Tamil Nadu Agricultural University,  
Coimbatore - 641 003.

2.Dr.K.Ramasamy, Vice Chancellor,  
Tamil Nadu Agricultural University,  
Coimbatore - 641 003.

3.Mr.Sandeep Saxena,  
Principal Secretary and  
Agricultural Production Commissioner,  
Agriculture Department,  
State of Tamil Nadu,  
Secretariat, Chennai.

(3<sup>rd</sup> respondent deleted as per  
Order dated 27.08.2013)

... Respondents

PRAYER in Contempt Petition No.1962 of 2013: Petition filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of Courts Act to punish the respondents for willful disobedience of the order passed by this Court in M.P.No.2 of 2012 in W.P.No.25703 of 2012, dated 11.10.2012.

For Petitioners : Mr.Gopalakrishnan  
For M/s.S.T.Natramil Kaviarasan

For Respondent : Mr.A.L.Somayaji, Senior Counsel  
For Mr.Abdul Saleem (for R1 & R2)

Mr.R.Govindasamy (for R3)  
Special Government Pleader

ORDER

In W.P.No.25703 of 2012, the petitioner association seeking issuance of a writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records relating to the impugned notification No.R3/2903/2012, dated 27.08.2012 issued by the first respondent, to quash the same and to issue fresh notification indicating the adoption of reservation policy of Government of Tamil Nadu based upon the representation of the Association dated 04.09.2012.

2. The contempt petition, being Contempt Petition No.1962 of 2013, has been filed by the petitioner association to punish the respondents for willful disobedience of the order passed by this

Court in M.P.No.2 of 2012 in W.P.No.25703 of 2012, dated 11.10.2012.

3. The petitioner association filed W.P.No.26356 of 2013 seeking issuance of a writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records on the file of the respondent University Advertisement No.R/3/01(Regular Vacancies)/2013, dated 09.09.2013, to quash the same and direct the respondents to fill up the shortfall vacancies in the second respondent University.

4. The facts of the present case are intertwined and they are narrated as follows: The petitioner is an association registered under the Tamil Nadu Societies Registration Act, 1975 and all the employees working in the Tamil Nadu Agricultural University belonging to Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe community are the members of the said association.

5. It is the case of the petitioner association that even though the respondent University is recruiting "University Officers" since the establishment of the respondent University, for about 40 years, though eligible candidates were available from Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes communities, adequate opportunity and representation was not provided and they are denied opportunity to work in the cadre of University Officer.

6. It is averred that even though on 27.08.2012, the first respondent issued a Circular bearing No.R3/2903/2012, inviting applications for recruitment of 31 University Officers, the same does not specify the adoption of reservation policy and the same is in gross violation of Article 16(4) of the Constitution of India.

7. It is stated that pursuant to the issuance of the above said circular, the petitioner association submitted a memorandum to the first respondent on 04.09.2012 requesting the first respondent to issue a fresh notification, indicating the rule of reservation in accordance with law, Government Orders and Constitution of India and to provide opportunity to improve the status and take their rightful place in the mainstream of the society. It is alleged that the said representation did not evoke any response.

8. It is further stated that though the impugned circular specifies that a "minimum 3 years of left over service is a must for applying the University Officers post", such requirement is not specified in the Act, Statutes and Regulations of the Tamil Nadu Agricultural University and, as such, the requirement contemplated under the impugned circular is contrary to the Act, Statutes and Regulations of the Tamil Nadu Agricultural University.

9. Likewise, it is alleged that though the Statute prescribes minimum experience of six years as Professor to be eligible for the post of University Officer, the circular states that a minimum of five years experience would suffice. It is stated that such amendment or modification can be made only by the Government with the approval of the Legislature and inasmuch no such approval was obtained in the instant case, the modifications made by the first respondent run counter to the requirement stipulated in the Act, Statutes and Regulations of the respondent University.

10. It is further stated that no adequate publication of the circular was made and it was merely published in the University Website and not in prominent dailies and, therefore, the Professors working elsewhere in the country with specified qualification are denied an opportunity to apply for the said post of University Officer.

11. In such backdrop, the petitioner association filed W.P.No.25703 of 2012 for the relief stated supra and the contentions advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioner are as under:

i. The posts of University Officers are of the same cadre, having equal powers and responsibilities, and the posts are transferable and interchangeable within the jurisdiction of the University and, therefore, the said posts should not be considered as single post or separate departmental post and hence, the reservation policy of the government is applicable to the said posts. That apart, the circular clearly states that aspirants can apply for any number or to all the posts and hence, the said posts are one and the same and are having equal responsibilities and powers and, therefore, it cannot be said that the posts should be considered as single post or separate departmental post.

ii. The impugned circular is issued not to promote candidates, but to recruit candidates directly and if reservation policy is not adopted, opportunity guaranteed under the provisions of the Constitution of India would be denied to the downtrodden and other backward communities.

iii. The prescription of minimum three years of left over service mentioned in the impugned circular is against the Act, Statutes and Regulations of the respondent University and on this ground also the circular is liable to be set aside.

12. Refuting the above said arguments, the learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent University contended as under:

a) No fundamental right of the petitioner association

has been violated and, therefore, the writ petition filed by the petitioner association is not maintainable, more so when the respondent University resolved that no recognition of any association formed on the basis of any caste, religion or any group having its movements or connections with community or caste or religion would be granted.

b) The rule of reservation is only at entrant level and not for the post of higher eminence and added that reservation to SC/ST candidates shall be for appointments by direct recruitment at the lowest level and in the case on hand, for recruitment of University Officers, the procedure as contemplated has been scrupulously followed.

c) If the candidate has short term of less than three years of service and if the post of University Officer falls vacant, then it would certainly cause difficulty in running the remaining term of the office without University Officers and to avoid such inconvenience hampering the sphere of administration, the condition of minimum three years of left over service is prescribed and the same is based on the resolution passed by the University.

d) The requirement of five years experience as stated in the circular is as per the Resolution passed by the Board of Management of the Tamil Nadu Agricultural University in its 137<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 14.02.2005 and such power to amend is conferred as per the provisions of Chapter XI of the Tamil Nadu Agricultural University Act, 1971.

e) The respondent University had widely circulated the advertisement through electronic methods and other modes and, therefore, the recruitment process should not be interfered with.

13. During the pendency of the above said writ petition, being W.P.No.25703 of 2012, by order dated 11.10.2012, this Court granted an order of interim injunction and stay and the same was made absolute vide order dated 28.11.2012.

14. Alleging that despite the above said interim order, the respondent University has filled the post with in-service candidates whenever any one of the 31 vacancies fell vacant by retirement of an incumbent, the petitioner has filed contempt petition.

15. It is specifically pleaded in the contempt petition that out of 31 candidates appointed pursuant to the interim order, only one candidate, namely Dr.K.Velayutham, belongs to Scheduled Caste community and all others belong to other communities and,

therefore, the recruitment process adopted shows that no reservation policy has been adopted by the respondent University.

16. Pending the interim orders passed in the above said writ petition (W.P.No.25703 of 2012) and the contempt petition, the respondent University issued circulars dated 09.09.2013 inviting application for filling up 11 backlog vacancies and 166 regular vacancies in the posts of Assistant Professors, of which we are concerned only with the latter 166 regular vacancies.

17. It is the contention of the petitioners in this writ petition, being W.P.No.26356 of 2013, that 67 short fall vacancies should be filled up before going for any regular recruitment and that the posts reserved for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes should be kept vacant and not filled up with other candidates and the same is violative of Articles 14, 16 (4), 16(4A) and 16(4B) of the Constitution of India. That apart, the procedure adopted by the respondent University is against the government orders and is also against Rule 22 of the Tamil Nadu State and Subordinate Service Rules.

18. Placing reliance on G.O.Ms.No.220, dated 14.09.2007 and the discussion with the Registrar and Deputy Registrar (Administration), TNAU on 27.06.2013, it is contended that it is the duty of the respondent University to fill the shortfall vacancies as a one time measure and the government order should not be violated.

19. On the issue of maintainability of the writ petition filed by the petitioner association, it is apposite to note that the writ petition filed in the year 2012 is pending for almost six years and even at the time of admission, this Court was satisfied with the maintainability of the writ petition and had also granted an interim order in favour of the petitioner association. Therefore, at this stage, this Court does not propose to delve deep into the aspect of maintainability of the writ petitions, more so when writ petition filed by the very same petitioner association had already been entertained by this Court and in fact, the writ appeal was also decided on merits by a Division Bench of this Court in Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, SC/ST Employees Welfare Association v. The Registrar, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore & Others [W.A.No.1946 of 2009, dated 31.03.2010] qua the challenge to the advertisement issued for recruitment of Assistant Professors.

20. A bare perusal of the notification dated 27.08.2012 shows that the advertisement invites applications for recruitment to the post of "University Officers" and invites applications even from deputationists. A reading of the terms and conditions of appointment and other instructions to

candidates information shows that "all technical post of equivalent pay scales are interchangeable, within the broad discipline/departments, at the discretion of the University". It also states that "Candidates who are selected shall be liable for transfer to any other post within the jurisdiction of the University".

21. That apart, the appended instructions to the circular states that "Persons who are already working in State or Central Government or any other organization should send their applications through proper channel." This shows that the persons working in State or Central Government or any other organization are also entitled to apply for the posts notified. Therefore, by no stretch of imagination, it can be construed that the process adopted by the respondent University is for promotion. It is crystal clear that the recruitment is not by promotion. Moreover, the posts are interchangeable within the broad discipline/departments, at the discretion of the University. A bare perusal of the circular shows, for instance in the case of the post of Dean, that there are 5 different disciplines under which there are 11 posts of Deans are to be filled, of course, the pay may be the same, but the faculty required in each case is based on discipline.

22. Assuming arguendo that the notification is for promotion, even then by virtue of the decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Suraj Bhan Meena v. State of Rajasthan*, (2011) 1 SCC 467 and *Anil Chandra v. Radha Krishna Gaur*, (2009) 9 SCC 454 the reservation for SC/ST in the matter of promotion is also constitutionally protected by virtue of Articles 16(4A) (4B) and 335 of the Constitution of India.

23. Article 16 of the Constitution of India provides for equality of opportunities in the matters of public employment and the relevant portion of the said Article reads as under:

"Article 16. Equality of opportunity in matters of public employment:

(1) There shall be equality of opportunity for all citizens in matters relating to employment or appointment to any office under the State.

(2) No citizen shall, on grounds only of religion, race, caste, sex, descent, place of birth, residence or any of them, be ineligible for, or discriminated against in respect of, any employment or office under the State.

(3) Nothing in this article shall prevent Parliament from making any law prescribing, in regard to a class or classes of employment or appointment to an office under the Government of, or any local or other authority within, a State or Union territory, any requirement as to residence within that State or Union territory prior to such employment or appointment.

(4) Nothing in this article shall prevent the State from making any provision for the reservation of appointments or posts in favour of any backward class of citizens which, in the opinion of the State, is not adequately represented in the services under the State.

(4A) Nothing in this article shall prevent the State from making any provision for reservation in matters of promotion, with consequential seniority, to any class or classes of posts in the services under the State in favour of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes which, in the opinion of the State, are not adequately represented in the services under the State.

(4B) Nothing in this article shall prevent the State from considering any unfilled vacancies of a year which are reserved for being filled up in that year in accordance with any provision for reservation made under clause (4) or clause (4A) as a separate class of vacancies to be filled up in any succeeding year or years and such class of vacancies shall not be considered together with the vacancies of the year in which they are being filled up for determining the ceiling of fifty per cent. reservation on total number of vacancies of that year.

(5) Nothing in this article shall affect the operation of any law which provides that the incumbent of an office in connection with the affairs of any religious or denominational institution or any member of the governing body thereof shall be a person professing a particular religion or belonging to a particular denomination."

24. A Constitution Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in a case of M.Nagaraj and others v. Union of India, (2006) 8 SCC 212, has accepted the submission that since the benefit under

Article 16(4A) was confined only to SCs/STs and did not extend to the wider class of any backward class of citizens, the constitutional provision passed muster of "width test" and the Constitutional amendment was therefore not violative of the basic structure. The Constitution Bench specifically held that the benefit of reservations at the stage of promotions enabled by Article 16(4A) was confined only to SCs/STs and did not extend to the wider class of any backward class of citizens. In effect, the Constitution Bench held as under:

"ROLE OF ENABLING PROVISIONS IN THE CONTEXT OF ARTICLE 14:

109. The gravamen of Article 14 is equality of treatment. Article 14 confers a personal right by enacting a prohibition which is absolute. By judicial decisions, the doctrine of classification is read into Article 14. Equality of treatment under Article 14 is an objective test. It is not the test of intention. Therefore, the basic principle underlying Article 14 is that the law must operate equally on all persons under like circumstances. [Emphasis added]. Every discretionary power is not necessarily discriminatory. According to the Constitutional Law of India, by H.M. Seervai, 4th Edn. 546, equality is not violated by mere conferment of discretionary power. It is violated by arbitrary exercise by those on whom it is conferred. This is the theory of 'guided power'. This theory is based on the assumption that in the event of arbitrary exercise by those on whom the power is conferred would be corrected by the Courts. This is the basic principle behind the enabling provisions which are incorporated in Articles 16(4A) and 16(4B). Enabling provisions are permissive in nature. They are enacted to balance equality with positive discrimination. The constitutional law is the law of evolving concepts. Some of them are generic others have to be identified and valued. The enabling provisions deal with the concept, which has to be identified and valued as in the case of access vis-a-vis efficiency which depends on the fact-situation only and not abstract principle of equality in Article 14 as spelt out in detail in Articles 15 and 16. Equality before the law, guaranteed by the first part of Article 14, is a negative concept while the second part is a positive concept which is enough to validate equalizing measures depending upon the fact-situation.

110. It is important to bear in mind the nature of constitutional amendments. They are curative by nature. Article 16(4) provides for reservation for backward classes in cases of inadequate representation in public employment. Article 16(4) is enacted as a remedy for the past historical discriminations against a social class. The object in enacting the enabling provisions like Articles 16(4), 16(4A) and 16(4B) is that the State is empowered to identify and recognize the compelling interests. If the State has quantifiable data to show backwardness and inadequacy then the State can make reservations in promotions keeping in mind maintenance of efficiency which is held to be a constitutional limitation on the discretion of the State in making reservation as indicated by Article 335. As stated above, the concepts of efficiency, backwardness, inadequacy of representation are required to be identified and measured. That exercise depends on availability of data. That exercise depends on numerous factors. It is for this reason that enabling provisions are required to be made because each competing claim seeks to achieve certain goals. How best one should optimize these conflicting claims can only be done by the administration in the context of local prevailing conditions in public employment. This is amply demonstrated by the various decisions of this Court discussed hereinabove. Therefore, there is a basic difference between 'equality in law' and 'equality in fact' (See: 'Affirmative Action' by William Darity). If Articles 16(4A) and 16(4B) flow from Article 16(4) and if Article 16(4) is an enabling provision then Articles 16(4A) and 16(4B) are also enabling provisions. As long as the boundaries mentioned in Article 16(4), namely, backwardness, inadequacy and efficiency of administration are retained in Articles 16(4A) and 16(4B) as controlling factors, we cannot attribute constitutional invalidity to these enabling provisions. However, when the State fails to identify and implement the controlling factors then excessiveness comes in, which is to be decided on the facts of each case. In a given case, where excessiveness results in reverse discrimination, this Court has to examine individual cases and decide the matter in accordance with law. This is the theory of 'guided power'. We may once again repeat that equality is not violated by mere

conferment of power but it is breached by arbitrary exercise of the power conferred.

#### APPLICATION OF DOCTRINE OF "GUIDED POWER"- ARTICLE 335 :

111. Applying the above tests to the proviso to Article 335 inserted by the Constitution (Eighty-Second Amendment) Act, 2000, we find that the said proviso has a nexus with Articles 16(4A) and 16(4B). Efficiency in administration is held to be a constitutional limitation on the discretion vested in the State to provide for reservation in public employment. Under the proviso to Article 335, it is stated that nothing in Article 335 shall prevent the State to relax qualifying marks or standards of evaluation for reservation in promotion. This proviso is also confined only to members of SCs and STs. This proviso is also conferring discretionary power on the State to relax qualifying marks or standards of evaluation. Therefore, the question before us is - whether the State could be empowered to relax qualifying marks or standards for reservation in matters of promotion. In our view, even after insertion of this proviso, the limitation of overall efficiency in Article 335 is not obliterated. Reason is that "efficiency" is variable factor. It is for the concerned State to decide in a given case, whether the overall efficiency of the system is affected by such relaxation. If the relaxation is so excessive that it ceases to be qualifying marks then certainly in a given case, as in the past, the State is free not to relax such standards. In other cases, the State may evolve a mechanism under which efficiency, equity and justice, all three variables, could be accommodated. Moreover, Article 335 is to be read with Article 46 which provides that the State shall promote with special care the educational and economic interests of the weaker sections of the people and in particular of the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes and shall protect them from social injustice. Therefore, where the State finds compelling interests of backwardness and inadequacy, it may relax the qualifying marks for SCs/STs. These compelling interests however have to be identified by weighty and comparable data.

112. In conclusion, we reiterate that the object behind the impugned Constitutional amendments is to confer discretion on the State to make reservations

for SCs/STs in promotions subject to the circumstances and the constitutional limitations indicated above."

25. The decision of the Constitution Bench in M.Nagaraj case, supra, was considered and followed in Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Limited vs. Rajesh Kumar and Others, (2012) 7 SCC 1 and Suresh Chand Gautam vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and Others, (2016) 11 SCC 113. The principles enunciated in the decision in M.Nagaraj case, supra, were re-stated in para (81) of the decision in Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Limited case, supra, the relevant portion of the said paragraph reads as under:

"81. ..

(v) The State has to form its opinion on the quantifiable data regarding adequacy of representation. Clause (4A) of Article 16 is an enabling provision. It gives freedom to the State to provide for reservation in matters of promotion. Clause (4A) of Article 16 applies only to SCs and STs. The said clause is carved out of Article 16 (4A). Therefore, clause (4A) will be governed by the two compelling reasons "backwardness" and "inadequacy of representation" as mentioned in Article 16(4). If the said two reasons do not exist, then the enabling provision cannot be enforced."

26. It is the duty of the respondent authorities to ascertain the backwardness and inadequacy of representation of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in the promotional cadres based on quantifiable data is a continuous process and cannot be a onetime exercise. The situation has to be assessed and reviewed on each occasion when promotion/ recruitment is contemplated.

27. In the case on hand, the respondent authorities did not make any attempt to pay heed to the representation of the petitioner association seeking reservation in the promotion specifically pleading that the members of the petitioner association, belonging to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, have not been given adequate representation for the last 40 years, despite such constitutional provisions enabling the State Government to form its opinion based on the quantifiable data regarding adequacy of representation. No iota of material has been placed on record to show that the respondent authorities have considered any quantifiable data before notifying the vacancies, more so, when there are 31 vacancies which are in different disciplines. In such view of the matter, the writ petition in W.P.No.25703 of 2012 deserves to be allowed.

28. It is not disputed by the respondent authorities that 67 short fall vacancies exist. The existence of backlog vacancies of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in promotional cadres, by itself, indicates inadequate representation in such cadres. By virtue of the provisions of the Constitution, referred supra, steps taken by the respondent University to go for regular recruitment of 166 posts, without filling up the shortfall vacancies with persons belonging to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes would deprive the persons belonging to backward classes leading to inadequacy of their representation. In the case on hand, it is not placed on record as to the time limit prescribed by the respondent authorities for the reserved post for being carried forward and as to whether such time limit for carrying forward the post reserved has lapsed. Before going for such regular recruitment, the respondent authorities will have to certainly ascertain the backwardness and inadequacy of representation of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in the promotional cadres based on quantifiable data.

29. In the result:

WP.No.25703 of 2012 - (a) The writ petition is allowed and the impugned notification No.R3/2903/2012, dated 27.08.2012 passed by the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent is quashed;

(b) the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent is hereby directed to issue fresh notification by indicating the adoption of reservation vacancies of Government of Tamil Nadu based upon the representation of the Association dated 04.09.2012;

(c) the said exercise shall be done within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order;

Cont.P.No.1962 of 2013 - The Contempt Petition is closed;

(d) though the violation of the interim order passed by the Court as apparent in view of the allowing of the writ petition, the Contempt Petition is closed.

WP.No.26356 of 2013 - (a) The writ petition is allowed and the impugned Advertisement No.R/3/01 (Regular Vacancies)/2013, dated 9.9.2013, passed by the respondent University is quashed;

(b) the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent is directed to fill up the short fall vacancies in the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent University;

(c) the said exercise shall be done within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

Sd/-  
Deputy Registrar

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar

To

- 1.The Registrar,  
Tamil Nadu Agricultural University,  
Coimbatore - 641 003.
  - 2.The Vice Chancellor,  
Tamil Nadu Agricultural University,  
Coimbatore - 641 003.
  - 3.The Principal Secretary and  
Agricultural Production Commissioner,  
Agriculture Department, Secretariat,
- + 1 cc to Mr.Abdul Saleem Advocate,SR.7904  
+ 1 cc to The Govt.Pleader, SR.7947  
+2cc to M/s.S.T.Natramil Kaviarasan,Advocate sr.no.8056(12/02/18)

W.P.Nos.25703 of 2012, 26356 of 2013  
and Contempt Petition No.1962 of 2013

nr 07/02/2018

सत्यमेव जयते  
WEB COPY