



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 16.02.2018

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE **MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM**W.P. (MD) No.11183 of 2013

WEB COPY

P.Murugesan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Secretary
School Education Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai.
2. The Director of Public Library,
737/1, Anna Salai,
Chennai - 2.
3. The District Library Officer,
Office of the District Library Officer,
144, Melaransalai, Kottai PO
Trichy-8.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records relating to the proceedings of the second respondent dated 14.05.2013 in proceedings in Na.Ka.No.3457/A2/2013 quash the same and consequently directing the respondents to regularize the service of the petitioner in the Department of 1st and 2nd respondents, in a permanent regular time scale basis from the initial date of appointment and pay all the attendant service benefits with arrears from the date of regularisation within the stipulated time.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Lakshmanan
For Respondents : Mr.M.Muthu A.G.P.,

O R D E R

The order impugned issued by the second respondent in his proceedings dated 14.05.2013 is under challenge in this writ petition. The further relief sought for in this writ petition is for a direction to direct the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioner in the second respondent department on permanent and regular basis.

2.The writ petitioner was appointed as Part-time Sweeper in Branch Library. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the writ petitioner states that the petitioner was allowed to work as



Part-time Sweeper in the Branch Library from the year 2001 onwards. The petitioner is fully qualified for regular appointment to the post of Sweeper. The Government also issued G.O.Ms.No.22, dated 28.02.2006, granting benefit of regularisation in respect of the temporary employees who have completed 10 years of continuous service. However, the benefit of Government Order has not been extended to the writ petitioner. The fact remains that the said G.O.Ms.No.22, dated 28.02.2006 had been withdrawn by the Government and in lieu of that the Government issued G.O.Ms.No.74, imposing certain restrictions for regularisation of services of the temporary employee.

3.The learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents made a submission that the writ petitioner was not appointed in accordance with the recruitment rules in force. The writ petitioner was appointed as Part-time Sweeper at Branch Library. The job of the Part-time Sweeper involves the limited work hours and therefore, the writ petitioner would not seek the benefit of regularisation.

4.The learned counsel for the petitioner has expressed his anguish before this Court by stating that the services of the writ petitioner was exploited by the authority. The authority by appointing the writ petitioner as Part-time Sweeper has exploited her services and in fact, the writ petitioner was made to work as full time employee by performing all the duties and responsibilities assigned by these officials. The competent authorities have misused the services and they had gone to the extent of exploiting the service knowing the fact that she was appointed as Part-time Sweeper and she is bound to obey all the instructions of the superior. The learned counsel has further stated that the permanent employees are working as part-time employees and part-time employees are made to work as full time and this is the state of affairs prevailing in the respondent department.

5.May that it be, the prevailing situation and nature of the duties and responsibilities allotted to the part-time employee are well narrated in the rules in force. However, this Court is of an opinion that the situation prevails factually in the department cannot be a ground for the writ petitioner to seek regularisation or permanent absorption. This Court has to go by the legal principles settled in the matter of regularisation and certain exploitations are to be dealt with in accordance with law and the authorities committed such exploitations are to be prosecuted in accordance with law. If the writ petitioner has suffered such an exploitation in the hands of the authorities then it is left open to the writ petitioner to initiate appropriate action in the law. This apart, the present writ petition is filed seeking the benefit of regularisation. Now, the benefit of regularisation or permanent absorption cannot be provided in



violation of the recruitment rules in force. The appointment made contrary to the service rules cannot be regularised nor the employees can be permanently absorbed.

6. This Court is of an opinion that the initial appointment of the writ petitioner was illegal and no order of appointment was issued. The writ petitioner was engaged only as part time sweeper and allowed to continue as such. At no point of time, the Rule relating to the recruitment was followed and therefore, the benefit of regularization and permanent absorption cannot be granted in favour of the writ petitioner in view of the fact that the Constitutional Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **the Secretary, State of Karnataka and others .vs. Umadevi (3) and others reported in (2006) 4 Supreme Court Cases 1**, wherein, at Paragraph 5,10,12,13,14,20 and 43 to 50, it is held as follows:

5. This Court has also on occasions issued directions which could not be said to be consistent with the Constitutional scheme of public employment. Such directions are issued presumably on the basis of equitable considerations or individualization of justice. The question arises, equity to whom? Equity for the handful of people who have approached the Court with a claim, or equity for the teeming millions of this country seeking employment and seeking a fair opportunity for competing for employment? When one side of the coin is considered, the other side of the coin, has also to be considered and the way open to any court of law or justice, is to adhere to the law as laid down by the Constitution and not to make directions, which at times, even if do not run counter to the Constitutional scheme, certainly tend to water down the Constitutional requirements. It is this conflict that is reflected in these cases referred to the Constitution Bench.

10. When these matters came up before a Bench of two Judges, the learned Judges referred the cases to a Bench of three Judges. The order of reference is reported in 2003 (9) SCALE 187. This Court noticed that in the matter of regularization of ad hoc employees, there were conflicting decisions by three Judge Benches of this Court and by two Judge Benches and hence the question required to be considered by a larger Bench. When the matters came up before a three Judge Bench, the Bench in turn felt that the matter required consideration by a Constitution Bench in view of the conflict and in the light of the arguments raised by the Additional Solicitor General. The order of reference is reported in 2003 (10) SCALE 368. It appears to be proper to quote that order of reference at this stage. It reads:



1 . Apart from the conflicting opinions between the three Judges' Bench decisions in **Ashwani Kumar and Ors. v. State of Bihar and Ors.** reported in MANU/SC/0379/1997 : (1997) IILLJ856SC , **State of Haryana and Ors. v. Piara Singh and Ors.** Reported in MANU/SC/0417/1992 : (1993) IILL J937SC and **Dharwad Distt. P.W.D. Literate Daily Wage Employees Association and Ors. v. State of Karnataka and Ors.** Reported in MANU/SC/0164/1990 : (1990) IILL J318SC , on the one hand and **State of Himachal Pradesh v. Suresh Kumar Verma and Anr.** Reported in MANU/SC/0406/1996 : [1996] 1SCR972 , **State of Punjab v. Surinder Kumar and Ors.** Reported in MANU/SC/0306/1992 : [1992] 194ITR434(SC), and **B.N. Nagarajan and Ors. v. State of Karnataka and Ors.** Reported in MANU/SC/0450/1979 : (1979) IILL J209SC on the other, which has been brought out in one of the judgments under appeal of Karnataka High Court in **State of Karnataka v. H. Ganesh Rao** decided on 1.6.2000, reported in 2001 (4) KLJ 466, learned Additional Solicitor General urged that the scheme for regularization is repugnant to Articles 16(4), 309, 320 and 335 of the Constitution of India and, therefore, these cases are required to be heard by a Bench of Five learned Judges (Constitution Bench).

2. On the other hand, Mr. M.C. Bhandare, learned senior counsel, appearing for the employees urged that such a scheme for regularization is consistent with the provision of Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution.

3. Mr. V. Lakshmi Narayan, learned Counsel, appearing in CC Nos. 109-498 of 2003, has filed the G.O. dated 19.7.2002 and submitted that orders have already been implemented.

4. After having found that there is conflict of opinion between three Judges Bench decisions of this Court, we are of the view that these cases are required to be heard by a Bench of five learned Judges.

5 . Let these matters be placed before Hon'ble the JChief Justice for appropriate orders.

We are, therefore, called upon to resolve this issue here. We have to lay down the law. We have to approach the question as a constitutional court should.

12. In spite of this scheme, there may be occasions when the sovereign State or its instrumentalities will have to employ persons, in posts which are temporary, on daily wages, as additional hands or taking them in without following the required procedure, to discharge



the duties in respect of the posts that are sanctioned and that are required to be filled in terms of the relevant procedure established by the Constitution or for work in temporary posts or projects that are not needed permanently. This right of the Union or of the State Government cannot but be recognized and there is nothing in the Constitution which prohibits such engaging of persons temporarily or on daily wages, to meet the needs of the situation. But the fact that such engagements are resorted to, cannot be used to defeat the very scheme of public employment. Nor can a court say that the Union or the State Governments do not have the right to engage persons in various capacities for a duration or until the work in a particular project is completed. Once this right of the Government is recognized and the mandate of the constitutional requirement for public employment is respected, there cannot be much difficulty in coming to the conclusion that it is ordinarily not proper for courts whether acting under Article 226 of the Constitution or under Article 32 of the Constitution, to direct absorption in permanent employment of those who have been engaged without following a due process of selection as envisaged by the constitutional scheme.

13. What is sought to be pitted against this approach, is the so called equity arising out of giving of temporary employment or engagement on daily wages and the continuance of such persons in the engaged work for a certain length of time. Such considerations can have only a limited role to play, when every qualified citizen has a right to apply for appointment, the adoption of the concept of rule of law and the scheme of the Constitution for appointment to posts. It cannot also be forgotten that it is not the role of courts to ignore, encourage or approve appointments made or engagements given outside the constitutional scheme. In effect, orders based on such sentiments or approach would result in perpetuating illegalities and in the jettisoning of the scheme of public employment adopted by us while adopting the Constitution. The approving of such acts also results in depriving many of their opportunity to compete for public employment. We have, therefore, to consider the question objectively and based on the constitutional and statutory provisions. In this context, we have also to bear in mind the exposition of law by a Constitution Bench in **State of Punjab v. Jagdip Singh and Ors.** MANU/SC/0273/1963 : (1966) 111 L 749 SC . It was held therein,




"In our opinion, where a Government servant has no right to a post or to a particular status, though an authority under the Government acting beyond its competence had purported to give that person a status which it was not entitled to give, he will not in law be deemed to have been validly appointed to the post or given the particular status."

14. During the course of the arguments, various orders of courts either interim or final were brought to our notice. The purport of those orders more or less was the issue of directions for continuation or absorption without referring to the legal position obtaining. Learned counsel for the State of Karnataka submitted that chaos has been created by such orders without reference to legal principles and it is time that this Court settled the law once for all so that in case the court finds that such orders should not be made, the courts, especially, the High Courts would be precluded from issuing such directions or passing such orders. The submission of learned Counsel for the respondents based on the various orders passed by the High Court or by the Government pursuant to the directions of Court also highlights the need for settling the law by this Court. The bypassing of the constitutional scheme cannot be perpetuated by the passing of orders without dealing with and deciding the validity of such orders on the touchstone of constitutionality. While approaching the questions falling for our decision, it is necessary to bear this in mind and to bring about certainty in the matter of public employment. The argument on behalf of some of the respondents is that this Court having once directed regularization in the **Dharwad** case (supra), all those appointed temporarily at any point of time would be entitled to be regularized since otherwise it would be discrimination between those similarly situated and in that view, all appointments made on daily wages, temporarily or contractually, must be directed to be regularized. Acceptance of this argument would mean that appointments made otherwise than by a regular process of selection would become the order of the day completely jettisoning the constitutional scheme of appointment. This argument also highlights the need for this Court to formally lay down the law on the question and ensure certainty in dealings relating to public employment. The very divergence in approach in this Court, the so-called equitable approach made in some, as

29/5/2019

Those decisions which have insisted on the rules being followed, also justifies a firm decision by



this Court one way or the other. It is necessary to put an end to uncertainty and clarify the legal position emerging from the constitutional scheme, leaving the High Courts to follow necessarily, the law thus laid down.

WEB COPY

20. The Decision in Dharwad Distt. P.W.D. Literate Daily Wage Employees **Association and Ors. v. State of Karnataka and Ors.** MANU/SC/0164/1990 : (1990) IILL J318SC dealt with a scheme framed by the State of Karnataka, though at the instance of the court. The scheme was essentially relating to the application of the concept of equal pay for equal work but it also provided for making permanent, or what it called regularization, without keeping the distinction in mind, of employees who had been appointed ad hoc, casually, temporarily or on daily wage basis. In other words, employees who had been appointed without following the procedure established by law for such appointments. This Court, at the threshold, stated that it should individualize justice to suit a given situation. With respect, it is not possible to accept the statement, unqualified as it appears to be. This Court is not only the constitutional court, it is also the highest court in the country, the final court of appeal. By virtue of Article 141 of the Constitution of India, what this Court lays down is the law of the land. Its decisions are binding on all the courts. Its main role is to interpret the constitutional and other statutory provisions bearing in mind the fundamental philosophy of the Constitution. We have given unto ourselves a system of governance by rule of law. The role of the Supreme Court is to render justice according to law. As one jurist put it, the Supreme Court is expected to decide questions of law for the country and not to decide individual cases without reference to such principles of law. Consistency is a virtue. Passing orders not consistent with its own decisions on law, is bound to send out confusing signals and usher in judicial chaos. Its role, therefore, is really to interpret the law and decide cases coming before it, according to law. Orders which are inconsistent with the legal conclusions arrived at by the court in the self same judgment not only create confusion but also tend to usher in arbitrariness highlighting the statement, that equity tends to vary with the Chancellor's foot.

19. Thus, it is clear that adherence to the rule of equality in public employment is a basic feature of our



instrumentalities or lend themselves the instruments to facilitate the bypassing of the constitutional and statutory mandates.

44. The concept of 'equal pay for equal work' is different from the concept of conferring permanency on those who have been appointed on ad hoc basis, temporary basis, or based on no process of selection as envisaged by the Rules. This Court has in various decisions applied the principle of equal pay for equal work and has laid down the parameters for the application of that principle. The decisions are rested on the concept of equality enshrined in our Constitution in the light of the directive principles in that behalf. But the acceptance of that principle cannot lead to a position where the court could direct that appointments made without following the due procedure established by law, be deemed permanent or issue directions to treat them as permanent. Doing so, would be negation of the principle of equality of opportunity. The power to make an order as is necessary for doing complete justice in any cause or matter pending before this Court, would not normally be used forgiving the go-by to the procedure established by law in the matter of public employment. Take the situation arising in the cases before us from the State of Karnataka. Therein, after the **Dharwad** decision, the Government had issue deprecated directions and mandatory orders that no temporary or ad hoc employment be given. Some of the authorities and departments had ignored those directions or defied those directions and had continued to give employment, specifically interdicted by the orders issued by the executive. Some of the appointing officers have even been punished for their defiance. It would not be just or proper to pass an order in exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 or 32 of the Constitution or in exercise of power under Article 142 of the Constitution of India permitting those persons engaged, to be absorbed or to be made permanent, based on their appointments or engagements. Complete justice would be justice according to law and though it would be open to this Court to mould the relief, this Court would not grant a relief which would amount to perpetuating an illegality.

45. While directing that appointments, temporary or casual, be regularized or made permanent, courts are swayed by the fact that the concerned person has worked for some time and in some cases for a considerable length of time. It is not as if the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature, is



the Commercial Taxes Department, should be directed to be regularized since the decisions in **Dharwad** (supra), **Piara Singh** (supra), **Jacob**, and **Gujarat Agricultural University** and the like, have given rise to an expectation in them that their services would also be regularized. The doctrine can be invoked if the decisions of the Administrative Authority affect the person by depriving him of some benefit or advantage which either (i) he had in the past been permitted by the decision-maker to enjoy and which he can legitimately expect to be permitted to continue to do until there have been communicated to him some rational grounds for withdrawing it on which he has been given an opportunity to comment; or (ii) he has received assurance from the decision-maker that they will not be withdrawn without giving him first an opportunity of advancing reasons for contending that they should not be withdrawn {See **Lord Diplock in Council of Civil Service Unions v. Minister for the Civil Service** 1985 Appeal Cases 374, **National Buildings Construction Corporation v. S. Raghunathan** MANU/SC/0550/1998 : AIR1998SC2779 and **Dr. Chanchal Goyal v. State of Rajasthan** MANU/SC/0133/2003 : [2003]2SCR112 . There is no case that any assurance was given by the Government or the concerned department while making the appointment on daily wages that the status conferred on him will not be withdrawn until some rational reason comes into existence for withdrawing it. The very engagement was against the constitutional scheme. Though, the Commissioner of the Commercial Taxes Department sought to get the appointments made permanent, there is no case that at the time of appointment any promise was held out. No such promise could also have been held out in view of the circulars and directives issued by the Government after the **Dharwad** decision. Though, there is a case that the State had made regularizations in the past of similarly situated employees, the fact remains that such regularizations were done only pursuant to judicial directions, either of the Administrative Tribunal or of the High Court and in some case by this Court. Moreover, the invocation of the doctrine of legitimate expectation cannot enable the employees to claim that they must be made permanent or they must be regularized in the service though they had not been selected in terms of the rules for appointment. The fact that in certain cases the court had directed regularization of the employees involved in those cases cannot be made use of to found a claim based on legitimate expectation. The argument if accepted would also run



counter to the constitutional mandate. The argument in that behalf has therefore to be rejected.

47. When a person enters a temporary employment or gets engagement as a contractual or casual worker and the engagement is not based on a proper selection as recognized by the relevant rules or procedure, he is aware of the consequences of the appointment being temporary, casual or contractual in nature. Such a person cannot invoke the theory of legitimate expectation for being confirmed in the post when an appointment to the post could be made only by following a proper procedure for selection and in concerned cases, in consultation with the Public Service Commission. Therefore, the theory of legitimate expectation cannot be successfully advanced by temporary, contractual or casual employees. It cannot also be held that the State has held out any promise while engaging these persons either to continue them where they are or to make them permanent. The State cannot constitutionally make such a promise. It is also obvious that the theory cannot be invoked to seek a positive relief of being made permanent in the post.

48. It was then contended that the rights of the employees thus appointed, under Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution, are violated. It is stated that the State has treated the employees unfairly by employing them on less than minimum wages and extracting work from them for a pretty long period in comparison with those directly recruited who are getting more wages or salaries for doing similar work. The employees before us were engaged on daily wages in the concerned department on a wage that was made known to them. There is no case that the wage agreed upon was not being paid. Those who are working on daily wages formed a class by themselves, they cannot claim that they are discriminated as against those who have been regularly recruited on the basis of the relevant rules. No right can be founded on an employment on daily wages to claim that such employee should be treated on a par with a regularly recruited candidate, and made permanent in employment, even assuming that the principle could be invoked for claiming equal wages for equal work. There is no fundamental right in those who have been employed on daily wages or temporarily or on contractual basis, to claim that they have a right to be absorbed in service. As has been held by this Court, they cannot be said to be holders of a post, since, a regular appointment could be made only by making appointments consistent with the requirements of Articles 14 and 16



of the Constitution. The right to be treated equally with the other employees employed on daily wages, cannot be extended to a claim for equal treatment with those who were regularly employed. That would be treating un-equals as equals. It cannot also be relied on to claim a right to be absorbed in service even though they have never been selected in terms of the relevant recruitment rules. The arguments based on Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution are therefore overruled.

49. It is contended that the State action in not regularizing the employees was not fair within the framework of the rule of law. The rule of law compels the State to make appointments as envisaged by the Constitution and in the manner we have indicated earlier. In most of these cases, no doubt, the employees had worked for some length of time but this has also been brought about by the pendency of proceedings in Tribunals and courts initiated at the instance of the employees. Moreover, accepting an argument of this nature would mean that the State would be permitted to perpetuate an illegality in the matter of public employment and that would be a negation of the constitutional scheme adopted by us, the people of India. It is therefore not possible to accept the argument that there must be a direction to make permanent all the persons employed on daily wages. When the court is approached for relief by way of a writ, the court has necessarily to ask itself whether the person before it had any legal right to be enforced. Considered in the light of the very clear constitutional scheme, it cannot be said that the employees have been able to establish a legal right to be made permanent even though they have never been appointed in terms of the relevant rules or in adherence of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution.

50. It is argued that in a country like India where there is so much poverty and unemployment and there is no equality of bargaining power, the action of the State in not making the employees permanent, would be violative of Article 21 of the Constitution. But the very argument indicates that there are so many waiting for employment and an equal opportunity for competing for employment and it is in that context that the Constitution as one of its basic features, has included Articles 14, 16 and 309 so as to ensue that public employment is given only in a fair and equitable manner by giving all those who are qualified, an opportunity to seek employment. In the course of upholding rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, a set of persons cannot be



preferred over a vast majority of people waiting for an opportunity to compete for State employment. The acceptance of the argument on behalf of the respondents would really negate the rights of the others conferred by Article 21 of the Constitution, assuming that we are in a position to hold that the right to employment is also a right coming within the purview of Article 21 of the Constitution. The argument that Article 23 of the Constitution is breached because the employment on daily wages amounts to forced labour, cannot be accepted. After all, the employees accepted the employment at their own volition and with eyes open as to the nature of their employment. The Governments also revised the minimum wages payable from time to time in the light of all relevant circumstances. It also appears to us that importing of these theories to defeat the basic requirement of public employment would defeat the constitutional scheme and the constitutional goal of equality.

7. The said legal principles were once again reiterated by the Two Judges Bench of the Honourable Supreme Court of India in the case of **Secretary to Government, School Education Department, Chennai .vs. R. Govindaswamy and others reported in (2014) 4 Supreme Court Cases 769**, held that:

'8. This Court in *State of Rajasthan .vs. Daya Lal* has considered the scope of regularization of irregular or part time appointments in all possible eventualities and laid down well-settled principles relating to regularisation and parity in pay relevant in the context of issues involved therein. The same are as under: (SCC P.435, Para 12)

'(i) The High Courts in exercising power under Article 226 of the Constitution will not issue directions for regularisation, absorption or permanent continuance, unless the employees claiming regularisation had been appointed in pursuance of a regular recruitment in accordance with relevant rules in an open competitive process, against sanctioned vacant posts. The equality clause contained in Articles 14 and 16 should be scrupulously followed and Courts should not issue a direction for regularization of services of an employee which would be violative of the constitutional scheme.

8. In view of the above fact, this Court is of an opinion that the writ petitioner was initially appointed only as Part-time Sweeper and a mere length of service cannot be a ground for regularisation of her service. Further, the Honourable Apex Court categorically directed the High Courts not to issue any order of



regularisation if the appointments are not made in accordance with the recruitment rules in force. This being the legal precedent settled by the Honourable Apex Court, this Court has no option to entertain the writ petition.

9. In view of the above discussion, no further consideration is required in this writ petition. Accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(crl side)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1. The Secretary
School Education Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai.
2. The Director of Public Library,
737/1, Anna Salai,
Chennai - 2.
3. The District Library Officer,
Office of the District Library Officer,
144, Melaransalai, Kottai PO,
Trichy-8.

+1cc to Mr.R.Lakshmanan, Advocate SR.No. 49229

SKN

VB/KKR/SAR1/09.04.2018/15P/5C

W.P. (MD) No. 11183 of 2013
16.02.2018