

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATE : 28.03.2019

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.PARTHIBAN

W.P. NO. 22766 OF 2011

1. M.Packiam (Decd.)
2. C.Duraipandian
3. D.Rajathi

.. Petitioners

(P-3 substituted as LR of deceased
P-1 vide order of Court dated 23.3.15
in M.P. No.1/2015 in W.P. No.22766/2011)

- Vs -

1. The Government of Tamil Nadu
rep. By The Secretary
School Education Department
Fort St. George, Chennai 600 009.
2. The Inspector General of Registration
Santhome High Road
Chennai 600 028.
3. The Director of School Education
College Road, Nungambakkam
Chennai 600 006.
4. The District Education Officer
Madurai.

5. R.Kannan

.. Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying this Court to issue a writ of certiorari calling for the records of the 2nd respondent in No.18904/I1/2006 dated 24.02.2011 and the consequential order of the 4th respondent in Mu.Mu. No.931/A4/2002 dated 23.03.2011 and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr. K.Doraisamy, SC, for
M/s. Muthumani Doraisami

For Respondents: Mr. Veerakathiravan, SC, for R-5
Mr. P.Raja, GA for RR-1 to 4

Reserved on	Pronounced on
15.03.2019	28.03.2019

ORDER

The petitioners, aggrieved by the order dated 24.2.2011, passed by the 2nd respondent and the consequential order dated 23.03.2011 passed by the 4th respondent in permitting the 5th respondent to act as the Secretary of the School Committee have preferred the present writ petition.

2. The facts leading to the filing of this writ petition are as under :-

In the year 1957, one K.Muthuvar formed a registered society known as "Muthuvar Mukkulathore Secondary School Trust (hereinafter called as 'Society')". The said Society established Muthuvar Mukkulathore Higher Secondary School (for short 'School') at Thirunagar and the said Muthuvar served as the President of the Society. In the year 1969, Muthuvar passed away, having served the Society as President till his life time and, thereafter, his wife, Mrs.Mariamammal held the post of President of the Society till her death in the year 1974. In 1974, the 1st petitioner, being the wife of the pre-deceased son, Muthuvelayutham, became the President of the Society and continued the Management of the Society and the School.

3. Whileso, on 25.11.1981, a Gazette Notification u/s 44 (2) of the Tamil Nadu Societies Registration Act, 1975 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act') was issued by the 1st respondent calling upon the various societies registered under the Act to show cause as to why the societies named in the Gazette Notification should not be declared as defunct for non-filing of statutory returns u/s 16 (3) of the Act for more than three years. As far as the petitioner Society is concerned, there was no response to the Gazette Notification and, hence, on 26.1.1983, a further Gazette Notification was published u/s 44 dissolving the various societies, including the petitioner society. However, it appeared that instead of mentioning the correct provision as Section 44 (4), the Gazette Notification dated 26.1.1983 mentioned the provision as Section 44 (3), but the reading of the Gazette Notification would reveal that it was an appropriate action taken u/s 44 (4) for dissolving of the societies, those societies which failed to respond to the earlier show cause notification, issued on 25.11.1981, including the petitioner society.

4. According to the petitioners, they had come to know about the dissolution of the society by the Government only in

the year 2000. In view of the dissolving of the society, the petitioner was constrained to form a new society by the members of the old society by name 'Muthuthevar Mukkulathore Higher Secondary School Committee to run and manage the affairs of the School on 14.12.2001. The new society was formed, according to the petitioners, on the basis of the advice tendered by the officials of the Education Department. According to the petitioners, many of the members of the old Society became members of the new Society, which effectively took over the old society in view of the same having become defunct for 17 years. On 6.2.11, a resolution was passed whereby the first and the second petitioners were elected as President and Secretary respectively and three other members were elected as members of the School Committee for the administration of the School.

5. While the matters stood thus, it appears that the 5th respondent, who claims himself to be a member of the old Society, had approached the 2nd respondent in February, 2001, for reviving the old Society, viz., Muthuthevar Mukkulathore Secondary School Trust. Simultaneously, the 5th respondent had also approached the educational authorities for recognition of the association of the School and for management of the School as such. The District Educational Officer, the 4th respondent herein, rejected the claim of the 5th respondent, vide order dated 24.8.2001. As against the said rejection by the 4th respondent, the 5th respondent filed W.P. No.15907/01. On 22.10.02, the Joint Director of School Education accorded sanction to the new Society headed by Packiathammal as its President. The 5th respondent, being aggrieved by the approval of the nomination of the 2nd petitioner as the Secretary of the School Committee, has once again approached this Court, by filing W.P. No.40827/04 challenging the said approval.

6. In the meanwhile, on 27.12.02, the Government passed an order in G.O. (RT) No.1186 granting exemption u/s 37 (3) of the Act and condoned the delay of 17 years in filing the appeal by the 5th respondent seeking to revive the defunct society. Thereafter, the 5th respondent, once again, sought approval of renomination for the post of Secretary of the School committee, which was once again rejected by the 4th respondent on 5.12.03. The 5th respondent, once again, approached this Court challenging the above order in W.P. No.6081/04. Subsequently, on 9.8.05, the appeal filed by the 5th respondent seeking reviving of the defunct society was allowed by the 2nd respondent by restoring the old Society on the technical ground that in the Gazette Notification, the provision of law was wrongly mentioned as Section 44 (3) instead of Section 44 (4). Challenging the order of the 2nd respondent, the second petitioner herein filed W.P. No.7274/06.

7. This Court, vide common order dated 29.1.07, disposed of all the writ petitions filed by both the 2nd petitioner herein as well as the 5th respondent herein in W.P. Nos.15907/01, 40827/02, 6081/04 and 7274/06 by quashing the order of the 2nd respondent, dated 9.8.05 and remanded the matter to the 2nd respondent for fresh disposal. A learned Judge of this Court, in para-20 of the said order, disposed of the writ petitions as under :-

"20. Now, the main question, which has to be decided by this Court is as to which of the two Societies, namely, Sri. K.Muthuthevar Mukkulathore Secondary School Trust. (Registration No.2/1957) and Muthuthevar Mukkulathore Higher Secondary School Committee (Registration No.1/2011) is the Society which would be recognised in the eye of law to be the Educational Agency to administer and manage the Muthuthevar Mukkulathore Higher Secondary School, Tirunagar. To answer the said question, it has to be found whether Muthuthevar Mukkulathore Secondary School Trust, Madurai, with registration No.2/1957, continued to be a registered Society from its initial date of registration or whether it had become defunct under Section 12 of the Tamil Nadu Societies Registration Act, 1975, and, thereafter, revived by subsequent orders passed by the concerned authorities. The answer to the said question would also depend upon whether Muthuthevar Mukkulathore Higher Secondary School Committee with registration No.1/2001, had legally and validly taken over the administration and management of Muthuthevar Mukkulathore Higher Secondary School, Tirunagar, at that time the earlier society was said to be not in existence. All the issues involved would possibly be settled if the matter is remitted back to the Inspector General of Registration, Chennai, to decide the matter afresh with regard to the legal position of the rival societies which are in contention, after giving sufficient opportunity to all the parties concerned. The above writ petitioners are given liberty to make detailed representations, along with the relevant supporting documents, in making their claims to the Inspector General of Registration, Chennai, within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The Inspector General of Registration is directed to decide the issues on merits and in accordance with law, based on the said representations, within six weeks from the date

of receipt of such representations, by fixing specific dates of hearing enabling the parties to participate in the proceedings."

8. As against the common order passed in the writ petitions, writ appeals were filed in W.A. Nos.456 to 459/07 and a Division Bench of this Court, vide common judgment dated 10.2.10, confirmed the order passed by the learned single Judge. The operative portion of the order passed by the Division Bench, as is found in para-10 of the said judgment, is extracted hereunder :-

"10. On re-appreciation of the entire materials placed on record, we are of the firm view that initiation of criminal proceedings on the ground of forgery, now pending against C.Duraipandiyar will not be a ground to suspect his claim, particularly when the said criminal case is still pending enquiry and not attained any finality. The learned single Judge, on a thorough analysis of the entire materials placed on record has found that the principles of natural justice have not been followed by the Inspector General of Registration, Chennai and remitted the matter back to the said Authority to decide the matter on merits, after giving due opportunity to both the parties, wherein we find no illegality or irregularity so as to cause our interference. However, since the issue is a long pending one, we direct the Inspector General of Registration, Chennai, to pass fresh orders, as directed by the learned single Judge, within eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Till such time, the order of interim stay granted by this Court on 20.3.2007 shall continue. With this direction, the common order of the learned single Judge is confirmed."

9. The learned Division Bench, in the aforesaid judgment, has directed the 2nd respondent to dispose of the petitions within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the said order. As against the said common order passed in the writ appeals, the 5th respondent filed Special Leave Petitions in SLP Nos.9281 to 9284/2010 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the Hon'ble Supreme Court dismissed all the Special Leave Petitions vide order dated 5.4.10.

10. Pursuant to the orders passed by this Court, both by the learned single Judge as well as by the Division Bench, which were confirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court by dismissing the Special Leave Petitions, the 2nd respondent passed an order on

24.2.2011 declaring that the dissolution of the Society, with Regn. No.2/1957, by Gazette Notification dated 26.1.1983 was erroneous. The 2nd respondent, in fact, reiterated the same reason that was stated in the earlier order dated 9.8.05, stating that the provision of law was wrongly mentioned as Section 44 (3) instead of Section 44 (4) and, therefore, there was no dissolution of the old Society. On the basis of the order passed by the 2nd respondent, dated 24.2.2011, the 4th respondent passed an order on 23.3.2011 recognising the appointment of the 5th respondent as Secretary of the School Committee. According to the petitioners, this order, passed by the 4th respondent, was contrary to his own order dated 29.8.01 and also contrary to the order passed by the Joint Director of School Education dated 22.10.02. In the meanwhile, on 21.11.14, the 1st petitioner died leaving behind her daughter Papathi @ Rajathi, wife of Duraipandian, the 2nd petitioner. The said Papathi was elected as the President of the new Society.

11. Mr. K.Duraisami, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that earlier, when the 2nd respondent passed the order dated 9.8.05, this Court took note of the reasons, which guided the 2nd respondent for passing an order in favour of the 5th respondent and not happy with the reasons, which weighed with the 2nd respondent, set aside the order and remanded the matter back to the 2nd respondent for fresh disposal. However, unfortunately, the 2nd respondent, even subsequently, after remand, has stuck to the same hyper-technical reason and found that originally when the notification was issued, it was issued only u/s 44 (3) of the Act and, therefore, there was no dissolution of the old Society. The order passed by the 2nd respondent cannot be countenanced both in law and on facts for the simple reason that the notification issued by the Government on 26.1.1983 clearly stated that the Societies mentioned in the said notification shall stand dissolved and mere mentioning of wrong clause cannot invalidate the order itself, since the entire order needs to be appreciated in its entirety. Unfortunately, the 2nd respondent, without reference to the actual order passed by the Government has proceeded to hold that there was wrong mentioning of the clause and, therefore, there was no dissolution of the Society. The reason, as adopted by the 2nd respondent, cannot stand the test of judicial scrutiny and, therefore, the same is liable to be interfered with.

12. Learned senior counsel for the petitioners relied on the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in The Vice Chancellor, Jammu University & Anr. - Vs - Dushiant Kumar Rampal (1977 (2) SCC 616). Particular attention of this Court was drawn to the observation of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in para-8, which is extracted hereunder for reference :-

"8. It is true that the Order of suspension did not recite Statute 24 (ii) as the source of power under which it was made, but it is now well settled, as a result of several decisions of this Court, that when an authority makes an order which is otherwise within its competence, it cannot fail merely because it purports to be made under a wrong provision of law, if it can be shown to be within its powers under any other proviso : a wrong label cannot vitiate an order which is otherwise within the power of the authority to make. Vide *Hukumchand Mills Ltd. - Vs - State of Madhya Pradesh and P.Balakotaiah - Vs - Union of India*)."

Learned senior counsel for the petitioners submitted that a wrong label cannot vitiate the order, which is otherwise within the power of the authority to make.

13. It is submitted that admittedly, the old Society became defunct way back in 1983 and, therefore, it cannot, by any stretch of legal standard, be construed that the original notification was issued only u/s 44 (3) and, therefore, there was no dissolution of the Society at all. That would be against the very action initiated by the Government since, admittedly, prior to the notification dated 26.1.83, a show cause notice was issued on 25.11.1981 u/s 44 (2) of the Act, calling for explanation from the Societies concerned. Therefore, for all intent and purpose, the notification by the Government dated 26.1.83 has to be construed as one issued u/s 44 (4) of the Act. However, the 2nd respondent, in order to favour the 5th respondent has adopted specious reasoning in holding that the Society was not dissolved. In any case, learned senior counsel submitted that the 2nd respondent has not conducted any enquiry with regard to the functioning of the old Society from 1983 to 2000 and no materials were referred to nor any investigation done in order to support the claim of the 5th respondent that the old society had been functioning for all those years. The 2nd respondent has simply stated that there was no dissolution of the old Society presupposing valid existence of the old society all these years in terms of the provisions of the Societies Registration Act. The 2nd respondent had also not taken into consideration the earlier orders passed by the educational authorities repeatedly rejecting the claim of the 5th respondent for being recognized as the Secretary of the School Committee and all his attempts by challenging the action of the educational authorities had failed and this Court had not ultimately granted any relief to the 5th respondent. When such was the position, the 2nd respondent ought to have considered all those materials and taken a comprehensive decision instead of sticking to hyper-technical reasons stating

that there was wrong mentioning of the provision of law and, therefore, there was no dissolution of the society factually. Such finding by the 2nd respondent is contrary to the record and the same is liable to be interfered with.

14. Per contra, Mr.Veerakathiravan, learned senior counsel for the 5th respondent submitted that the new Society cannot be a successor-in-interest to the old Society since formation of the new society by the petitioners was not in conformity with the provisions of the Societies Registration Act. According to the learned senior counsel for the 5th respondent, elaborate procedure has been prescribed under the provisions of the Act, particularly u/s 40 and 41. Such procedure has not been followed in order for the new Society to be put in place of the old Society to enable the new society to succeed in interest of the old society in managing the affairs of the School. Since the formation of the new Society was not in accordance with the provisions of the Societies Registration Act, the new society cannot have any right to manage the affairs of the School as being a successor-in-interest to the old society. The formation itself being not authorised by the Societies Registration Act, as a successor-in-interest of the old society, which was formed as early as in 1957, the question of recognition of the new society by the educational authorities for managing the affairs of the School does not arise at all. Although earlier the new society was successful in resisting the claim of the 5th respondent, yet the 2nd respondent, after going through the records, has found that the old society had been maintaining the accounts and the old society had been functioning without any interruption and held that there was in fact no dissolution at all. When a factual finding of this nature has been rendered by the 2nd respondent, the same cannot be interfered with unless such a finding is found to be legally unacceptable and perverse. In this case, the 2nd respondent has gone into the inter se claims of the new society as well as the 5th respondent and held in favour of the 5th respondent and on the basis of such finding the 4th respondent has passed an order approving the appointment of the 5th respondent as Secretary of the School Committee.

15. It is further submitted that the contention of the learned senior counsel for the petitioners that the order passed by the 4th respondent, dated 23.3.11 was contrary to the earlier order passed by the same respondent on 24.08.01 is not a valid piece of argument for the simple reason that the earlier order passed by the 4th respondent was with reference to the existing situation at that point of time. When the circumstances changed with the passing of the order by the 2nd respondent dated 24.2.11, the 4th respondent was literally left with no choice except to grant approval to the 5th respondent as Secretary of the School Committee. After passing of the order by the 2nd

respondent on 24.2.11, it is not open to the petitioners herein to any more assail the order passed by the 4th respondent dated 23.3.2011, since the new Society floated by the petitioners and their predecessors had no existence in the eye of law and, therefore, the present writ petition is highly misconceived and is devoid of merits and substance and is liable to be dismissed.

16. On behalf of respondents 1 to 4, Mr.Raja, learned Government Advocate appeared and submitted that the 2nd respondent as well as the other authorities concerned have acted on the basis of the order passed and the materials on record and their action, which is impugned in the writ petition, was taken on the basis of merits, inter se claim and also on the basis of the legal principles. In fact, it is submitted in the counter affidavit filed by the 4th respondent, the 5th respondent had been functioning as Secretary of the educational agency and the School Committee had submitted all the accounts relating to the Society and the Society was not struck off from the register. In the said circumstances, the nomination of the 5th respondent as the Secretary of the School Committee was approved. It is categorically mentioned in the counter affidavit that as on date, the 5th respondent is functioning as the Secretary of the School Committee of Muthuthevar Mukkulathore Secondary School Trust with Regn. No.2/1957.

17. So far as the 2nd respondent is concerned, it is submitted that the original Society of the year 1957 has been in continuous operation and a report was also submitted to the District Registrar of Madurai (South). On the basis of the report, it was held by the 2nd respondent that the Society had never become defunct nor was it dissolved. According to the counter affidavit filed on behalf of the 2nd respondent, in case of any dispute between the holding of the post of office bearers of the Executive Committee of the Society, the appropriate course open to the parties is to approach the civil court and sort out the dispute. Moreover, it is averred in the counter affidavit that the new Society has not been formed by any special resolution by dissolving the old Society and by transfer of the properties to the new Society by registered deed of transfer. Therefore, the legal status of the new Society is questionable and, hence, the writ petition filed by the new Society need not be entertained and no relief could be granted to the petitioners.

18. Heard the learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioners, the learned senior counsel appearing for the 5th respondent and the learned Government Advocate appearing for respondents 1 to 4 and perused the materials and the pleadings placed on record.

19. By a common order dated 29.1.07, a learned Judge of this Court had remanded the matter back to the 2nd respondent issuing directions contained in para-20 of the order, which is extracted supra. Learned Judge of this Court was of the view that the issue could be resolved comprehensively at the hands of the 2nd respondent and direction was issued to that effect to the 2nd respondent. But, it appears that the 2nd respondent, instead of giving a finding on the dispute comprehensively, has decided to take a shortcut in taking a decision in the matter by clinging on to the aspect of wrong mentioning of provision of law, i.e., Section 44 (3) instead of Section 44 (4) of the Societies Registration Act. The 2nd respondent, unfortunately, has failed to read the original Gazette Notification dated 26.1.1983, which clearly mentions that all those societies, which were covered under the said notification stood dissolved. Unfortunately, the provision of the Act was wrongly mentioned, but it did not take away the effect of the order.

20. As rightly contended by the learned senior counsel for the petitioners, wrong mentioning of the provision of law or the statute cannot vitiate the order itself, as observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Dushiant Kumar Rampal's case (supra).

21. In this case, the 2nd respondent, instead of conducting a thorough enquiry into the rival claims of the petitioners (new Society) and the 5th respondent in the aspect of functioning of the old Society from 1957 onwards and also subsequent to 1983 after the dissolution of the old Society, has concluded such enquiry in favour of the 5th respondent and superficially held that the Society had been functioning and, therefore, there was no dissolution at all factually. From the order passed by the 2nd respondent, after remand, dated 24.2.11, nothing could be discerned with regard to a thorough application of mind on the part of the 2nd respondent towards finding out the factum of functioning of the old Society in terms of the provisions of the Societies Registration Act. Except stating that there was wrong mentioning of the provisions of the Act, no other detail/reason has been mentioned in regard to the actual functioning of the old Society. Merely referring to the statement that the old society had been functioning during the relevant period does not make the order valid unless it is supported by evidence and materials. In this case, no such materials have been relied on or referred to by the 2nd respondent and, therefore, the ultimate order passed by the 2nd respondent on 24.2.11 cannot be countenanced either in law or on facts.

22. Although there appears to be some force in the contention of the learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the 5th respondent that the formation of the new Society was not in terms of the Societies Registration Act, as there was no

transfer of properties validly made, nevertheless, the persons, who formed the new society have also been associated with the founder of the Trust by being relatives and the new Society was formed by the force of circumstances in view of their bona fide understanding that the old Society had become defunct by virtue of the notification of the Government dated 26.1.1983. Perhaps, if the petitioners had any intuition about the wrong mentioning of the provisions of the Societies Registration Act by the 2nd respondent, the petitioners could have also claimed to be in the management of the old Society. However, the petitioners, probably were under the bona fide impression that the old society was dissolved in the year 1983 itself and, therefore, it became a legal imperative for them to form a new society in order to manage the affairs of the school. Ultimately, the 2nd respondent, who is the authority to take a call in the matter had been guided by hyper-technicality, namely wrong mentioning of the provision of law, and passed the impugned order without reference to the purport of the order dated 26.1.1983, ultimately passed by the Government. In any case, it appears that the 2nd respondent has not appreciated the order passed by the learned single Judge of this Court in proper perspective and has stuck to the shallow reasoning adopted in the earlier order passed on 9.8.05, which was, in fact, discountenanced by the learned single Judge of this Court in the order dated 29.1.07. After the remand, the 2nd respondent ought to have considered all the materials before giving a finding, but, unfortunately, in this case, the 2nd respondent has surrendered and abdicated his responsibility meekly by sticking to a very minor error, which had crept in, in the Gazette Notification dated 26.1.1983 and while the error had been given undue importance, the intention of the order was given a go-by.

23. In the above circumstances, this Court is of the considered view that the order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 24.2.2011 has to be tested on the touchstone of reasonableness and legality and also on the touchstone of such order being in consonance with the provisions of the Societies Registration Act and also in compliance with the common order, dated 29.1.07, passed by this Court in a batch of writ petitions. To the above, the answer would be a plain 'No' as the 2nd respondent has completely misdirected itself by not conducting a proper enquiry into the rival claims and had merely taken advantage of the error that had crept in, in the original notification issued by the Government on 26.1.1983. Such an approach adopted by the 2nd respondent cannot be countenanced in law or on facts and this Court is of the view that the impugned order passed by the 2nd respondent is liable to be interfered with for more than one reason as stated above.

24. Since this Court is of the view that the impugned order dated 24.2.11, passed by the 2nd respondent is unsustainable in law, the order of the 4th respondent, dated 23.3.11, which is squarely based on the order passed by the 2nd respondent, dated 24.2.11, cannot also stand the test of reasonableness and is unsustainable and, therefore, the subsequent order dated 23.3.11 passed by the 4th respondent is also liable to be interfered with.

25. For the reasons aforesaid, this Court has no hesitation is allowing the writ petition with the following directions :-

a) The impugned order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 24.2.11 in No.18904/I1/2006 and the consequential order passed by the 4th respondent dated 23.3.11 in Mu.Mu. No.931/A4/2002 are set aside;

b) The matter is once again remanded back to the 2nd respondent to pass orders afresh in regard to the dissolution/functioning of the old Society (Regn. No.2/1957) and also the legality and validity of the new society formed in the year 2000, after giving due opportunity of hearing to the parties concerned;

c) The 2nd respondent is directed to construe the Gazette Notification issued on 26.1.1983 as one issued u/s 44 (4) of the Societies Registration Act, since it was an accidental mistake committed by the authority in mentioning the provision of law wrongly as Section 44 (3) of the Societies Registration Act in the notification and proceed to give a finding on the above aspect;

d) The 2nd respondent is directed to complete the investigation and enquiry within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of the order;

e) The petitioners as well as the 5th respondent are at liberty to submit all the materials in their possession in order to establish their respective claims;

f) Till the disposal of the matter by the 2nd respondent, status quo, as on date, shall be maintained and the parties are directed not to initiate any action as against each other in order to disturb the status quo pending a final decision to be taken by the 2nd respondent in the matter;

g) Status Quo as on date is ordered in the interest of the School Management as any other

arrangement would affect the conduct of the management of the school and may result in dislocation of the academic activities of the school during the coming academic year.

26. The writ petition is allowed with the aforesaid directions. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CCC)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

GLN

To

1. The Secretary to Government
School Education Department
Government of Tamil Nadu
Fort St. George, Chennai 600 009.
2. The Inspector General of Registration
Santhome High Road
Chennai 600 028.
3. The Director of School Education
College Road, Nungambakkam
Chennai 600 006.
4. The District Education Officer
Madurai.

+1cc to M/s. Muthumani Doraisami, Advocate sr.no.29678
+1cc to M/s.A.Mohammed Ismail Advocate sr.no.30919
+1cc to Government Pleader sr.no.31071

W.P. NO.22766 OF 2011

nr 03/04/2019