

THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Orders reserved on : 01.10.2019

Order Pronounced on : 05-11-2019

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SUBBIAH
and
THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE T. KRISHNAVALLI

Writ Petition No. 3312 of 2019

1. R. Palanisamy
Son of Ramasamy
working as Office Assistant
I Additional District Munsif Court
Bhavani, Erode District
2. M. Subramanian
Son of Maran
working as Office Assistant
Judicial Magistrate Court No.II
Erode, Erode District
3. C. Sivakumar
Son of Chennanayakkar
working as Office Assistant
Chief Judicial Magistrate Court
Erode, Erode District
4. S. Rangasamy
Son of Senkodan
working as Office Assistant
Judicial Magistrate Court No.II
Erode, Erode District
5. K. Maran
Son of Karuppan
working as Office Assistant
Fast Track Court
Erode, Erode District
6. P. Thangaraj
Son of Bokkiyannan
working as Office Assistant
Principal District Judge Court
Erode, Erode District

7. S. Madhammal
Son of Senkodan
working as Office Assistant
Sub Court, Perundurai
Erode, Erode District
8. P. Periyasamy
Son of Perumal
working as Office Assistant
Sub Court, Perundurai
Erode, Erode District
9. S. Boopathy
Son of Shanmugam
working as Office Assistant
II Additional District Court
Erode, Erode District
10. S. Manesan
Son of Ganesan
working as Office Assistant
Principal District Judge Court
Erode, Erode District
11. S. Sivakumar
Son of Selvaraj
working as Office Assistant
Judicial Magistrate Court No.I
Erode, Erode District
12. M. Sakthivel
Son of P.C. Mani
working as Office Assistant
Sub Court, Bhavani
Erode District
13. G.S. Chidambaram
Son of Chenni
working as Office Assistant
IV Additional District Court
Bhavani, Erode District
14. G. Saritha
Wife of Gunasekaran
working as Office Assistant
District Munsif Court
Gopichettipalayam, Erode District

15. D. Venkatachalam
Son of Duraisamy
working as Office Assistant
Land Grabbing Court
Erode, Erode District
16. K. Ravikumar
Son of Kuppusamy
working as Office Assistant
Principal District Judge Court
Erode, Erode District
17. A. Selvarasu
Son of Arunagiri
working as Office Assistant
Principal District Judge Court
Erode, Erode District
18. M. Kathiresan
Son of Mani
working as Office Assistant
Judicial Magistrate Court No.I
Bhavani, Erode District
19. V. Rathnakumar
Son of Vettrivel
working as Office Assistant
Judicial Magistrate Court No.II
Erode, Erode District
20. K. Amudha
Wife of Kittan
working as Record Clerk
Family Court
Erode, Erode District
21. P. Thangammal
Wife of Palaniyappan
working as Record Clerk
II Additional District Judge Court
Erode, Erode District
22. A. Andeavarsamy
Son of Angamuthu
working as Record Clerk
Special MCOP Court
Erode, Erode District

.. Petitioners

Versus

1. The Registrar General
High Court of Madras
Chennai - 600 104
2. The Principal District Judge
Erode, Erode District
3. The Government of Tamil Nadu
represented by its Secretary
Home Department
Fort St. George
Chennai - 600 009

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents to forthwith promote the petitioners as Junior Bailiff in the existing vacancies based on the order passed by this Court in WP Nos. 5865 to 5870 and 7017 of 2009 dated 22.07.2019 without insisting SSLC qualification.

For petitioners : Mr. K. Raja

For respondents : Mr. S. Kaithamalai Kumaran for RR1 and 2

Mrs. Narmadha Sampath
Additional Advocate General
assisted by Mr. K.S. Suresh
Government Advocate for R3

ORDER

R. Subbiah, J

The petitioners, who are employed as Office Assistants/Record Clerks, as the case may be, in various Courts within Erode District, have come forward with this writ petition praying to issue a Mandamus directing the respondents to forthwith promote them as Junior Bailiff in the existing vacancies on the basis of the order dated 22.07.2009 passed by this Court in WP Nos. 5865 to 5870 and 7017 of 2009.

2. The petitioners 1 to 19 are working as Office Assistant and the petitioners 20 to 22 are working as Record Clerk in various Courts within Erode District. All the petitioners have passed VIII Standard. It is the grievance of the petitioners that from the initial date of their appointment, they were not given promotion to the post of Junior Bailiff, to which they are eligible. According to the petitioners, they are fully qualified for being promoted to the post of Junior Bailiff, however, such promotion is not forthcoming to them. The

petitioners place reliance on the earlier order dated 22.07.2009 passed by the Division Bench of this court in WP Nos. 5865 to 5870 and 7017 of 2009, which was filed by similarly placed persons working as Office Assistants in various Courts within Dharmapuri and Salem Districts, wherein this Court held that denial of promotion to the petitioners therein by virtue of G.O. Ms. No.761, Home (Courts V) Department dated 10.07.2008 on the ground that the petitioners did not possess the prescribed educational qualification cannot be countenanced especially when there was no amendment made to the service Rules. Therefore, the Division Bench of this Court held that the petitioners are entitled for a declaration to the effect that till the Tamil Nadu State and Subordinate Service Rules are amended and if any promotion to the post of Junior Bailiff arises, the case of the petitioners can be considered in accordance with the existing Rules. By placing reliance on the above order passed by the Division Bench, the petitioners would contend that there were 37 vacancies available in the post of Junior Bailiff in Erode District in which the petitioners can very well be accommodated. However, the second respondent did not consider the claim of the petitioners on the ground that the petitioners are only possessing VIII Standard qualification and not SSLC, as required. When there is no amendment made to the Service Rules namely Special Rules for Tamil Nadu Basic Service, which govern the petitioners, the respondents cannot insist the petitioners to possess S.S.L.C. qualification as a condition precedent for conferring them promotion. The petitioners have also submitted a representation dated 25.10.2018 to the second respondent and it was forwarded to the first respondent on 26.10.2018, but so far there is no order passed thereon. According to the petitioners, even as on the date of filing the present writ petition namely 22nd January 2019, there was no amendment made to the Special Rules for Tamil Nadu Basic Service, which governs the service of the petitioners and therefore, the petitioners have filed this writ petition for the relief stated supra.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would vehemently contend that the petitioners are working as Office Assistants/Record Clerks as the case may be and they are governed by the Special Rules for Tamil Nadu Basic Service. The Special Rules for Tamil Nadu Basic Service is a special rule governing the lower posts in the hierarchy of the Government service. As per the Special Rules for Tamil Nadu Basic Service, the qualification prescribed for promotion to the post of Junior Bailiff is only VIII Standard and not X Standard. Therefore, according to the learned counsel for the petitioners, it is no longer open to the respondents to insist possession of S.S.L.C. qualification as a condition precedent for promoting the petitioners to the post of Junior Bailiff, as it is in violation of the provisions contained under the Special Rules for Tamil

Nadu Basic Service. Even in the earlier writ petition filed before this Court, this Court had specifically directed that unless the Service Rules are amended, the respondents cannot insist the petitioners to possess S.S.L.C. qualification and were directed to consider the claim of the petitioners for promotion in accordance with the existing Service Rules. It is further contended that till date, amendments were not made to the Special Rules for Tamil Nadu Basic Service prescribing SSLC as minimum general educational qualification for promotion to the post of Junior Bailiff. It is also submitted that by reason of the denial of promotion to the petitioners on the ground that they did not possess SSLC qualification, the juniors of the petitioners have scaled the promotional ladder and thereby the petitioners are prejudiced. In any event, till date, the Service Rules were not amended requiring the petitioners to possess S.S.L.C. qualification to get promotion to the post of Junior Bailiff. Further, in all other Districts, similarly placed persons like the petitioners, who are holding the post of Office Assistants/Record Clerk, were given promotion and those persons are only holding VIII Standard qualification. Therefore, it is contended by the learned counsel for the petitioners that the denial of promotion to the petitioners is unjust and arbitrary. It is also contended that the petitioners, through out their career, can get only one promotion to the post of Junior Bailiff/Process Server and even that is being denied by the respondents arbitrarily. When there is no amendments made to the Special Rules for Tamil Nadu Basic Service, insisting SSLC qualification as a condition precedent for conferring promotion to the petitioners to the post of Junior Bailiff is illegal and arbitrary. The learned counsel for the petitioners therefore prayed for allowing this writ petition as prayed for.

4. Per contra, the learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the third respondent/Government would contend that prior to the enactment of Tamil Nadu Government Servants (Conditions of Service) Act, 2016, the qualification prescribed for promotion to the post of Junior Bailiff was VIII Standard. It is further submitted that based on the V Pay Commission recommendations, the Government had changed the designation/nomenclature 'Process Server' into that of Junior Bailiff with revised scale of pay. Since the scale of pay to the post of Junior Bailiff comes under Group C from Group D, the Government issued G.O. (Ms) No.1653, Home (Courts V) Department dated 22.12.2018 whereby the designation 'Process Server' coming under Class III in Rule 1 of the Special Rules of the Tamil Nadu Basic Services has been deleted. There has been no mentioning in the said Government Order about the qualification prescribed for the post of Junior Bailiff. On the contrary Section 20 (1) (2) and (3) of Tamil Nadu Government Servants (Conditions of Services) Act, 2016, which came into force since 2016,

prescribes the minimum general educational qualification required to be possessed by a candidate for appointment and promotion to any post in the Government service which is applicable to the petitioners as well. The petitioners are coming under Judicial Ministerial Service and they are governed by the Tamil Nadu Government Servants (Conditions of Services) Act, 2016 which was introduced in the year 2016.

5. The learned Additional Advocate General would further contend that this Court in identical circumstances, passed the order dated 22.07.2009 in WP Nos. 5865 to 5870 and 7017 of 2009, which was also relied on by the counsel for the petitioners. Pursuant to the said order, the Honourable Staff Grievance Redressal Committee of this Court passed an order, based on which, the first respondent herein issued an Official Memorandum dated 11.11.2009 to all the subordinate Courts. On the basis of the Official Memorandum dated 11.11.2009, the District Judge, Karur in his proceedings had reverted 6 Process Servers and 6 Record Clerks and those who were seniors to them and are possessing the requisite educational qualification have been given the post. Challenging the Official Memorandum dated 11.11.2009 and the proceedings of the District Judge, Karur dated 24.11.2009, WP (MD) No. 12637 to 12642 of 2009 was filed and the same is pending before the Madurai Bench of this Court. In such circumstances, the Principal District Judge, Erode, by letter dated 14.05.2018 sought clarification as to whether promotions may be given to the Office Assistants to the post of Junior Bailiffs, based on the Tamil Nadu Government Servant (Conditions of Service) Act, 2016. Further, by another letter dated 26.10.2018, the second respondent had also forwarded representations received from 84 Office Assistants and requested for a clarification for conferring promotion to the Office Assistants to the post of Junior Bailiff, by stating that they did not possess S.S.L.C. qualification but have acquired 8 years of experience. When the letter dated 26.10.2018 was placed before the concerned Portfolio Judges of this Court, it was directed to be placed before the Staff Grievance Redressal Committee for examining the issue afresh. When the matter was placed before the Staff Grievance Committee, a detailed order was passed, based on which, an Official Memorandum was issued to the second respondent herein stating that "in view of the pendency of WP (MD) No. 12637 to 12642 of 2009 and Rule 20 (1), (2) and (3) of Tamil Nadu Government Servants (Conditions of Service) Act, 2016 (Tamil Nadu Act No.14/2016) is in force, the request made by her for relaxation of minimum educational qualification is not proper." In any event, the minimum general educational qualification prescribed in Tamil Nadu Government Servants (Conditions of Service) Act, 2016 (Tamil Nadu Act No.14/2016) is applicable to the petitioners who are also in government service and they cannot assert, as a matter of right,

that they should be conferred promotion to higher post to which they are not eligible. The learned Additional Advocate General also placed reliance on the decision of the Honourable Supreme court in the case of Union of India and others vs. Krishna Kumar and others reported in 2019 (4) Supreme Court Cases 319 wherein it was held as follows:-

"In considering the rival submissions, it must, at the outset, be noted that it is well-settled that there is no vested right to promotion, but a right be considered for promotion in accordance with the Rules which prevail on the date on which consideration for promotion takes place. This Court has held that there is no rule of universal application to the effect that vacancies must necessarily be filled in on the basis of the law which existed on the date when they arose. The decision of this Court in Y.V. Rangaiah vs. Sreenivas Rao has been construed in subsequent decisions as a case where the applicable Rules required the process of promotion or selection to be completed within a stipulated time frame...."

6. By placing reliance on the above decision, the learned Additional Advocate General would contend that the petitioners has the right to be considered for promotion only in the light of the existing Rules viz., rules in force on the date the consideration takes place and their claim for promotion cannot be considered on the date on which vacancy arises. The learned Additional Advocate General therefore prayed for dismissal of the writ petition.

7. By way of reply, learned counsel for the petitioners would contend that Tamil Nadu Government Servants (Conditions of Service) Act, 2016 is not applicable to the petitioners as the petitioners are only coming under the purview of Special Rules for Tamil Nadu Basic Service and thereafter under Tamil Nadu Judicial Ministerial Service Rules. Even assuming without admitting that the petitioners service are governed by the Tamil Nadu Government Servants (Conditions of Service) Act, 2016, with effect from 14.09.2016, the vacancies that had arisen prior to that date should be filled up by considering the seniority possessed by the petitioners as per the then existing rules. The Special Rules for Tamil Nadu Basic Service is a special Rule and it has not been amended to the effect that the members covered by the said Rule must possess S.S.L.C. as the minimum general educational qualification. In fact, Tamil Nadu Government Servants Subordinate Service Rules, 1955 alone was amended and in its place Tamil Nadu Government Servants (Conditions of Service) Act, 2016 came into force. The said Act

is applicable to all posts in the State and Subordinate Service and not to those who are coming within the purview of 'basic service'. It is further stated that in all the Districts in the State, except Erode District, persons who are possessing only VIII Standard qualification and holding the post of Office Assistant were given promotion to the post of Junior Bailiff, however, the petitioners alone were discriminated.

8. On the above contention, this Court also heard the learned counsel appearing for the respective respondents 1 and 2.

9. Keeping the above submissions made by the learned counsel on either side, we have carefully gone through the records. We find that the post of Process Servers comes under Category 3 of Class III in Special Rules for Tamil Nadu Basic Service. In the very same Rule, the post of Office Assistant comes under category V of Class III. Rule 5 of the Special Rules for Tamil Nadu Basic Service deals with Qualification required to be possessed for various posts covered by the Special Rules. Rule 5 (2) (a) deals with educational qualification which reads as follows:-

"5 (2) (a) No person shall be eligible for appointment by direct recruitment to any category of the service in Class I, II and III unless he has passed the III form or the VIII Standard (or the E.S.L.C.) of a recognised school (i.e.,) a school maintained by or opened with the sanction of the Government of Tamil Nadu or to which recognition has been accorded by the Director of School Education under the Educational Rules of the State.

Explanation: The above educational qualification shall come into force with effect from the 6th November 1968

Provided that those who have passed III Form or VIII Standard of E.S.L.C. and completed probation in Class IV or served in the said class for not less than one year shall be eligible for appointment by transfer from the categories in Class IV to the categories in Class III of the said service."

10. It is evident that by virtue of the powers conferred under Article 309 of The Constitution of India, General Rules for the State and Subordinate Services were framed with effect from 01.01.1955 to regulate the conditions of services of Government employees. However, as a matter of policy, the State Government have converted the above General Rules for the State and Subordinate Service by enacting Tamil Nadu Government Servants (Conditions of Service) Act, 2016 with effect from 14.09.2016 invoking Article 309 of The Constitution of India.

This Act viz., Tamil Nadu Government Servants (Conditions of Service) Act, 2016 regulates the services of the government servant from his appointment till his retirement. It covers all matters relating to the conditions of service in connection with the affairs of the State including appointment, age and educational qualifications, declaration of probation, disciplinary action, transfer etc., Section 2 of this Act deals with applicability of this Act. Section 2 contemplates that this Act shall apply to the holders of all posts, whether temporary or permanent, in all State and Subordinate Services except to the extent otherwise expressly provided (a) by or under any law for the time being in force or (ii) In respect of any member of such service by a contract or agreement subsisting between such member and the Government. In this context, Section 20 of the Act assumes significance for the purpose of deciding this writ petition, which reads as follows:-

"20. Qualifications:- (1) The minimum general educational qualification wherever referred to in the special rules shall mean the qualification specified in Schedule III.

(2) Where the special rules for any service prescribe the possession of the minimum general educational qualification referred to in sub-section (1) as a qualification for appointment as full member in such service, or in any class or category thereof or for promotion to any other class or category in such service or for appointment by transfer to any other service, a person who is already a member of a service who does not possess the minimum general educational qualification but who is certified by the head of the department concerned to be otherwise deserving for appointment as full member or promotion or transfer as the case may be, shall be deemed to possess the minimum general educational qualification, if he appears for the examination of the S.S.L.C. Standard conducted by the Commission and obtain the minimum per centage of marks specified below:-

Subject for the examination	Minimum per centage of marks

1. English	35
2. General knowledge	35

Provided that persons in service without an adequate knowledge of Tamil or whose knowledge of Tamil is not of such standard as to write the examinations referred to in this sub-section in Tamil may write them in any one of the languages, namely Telugu, Malayalam, Kannada, Urdu or Hindi and they need not pass the language test in Tamil on their appointment to higher post by transfer or promotion

(3) The rule relating to possession of minimum general educational qualification will not be relaxed in any case of appointment to a higher post from a lower post

(4) No person shall be eligible for appointment to any service by direct recruitment unless he satisfies the Commission in cases where the appointment has to be made in consultation with it or the appointing authority, in other cases-

(i) that his character and antecedents are such as to qualify him for such service;

(ii) that such a person does not have more than one wife living or is such a person is a woman that she is not married to any other person who has a wife living.

(iii) that such a person satisfies the age prescribed in the special rules on the first day of july of the year in which the vacancy is notified; and

(iv) that, notwithstanding anything contained in the special rule, such a person also possess the qualification including experience prescribed for a post, on the date of notification of the vacancy;

provided that the candidates who have written the final year degree examination shall be admitted to the preliminary examination for recruitment to the posts included in Group - I Service conducted by the Commission, subject to the condition that such candidates should produce proof of having passed the degree examination, failing which they will not be admitted to the main written examination."

Schedule III (See Section 20 (i))

(1) A pass in the Secondary School Leaving Certificate Examination with the eligibility for admission to College Course of studies in the Universities in the State; or

(2) A pass in the Secondary School Leaving Certificate Examination of this State

Explanation- (i) A person who had appeared for 11 year S.S.L.C. Public Examination and obtained 35% marks in each subject either in one sitting or compartmentally, shall be deemed to have passed the S.S.L.C. Public Examination

Explanation- (ii) A person who had appeared for 11 year S.S.L.C. Public Examination and had failed to obtain 35% marks in one or more subjects, but who has appeared and obtained 35% marks in the corresponding subject or subjects in 10 year S S L C Examination, shall be deemed to have passed the S S L C Public Examination

Explanation- (iii) A person who had studied optional subjects in 11 year S S L C and failed in the optional subjects but had obtained 35% marks in all other subjects except the optional subjects in 11 year S S L C Public Examination shall be deemed to have passed the S S L C Public Examination

Explanation- (iv) A person who had appeared and passed the X standard Government Examination conducted by the Board of Open School, Tamil Nadu shall be deemed to have passed S S L C Public Examination.

11. A reading of Section 20 read with Schedule III of Tamil Nadu Government Servants (Conditions of Service) Act, 2016 indicates that the minimum general educational qualification required to be possessed by a member of service in Government service is S.S.L.C. Sub-section (2) of Section 20 specifically states that the possession of minimum general educational qualification, as a qualification for appointment as full member in such service, or in any class or category thereof or for promotion by transfer to any other service is mandatory (emphasis supplied). The word 'any' referred to in sub-section (2) of Section 20 relates to all the posts in connection with the affairs of the State and there is no express exclusion of the posts of Office Assistants or Record Clerks. If a reasonable interpretation is given to the services to which the petitioners are governed, it can be stated that the services under the State includes the services under the Government or any other authority in respect of which the State Legislature is competent to make laws. In the present case, the petitioners are working as Office Assistants and Record Clerks, whose services are regulated by laws enacted by the State Government, including Tamil Nadu Government Servants (Conditions of Service) Act, 2016. Further, the Special Rules for Tamil Nadu Basic Service can no longer govern the service of the petitioners

herein as it was superseded by virtue of enactment of Tamil Nadu Government Servants (Conditions of Service) Act, 2016, which came into effect from 14.09.2016. The service of the petitioners was hitherto governed by the Special Rules for Tamil Nadu Basic Service, however, after enactment of Tamil Nadu Government Servants (Conditions of Service) Act, 2016, the service of the petitioners will fall within the fold of Tamil Nadu Government Servants (Conditions of Service) Act, 2016 with effect from 14.09.2016 and their service, including promotion or transfer are governed by the same. The definition provided under Section 3 (z) of Tamil Nadu Government Servants (Conditions of Service) Act, 2016 also stipulate that "Special Rules" means the Rules in Part III of Tamil Nadu State and Subordinate Service Rules applicable to each service or class of service. When we look into Section 12 of The Tamil Nadu State and Subordinate Service Rules, it deals with qualification, where, in sub-rule (a) (i) of Rule 12, it is stated that the minimum general qualification wherever referred to in the Special Rules shall mean the qualification prescribed in Schedule I to Tamil Nadu State and Subordinate Service Rules. Schedule I (1) of the Tamil Nadu State and Subordinate Service Rules clearly states that the minimum general educational qualification referred to in Rule 12 (a) (i) thereof is a pass in the Secondary School Leaving Certificate examination with the eligibility for admission to college course of studies in the Universities in this State; or (2) a pass in the Secondary School Leaving Certificate Examination of this State. Thus, the petitioners can no longer rely upon Special Rules for Tamil Nadu Basic Service and their services are only covered and/or governed by the Tamil Nadu Government Servants (Conditions of Service) Act, 2016 with effect from 14.09.2016.

12. The petitioners placed heavy reliance on the earlier order passed by the Division Bench of this Court on 22.07.2009 in WP Nos. 5865 to 5870 and 7017 of 2009. The petitioners can no longer place reliance on the order dated 22.07.2009, as, at that time, the Tamil Nadu Government Servants (Conditions of Service) Act, 2016 was not enacted and that is the reason why the Division Bench of this Court in the order dated 22.07.2009 specifically held that unless the Service Rules are amended, the respondents cannot insist the petitioners to possess S.S.L.C. qualification and were directed to consider the claim of the petitioners for promotion in accordance with the existing Service Rules. Thus, it is evident that as on the date of passing the order in WP Nos. 5865 to 5870 and 7017 of 2009, the Service Rules governing the petitioners has not been amended. Now, by virtue of the enactment of Tamil Nadu Government Servants (Conditions of Service) Act, 2016 with effect from 14.09.2016, the service of the petitioners herein are regulated by the said Act and therefore, the earlier order passed by the

Division Bench of this Court can no longer be relied on by the petitioners herein.

13. The Tamil Nadu Government Servants (Conditions of Service) Act, 2016 which came into effect from 14.09.2016 require the minimum general educational qualification to be possessed by all members of the service in connection with the affairs of the State is S.S.L.C. The said Act applies and regulates the conditions of service of the petitioners in the cadre of Office Assistant and Record Clerk. The further promotion of the petitioners therefore depends upon the fulfilling the minimum general educational qualification prescribed by the said Act. When admittedly the petitioners did not possess the minimum general educational qualification prescribed in the Act, which came into effect from 14.09.2016, the claim of the petitioners for promotion to the post of Junior Bailiff cannot be countenanced. Consequently, a Mandamus cannot be issued to the respondents to confer promotion to the post of Junior Bailiff to the petitioners herein.

14. For all the reasons stated above, the writ petition fails and it is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

15. Registry is directed to circulate a copy of this order to the subordinate judiciary in the State of Tamil Nadu and Union Territory of Puducherry, for information.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar (Insp.Cell)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

rsh

To

1. The Registrar General
High Court of Madras
Chennai - 600 104
2. The Principal District Judge
Erode, Erode District

3. The Secretary,
Government of Tamil Nadu
Home Department
Fort St. George
Chennai - 600 009

4. The Section Officer,
F Section, High Court, Madras.
(kindly arrange to circulate copy of this Order)

+1 cc to Mr.S.Kaithamalai Kumaran, Advocate, S.R.No.91653

+1 cc to Mr.K.Raja, Advocate, S.R.No.91421

WP No. 3312 of 2019

SR(CO)
SSM(14/11/2019)