IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on: 27.02.2019

Delivered on: 27.03.2019

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.PARTHIBAN

W.P.Nos.14368, 10051, 10274, 10413, 10414,
10415, 11609, 11610, 11611, 11612, 13308,
14145, 14189, 14736, 16229, 17170,
20458 to 20464, 22403, 23131, 23713,
24661, 24662, 25483, 29512, 4804, 5405,
5406, 5407, 5562, 5563, 7126, 846,
909, 910, 22343, 30681, 30684,
30688, 31347, 31358, of 2018
and 2429, 2433, 4308,
4436, 5315, 6289, 6296 & 6902 of 2019
and
W.M.P.Nos.12009, 12369 to 12371,
12374 to 12376, 12379 to 12381,
13584 to 13586, 13590, 13591,
13594 to 13596, 13599 to 13601,
15679, 16714, 17415, 20381 to 20384,
20429, 24028 to 24055, 24143,
26245 to 26247, 27031, 27654 to 27658,
28693 to 28702, 29664, 29666, 34481,
34483, 34486, 5953, 6651 to 6653,
6656 to 6658, 6661 to 6663, 6882,
8822 to 8824, 1009 to 1013,
1095 to 1103, 35791, 35796, 35799,
36520, 34936, 36543 to 36545 of 2018
and 697, 2711, 2704, 2706, 2715,
2717, 2719, 2700, 5274, 5276 of 2019
AND
The following W.Ps., Reserved on 26.03.2019

W.P.NOs.26234, 32879, 33605 to 33607,
34331 of 2017 and
W.M.P.Nos.27887, 27888, 27889, 36239,
36240, 36241, 37157 to 37163, 37165 to 37167,
33606 & 33607 of 2017

ONGC RETIRED EMPLOYEES
WELFARE ASSOCIATION REP. BY ITS PRESIDENT
... PETITIONER in WP No.14368 of 2018

SPIC EPS PENSIONERS WELFARE ASSOCIATION REP. BY V.T. SANKARARAMASUBRAMANIAN

... PETITIONER in WP No.10051 of 2018

SPIC EPS PENSIONERS WELFARE ASSOCIATION REP. BY V.RAJASEKAR

... PETITIONER in WP No.10274 of 2018

1 N.SIVALINGAM

2 L.ALAGIRISAMY

3 S.RAGHURAMAN

4 G.BALASUBRAMANIAN

5 R.DORAISWAMY

6 V.R.NANJUKUTTY

7 S.GOVINDARAJ

8 N.AYYASWAMY

9 A.MUTHIAH

10 V.DHANARAJ

11 C.P.SHANMUGA SUNDARAM

12 D.YOBIRAJ

13 P.PUSHPARAJ

14 L NATARAJAN

15 A RANGASWAMY

16 JAYAPRAKASAM

17 R.KANAGARAJ

18 C.SWAMINATHAN

19 R.MUTHUSAMY

20	K.K.RAJAMANI
21	K.JAGANNATHAN
22	J.SYED SHOWKAT H
23	L.HARIKRISHNA DASS
24	K.SHANMUGANATHAN
25	K.KAWSALYA DEVI
26	S.RATHINAM
27	K.SHANMUGAM
28	P.BALASUBRAMANIAN
29	V.D.SHANMUGADASS
30	K.ARUNACHALAMOORTHY
31	A.MOHAMED JACKIR
32	N.PARAMASIVAM
33	K.MALLIKARAJAN
34	R.RAMASAMY
35	U.CHIDAMBARAM
36	S.NATARAJAN
37	S.SUBRAMANI
38	M.THIRUMALAISAMY
39	K.RAJAMANICKAM
40	S.SEETHARAMAN
41	K.RAVINDRAN
42	R.BALAKRISHNAN
43	S.X.AVELEO

44 P.KRISHNAN

45 K.NATARAJAN

46 A.SHANMUGAM

47 M.VENKATACHALAM

48 N.NATESAN

49 P.SUBRAMANIAM

50 N.RAMARAJ

51 R.MURUGESAN

52 S.VELLIMUTHU

53 P.RADHAKRISHNAN

54 S.VENKATASAMI

55 C.AROKIASAMY

56 P. SANKARANARAYANAN

57 C.THANGAVELAYUTHAM

58 A.PONNAN

59 A.PECHIMUTHU

60 K.PONNUSAMY

61 P.KAMATCHI

62 V.M.AMBROSE

63 V.BALAKRISHNAN

64 V.KUMANAN

65 V.BALACHANDRAN

66 T.DHANDAPANI

67 V.PALANI

68 M.MURUGANANDAM

69 P.MUTHUSAMY

70 R.DAKSHINAMURTHY

71 N.CHENNIAPPAN

72 K. THANGAVEL

73 A.NAGARAJU

74 N.ALLABAKSHA RAO

75 S.PALANISWAMY

76 K.RAVANAN

77 V.LOGANATHAN

78 C.LOGANATHAN

79 R.MANI

80 A.GOVINDARAJULU

81 K.ARUNACHALAM

82 I. YESSIAN

83 R.VASUDEVAN

84 P.MUTHUSAMY

85 R.SHANMUGAM

86 T.SIVASUBRAMANIAN

87 V.P.MANOHARAN

88 P.THANGARAJU

89 N.SUBRAMANIAN

90 B.RAMADOSS

91 P.PRABHAKARAN

92 R.RAJENDRAN

93 P.KASTHURI

94 G.INDRANI

95 P.KUMUTHAM

96 K.N.PALANISWAMY

97 K.PALANIAPPAN

98 R.PONNUSWAMY

99 R.SUBRAMANIAM

100 R.MAHENDRAN

101 R.SELVARAJ

102 N.THAMILARASI

103 V.VIJAYAKUMAR

104 P.JAYAPAL

105 N.GNANAVEL

106 K.RAMASAMY

107 R.SISILET

108 P.SUBRAMANIAN

109 S.R.MOHAN

110 A.NATARAJAN

111 A.CHINNASAMY

112 N.PALANISAMY

113 P.A.SIVADASAN

114 S.KRISHNAMURTHY

115 N.GOVINDARAJ

116 K.SHANMUGASUNDARAM

117 I.KANDASAMY

118 R.GOVINDARAJ

119 S.VELUSAMY

120 K.RAMAKRISHNAN

121 G.KUPPUSAMY

122 J.MANOHARAN

123 G.RAJARAM

124 R.K.ANGANNAN

125 A.S.JOSEPH

126 D.BALAMANICKAM

127 K.A.PALANISAMY

128 V.PARTHASARATHY

129 C.BADRUSAMY

130 P.CHINNAPPARAJ

131 R.RAJAN

132 C.KITNASAMY

133 V.KRISHNADEVARAJ

134 K.PALANISAMY

135 N.THIRUMALAISAMY

136 S.AYYAVOO

137 A.GURUNATHAN

138 S.JAYAPRAKASH

139 R.NALLAMUTHU

140 K.SUNDARAKUMAR

141 G.SUBRAMANIANM

142 R.MANOHARAN

143 A.SUBHAN

144 V.VALLIAMMAL

145 K.NARAYANAN

146 C.THANGAVEL

147 M.ABDUL KALAM AZAD

148 M.THIRUMALAISAMY

149 C.RAJAKRISHNAN

150 N.MANOHARAN

151 K.SATHIAVELU

152 K.SUBRAMANIAN

153 A.VELLINGIRI

154 K.KANNIMUTHAN

155 R.CHANDRARAJ

156 M.SHANMUGAM

157 I.U.KRISHNASWAMY

158 S.RAJENDRAN

159 TMT. R.P.GEETHARANI

160 C.RADHAKRISHNAN

161 P.KRISHNAMOORTY

162 P.SINGARAM

163 D.SELVARAJ

164 S.VELUSAMY

165 R.JEEVANANDHAM

166 K.KALIAPPAN

167 M.JAYAPANDIAN

168 A.KOMAGAN

169 P.NAGARAJ

170 M.MATHAIYAN

171 M.GOKULAVALSAN

172 R.SIVASAMY

173 K.RANGANATHAN

174 T.SUBRAMANIAN

175 S.RAMADOSS

176 P.MUTHUSWAMY

177 V.RANGADURAI

178 P.SHADHASHIVAM

179 P.M.ROSEMARY ...PETITIONERs in WP No.10413 of 2018

1 S.MOHANRAM

2 D. CHINNAKKANNU

3 N.SANTHAKUMAR

4 S.AIYAPPAN

5 S.RAMANI

6 A.SUBRAMANIAN

7 K.SHANMUGAM

8 VARADARAJULU R

9	G.BALASUBRAMANIAN
10	V.DURAIRAJ
11	K.S.KARUNAKARAN
12	A.N.THIRUSOOLI
13	N.RAJENDRAN
14	T.S.MADHAVAN
15	B.VINCENT PEERIS
16	K.KARUNAKARAN
17	A.SUBRAMANI
18	H.ALIJOHN
19	M.P. DELHI
20	A.N.SEETHA
21	K.DURAISAMI
22	P.MALAIRAJ
23	K.RAJAGOPAL
24	THANGAMANI P
25	G.RAJENDRAN
26	M.RAJESWARA PRASAD
27	R.SRINIVASAN
28	G.GAJENDRAN
29	M.RAJAMANI
30	R.KALIAPERUMAL
31	M.SUBRAMANIAM
32	T.S.THAMBURAYAN

33 S.KIRUBAKAR

34 D.VISHNUMAYA RAJA

35 A.ARUMUGAM

36 E.RAJU

37 R.SOUNDARARAJAN

38 P.S.VIJAYAKUMAR

39 G.KALADEVI

40 S.GOPALAKRISHNAN

41 N.KALIYAPERUMAL

42 P.BALASUBRAMANIAN

43 K. PALALNI

44 S.AMARNATH

45 V.BHUPALAN

46 M.NANDAGOPAL

47 J.CHANDRAN

48 B.PARTHASARATHY

49 E.SUDALAIMUTHU

50 A.T. FRANCIS

51 S.BALAN NATARAJAN

52 M.G.KIRABAKARAN

53 B.PALAVESAM

54 J.D.SEBASTIN

55 P.K.JAGADEESWARI

56 V.RAJASEKARAN

57 P.JAYARAMAN

58 J.VIOLET VIJAYAKUMARI

59 B.S RAMAMOORTHY

60 P.GOVINDASAMY

61 S.GOPALAKRISHNAN

62 S.K.INDU

63 D.VICTOR NAVARAJ

64 M.MANI

65 R.RADHAKRISHNAN

66 M.RAJALAKSHMI

67 N.NADANASABAPATHY

68 P.KAMARAJ

69 N.ARUMUGAM

70 K.NAVANEETHAM

71 R.NARAYANASAMY

72 P.PALCHAMY

73 M.A.NOORDEEN

74 S.RAMAMOORTHY

75 H.VAIYAPURI

76 A.K.SANTHANAKRISHNAN

77 A.NAGARAJAN

78 V.RAMASAMY

79 S.THANGAMARIAPPAN

80 M.BASHKARAN

81 S.RAJAGOPAL

82 L.MEYYAPPAN

83 A.P.SUBRAMANIAN

84 K.M.ABATHBANDAVAN

85 S.PARNAPAS

86 R.JAYAKUMARI

87 J.VASUDEVAN

88 M.UMA

89 B.BAKTHAVATCHALU

90 S.SIVA

91 B.VALLI NAYAGAM

92 K.SIVANNATHAM

93 D.JAYARAMAN

94 P.RAJAGOPALAN

95 R.V.JAYANTHI

96 T.THANASEKARAN

97 P.G.RADHA

98 S.MYTHILI

99 G.S.FLORENCE PREMA KUMARI

100 A.MUTHUSAMY

101 K.P.ARUMUGAM

102 R.JAMUNARANI

103 B.ASHOK KUMAR

104 G.SEMBIAN

105 P.SAMPATH KUMAR

106 V.G.SANCTA CRUZ

107 T.G.CHANDRASEKARAN

108 A.RAGHUPATHY

109 MIR MAZHER HUSSAIN

110 K.NAMACHIVAYAM

111 K.M.MUNUSAMY

112 S.JAYAKUMAR

113 S.MOHANA MURTHY

114 V.S.RAVICHANDRA RAO

115 P. DHANARAJALU

116 V.G.THIRUPURASUNDARY

117 I.POTHIMOHAN

118 D.SEKAR

119 JEGANATHAN M.

120 P.V.JANARTHANAM

121 C.SUBRAMANIAN

122 A.KAMARAJ

123 M.MUTHUKUMARASAMY

124 PR.SUGUMARAN

125 G.KRISHNAVEL

126 T.V.SUBRAMANIAN

127 V.DURAIVENKATRAMAN

128 A.ANVARDEEN

129 G.N.KRISHNAKUMARI

130 K.VALSALA

131 MOHAMMED FARHATHULLAH

132 S.PANDIAN

133 T.CHANDRASEKAR

134 S.NAGARAJAN

135 G.SATHYAMURTHY

136 S.LAKSHMANAN

137 S.YESUDIAL

138 E.UDAYAKUMAR

139 T.LAKSHMI

140 C.VATHSALA

141 D.JAMUNA

142 E.VIJAYAN

143 V.M.KUNHIRAMAN

144 R.S.GOPI

145 G.REVATHI

146 E.RAJARAM

147 S.VELAYUTHAM

148 P.S.SUNDARESAN

149 S.MOHAN

150 P.JEYAKARTHIKEYAN

151 V.ETHIRAJ

152 T.VYDEHI

153 P.MARY ANGEL

154 T.N.GOVINDARAJAN

155 R.BALRAJ

156 P.R.JAYARAMAN

157 S.GNANATHANGAM

158 A.RAJAMMAL

159 D.DAMODARAN

160 T.PUSHPARAJ

161 S.SARAVANAN

162 P.PRABAHARAN

163 P.KUMAR

164 S.MOHAN

165 V.SUBRAMANIYAM RAJU

166 A.CHANDRASEKARAN

167 J.HIRUDAYARAJ

168 P.JAYACHANDRAN

169 V.BALASUBRAMONIAN

170 T.DEVARAJ

171 D.GANAPATHY

172 S.RAJARAM

173 C.SHANMUGAM

174 N.KUPPUSWAMY

175 S.SANTHAKUMARI AGED 66 YEARS

176 V.SRINIVASAN

177 D.PALANI

178 K.VANATHI

179 K.JAYALAKSHMI

180 K.KANNAIAHRAJ

181 V.VASANTHA

182 K.PREAMA

183 K.DEAVA SENAPATHY

184 R.NARAYANAN

185 A.MOORTHY

186 R.SAVITHIRI

187 M.SANTHI

188 K.GANESAN

189 R.SURYANARAYAN RAO

190 P.SELVAM

191 N.PALANI

192 S.P.KANNAPAN

193 R.MALLEESWARI

194 C.DEIVANATHAN

195 P.RATHINAVELU

196 R.PERUMALSAMY

197 C.SEETHAPATHY

198 U.VAITHILINGAM ... PETITIONERs in WP No.10414 of 2018

1 S.NARAYANASAMY RAJA

2 S.CHANDRAMOHAN

3 S.SWAMINATHAN

4 S.ABDUL RAONISDAR

5 R.PURUSHOTHAMAN

6 M. RAJAMOHAN

7 N. MOHAN

8 G.SIVAKUMAR

9 K. GANESAN

10 R.RAVICHANDRAN

11 P. GANESAN

12 R.VENUGOPALAN

13 R.SIVAMANI

14 S.GANESAN

15 C.MANIVASAGAM

16 R.JAGANATHAN

17 L. AROKIARAJ

18 M. RAJAGOPAL

19 M.DAKSHINAMOORTHY

20 D.SUBRAMANIAN

21 S.GURUNATHAN

22 S.KALIAMOORTHY

23 R.THIRUGNANAM

24 R.RAVI

25 A.GANAPATHY

26 V.PANNERSELVAM

27 R.ANTHONISAMY

28 N. PASUPATHY

29 K. GUNASEKARAN

30 K. PADMAVATHI

31 M. KULANDAIVELU

32 A.IRUDAYARAJ

33 R.PACKIRISAMY

34 K. KULANDAIVELU

35 M. GOVINDARAJAN

36 C.DEVADOSS

37 S.PURUSHOTHAMAN

38 M. THAGAVELU

39 G.SHANMUGAVADIVELU

40 V.VADUVAIYAN

41 R.DANDAPANI

42 S.GOWDHAMAN

43 K. RAJANGAM

44 P. BALU

45 S.R.KALAISELVAN

46 P.CHINNAMANI

47 K. KANNAN

48 M. SELVAM

49 G.SURIYAMURTHI

50 R.PARAMASIVAM

51 J.NAGARAJAN

52 N.SELVAMANI

53 R.VELAPPAN

54 R.SOMASUNDARAM

55 D.ANANDARAYAN

56 C.MURUGESAN

57 S.SARGUNAM.

58 C.GOPINATH

59 S.THANANCHEYAN

60 N.VADUGARAJAN

61 R. MURUGAIYAN

62 T.V.PANNERSELVAM

63 S.PETHAPERUMAL

64 T.R.GANESAN

65 S.MURUGANANDAM

66 S.DHANABALAN

67 S.R.MURUGANANDAM

68 S.GANDHI

69 V.NAGARAJAN

70 R.RAJENDRAN

71 K.VEERABADRAN

72 R.THANDAPANI

73 K.JAYABALAN

74 M. CHANDRASEKARAN

75 D.SUBRAMANIAN

76 S.THAVASUMUTHU

77 A.RAVIKUMAR

78 K.ANNADURAI

79 D.DHANAPALAN

80 M.ANNADURAI

81 N.RAMALINGAM

82 S.GOVINDARAJALU

83 A.S.THIAGARAJAN

84 N.SUBRAMANIAN

85 P.MARIMUTHU

86 S.GOPU

87 T.R.KUMAR

88 S.RAJAMOHAN

89 D.SUNDARAM

90 K.BALASUBRAMANIAN

91 S.RAMACHANDRAN

92 D.ARUL JAGANATHAN

93 H.R.V.RAMASAMY

94 D.GUNASEKARAN

95 S.ELANGOVAN

96 I. DURAIRAJ

97 E.P.DHARMARAJAN

98 H. ARULMOZHI

99 R.VARADHARAJULU

100 K.NATARAJAN

101 V.R.SUBRAMANIAN

102 M.VADIVELU

103 S.RAMADOSS

104 S.SHANMUGASUNDARAM

105 T.R.JAYAPRAKASH NARAYANAN

106 A.KAHDAR MOHIDEEN

107 R.SIVASUBRAMANIYAN

108 R.SUKUMARAN

109 N.RAJENDRAN

110 V.SUBRAMANIAN

111 R.PADMARAJ

112 A.THANIKASALAM

113 K.NARAYANASAMY

114 A.B.NALLATHAMBI

115 G.RAJENDRAN

116 K.NARAYANASAMY

117 U.MAHALINGAM

118 N.DURAIRAJAN

119 V.RAVI

120 A.TAMILMANI

121 A.PANNERSELVAM

122 P.SELVAM

123 R.GUNASEKARAN

124 S.SUBBAIYAN

125 S.SUKUMARAN

126 D.SADAGOPAN

127 S.GOPALAN

128 S.CHINNASAMY

129 K.KANAGASABAI

130 T.ARUNACHALAM

131 R.RAJENDRAN

132 R.VISWANATHAN

133 R.NATARAJAN

134 A.JAYASEELAN

135 R.MURUGESAN

136 R.MARIYAPPAN

137 R.SEKAR

138 K.CHANDRAMOHAN

139 S.V.AMALDOSS

140 M.DHANASEKARAN

141 R.SHANMUGAM

142 S.BALASUBRAMANIYAN

143 A.DHARMARAJAN

144 S.JERALD GOVINDASAMY

145 P.GANESAN

146 M.ABDUL RAZACK

147 J.JEELAN BATCHA

148 V.SELVARAJ

149 M.RAMALINGAM

150 V.CHELLAIYAN

151 N.MUTHUSAMY

152 C.KANAGASABAPATHY

153 S.RAMASAMY

154 R.AYYAKKANNU

155 N.SINGARAVELU

156 P.GANAPATHY

157 N.BALASUBRAMANIAN

158 S.NADESAN

159 D.RAJAGOPALAN

160 V.NATARAJAN

161 P.PACKIRISAMY

162 S.KITTAPPA

163 M.RADHAKRISHNAN

164 R.LAKSHMINARAYANAN

165 M.ARULNATHAN

166 K.THANGARASU

167 A.CHINNAKKANNU

168 P.VIJAYALAKSHMI

169 A.RAJALAKSHMI

170 I.AROKIASWAMY

171 G.MOHANDOSS

172 R.ELANGO

173 A.VAITHIYANATHAN

174 V.RETHINAM

175 P.VEERAPPAN

176 J. AYYAPPAN

177 R.ELANGOVAN

178 R.PALANIVELU

179 P.MARAGATHAM

180 S.RAMANATHAN

181 P.PACKIRISAMY

182 V.JAYARAMAN

183 M.KARIKALAN

184 A.ABDUL LATHIFF

185 K. RAMASAMY

186 P.SELVAKUMAR

187 T.BALASUBRAMANIAN

188 T.ELANGOVAN

189 L. NAGESWARA RAO

190 S.VELAYUTHAM

191 A.BALAKRISHNAN

192 P.LOURDURAJ

193 S.KUMARIKAMALA

194 G.KARUPPUDORAI

195 A.GOVINDARAJU

196 B.KASIVISHVANATHAN

197 V.RAJAKUMAR

198 N.GANDHIMATHI

199 K.SIVASAMY

200 T.TAMILSELVAN

201 G.SIVASUBRAMANIAN

202 C.VIJAYAKUMAR

203 B. RAJAGOPAL

204 C.VASIVEL

205 C.RENGASAMY

206 T.IRULAPPAN

207 A.RAMACHANDRAN

208 G.VENKADACHALAM

209 R.NATARAJAN

210 P.JOSPHRAJ

211 M. SIVAPATHAVAIRAVAN

212 M. SIVANANDAM

213 T.VEERAPANDIAN

214 N.K. RAMAMURTHY

215 J.V. RAJARAMAN

216 P. SELVARAJ

217 V.RAVINATH SANKAR

218 R.ALAGANANDHAN

219 V.MANNAN UMASANKAR

220 A.INBARAJ

221 B.JAYALAKSHMI

222 A.MARY MARTHAL

223 P. GOPALAKRISHNAN

224 M. MANOHARAN

225 S.RAVI

226 N.R.SUBRAMANIAN

227 K.KARUNANITHI

228 P.THULASI

229 S.SELVARAJ

230 S.SUBBAIYAN

231 M.VENKATASUBRAMANIAM

232 N.BALAN

233 P.SELVARAJ

234 M.CHELLAPPA

235 S.ANDAL

236 S.KIRTHIVASAN

237 S.GANESHAN

238 P.SAMBANDAM

239 N.SELVARAJU

240 N.SWAMINATHAN

241 P.KOOTHAPERUMAL

242 T.N.SELVARAJ

243 R.SUKUMAR

244 N.SINGARAVELU

245 K. CHELLAMANI

246 S.ABDUL MUNAF

247 M.KALIYAPPAN

248 S.SUMATHI

249 C.DURAISAMY

250 M. RAJESWARI

251 VENKADAKRISHNAN K.

252 T.KANNAN

253 S.BATCHA

254 S.K. CHANDRAMOHAN

255 S.SAMPATH

256 R.GAJENDRAN

257 N. CHELLAPPAN

258 A.MURUGANANATHAN

259 K. KRISHNAMOORTHY

260 A.PANNERSELVAM

261 K.PANDIAN

262 M.KALIAPERUMAL

263 G.JAWAHAR

264 S.DORAIRAJ

265 PV. RAMAMOORTHY

266 N.JANAKIRAMAN

267 S.CHIDAMBARAM

268 A.ATHMARAMAN

269 K.KRISHNAMOORTHY

270 K.MUNIAPPAN

271 S.SELVARASU

272 K.SIVANANDAM

273 G.JOE RAJASEKARAN

274 V.PONNUSAMY

275 C.MUTHUSAMY

276 D.DUKKARAM

277 A.BALASUBRAMANIAN

278 R.SELVAMANI

279 J.JOHN THIRUMOORTHY

280 P.SELVARAJ

281 S.GUNASEKARAN

282 R.VELAYUTHAM

283 C.PONNAMBALAM

284 U.K.RAMALINGAM

285 A.PACKIRISAMY

286 M. AMBALAVANNAN ...PETITIONERs in WP No.10415 of 2018

1 R.KANNAIYAN

2 M.D.DHANDAPANI

3 C.SAM JACOB JOHNSON

4 S.RAJAMANICKAM

5	R.PERIYASAMY
6	A.NATARAJAN
7	R.MOHAN
8	R.MEENA
9	G.ALEXANDER
10	D.DHESINGURAJAN
11	D.RAMU
12	V.SUBRAMANIAN
13	S.RAJAGOPAL
14	R. KRISHNAMOORTHY
15	R.POOCHIANNAN
16	V.MUTHIAH
17	S.KUMARARAJ
18	NALLUCHAMY
19	K.MAHALINGAM
20	P.NAGARAJ
21	A.AROCKIASAMY
22	K.RENGASAMY
23	K.MASANAM
24	P.SYED KHADER
25	M.MARIAPPAN
26	T.MOHAN
27	R.JAYANTILAL
28	M.NOOR MOHAMED

29 M.SETHU MADHAVAN

30 K.MANOHARAN

31 K.KRISHNAN

32 S.ALAGAR

33 K.RAJENDRAN

34 A.ANNA KAMU

35 C.ANBALAGAN

36 M.SUBRAMANIAN

37 K.DHARMALLINGAM

38 S.SUNDARAMOORTHY

39 N.GOWDHAMAN

40 M.NATARAJAN

41 G.ESWARAN

42 S.SUBRAMANIAN

43 T.THIAGARAJAN

44 R.RAMSANKAR

45 S.KAJA MEERA MOHIDEEN

46 S.VENKATARAMAN

47 G.MUTHUKRISHNAN

48 D.S.KUMAR

49 M.MANIMEKALAI

50 V.LALITHA

51 S.VASANTHI

52 A.BALAKRISHNAN

53 M.PANDIYARAJAN

54 V.THIYAGARAJAN

55 M.GNANAPRAGASAM

56 M.N.ANANDASUBRAMANIAN

57 V.JEYABAL

58 S.RAJARAM

59 E.PONNUCHAMY

60 K.SANKARALINGAM

61 A.K.MANAMOHANRAJ

62 P.RAJENDRAN

63 T.SAMAYAMUTHU

64 M.MARIMUTHU

65 G.GANAPATHY

66 A.CHELLAMANI

67 M.MURUGESAN

68 J.MURUGESAN

69 G.SEKAR

70 N.KANNAN

71 R.MUTHUPILLAI

72 S.KRISHNAN NAIR

73 R.ANBALAGAN

74 M.JOHNSON

75 K.KARUPPAN

76 C.RAJ

77 RAMASUBRAMANIAN.S.

78 S.S.SHAHUL HAMEED

79 R.KAMARAJ

80 E.PALANI

81 R.NALINA

82 P.D.RANGU

83 R.RAJESWARI

84 M.N.VIJAYALAKSHMI

85 G.RAVICHANDRAN

86 K.N.ANURADHA

87 R.RADHAKRISHNAN

88 P.VELAYUDHAM

89 A.MURUGESAN

90 A.KANNIYAPPAN

91 P.LOGANATHAN

92 K. VARDHAN

93 D.PUSHPARAJ

94 N.KUMARESAN

95 P.M.KRISHNAMOORTHY

96 J. KUPPUSAMY

97 K. KALIYAPPAN

98 K. VEDIAPPAN

99 K. SUBRAMANIAN

100 R. RAMASAMY

101 C.NATARAJAN

102 V.CHINNASAMY

103 M. SUBRAMANIAN

104 N.MURUGAN

105 A.ARPUTHANATHAN

106 V.MURUGAN

107 L. MURUGESAN

108 M.KANNAN

109 M. DHARMALINGAM

110 K. RAMAN

111 A.SHAIK DAVOOD

112 M.MEGANATHAN

113 A.PALANI ASARI

114 R.ELUMALAI

115 K. MEERA

116 P.RANGAN

117 S.GOVINDAN

118 C.THIMMAPPAN

119 S.RAMAKRISHNAN

120 M.NAINAN

121 C.VEDIAPPAN

122 C.CHENNAKRISHNAN

123 M.SADHASIVAM

124 G.MANI

125 RAMASAMY.M.

126 G.NAGARAJAN

127 L.KRISHNAN

128 A.GOVINDASAMY

129 K.SUBRAMANIAN

130 M.MANI

131 T.RATHAKRISHNAN

132 P.CHANDRABABU

133 K.SIVALINGAM

134 R.VIJAYAN

135 K.ABDUL SALEEM

136 M.KRISHNAN

137 K.ELUMALAI

138 RANGANATHAN

139 V.P.RAMALINGAM

140 J.MOHANDOSS

141 G.RAAMALINGAM

142 T.P.ARUMUGAM

143 B.KRISHNAMOORTHY

144 E.GUNASEKARAN

145 R.VAITHILINGAM

146 K.ILAN TAMILAN

147 R.SEKAR

148 N.PURANSINGH

149 S.NATARAJAN

150 A.KRISHNARAJ

151 S.VENKATARAMAN

152 R.MEENAKSHISUNDARAM

153 A.PICHANDI

154 S.NAZEER

155 S.RAMANATHAN

156 J.GANESAN

157 P.ELANGOVAN

158 S.VENKATESAN

159 M.ANBARASAN

160 K.THOLKAPPIAN

161 A.VELAYUTHAM

162 K.T.SUBHARANIYAM

163 P.JOTHI

164 N.PANNERSELVAM

165 S.THIYAGARAJAN

166 R.CHANDRA SEKARAN

167 N.AMIRTHALINGAM

168 A.R.ANBALAGAN

169 K.ANBALAGAN

170 M.RAMAMOORTHY

171 R.CHOKALINGAM

172 R.ANANTHAN

173 M.SUNDARASEKAR

174 C.RAJENDRAN

175 P.THIVIYANATHAN

176 S.SEKAR

177 R.KANAKASABAPATHY

178 K.RAMALINGAM

179 A.R.PANEER SELVAM

180 K.ANBAZHAGAN

181 R.MANI

182 R.RAJENDRAN

183 G.RAJARAMAN

184 P.RAMAKRISHNAN

185 D.GANAPATHY

186 R.SHANMUGAM

187 M.PARISUTHAM

188 K.RENGANATHAN

189 S.NATARAJAN

190 S.BALASUBRAMANIYAN

191 N.SEKAR

192 A.JAYARAMAN

193 S.KRISHNAMOORTHI

194 A.GANAPATHY

195 S.MAYAKRISHNAN

196 M.RAMAKRISHNAN

197 N.SUDI MUTHU

198 M.SHAHUL HAMEED

199 S.SANKARALINGAM

200 S.M.NOOR JOHAN

201 KATHEEJA ... PETITIONERs in WP No.11609 of 2018

1 M.KASIVISWANATHAN

2 S.KUPPUSAMY

3 T.G.KASI

4 J.KANAKARAJAN

5 S.VISWANATHAN

6 M.VITTAL RAO

7 G.RANI

8 S.SUSILA

9 K.SARAVANA MOORTHY

10 V.JANAGAN

11 P.GOPALASUBRAMANIAN

12 W.SOLOMAN NAVAMAI

13 S.PITCHAIAH

14 M.MAHALINGAM

15 L.AMALANADHAN

16 JACOB THOMAS

17 S.THARMARAJAN

18 T. RAJADURAI

19 S.RAJAGOPAL

20 P. SUBBIAH

21 C.DEVADHASAN

22 K. ALAGU

23 D.SUBRAMANIAN

24 R.MATHIYARASAN

25 S.BALACHANDRAN

26 R.SUBRAMANIAN

27 S.KUMARASAMY

28 M. PONNARASU

29 R.SHANMUGAM

30 M.KAMALUDEEN

31 S.SOUNDARAJAN

32 P.PALANIYANDI

33 P.J.THULASI RAMAN

34 K.A.GAJARAJAN

35 A.THAMIZHARASAN

36 K.KANCHISHANMUGAM

37 J.DAMODARAN

38 V.MUTHUKUMAR

39 D.SIMPSON RAJASEKARAN

40 R.KALYANI

41 M.MEENA

42 A.JOSEPH

43	K.P.BALAKRISHNAN
44	M.ANANDA RAJ
45	S.KANNAN
46	S.VIJAYARAGHAVAN
47	S.DHANALAKSHMI
48	S.N.BALASUBRAMAN
49	P.GOVINDARAJAN
50	R.GNANAVELU
51	S.VINAYAGAM
52	J.JEYAKARAN
53	S.SANKARASUBBU
54	R.PARTHASARATHI
55	S.SAM CHRISTOPHER
56	S.JOHAN SELVARAJ
57	P.KANNAN
58	M.SUBRAMANIAN
59	G.PALANIVELU
60	M.BALAKRISHNAN
61	D.DHANDAPANI
62	A.RAJAGOPALAN
63	R.UDHYARANI
64	S.VENKATARAMANI
65	T.E.PERIYASAMY
66	J.MANOHAR

67 R.BALASUBRAMANIAN

68 S.VIJAYAN

69 A.ALAGIAH

70 V.S.GANAPATHY

71 C.KUMAR

72 M.JAMBUNATHAN

73 P.KALIAMOORTHY

74 G.UMAKANTHAN

75 V.SURENDRAN

76 T.KOTHIAMMAL

77 K.MOHANAN

78 M.SASIKALA

79 G.JAGANATHAN

80 M.RADHAKRISHNAN

81 V.SUDDALIMUTHI

82 J.KOMALA

83 TT.PANKAJAM

84 N.PREMAKUMARI

85 K.THIAGARAJAN

86 P.MUTHAIYAMU

87 K.R.NARASHIMAN

88 M.K.MUNUSAMI

89 V.RAMAIYAN

90 K.LAKSHMANAN

91 B.DIVIARAJ

92 S.KALIDAS

93 G.SEKAR

94 G.MEENAKSHI

95 R.JAYAKUMAR

96 C.SARATHASAI KUMARI

97 M.GUNASEKARAN

98 M.DHANARAJ

99 N.RAMANATHAN

100 H.SYED FAROOK

101 N.SAVARIMUTHU

102 C.SANTIYAGU

103 K.NATARAJAN

104 K.RAMESH BABU

105 R.THANGAVELU

106 S.AJOO

107 A.WILLIAM

108 K.B.MURTHY

109 J.MANI

110 H.RAMAN

111 J.RAMAKRISHNAN

112 K.S.RAJU

113 K.RAMACHANDRAN

114 N.L.KAMARU

115 J.VISWANATHAN

116 I.HARI DASS

117 T.NANJAN

118 SANKARAN.H.M.

119 K.P.BHASKARAN

120 N.THIYAGN

121 K.MOHANKUMAR

122 P.PALRAJ

123 S.JANAKI

124 M.RAJU

125 P.LOGANATHAN

126 S.DHARUMAN

127 M.CHANDRAN

128 T.RANGU

129 K.N.INDIRA

130 G.BARNABAS

131 B.S.MANI

132 B.SENNAN

133 T.NANJAN

134 S.M.SAITH BARITH

135 K.ASHOK KUMAR

136 N.RAMAN

137 M.DEVIBALAN

138 R.KRISHNAN

139 A.BHOJAN

140 K.JAGANATHAN

141 A.BALAKRISHNAN

142 S.KANDHIYA ... PETITIONERs in WP No.11610 of 2018

1 P.V.GAJAPATHY

2 H.SESHADRI

3 S.DEVARAJ

4 M.PARAMASIVAM

5 V.S.SUNDARA RAJAN

6 K.P.RAJENDRAN

7 V.THIAGARAJAN

8 M.MUNUSAMY

9 G.BALAKRISHNAN

10 G.SAMPATH

11 R.SANKAR

12 D.DHANDAPANI

13 B.VARADHARAJU

14 N.MARGASAGAYAM

15 D.DEVARAJ

16 G.KRISHNAMOORTHY

17 A.SATHYAMURTHY

18 M.MANI

19 N.DEVAKI

20 E.PERUMAL

21 M.UDAYAKUMAR

22 N.VENKATACHALAPATHY

23 P.GOPAL

24 K.ARUMUGAM

25 R.PARTHASARATHY

26 G.KUSALAKUMARI

27 M.RAMACHANDRAN

28 P.MOHANAM

29 V.SIVANANDAM

30 K.V.RAMACHANDRAN

31 C.GANDHI

32 K.R.DAMODARAN

33 M.KARUNAKARAN

34 R.SADAGOPAN

35 N.ARUL RAJ

36 R.SELVARAJ

37 E.SEKAR

38 K.MURTHY

39 K.NEELAMEGAN

40 E.SELVARAJ

41 K.PRAKASAM

42 G.ELUMALAI

43 O.J.PALANIVELU

44 K.ILANGOVAN

45	M.MARGA BANDU
46	V.NEETHIPATHY
47	T.KRISHNAMOORTHY
48	K.KUMAR
49	K.GOPINATH
50	S.SELVAMOORTHY
51	G.ARUMUGAM
52	S.DHANAPAL
53	M.NAGAJOTHI
54	K.SURIYA ACHARI
55	C.MUNISAMY
56	S.PADMANABAN
57	A.M.VEERAMANI
58	K.G. BALAKRISHNAN
59	M.MAHALINGAM
60	R.RAMALINGAM
61	K.MANIVANNAN
62	P.MAHENDIRAN
63	M.MANI
64	K.PERUMAL
65	T.PERIYASAMY
66	P.KANNAN
67	N.MANOKAR
68	R.THAVASELVI

69 A.J.VIJAYAKUMAR

70 K.KUPPAMMAL

71 K.PALANI

72 G.SAMPATH

73 I.SOUNDARA RAJ

74 M.PASUPATHY

75 P.SERAN

76 C.SANTHAKUMAR

77 A.P.SANKARAN

78 D.VETRIVEL

79 P.K.KOTEESWARAN

80 A.K.VIJAYAN

81 A.NATARAJAN

82 B.NANDAGOPAL

83 D.SUBRAMANIAN

84 M.CHINNATHAMBI

85 J.KUMARLAL

86 P.S.SUBRAMAIAN

87 P.M.VENKATESAN

88 A.MOHAMED HUSSAIN

89 N.S.GANESAN

90 S.M.APPADURAI

91 R.P.ARUMUGAM

92 N.KOTHANDAPANI

93 R.MUNISAMY

94 B.NARAYANAN

95 T.VIJAYA KUMAR

96 C.SUBRAMANIAN

97 N.GOPAL

98 P.VENUGOPAL

99 K.S.SRINIVASAN

100 K.V.RANGAN

101 R.KANNAN

102 P.P.KANNIAPPAN

103 M.VENUGOPAL

104 P.MOORTHY

105 P.SUBRAMANIAN

106 L.SUBRAMANIAN

107 T.THIRUMENI

108 V.DHANDAPANI

109 V.THANIKACHALAM

110 C.DHANDAPANI

111 A.JAYARAMAN

112 E.NARAYANAN

113 A.AMSAVELU

114 P.SEKAR

115 P.ELUMALAI

116 P.JAYARAMAN

117 G.MANIVANNAN

118 N.POOVAPPAN

119 N.KUMAR

120 G.SUNDRAMOORTY

121 M.NARAYANAN

122 P.MD.ANWAR

123 G.PANDIYAN

124 T.AYYAKKANNU

125 P.SHANMUGAM

126 P.SUBBARAYN

127 M.DHAKSHINA

128 S.VENKATESAN

129 P.KUPPUSAMY

130 M.VEERASAMY

131 G.KANNIAPPAN

132 M.RAMADOSS

133 A.SAGUL AHMED

134 S.MANI

135 S.THIRUNAVUKKARASU

136 S. NATARAJAN

137 K.NATARAJAN

138 Y.R.PANEERSELVAM

139 M.PARANDAMAN

140 S.KUMAR

141 N.MAHENDRAN

142 E.SUBRAMANI

143 N.ALAGIRISAMY

144 N.MANICKAN

145 G.MOHAN

146 V.NITYANANDAM

147 N.POOVATHAI

148 S.SRINIVASAN

149 P.GOVINDASAMY

150 M.KUSALDOSS

151 B.RAJALAKSHMI

152 V.MYLSAMY

153 L.KESAVAN

154 G.GANGIAH

155 P.KRISHNASAMY

156 G.BALASUNDARAM

157 A.BENTICK JOSEPH

158 P.MURUGAN

159 L.AZHAGIRI

160 A.ANTHONYSAMY

161 V.THIRUMURTHY

162 A.GOPALAKRISHNAN

163 M.THIYAGARAJAN

164 A.NANJAPPAN

165 A.NAGARAJAN

166 A.MAHALINGAM

167 S.ANANTHA KRISHNAN

168 M.SUBRAMANIAN

169 I.P.ESWARAN

170 P.NATARAJAN

171 N.ARUMUGAM ...PETITIONERs in WP No.11611 of 2018

1 G.GOVINDARAJAN

2 M.KRISHNAKUMAR

3 A.ALAGIRI

4 R.RAJAMANICKAM

5 P. VEERAMALAI

6 P. PARAMASIVAN

7 P. SELVARAJ

8 P. THANGAVELUL

9 G.ASAITHAMBI

10 P. SELVARAJ

11 P. RATHINAM

12 D.RAVICHANDRAN

13 R.PORSELVAN

14 S.ALAGIRISAMY

15 M.KUMARASAMY

16 V.UMADEVI

17 N.VALAYAPATHI

18 M.CHANDRA

19 D.RAVI

20 S.ARUMUGAM

21 R.RENGANATHAN

22 M.PENNACHI

23 M.R.MAYALAGU

24 K.BALU

25 K.SUNDAR

26 P.R.VARADHARAJAN

27 N.KAMALESAN

28 V.DHANUSKODI

29 R.LALITHA

30 M.RATHINAGIRI

31 P.PETER ROY

32 CHANDRASEKARAN K.

33 A.CELINEMARY

34 K.KARUNANITHI

35 S.LEELA

36 S.R.RAJU

37 T.BALRAJ

38 M.PANJA KALYANI

39 V.KRISHNASWAMY

40 N.G.MAHALAKSHMI

41	T.S.MURUGAN
42	PACKIRIDOSS.T
43	PICHAIPILLAI.P
44	V.MADHAVAN
45	N.PANDIAN
46	P.PAPPU
47	R.MURUGESAN
48	P.SUBRAMANIAN
49	S.SUBRAMANIAM
50	P.M.KALIYAPERUMAL
51	K.PURAVI
52	S.RAJESWARI
53	R.CHANDRASEKARAN
54	M.RAMACHANDRAN
55	P.GOVINDARAJAN
56	G.BALAKRISHNAN
57	M.NATARAJAN
58	D.KRISHNAVENI
59	E.D.CICILY
60	P.JAYABALAN
61	R.SUBRAMIAN
62	P.MOHAN
63	C.ELANGOVAN
64	K.SELVENTHIRAN

65 K.THANASEKARAN

66 V.RAJENDRAN

67 S.RAJENDRAN

68 S.ANBALAGAN

69 V.NAGARAJAN

70 VEERABADRAN

71 R.KRISHNAMURTHI

72 R.KARTHIKESAN

73 R.SUBRAMANIAN

74 M.DHAVAMANI

75 V.SUBRAMANIAN

76 P.SELVAVINAYAGAM

77 S.SEKAR

78 R.KANNADOSS

79 V.PITCHAI

80 K.NATARAJAN

81 M.GUNASEKARAN

82 J.JAYASEKHARAN

83 O.PERUMAL SAMY

84 T.RAMANLINGAM

85 V.SUBASH

86 I.BALASINGH

87 S.BALAKRISHNAN

88 T.CHARLES SIMON

89	E.SRINIVASAN
90	V.SINNADURAI
91	R.SRINIVASAN
92	V.KRISHNAN
93	R.MARIMUTHU
94	R.VIJAYA PANDIAN
95	B.GNANA PRAKASAM
96	M.NAGA SUBRAMANIYAN
97	I.CHANDRASEKARAN
98	S.SIVAKUMAR
99	S.NANTAKUMAR
100	T.P. KRISHNAMOORTHY
101	L.MARIA JOHN
102	S.NAGANATHAN
103	A.BALASUBRAMANIYAN
104	M.PERIYASAMY
105	C.SENTHILKUMAR
106	B.LAZAR LOURDY RAJ
107	R.JOHN
108	P.ARANGANATHAN
109	A.MANI
110	DURAI RAJ.K
111	R.MANI
112	J.SHANMUGASUNDARAM

113 C.SELVARAJU

114 S.NAVANEETHAM

115 S.VEERAN

116 M.MUTHUMANI

117 A.MUTHIAH

118 P.CHINNNATHAMBI

119 L.ANANDA RAO

120 V.SUBRAMANIAN

121 D.MANIAN

122 N.KULASAKARAN

123 M.GANAPATHY

124 S.BOOMINATHAN

125 S.PITCHAIAH

126 K.MATHIAZHAGAN

127 G.DURAIRAJAN

128 A.JOSEPH

129 A.RAJAGOPAL

130 M.PANNEERSELVAM

131 C.BALASUBRAMANIAN

132 S.VEILUMUTHU

133 R.CHIDAMBARAM

134 B.SOMASEKAR

135 K.M.CHOCKALINGAM

136 R.SELVARAJAN

137 S.SHANMUGAM

138 T.RAJENDRAN

139 K.GOPAL

140 M.PRABAKARAN

141 K.V.PATHASARATHY

142 A.LAKSHMANA KUMAR

143 S.KANAGARAJAN

144 R.VENGADASALAM

145 N.BALASUBRAMANIAN

146 A.MOHAMED YUSUFF

147 K.VELSWAMY

148 R.PONNUSAMY

149 V.CHINNARAJ

150 M.MALLIKA RANI

151 G.MARAPPAN

152 V.PAULRAJ

153 S.MOORTHY

154 K.C.KRISHNAMOORTHY

155 N.RAMA

156 P.NACHIMUTHU

157 A.SIVALINGAM

158 S.PADMANABAN

159 V.DHANASEKARAN

160 S.NAGARAJAN

161 V. REVATHI

162 L. JEYAPRAKASAN

163 T.DURAISAMY

164 A.THANGAVELU

165 S.SIVALINGAM

166 S.P. KARTHIKEYAN

167 R.MADESWARAN

168 M.KUNJAPPAN

169 K.SHANMUGHAN

170 R.CHANDRAN

171 C.MUNISWAMY

172 M.SELVAM

173 L. KANDASAMY

174 P.R.CHINNASWAMY

175 R.SHANMUGAM

176 A.BALASUBRAMANIAN

177 T.BALASUBRAMANIAN

178 SELVAM S.

179 P.R.VASUDEVAN

180 A.ELANGOVAN

181 R.MANICKAM

182 L.KANNAPPAN

183 S.MURUGESAN

184 K.S.RAMASAMY

185 M.K.SUBRAMANIAN

186 B.SUGUMAR

187 K.THANGAVELU

188 N.P.BALASUBRAMANIAM

189 V.M. RAVI

190 V.GUNASEKARAN

191 R.CHIDAMBARAM

192 V.BALASUBRAMANIAM

193 V.SUBRAMANIAN

194 V.C.PONNUSAMY

195 M.S.A.SIRAJUDEEN

196 E.SOUNDARARAJ

197 K.DASTAGIR

198 M.DHANABALAN

199 K.MOHANDOSS

200 S.MOHANAKRISHNAN

201 K.NATARAJAN

202 N.M.SHAHUL HAMEED

203 S.S.MOHAMED YOUSUFF

204 S.T.KAJA MOHIDEEN

205 M.MOHAMMED KOYA

206 V.SYED MOHAMED GANI

207 A.SHEIK MANSOOR

208 V.ABDUL HAMEED

209 O.K.ABDUL HAMEED

210 A.ABDUL HAMEED

211 S.MEERAN MOHIDEEN

212 O.M.ABDUL KADER

213 M. RAMAKRISHNAN

214 MOHAMMED MOHIDEEN

215 M.RAJASEKARAN

216 M.SETHURAM

217 V.ESWARAN

218 B.KANNIAHSAMY

219 S.THIYAGARAJAN

220 P.DEVADOSS

221 R.PANDIARAJ

222 R.P.RAVICHANDRAN ... PETITIONERs in WP No.11612 of 2018

1 SITRA (SOUTH INDIA TEXTILE
RESEARCH ASSN) PENSIONERS ASSN. REP BY ITS
PRESIDENTS KADIRVEL ... PETITIONER in WP No.13308 of 2018

1 S.MEENAKSHISUNDARAM

2 HARIKRISHNAN T E

3 JEYA CHANDRA REDDY

4 SANKER B S

5 RAVINDRANATH J R

6 GOPALAKRISHNAN G

7 KRISHNAN R V

8 GEORGE VICTOR P

9	RAJENDRAN T
10	RAVINDRAN P
11	CHANDRAMOHAN V
12	MAHADEVAN S
13	RAMAKRISHNAN K
14	SANJEEVA RAO N
15	KRISHNAMURTHY S
16	NARASIMHAN K
17	MUTHUKUMAR P
18	SESHADRI S
19	MANICKAVASAGAM G
20	RAJAGOPALAN R
21	KAMALAMBAL T S
22	RAJALAKSHMI S
23	JAGADAMBAL AR
24	CHITTY BABU K
25	RENGANATHAN V
26	NETHRA SHOBANASIR T
27	KISHORE A
28	UMAKANTHAN G
29	BOOPALAN V
30	NARASIMHAN K V
31	SUNDARAMOORTHY S
32	VELLIANGIRI A

33 ARUNACHALAM M

34 SUGUMARAN P

35 GUNASEKAR J P

36 SAMARASAM S

37 JOHN LEO SINGARAYAN P

38 VIJAYARANGAN A D

39 ANGAMUTHU A

40 RAJENDRA BABU K

41 KRISHNAMOORTHY A

42 MURUGAN S

43 PARAMESHVARAN V K

44 GOPAL K R

45 GOPAL V

46 MURALI K

47 VISWANATHAN K

48 RAJAGOPALAN C

49 BALAN N

50 MOHAN RAO N R DR.

51 BOOPATHY R

52 SETHUMADHAVAN K P

53 THANGAMANI V

54 THIRUPPATHIRAJU N

55 JAGANNATHAN N

56 SUBRAMANIAM R

57 CHAKRAVARTHY KCK

58 KESAVAN P

59 UDAYA KUMAR P

60 SURESH G

61 KARMEGAM K

62 VENKATARAJU V

63 NATARAJAN T

64 SRINIVASAN R

65 ANBALAGAN M

66 KARUPPANNAN A

67 CHINNATHAMBI M

68 GOVINDARAJAN S

69 RAJENDRAN K V

70 VISWANATHAN R

71 KANNAN R

72 MURUGAN V

73 V M ARULSELVAM

74 ESWARAMOORTHY M

75 SUBRAMANIAN C

76 BALAMURUGAN S

77 GUNASEKARAN K

78 CHANDRASEKAR K

79 NATESAN R

80 RAMASAMY S

81 CHANDRASEKARAN K

82 RAMACHANDRAN P M

83 JEHAANGIR S

84 ABDUL MUTHALEEF A

85 DHARMARAJ N

86 DHARMALINGAM P

87 PERIASAMY M

88 KRISHNARAJ P

89 SATCHITHANANTHAM M

90 VANAMOORTHY S

91 VIJAYAKUMAR V

92 RAMAKRISHNA IYER S

93 MUTHUCHELLAPPAN S

94 PUSHPARAJ V

95 D DOMNICK MARSHAL

96 ALAGAR SAMY P

97 SANTHANAM K

98 PANDIARAJ K

99 THUSU N K

100 MEENAKSHISUNDARAM R

101 MANICKAM K

102 BHASKARA REDDY V

103 RAM BABU Y

104 D MOORTHY ... PETITIONERs in WP No.14145 of 2018

1 SPIC EPS PENSIONERS WELFARE ASSOCIATION REP. BY A.V.KUMAR
... PETITIONER in WP No.14189 of 2018

1 TECHNIP EPS PENSIONERS WELFARE ASSON. REP BY S.ASOKAN
... PETITIONER in WP No.14736 of 2018

1 GREENSTAR FERTILIZERS LTD. (GFL) EPS PENSIONERS WELFARE ASSOCIATION REP. BY J.VISWANATHAN ... PETITIONER in WP No.16229 of 2018

1 NAGABOOSHANAM T.S

2 SIVAKUMAR V

3 PANNERSELVAN K

4 NATARAJAN S

5 RAVINARAYANAN R

6 SUKUMAR K

7 SHANMUGASUNDARAM T

8 MOHAN K

9 KOLAPPAPILLAY S

10 MURUGAN A

11 JAYA RAMAN P

12 JOTHI RAMALINGAM T

13 ASHA DHANDAPANI

14 SABIR ALI KHAN

15 MURALEEDHARAN PP

16 SUBRAMANIAN M

17 SANTHANAKRISHNAN R

18 RAMADASAN M V

19 JAGADEESAN K

20 DAVID P

21 BALASUBRAMANIAN P

22 NAVANEETHAKRISHNAN B

23 SANKARASUBBU S

24 MANDIRAMURTHY S

25 MANI KBS

26 NARAYANAMURTHY CH

27 VELAN R

28 RAVIKIRAN BABU

29 GIRIDHARAN P

30 KUPPUSAMY K

31 THANGAVEL P

32 MURUGAIYAN K

33 VELUSAMI P

34 VENKATESAN V

35 NAGARAJAN S

36 CHANDRASEKARAN G

37 SWAMINATHAN S

38 THIYAGARAJAN R

39 RATHINAM P

40 ANTONYRAJ P A

41 KRISHNA KUMAR D

42 JEYAPAUL A

43 RAVIKUMAR R

44 KRISHNA MOORTHY S

45 PERIASAMY S

46 RAMARETHINAM R

47 SRIDHARAN G

48 SESHADRI T

49 GOVINDAN C

50 MAHENDRA RAO

51 BALAVARAYAN T

52 AKBAR ALI M

53 ILANGO S

54 PAKKIRISAMY D

55 MANI R

56 MANOHARAN P

57 NAVANEETHAKRISHNAN K

58 MATHIVANAN K

59 AMUDHAN S

60 SANGAPILLAI T

61 KESAVAN S

62 ARJUNAN K

63 SUBRAMANIAN D

64 GANESAN K

65	ASOKAN A	
66	RAMASUNDARAM C	
67	KALYANASUNDARAM S	
68	RATHINAM K P	
69	PADMANABAN C	... PETITIONERs in WP No.17170 of 2018
1	M.KANAGARAJ	... PETITIONER in WP No.20458 of 2018
1	V.SUNDARAM	... PETITIONER in WP No.20459 of 2018
1	S.GOPALAN	
2	A.R.PERUMALSAMY	.. PETITIONERs in WP No.20460 of 2018
1	K.M. PADMANABHAN	... PETITIONER in WP No.20461 of 2018
1	P.KANNIAPPAN	... PETITIONER in WP No.20462 of 2018
1	S.RAMAN	... PETITIONER in WP No.20463 of 2018
1	V.VILVAJOTHY	... PETITIONER in WP No.20464 of 2018
1	G.JEEVANANDAN	
2	N.RAJU	
3	M.SADASIVAM	
4	K.NATARAJAN	
5	K.RAJU	
6	K.PEETHAMBARAN	
7	M.RAVICHANDRAN	
8	C.VENKATAPATHIRAJU	
9	S.NAGARAJAN	
10	P.RAMASUBBU	
11	P.CHANDRASEKARAN	

12 S.KALAIMANI

13 P.RAVI S/O.P.CHINTHAIA

14 D.RAJARATHINAM

15 MANEY DORRAYYA NAIDU

16 R.SANKARANARAYANAN

17 A.RAVINDRAN

18 K.MARIAPPAN

19 M.RAJAMANICKAM

20 P.THANKAPPAN

21 A.JAYAKUMAR

22 C.GANDHI

23 P.GUNASEKARAN

24 G.MOHAN

25 L.SAMPATH

26 N.MANIKKODI

27 E.SUBRAMANIAN

28 R.MANICKAM

29 L.KANNAN

30 A.JAYACHANDRAN

31 S.MOHANDOSS

32 S.SRIDHARAN

33 R.RAMASAMY

34 P.RAVICHANDRAN

35 K.MOHAN

36	K.MATHIYALAGAN	
37	K.SELVARAJ	
38	V.THANGARAJ	
39	K.SOMAN	
40	M.PALANISAMY	
41	S. MAHENDRAN	
42	P.GANESAN	
43	K.R. VENKATACHALAM	
44	P.NATARAJAN	
45	A.MATHIALAGAN	
46	M.KALIYARAJ	
47	K.VENKATESAN	... PETITIONERs in WP No.22403 of 2018
1	NATARAJAN H	
2	VENGATANARASU S	
3	PALANI S	
4	GNANASEKAR S	
5	KONDAIAH C H	
6	SENTHILVELAN S	
7	INBADOSS R A	
8	NALLASIVAM K	
9	PALANISAMY P R	
10	VENKATACHALAPATHY R	
11	JAGADEESAN A	
12	JAFFAR H	

13 CHANDRASEKARAN V

14 RAJENDRAN P

15 MUTHAMIL SELVAN T

16 ELANGO S

17 ARUMUGAM K

18 SIVAGURU T

19 RAMASAMY M

20 MANI V

21 GOVINDAN A

22 BOOPATHY S

23 VALARMATHI R

24 SANTHIRAJ S

25 SIDDALINGAM S

26 SHANMUGAM M

27 MURUGESAN R

28 RAMACHANDRAN V

29 ELANGOVAN S

30 KASINATHAN M

31 SOUNDARARAJAN V

32 RAMASHRAY SINGH

33 DHARMA RAJU S

34 UDAYASANKAR S

35 SATYANARAYANA TVV

36 SATHIYANATHAN D

37 RATHNASAMY M ... PETITIONERs in WP No.23131 of 2018

1 G.SRINIVASAN

2 R.NARAYANAN

3 G.JAYAPANDIAN

4 M.RAVICHANDRAN

5 K.ARUMUGAM

6 N.PONNUSAMY

7 T.V.BALAKRISHNAN

8 M.JEYA PAUL

9 P.R.SUBRAMANIAM.

10 N.SRIKANTHAN

11 GEORGE ALEXANDER

12 S.M.BALAKUMAR

13 M.S.N.VIJAYAMOHAN

14 M.MURUGAIYA

15 M.KANNIAPPAN

16 K.KUMARA SUBRAMANIAM

17 P.RADHAKRISHNAN

18 M.S.HARIHARAN

19 S.PANNEERSELVAM

20 S.JEYARAMAN

21 K.JAYARAMAN

22 S.RAJENDRA PRASAD

23 V.A.S ABDUL RASOOL

24 S.PANDI

25 N.PANDI

26 M.PITCHIAH

27 K.JOTHIKUMAR

28 N.VENKATARAMAN

29 M. RAMAKRISHNAN

30 V.THAMARAI MANAVALAN

31 Y.SARDAR

32 K.MANOHARAN

33 S.JEYACHANDRAN

34 C.SELVARAJ

35 A.DAKSHINAMURTHY

36 J.ETHIRAJULU

37 V.SANKARAN

38 S.SESHAGIRI RAO

39 S.KRISHNAMOORTHY

40 V.MANIVANNAN

41 S.GUNASEKARAN

42 T.MASILAMANI

43 S.GOPALAKRISHNAN

44 P.N.RANGARAJAN

45 A.VELUSAMY

46 V.R.VEERAPPAN

47 M.DHANA SEKAR

48 K.MOHAN

49 D.VASU DEVAN

50 SHRI MANIVENKATESAN

51 V. RADHAKRISHNAN

52 M.V.MUKUNDHAN

53 S.RADHA KRISHNAN

54 C.GANESAN

55 M.VISHNU

56 S.SANKARAN

57 K.MURUGAN

58 PATRICK XAVIER K

59 G.BALU

60 P.N.RAMAMURTHY

61 A.K.GOPINATH

62 C.N.RAVINDRAN

63 E.MARI

64 S.VEERARAGHAVAN

65 K.S.ANANDAKUMAR

66 P.PERUMAL

67 K.KUMAR

68 S.MOHAMED GANI

69 D.DEVA ASIRVATHAM

70 K.RAMASAMY

71 M.V.SRINIVASA RAGHAVAN

72 R. VENUGOPAL

73 P. DURAISWAMY

74 K. RAJENDRAN

75 S. RANGARAJAN

76 M. GANAPATHI RAM

77 S. DURAI

78 S. JOSEPH BABU

79 R. JAWAHAR

80 R.RADHAKRISHNAN

81 P.SIVANATHAN

82 K.MURALI ... PETITIONER in WP No.23713 of 2018

1 P.MATHIYAZHAGAN

2 T.PALANICHAMY

3 K.VEDAGIRI

4 S.KALIAPERUMAL

5 P.PANDIAN

6 C.BALACHANDRAN

7 S.PERUMAL

8 K.SANKARA KRISHNAN

9 G.RAMAKRISHNAN

10 N.ZIAUDDIN

11 S.VIJAYA RAGHAVAN

12 P.DEVAN ... PETITIONERs in WP No.24661 of 2018

1 M.RAJENDRAN

2 R.DHARMARAJ

3 G.SIVASANKARAN

4 V.PERUMAL ... PETITIONER in WP No.24662 of 2018

1 A.RAJAMANI

2 A.M.THOMAS

3 S.BALASUBRAMANIAN

4 K.KARUMALAI

5 M.RAJENDRAN

6 M.MANOHARAN

7 K.SUBRAMANIAN

8 M.PERIASAMY

9 R.DHANDAPANI

10 K.MUTHUSAMY

11 P.MARUTHAIYAPPAN

12 P.RAJENDRAN

13 S.SELVARAJ

14 T.SRINIVASAN

15 S.ONDIMUTHU

16 T.SELVARAJ

17 K.MURUGAIYAN

18 R.MOHANASUNDARAM

19 MOHAMED ISMAIL

20 N.MURUGESAN

21 V.N.SRINIVASAN

22 R.SRIDHAR

23 C.KRISHNAN

24 R.BODI ... PETITIONERs in WP No.25483 of 2018

1 SIDCO PENSIONERS WELFARE
ASSOCIATION (SPWA) REP. BY ITS PRESIDENT
MR.V.VASAGAM ... PETITIONER in WP No.29512 of 2018

1 NATIONAL TEXTILE CORPORATION
(NTC) PENSIONERS ASSOCIATION REP BY ITS
PRESIDENT N.VIJAYAN ... PETITIONER in WP No.4804 of 2018

1 B.ASHOK KUMAR

2 M.RAMANATHAN

3 K.SWAMINATHAN

4 K.MURUGESAN

5 G.GOMATHI

6 S.SANKARAIAH

7 A.PALANICHAMY

8 P.RATHINAVEL

9 K.TAMILSELVAN

10 D.SELVAKUMAR

11 S.KANDASAMY

12 B.PANDIAMMAL

13 S.RAJU

14 L.ARUMUGAM

15 K.PALANICHAMY

16 A.KARAICHAMY

17 C.SIVAKANTHY

18 C.SELVARAJ

19 M.VAITHILINGAM

20 T.BALAN

21 K.SUKUMAR

22 P.CHINNUSAMY

23 C.RUKKUMANI

24 K.BALAMANI

25 A.MALLIGA

26 P.MANICKAM

27 P.KARUPPIAH

28 S.SWAMY JAYASEELAN

29 M.SHANMUGAN

30 K.MANI

31 GR.DURAISAMY

32 A.PONNUSAMY

33 K.KARUNAKARAN

34 R.MANICKAM

35 P.SINGARAVELU

36 N.SETHUPATHY

37 M.VELLANGIRI

38 P.MAHALINGAM

39 K.MADHAYAN

40 S.PACHAMUTHU

41 P.RAMASAMY

42 C.RAMALINGAM

43 S.VISWANATHAN

44 A.MARAN

45 M.NAGARAJAN

46 A.CHINNAPPAN

47 R.SUBRAMANIYAN

48 P.VELLINGIRI

49 P.SUBRAMANIAM

50 G.ANNAMALAI

51 N.RANGARAJAN

52 K.SENDRAYAN

53 M.KALIMUTHU

54 A.MANISEKARAN

55 S.MAKALIAPPAN

56 R.UMADEVI

57 K.BALACHANDRAN

58 R.IYYAAAKANNU

59 V.CHINNARAJU

60 S.JAYAPAL

61 C.MARIAPPAN

62 K.VENUGOPALAN

63 NP.THANGAVELU

64 C.RAJAMOHAN

65 AK.VELUCHAMY

66 K.APPUSAMY

67 S.VEERASAMY

68 M.SANTHANAM

69 K.NAGARAJAN

70 S.RAMAKRISHNAN

71 V.RADHAKRISHNAN

72 VK. LAKSHMANAN

73 K.NAGARAJ

74 M.PONNUSAMY

75 V.CHELLAMUTHU

76 R.NATARAJAN

77 B.SIVASUBRAMANIAN

78 G.HARI

79 P.C. SHANMUGAM

80 V.JAYARAMAN

81 N.JAYABALAN

82 B.AMARESAN

83 T.MUNUSAMY

84 P.MANI

85 K.VENUGOPAL

86 R.MOHANDAS

87 P.GANESAN

88 K.SENNIMALAI

89 RP. MANIVANNAN

90 M.PERUMAL

91 M.PONNUSAMY

92 D.RAJASEKAR

93 C.RADHA KRISHNAN

94 K.PARAMASIVAM

95 M.LAKHSMI

96 T.KRISHNAVENI

97 G.GUNALAN ... PETITIONERs in WP No.5405 of 2018

1 V.L.NATHAN

2 A.PARAMANANDAN

3 R.SOMANATHAN

4 V.R.NAVANEETHAN

5 S.HARICHANDRAN

6 C.RAJAN

7 R.PREMSUNDAR

8 S.BAKKIYAM

9 R.PRABAKARAN

10 V.RAMU

11 M.GANGACHALAM

12 V.SAKUNTHALA

13 A.AEETIYAN

14 R.GANESAN

15 SHAIKALLADIN

16 L.RENGANATHAN

17 M.BALASUBRAMANIAN

18 M.KANNIYAMMAL

19 FARITHA BEGAM

20 KATHEEJANACHIYAR

21 S.N.DAKSHINAMURTHY

22 V.VENUGOPAL

23 S.PALANI

24 M.RAJASEKARAN

25 M.MADHAPPAN

26 P.ARUMUGAM

27 M.KRISHNAN

28 A.TAMILSELVAN

29 K.UMAPATHY

30 M.GOPALAN

31 K.RAMAKRISHNAN

32 P.KANDASAMY

33 K.SUBRAMANIAN

34 M.ARIBAL

35 E.SHANMUGAM

36 V.KOTHANDAM

37 M.PAVADAI

38 P.MARI

39	P.SUNDAYEE
40	G.M.MANI
41	P.SKEIK ALLAVUDDIN
42	V.MOORTHY
43	P.MANI
44	R.DEENADAYALAN
45	E.NAGARANI
46	V.MARGANDAN
47	K.MALLIGA
48	M.ARULALAN
49	S.PADMAVATHY
50	V.THERESA
51	V.MAHALINGAM
52	J.NARASIMMAVARMAN
53	P.BALAKRISHNAN
54	K.JOTHIRAM
55	L.SRIRAMAN
56	K.JAYACHANDRAN
57	A.BALAKRISHNAN
58	R.SOUNDARY
59	M.ANNAMALAI
60	S.SEKAR
61	V.THASATATHAN
62	N.GOPINATHAN

63 MK.SRINIVASAN

64 M.DURAISAMY

65 E.MANOGARAN

66 G.THINAKARAN

67 T.WILLIAM JAMES

68 K.NAGESHWARA RAO

69 R.MAHALINGAM

70 G.VENGATACHALAM

71 K.KALAISELVAN

72 S.JAYARAMAN

73 K.RAMAYEE

74 P.SHANMUGAM

75 L.SUBRAMANI

76 A.SHAMEEMA BEGUM

77 R.JAYARAMAN

78 E.DAMODARAN

79 V.C.KRISHNAN ... PETITIONERs in WP No.5406 of 2018

1 K.RAMANI

2 G.MAHARAJAKUMAR

3 M.JAFFRULLA

4 N.THANGARAJ

5 K.MALA

6 M.DEIVASIGAMANI

7 S.THANGAPALAM

8 VARKEY JOHN

9 S.ANBU

10 K.PAULRAJ

11 R.MANOHARI

12 G.PONNUSAMY

13 M.NIRMALA

14 L.T.UMAYALVATHI

15 N.VENKATRAMAN

16 C.BAKTHAN

17 K.KESAVAN

18 K.R.PREMCHANDRAN

19 V.MARIAPPAN

20 J.PALANI

21 S.VASUDEVAN

22 J.EBENEZAR

23 M.KAMALA

24 K.ELLAPPAN

25 S.KARUTHAPANDY

26 C.MANI

27 S.MALA

28 G.GOPALAKRISHNAMOORTHY

29 C.JANAKIRAMAN

30 A.RAHMANSHRIF

31 K.RAVINDRANATH

32 V.NEELAMEGAM

33 PA.ZACKIRIAYH

34 N.SELLAPANDIAN

35 K.KARUNANITHY

36 C.ELUMALAI

37 M.VENUGOPAL

38 P.UMAPATHY

39 K.DAYALAN

40 S.NAGARAJAN

41 E.ANBALAGAN

42 R.JAGANATHAN

43 C. PERUMALDOSS

44 C.H. SAMBASIVA RAO

45 D.JAYASINGHMADUKUMAR

46 K.SINGARAM

47 P.GNANAM

48 L.VIMALARAMANI

49 S.JEEVANANDAM

50 G.RAMACHANDRAN

51 G.SELVADURAI

52 M.ANUSUYA

53 M.SEKARBABU

54 R.NATARAJAN

55 C.VENUGOPAL

56 K.BAKKIYALAKSHMI

57 K.SIVAKUMAR

58 S.BALAKRISHNAN

59 V.DURAIVELU

60 C.PAKIRISAMY

61 S.LAKSHMI

62 S.MOHANDOSS

63 R.GOPU

64 D.DASHNAMOORTHY

65 G.DOSS

66 N.DEIVASIGAMANI

67 D.ANJALI DEVI

68 K.RAMACHANDRAN

69 TR.JAYALAKSHMI

70 P.MESHACK

71 R.ETHIRAJ

72 SAYEEDA BADRUNNISA BEGUM

73 A.P.DURAISAMY

74 C.GOWRI

75 P.SHANMUGAM

76 S.GRIJA

77 G.SAMPATH

78 L.CHANDRASEKARAN

79 K.RAHMAN HUSSAIN SAYEED

80 E.MAHALINGAM

81 S.ANANDAN

82 M.SHEELA RAMANI

83 V. ELAVARASI ...PETITIONERs in WP No.5407 of 2018

1 P.N. CHANDRASHEKHAR

2 PRASAD G.N.

3 NAGABHUSHANAM T.R.

4 P.VENKATESAN

5 S.C.SUNDARARAJAN

6 K.LAKSHMIPATHY

7 T.N.SANKARANARAYANAN

8 C.RAMIAH

9 USHA SOMAN

10 RAMANATHAN.S

11 G.B.MURALIDHARAN

12 A.JUSTIN

13 RAMANAN.S

14 M.S.ANTHONY RAJ

15 MURALIDHARAN.S

16 G.PRABHAKARAN SM

17 B.AROCKIARAJ

18 V.A.BALASUBRAMANIAN

19 V.BALASUBRAMANIAN

20 R.SWAMINATHAN DGM(RETD)

21 ARIVANANDAM.R

22 N.RAVICHANDAR

23 N.MOHAN AGM (RETD)

24 LAKSHMIPATHY.K.L.

25 R.KANNAIYAN

26 SANKAR RAMAN.V

27 RAVICHANDRAN.N

28 S.R.GOPINATHA RAO

29 SHANMUGAM.M

30 ARUNACHALAM.P

31 RAJARAMAN.N

32 PALANICHAMY.A

33 V.MANIVASAGAM

34 V.THYAGARAJAN

35 V.SANKARAN SR MANAGER

36 JANAKIRAMAN.C

37 K.SETHUMADHAVA RAO

38 V.PONNUVELSAMY

39 G.JEYAKUMAR

40 G.MOHAN

41 S.BALASUBRAMANIAN

42 N.R.NANDAKUMAR

43 R.RAMACHANDRAN

44 SOUNDARARAJAN.G

45 R.GOPINATH

46 R.PASUPATHY

47 RAMADASS.A

48 A.N.ARUNACHALAM

49 A.K.GANESAN

50 SRINIVASAN.R

51 MADHAVAN.M.C.

52 M.S.SUDERSHAN

53 MYTHILI CHANDRASEKHARAN

54 A.MURUGANANTHAN

55 V.DAMODARAM

56 REVATHY MURALI

57 V.KAMALAKUMAR

58 S.RADHAKRISHNAN

59 R.VENUGOPAL

60 KALYANARAMAN.R

61 LAKSHMINARAYANAN.M.S

62 T.J.VIJAYARAGHAVAN

63 NALINI SUNDER

64 SEETHARAMAN.S.R

65 A.AKBAR KHAN

66 S.SUNDARAKRISHNAN

67 V.SRIKANTHAN

68 SOMASUNDARAM MANI

69 RAMA VENKATESAN

70 V.PARAMESWARAN

71 M.ILANGOVAN

72 R.SARANGARAJAN

73 PILLAI.N.S.N

74 RAMESH.S

75 ASHOK RAMAMURTHI

76 V.VAIDYANATHAN

77 K.SRIDHARAN BALAJI

78 KOTHANDARAMAN.R

79 KAMALA SRINIVASAN

80 SAMPATH KUMAR.S

81 M.N.BABU

82 V.S.MANI

83 LUCIEN PATTIANADANE

84 G.ELIZABETH

85 CHANDRASEKAR.S

86 K.MOHANDASS

87 MANICKAVASAGAM.S

88 T.MUTHU KUMAR

89 RAMADURAI.S.G

90 VISWANATHAN.R

91 A.K.SIVABALAN UNNI

92 E.SWAMINATHAN

93 SRIDHARAN.T.S.

94 JOLLY.V.A.

95 VENUGOPALAN

96 L.MARIA JOSEPH CYRIL.

97 CHANDRASEKARAN.G

98 M.DAKSHINAMOORTHY.

99 S.VAIDYANATHAN

100 BALACHANDRAN B

101 HOMBALI VARADRAJ M.

102 RAVICHANDRAN V.S

103 NATARAJAN S.

104 D.KUPPUSWAMY

105 M.JAYARAMAN

106 R.RAJA GOPAL.

107 SAYEE RAJAN V

108 SRIKUMAR S

109 BALACHANDRAN S

110 V.S.KUMAR

111 K.CHAKRAPANI

112 SINIVASAN R.

113 T.N.PRABHAKARAN

114 L.C.SAMPATH

115 RAJU S

116 S.M.THIAGARAJAN

117 LOHITHAKSHAN T.K

118 V.GNANASEKARAN

119 S.RAJA KUMAR

120 SESHADRI.R SR.MANAGER

121 MEGANATHAN.E

122 V.JAMES

123 R.BADRINARAYANAN

124 V.RAVICHANDRAN

125 V.MURALIDHAR

126 BALAKRISHNAN M.V.

127 PRAKASH M.S.

128 K.VIJAYA RAGHAVAN

129 B.M.UDAYA SHANKAR.

130 P.SEETHARAMAN

131 RAMADASAN.K.P.

132 M.J.RAJAN

133 T.K.ANANDAN.

134 NAGARAJAN.T.

135 R.MAHADEVAN

136 GOVINDARAJAN.S.

137 S.BALASUBRAMANIAN

138 C.SOUNDARARAJAN

139 K.V.KRISHNAN

140 P.KRISHNAMURTHY

141 LOBO.A.

142 P.MANGALESWARAN

143 T.M.RAVICHANDRAN

144 VASUDEVAN.N.S.

145 G.SUKUMAR

146 S.RAVI

147 T.KOTHANDAM

148 C.N.SAMPATH

149 THIAGARAJAN.T.R.

150 VENKATESWARAN.N.S.

151 S.A.SAMUEL

152 S.JOSEPH MARTIN

153 S.BALASUBRAMANIAN

154 VARALAKSHMIY RAMESH.

155 VASAN ISAAC

156 P.B.KOUSALYA.

157 K.P.SEKAR.

158 S.RENGANATHAN

159 G.GOVINDARAJAN.

160 BHARADWAJAN.S.

161 BALACHANDRAN.V.S.

162 K.JANAKIRAMAN

163 RAMACHANDRAN.S.

164 N.LOGANATHAN

165 T.DAMODARAN

166 N.JAYARAMA ATHREYAN

167 VIMALA.K.

168 SUNDARAM PARTHASARATHY

169 S.VENKATRAMANI.

170 C.R.RAVI

171 S.PARTHASARATHY.

172 RAMAN.K.S.

173 E.THIRUVIKKOLAM

174 RAM.V.V.

175 S.SRIDHAR

176 SESHAN.T.V.

177 G.KRISHNAMURTHY

178 S.MEHALINGAM

179 S.MURALI

180 R.MANOHARAN

181 R.VENKATACHALAM

182 BABU.K.

183 S.NAGARAJAN

184 MATHEW A.THANIKAL

185 T.VASUDEVAN.

186 K.R.VENKATARAMAN

187 SHANKAR.K.

188 JANARDHANAN.T.C.

189 PRAMOD BHUSHANAN.T.S.

190 GAFFAR.A.A.

191 S.SRINIVASAGAN

192 MURUGAPPAN.N.

193 THOMAS.T.ABRAHAM

194 K.N.KRISHNAMURTHY

195 P.S.ANANTHARAMAN

196 MAHADEVAN.V.

197 VIJAYARAGHAVAN.C.

198 ASOKKUMAR.K.

199 GANESH PRABHAKAR

200 RAMACHANDRAN.S.

201 N.RAMACHANDRAN.

202 K.A.ANANDAN

203 RAMAKUMAR.M.

204 VASUDEVAN.S.

205 SUNDARARAJAN.M.S.

206 ANNETTE NOEL KENT.

207 SANTHANAM.R.

208 V.PRABHAKAR

209 R.VIJAYARAGHAVAN

210 SADHU CHANDRASEKARAN.

211 JAI RAMAN.R

212 R.SEHAR

213 SESHADRI N

214 N.NANDAKUMAR

215 HARIDOSS.N

216 SUNDARAMOORTHY.S

217 J.KARUNAKARAN

218 V.INGARSAL

219 VISWANATHAN.M.P

220 C.N.SOUNDARARAJAN

221 SUBRAMANIYAN.P

222 V.KALIAPERUMAL

223 A.R.JAYAKUMAR

224 MENON.K.R.G

225 C.B.FRANCIS XAVIER

226 LAKSHMINARASIMHAN.T.S

227 R.NAGESWARAN

228 M.BALASUBRAMANIAN

229 VARADHARAJULU.M

230 S.CHANDRASEKARAN

231 SUBRAMANIAN.A

232 NATARAJAN.S.V

233 G.NATARAJAN

234 R.S.RAJAGOPALAN

235 S.RAJARAMACHANDRAN

236 SHAFI AHAMED SYEED

237 PALANISAMI.A

238 P.H.RAMANI

239 R.PICHUMANI

240 C.M.UDAYAKUMAR

241 S.SAMPATH

242 B.RANGANATHAN

243 ANBARASU.P.S

244 R.CHIDAMBARAM

245 A.RAJAMANICKAM

246 K.SUBRAMANYAM

247 PANDURANGA MURALI BABU.V

248 J.MOHAN

249 P.SOUNDAR RAJAN

250 RAVI.K

251 S.SIVARAMAN

252 GOWRISANKAR.C.V

253 N.JAGANNATHAN

254 V.ARUMUGA NAINAR

255 SOCKALINGAM.S

256 V.RAJAKUMAR

257 C.C.J.CHINNATHAMBI

258 B.V.SHANMUGAM

259 S.GOPALA KRISHNAN

260 LAKSHMIKANTHAN.R

261 S.KANNAN

262 R.VISWANATHAN

263 V.KANNAN SR OFFR

264 A.N.KUPPUSWAMY

265 N.CHANDRASEKARAN

266 A.K.GIRIRAJ

267 R.SHANKAR

268 MOHANRAO PULAGALA

269 LOVESEA MICKY MARKOSE

270 KRISHNA RAJ.V

271 V.RADHAKRISHNAN

272 S.KRISHNAN

273 DEVADOSS.C

274 R.RANGANATHAN

275 C.M.VASANTHARAJ

276 P.VINAYAGAMURTHY

277 SRIDHARAN.V

278 KASILINGAM.V

279 M.SUBRAMANIAN

280 V.JAYARAMAN

281 R.SWAMINATHAN

282 T.V.ANAND

283 SRINIVASAN.M

284 S.SRIDHARAN

285 BADRINARAYANAN.K.S

286 GOPALAKRISHNAN.S

287 DAKSHINAMOORTHY.S

288 V.DANDAPANI

289 D.UMAMAHESWARAN

290 SUKUMAR.C

291 CHANDRAN.V

292 K.S.RAJU

293 RAMADURAI.S

294 P.VENUGOPAL

295 P.SANTHANAM

296 GOPALAKRISHNAN.R

297 MURUGESAN.R

298 SANKARAN.M

299 MENON.N.K

300 M.PRABHAKARAN

301 PARTHASARATHY.P

302 RAMJI NARAYANASWAMY

303 B.NICHOLAS

304 DEVARAJAN.P

305 SAMBANDAM.V.A

306 N.ANANTHAKRISHNAN

307 PASUPATHY.D

308 K.C.BALASUBRAMANIAN

309 VASUDEVAN.C.V

310 SWADHEEN KUMAR PATNAIK

311 SUNDARAM.S

312 GOPALAN.K

313 S.PANEERSELVAM

314 G.RAVICHANDRAN

315 CHANDRASEKAR.T

316 B.KRISHNAKUMAR

317 MOHAN.S

318 V.SRINIVASAN

319 C.NARAYANANKUTTY

320 KESAVAN.R

321 R.SUBRAMANIAN

322 BALAKRISHNAN.B

323 N.JAYARAMAN

324 PRAKASH CHANDRAN.P.M

325 V.MUTHUKUMAR

326 BALASUBRAMANIAN.K.

327 RAMAKRISHNAN.V

328 RAJAN.P

329 K.V.SUBRAMANIAN

330 P.RAMALINGAM

331 S.K.RAMANAN

332 S.VENKATARAMAN

333 V.BASKARAN

334 VENKATAKRISHNAMACHARI

335 RAMACHANDRAN.R

336 RAVEENDRA DAS.T.V

337 JAYASHANKAR.P.B

338 BALAGOPALAN.C

339 CHANDRASEKARAN.K.C

340 S.KRISHNA KUMAR

341 K.P.HARIHARAN

342 RAVEENDRAN.K

343 THANGAMANI.S

344 SHEKHAR ARORA

345 NARAYAN DHONDIBA BHILARE

346 JAYAKAR PADUBIDRI

347 KRISHNAMOORTHY.M.N

348 M.N.AKHILESWARAN

349 UPADYAY.D.C

350 K.BALAN

351 M.BALASUBRAMANIAN

352 ARUNKUMAR.B.DESAI.

353 RAVI SHANKAR GANTI

354 S.SHANMUGAM

355 ABHAY SHRINIWAS DESHPANDE

356 YESHODA SUNDAR KOTIAN

357 PROSENJIT PATHAK

358 INDIRA RAJARAMAN

359 MADHU SUDAN PAUL

360 TAPASH BOSE

361 V.NATARAJAN

362 RUMA SAHA

363 MITALI GHOSH

364 BANERJEE MILAN KANTI

365 BHASKAR SEN

366 ACHINTYA KUMAR MUKHOPADHY

367 SARKAR.B.K

368 JANAKIRAMAN VENKATARAMAN

369 TARUN KUMAR DUTTA

370 LAKSHMANAN.K.A

371 SUBASIS BOSE

372 PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE

373 A.K.MUKHERJEE

374 KUMAR.S

375 VENKATA RAMANAN.K

376 K.NAGESH PRAKASH

377 T.S.LAKSHMAN SUNDER

378 R.KRISHNAN

379 SHRAWAN KUMAR GUPTA

380 MARUTI NARASINGRAO LADDE

381 PADMANABHAN.K.G.

382 T.G.SAMPATH

383 SURENDRAN.J

384 U.RAJAMANI

385 LAKSHMIPATHY.B

386 SRINIVASAN.A

387 G.S.CHANDRASEKARAN

388 A.SUNDARA MURTHY

389 V.VASUDEVAN

390 DR.G.R.VIJAYKUMAR

391 SURESH.B

392 DWARAKANATH.V

393 MURALIDHARAN.S

394 VENKATARAMANI.N

395 R.NAGARAJA

396 RAMNATH COWSIK

397 PRAKASH.M.V

398 RAMA MUTHUKUMARAN

399 RAJAGOPAL.R

400 PARAMESWARAN.R

401 SURYANARAYANAN.V

402 KRISHNA VENI.N

403 PARTHASARATHY.T.V

404 ABDUL AYUB

405 M.K.R.NAIR

406 P.VIJENDIRAN

407 GOPALAKRISHNAN.N

408 B.S.CHANDRASHEKARAN

409 P.SELVARAJ

410 RAMANAND.M

411 M.A.MOHAMED ALI

412 RAMACHANDRAN.K.N

413 RAMA BALACHANDRAN

414 C.V.JAI RAJ

415 MARIAM MATHEW

416 KRISHNA RAO.B.N

417 N RAGHUTHAMAN

418 SHARMA.T.S.R

419 SURIANARAYANAN.V.N.S

420 S.HARIHARAN

421 MYNUTHEEN.D

422 S.PADMANABHAN

423 L.A.THEERTHAGIRI

424 BALASUBRAMANIAM.R

425 S.MOHANASUNDARAM

426 K.MARIA JOSEPH

427 BALACHANDRAN.A

428 VEERARAGHAVAN.R

429 RAGUNATHAN.M.N

430 MOHANKUMAR.D.S

431 V.RAMADASS

432 G.SOUNDARA RAJAN

433 G.KANNAN

434 P.R.SUBRAMANIAN

435 C.SRINIVASAN

436 M.N.RAMACHANDRAN

437 R.SRINIVASAN

438 M.RAMAMOORTHY

439 DHANAPAL.T

440 RAGHAVAN.V

441 NIRMALA CABAH SUDHAKAR

442 R.KANDASAMI

443 K.S.K.ABDUL HUTHA

444 ANDIAPPAN.P

445 M.N.SHANMUGAM

446 PREMA.M.K

447 D.RAMESH

448 MANOHAR RAJ.E

449 PARANDHAMAN.V

450 VISWANATHAN.C.V

451 B.KHAITAN

452 SARWAN KUMAR

453 RAVINDER SINGH

454 CHACKO.E.J

455 P.S.GULERIA

456 S.VENKAT NARAYANAN

457 SURINDER SINGH KALSI

458 AMBRISH KUMAR SINGH

459 AHMED FAHEEM

460 CHAUDHRY.C.P

461 RAMESH CHANDER KHANNA.

462 MAHESH CHANDRA GAUTAM.

463 KALYAN SINGH SHEKHAWAT

464 DIWAN.N.K.

465 GOKULARAJAN.S.

466 KAN CHAND

467 HAR SWAROOP SHARMA.

468 PRADEEP KUMAR ZUTSHI

469 V.RAMA IYER MANAGER

470 KAMAT TIMMAPPA DAMODAR.

471 AJAYA A.KHANOLKAR

472 GODA RANGAN

473 MOHAN KUMAR

474 RAVEENDRANATHAN NAIR.P.G.

475 K.S.J.PANICKER

476 THOMAS.V.A.

477 SETHURAMAN.P.

478 S.SAMBASIVAN

479 K.SRIDHARAN

480 N.P.VISWANATHAN

481 K.SRIDHARAN.

482 L.A.SUNDARAM

483 G.JANARDHANAM

484 J.SUNDARAGANESH

485 S.RAVISHANKAR

486 P.KARTHIKEYAN

487 S.RAVICHANDRAN

488 RAVICHANDAN P.

489 H.V.DAMODARA

490 R.RAGHAVAN

491 N.SRIDHARAN

492 CHANDRASEKARAN N.

493 P.BALASUNDARAM

494 M.BRINDAVANAM

495 T.THANAM

496 VARADHARAJAN V.

497 J.GOPALAN

498 V.K.NARASIMHAN

499 CHELLAPPAN K.V.

500 N.MURALI

501 DHARMALINGAM M.L.

502 V.K.VIJAYAKUMAR UNNI

503 LAKSHMINARAYANAN S.

504 K.PURUSHOTHAMAN

505 KALYANAM G.

506 P.JEYAPAUL

507 G.SHANMUGAM

508 R.BALAKRISHNAN

509 GOPALAKRISHNAN.V.

510 S.EKAMBARAM

511 V.S.USHA

512 ROSAMUND REBELLO.

513 V.SETHURAMAN.

514 C.M.RAMESH

515 RAMAN.R.V.

516 A.STANLEY JONSTONE.

517 S.NATARAJAN

518 B.V.RAMACHARI

519 KOTEESWARAN.S.

520 E.JEYAGOPU

521 C.S.MUTHU SUBRAMANIYAN

522 RAVI KUMAR SAMUEL

523 D.ETHIRAJAN.

524 G.G.MANOHARAN

525 R.M. SRIDHARAN

526 R.BHAVANI SHANKAR

527 G.RADHA

528 N.C. DRIVATSAN

529 M.KUMARAN

530 ANDERSON K.

531 R.VISWANATHAN

532 A.HIRUDAYA RAJ

533 J.V.N. PRABHAKARA RAO

534 SUDHA BADRI

535 A.V.RANGARAJAN

536 M.KALYANAMOHAN

537 ELEANOR PAUL

538 M.G.SADHANANDAN

539 GURUSAMY M.

540 SHIVASWAMY C.K.

541 K.A.KUMAR

542 S.V.BOTHANATHASAIE

543 SUKANYA CHANDRAMOULI

544 G.BASKARAN

545 V.VASUDEV

546 G.NADARAJAN

547 VENKATACHALAM K.

548 B.VISALAKSHMI

549 V.VENKATARAMAN

550 K.S.D.ARUMANIAYAGAM

551 R.BALAJI N.RANGANATHAN

552 G.KALIAPERUMAL

553 V.RAJENDRAN

554 C.N.SUNDARARAMAN

555 J.RADHAKRISHNAN

556 R.P.JAYAVELAN

557 B.DEVASENA

558 A.A.GNANASEKARAN

559 V.NARAYANASWAMY

560 R.KUPPURAJ

561 S.N. ADIKALAM

562 S.GOPAL

563 G.D.GURUNATHA RAO

564 HARIKRISHNAN A.R.

565 K.RAMANATHAN

566 P.MATHAVAN

567 G.KARUNANIDHI

568 K.RAJAMANI

569 B.VENU

570 V.A.VISWANTHAN

571 ANANTHA NARAYANAN T.

572 MOHANAKRISHNAN N.

573 A.MURUGAN

574 ASHOK L.NAIK

575 VINOO MASILAMANI

576 K.SUBRAMANI

577 S.SEKAR

578 N.CHOCKLINGAM

579 B.PALANI

580 A.JEYARAGAVAN

581 R.RAVINDRAN

582 S.SUBRAMANIAN

583 R.GANESAN

584 K.SETHUMADHAVAN

585 N.SRIDHARAN

586 N.SUBRAMANIAM

587 C.R.BHOOPALAN

588 K.B.SANTHANAM

589 E.A.R.SASTRY

590 M.P.I. GNANARAJ

591 SUSHEELA GNANARAJ

592 NIMALAN DAVID

593 JAYANTHINATHAN.M

594 PEJAVER KRISHNAN

595 N.ANAND KUMAR

596 T.S.GANESAN

597 RAJA KUMAR

598 SIVAGURU R

599 RAJU S

600 J.K.MAJUMDAR

601 B.P.NIYOGI ... PETITIONERs in WP No.5562 of 2018

1 KUNHI KANNAN.E.T.

2 THANKATHURAI.C.

3 MOHAMMED RAFI.B.

4 SHAJI.S.N.

5 BALAKRISHNAN.M.

6 NARAYANA.M.

7 MATHEW.P.

8 JOSEPH.S.

9 SAMPATH.M.

10 SUBRAMANIAN.K.

11 KRISHNA REDDY.B.

12 SANKARA KUMAR.N.

13 APPAIAH.R.

14 DEVASIA.V.

15 THIAGARAJAN.M.

16 VENKATESH.H.V.

17 GANDHI BOSE.G.

18 JAYACHANDRAN.V.

19 VEERAN.M.

20 KUMAR NATESAN.S.

21 SAPTHARISHI L.R.

22 LAKSHMINARASIMHAN V.

23 MEENAKSHI SUNDARAM R.

24 RAMACHANARAN S.

25 KUPPUSWAMY NADAR R.

26 MANI R.

27 NATARAJAN M.

28 RAGHAVENDRA KUMAR K.

29 DAMODARAN R.

30 PALANIAPPAN N.

31 MAHIMAI NATHAN A.

32 KRISHNAPPA M.

33 NARENDRA A.

34 BENCYANT A.

35 JAYADEVAN S.

36 NATARAJAN.C.

37 SUNDARAMURTHY.V.

38 SUBRAMANIAN.E.

39 MALLESH.M.

40 HARIRAMAR.A.

41 MANI.E.

42 STEPHEN JEBAKUMAR.K.

43 CHANDRAN.D.

44 SUNDER.R.

45 CHIDAMBARAM.R.

46 ELANGOVAN.S.

47 JAYARAMAN.S.

48 RAJAN BABU.N

49 JAYARAMAN.S

50 KRISHNASAMY.P

51 DEVANANDAM.J

52 RAGHUNATH.K.

53 SELVARAJ.D

54 RAJARAM.S

55 JAYAKUMAR.S.

56 KRISHNAPPA.C.

57 SRIDARAN.R.

58 GOPALAN.V.

59 RAVICHANDRAN.K

60 NARAYANAPPA.Y

61 SAMPATH KUMAR.J.

62 VIVEKANANDAM.C.

63 DESIKAN.G.

64 CHANDRASEKARAN.K.

65 SUNDARARAJAN.M.

66 CHANDRASEKARAN.A.

67 SRINIVASAN.M.N.

68 KUPPUSAMY.M.

69 KANNAN.R.

70 VENKATESAN.S.

71 MATHESAN.A

72 KRISHNAN.R.

73 RAJARAJAN.S.K

74 MUNIVENKATA REDDY.M

75 JOTHIRAMALINGAM.M

76 DAVIS.P.A

77 NARAYANAN.B

78 ELUMALAI.V

79 KOKILAVANAN.K

80 KUPPUSWAMY.S.

81 JAYAPAL.C

82 JAYARAJU.R

83 BALACHANDRAN.R

84 DHANDAPANI.N

85 NAGARAJAN.P

86 JAYARAJ.B

87 UMA SHANKAR.S

88 NALLASAMY.K

89 PUSHPARAJ J

90 JAGADEESAN.S ... PETITIONERs in WP No.5563 of 2018

1 BASKAR S

2 KRISHNAMURTHY PJ

3 MARGABANTHU

4 THIRU KAMAL K

5 KALVIRAYAPILLAI G

6 KANNUSAMY CA

7 RAJU G

8 ALPHONES A

9 MANOHAR K

10 RAMAMOORTHY JP

11 SANKARALINGAM T

12 KASINATHAN V

13 VADIVELU A

14 SETHURAMALINGAM S

15 SACHINDRAN R

16 ELANGOVAN A

17 PITCHIAH E

18 KUMAR RK

19 ANANDAN S

20 SHANMUGASUNDARAM A

21 UDAYAKUMAR T

22 AYYAMUTHU R

23 LAKSHMANAN K

24 JAMUNA B

25 CHANDAR SINGH G

26 VASANTHA TR

27 SUBRAMANIAN K

28 TAMILSELVAM K

29 PARAMESWARI V

30 SUNDAR B

31 NALINI M

32 JEEVANANDAM P

33 KANNAKI C

34 AMUDHA S

35 PUSHKALA D

36 PANDIAN S

37 BANUMATHI R

38 RAJAKUMAR S

39 BALAKRISHNAN S

40 ISAIARASAN DJ

41 GANESA SUNDAR N

42 PAKKIRISWAMY N

43 CHIDAMBARAM P

44 VEERARAGHAVAN R

45 SIVAGNANAM V

46 RAMANI N

47 ARUL L

48 LAKSHMINARAYANAN S

49 CHARLEY WILSON M

50 RAJAMANICKAM VG

51 ABDUL HAMEED C

52 RAJARETHINAM P

53 RANJINI S

54 SENTHAMIL SELVI AS

55 SAROJINI KG

56 MANGAYARKARASI S

57 THENMOZHI N

58 RAGHUKUMAR PM

59 MANICKAM A

60 DINAKARAN SM

61 SYAMALA ILANGO

62 VIJAYAKUMARI VT

63 RAMALINGAM VS

64 BASKAR D

65 VELUSWAMI B

66 KUMARASWAMY Y

67 RAVIRAJ VA

68 CHANDRASEKAR G

69 ASOKAN D

70 TAMILSELVI A

71 SIVAGNANAM M

72 RAJENDRAN BALA SINGH S

73 RADHAKRISHNAN N

74 SIVASUBRAMANIAN V

75 VAIJAYANTHI VT

76 RAMAMURTHY T

77 SETHURAM P

78 VIDHYA A

79 SHIVARAJ KA

80 PADMINI TS

81 KUMAR S

82 SUDHA GANESH

83 ALLI S

84 VALLIAMMAL K

85 AHALYADEVI M

86 ANNAPOORANI A

87 PANCHAPAGESAN K

88 PONNUSWAMY N

89 SUBRAMANIAN KN

90 VELUSWAMY N

91 ABUL KHALAM AZAD S

92 VIJAYAKUMAR R

93 CHANDRABABU P

94 THANGARAJ D

95 VENKATESAN K

96 KATHAMUTHU A

97 CHANDRASEKAR S

98 SUBRAMANIAN A

99 SUBRAMANIAN M

100 RAJARAJAN KGR

101 ALAGUDESIGAN A

102 SWAMY SK

103 DAKSHINAMURTHY K

104 ARUMUGAM A

105 RAMADOSS A

106 CHELLAPPA P

107 NAGARAJAN C

108 GUNASEKARAN S

109 NATARAJAN K

110 VELAYUTHAM A

111 GIRIDHAR H

112 KARTHIYAHINI P

113 RAMACHANDRAN S

114 KANCHANA PL

115 SAHUL HAMEED I

116 PANNEER SELVAM L

117 CHANDRASEKARAN P

118 PANNEERSELVAM A

119 SUBRAMANIAN E

120 KANAGARAJ D

121 KANCHANA R

122 ANANTHAN K

123 KHAJA GAYASUDEEN A

124 N. MATHIVANAN

125 KANNIAPPAN D

126 FEROZ KHAN M

127 KOTHANDAN SS

128 SANKARAN T

129 SETHURAMAN N

130 BASKARAN M

131 SHANMUGAM N

132 SEETHARAMAN K

133 NATARAJAN S

134 CHELLASWAMY R

135 RATHNA BAI P

136 RADHAKRISHNAN E

137 SUNDARAPANDIAN KS

138 GIRIDHARAN RA

139 MURUGESAN A

140 SAMINATHAN S

141 NATARAJAN M

142 ELAVAZHAGAN N

143 THULASIRAMAN M

144 SOMANATHAN M

145 MURUGESAN P

146 MANIVANNAN M

147 JAGADESSWARAN R

148 SOUNDARA RAJAN P

149 KANRAJ G

150 RAJAN BABU S

151 ISMAIL A

152 KRISHNAMOORTHY SS

153 KRISHNAMOORTHY S

154 KUMARAGURU K

155 RAJAMOHAN V

156 KRISHNAN C

157 RAJESWARAN S

158 SYED ABDUL KADER PMM

159 ELANGOVAN S

160 SANKARAMURTHY T

161 SRINIVASAN A

162 GOPAL A

163 VINAYAGAM D

164 KATHIRESALU T

165 MEENAKSHISUNDARAM P

166 THAMIL SELVAN P

167 MARY ARPUTHA KALAISELVI

168 LOGANATHAN P

169 ARUNRAJA T

170 GNANAPRAKASAM TP

171 VIJAYAGOPAL C

172 MANGAI V

173 VENKATABASHYAM N

174 SELVARAJ T

175 THANGAVEL S

176 MOHAMED ZOOBERA A

177 VINAYAGAM MP

178 CHANDRASEKARAN R

179 VENKATARAMAN K

180 SRINIVASAN K

181 RAJESWARI N

182 RADHAKRISHNAN T

183 DEVARAJAN K

184 KALIAPERUMAL G

185 AMBALAVANAN C

186 CHITTIBABU L

187 SUCHITHA R

188 MAHENDRAN R

189 MURALIDHAR S

190 YUVARAJ PT

191 THAIYANAYAKI R

192 SIVAKUMARA SASTRY P

193 MATHIVANAN A

194 SEKAR T

195 PATRIC LAZAR A

196 CHOZHAN VR

197 SAMPATHKUMAR VV

198 VIJAYAKUMAR K

199 MANOHARAN CA

200 THATCHINAMOORTHY K

201 SAROJINI J

202 MUTHAZHAGAN K

203 BOJAN L

204 CHAMUNNI KM

205 MANI K ... PETITIONERs in WP No.7126 of 2018

1 K. SUDARSANAN

2 C SIVARAMAN

3 C. NAGALINGAM

4 K SRINIVASAN

5 SUGANYA RAMADURAI

6 M.K. SHANMUGAM

7 V. AMARNATHAN

8 PADMAVATHI AMARANATHAN

9 E. JAYAPATHY

10 J. AKILA

11 L. BHANUMATHY

12 N. SOWRIRAJAN

13 S.DHANASEKARAN

14 D. SAMANTHAGAMANI

15 P.DEVARAJAN

16 N. MURALIDHARAN

17 PRABHA SRINIVASA RAGHAVAN

18 LAKSHMI JAYAKUMAR

19 K. MADHESU

20 T.V. MOHAMED IQBAL

21 N. SELVARAJ

22 T.R. THAVAPRAKASH

23 B. MANOHAR

24 M. RAJAMANICKAM

25 K. PANNER SELVAM

26 S. GANESAN

27 G. DIVAKARAN

28 N.S. RAVI

29 S. SRIDHARAN

30 S.JAYAGOPAL

31 BABY VARGHESE

32 C. JAYASREE

33 A.VASANTHA

34 R.GANDHI

35 P. PERIYASAMY

36 G. RAMACHANDRAN

37 V. SUDHAKAR

38 V.KANNA

39 B. CHANDRASEKARAN ... PETITIONERs in WP No.846 of 2018

1 S.MANOHAR

2 A.VAITHILINGAM

3 P.SOLAIMUTHU

4 G.KASIMANI

5 P.SIVALINGAM

6 S.RAMASAMY

7 A.GOVINDASAMY

8 R.RAMAKRISHNAN

9 R.SUGUMARAN

10 A.JABAMALAI

11 S.NAGARAJAN

12 A.MUTHU

13 P.NARAYANAN

14 V.RAMALINGAM

15 T.JAYAPALAN

16 R.SUBRAMANIYAN

17 T.KALAICHELVANN

18 S.JAYACHANDRAN

19 S.SINNAPPAN

20 M.MATHEW

21 P.THANGARAJ

22 A.VAITHILINGAM

23 S.VENUGOPAL

24 P.PAUL RABIN

25 S.AMBIKAPATHY

26 A.JOSOPH IRUDAYARAJ

27 M.SULTHAN ALLAUDEEN

28 P.MUTHIYAN

29 S.SRINIVASAMURTHI

30 S.SANTHOSH

31 N.K.NAGARAJAN

32 S.NALINI

33 S.SYED RAHAMATHULLAH

34 T.RAMALINGAM

35 R.SIVAKUMAR

36 A.RADHAKRISHNAN

37 A.RAMAMOORTHY

38 A.NATESON BABU

39 T.N. VIJAYAKUMAR

40 V.BALASUNDARAM

41 G.MOHANDOSS

42 P.SHANMUGADURAI

43 D.SURESH CHANDRAN

44	S.RAJU
45	S.VELUCHAMY
46	P. RAJENDRAN
47	S.JEYACHANDRAN
48	K. ARUNAGIRI
49	M.BASKARAN
50	S.ARUL ANANDAM
51	S.ABULKALAM AZAD
52	R.JAYAMANI
53	S.RENGARAJAN
54	A.VENKATARAMAN
55	E.RAMACHANDRAN
56	P.GANAPATHY
57	G.KRISHNAN
58	G.PAULRAJU
59	K.SUBBIAH
60	S.CHOKKAIAH
61	R.KANNAN
62	V.MUTHUKRISHNAN
63	S.VELLADURAI
64	D.SIVASUBRAMANIAN
65	S.RENGARAJAN
66	J.MARIASUSAI
67	L. PARAMASIVAN

68 K.ANDIAPPAN

69 A. VAIDISWARAN

70 V.KUMAR

71 T.KANNAN

72 N.VENKATRAMAN

73 T.JAYAPAUL

74 S.SABHARATHINAM

75 S.MANIVANNAN

76 N. KUPPUSAMY

77 V.NAGARAJAN

78 S.RAMASAMY

79 G.R.N. RATHAA

80 S.GANESAN

81 S.RAMAPRASAD

82 G. HABIBUDEEN SHERIFF

83 V.SHANMUGAM

84 B. RAJARAJAN

85 V.SAMINATHAN

86 B.CHANDRAMOHAN ... PETITIONERs in WP No.909 of 2018

1 R.MUTHUSWAMY

2 R.EBENEZER PONRAJ

3 D.RAJARAM

4 K.SAMINATHAN

5 T.GURUSAMI

6 M.RAGHUPATHY

7 V.RENGARAJ

8 A.GEORGE VINCENT

9 G.JAGADEESAN

10 C.KARTHIRESAN

11 S.ARAVINDAN

12 N.SUNDARESAN

13 T.KALYANASUNDARAM

14 A.UMASANKARAN

15 N.SIVAJI

16 V.KRISHNAMURTHI

17 S.SELVARAJU

18 R.GUNASEKARAN

19 D.SELVAN

20 L.INDUMATHY

21 V.SANKARI

22 N.BABU

23 S.T.SHAMIM KHATHOON

24 D.RAMALINGAM

25 J.MARIA JESEPH

26 S.JANAKIRAMAN

27 M.RAVICHANDER

28 K.HARIHARAN

29 M.PANDIAN

30 M.SHANMUGAM

31 S.RAJAKUMARI

32 C.SACRAPANI

33 A.RAMACHANDRAN

34 S.RAJASEKARAN

35 S.VENKATRAJAN

36 V.KAMALAM

37 JAYANTHI MADUBASHKAR

38 S.SHANMUGA SUNDARAM

39 K.RADHAKRISHNAN

40 V.GOPALAKRISHNAN

41 Y.S.GIRIJA

42 S.JAYARAMAN

43 V.SRINIVASAN

44 K.SELVARAJU

45 K. SASIKALA

46 P. RAMU

47 S.JAYAKUMAR

48 R. MUTHAMILSELVAM

49 S. KRISHAMOORTHY

50 A. SIVASUBRAMANIAN

51 S.SIVAPRAKASAM

52 P. KARUNAGARAN

53 S.GNANASAMBANDAM

54 J. KRISHNAPILLAI

55 N. CHELLAYAN

56 S.LAKSHMANASAMY

57 J. SANKAR

58 P. VIJAYALAKSHMI

59 D.GOWTHAMAN

60 K. VEERAPANDIAN

61 T.RAJENDIRAN

62 S.RAVIKUMAR

63 R.PRINCE EDWARD

64 N. DHANAM

65 A.NATARAJAN

66 P. MANIMOZHI

67 MD. IKRAMULLAH

68 V.R.VENKITACHALAM

69 N. VELLAISWAMY

70 G.MURUGAN

71 P. SELVAKUMAR

72 D.BALSUNDARAM

73 V.RAMAMURTHI

74 P. DHESINGH

75 R.SAKTHIVEL

76 M.MAHALINGAM

77 R.RADHAKRISHNAN

78 P.KANDASAMY

79 P. POUNRAJ

80 T.RAMACHANDRAN

81 S.BASKARAN

82 M.BALRAJU

83 K.GENGARAJ

84 C.RATHINAM

85 M. KAMALAVALLI

86 S. STANLEY THAMBIRAJ

87 P. THANGARAJ ... PETITIONERs in WP No.910 of 2018

1 V.KRISHNASWAMY

2 T. KRISHNAMOORTHY

3\. K.RAJENDRAN

4 N. JAYAPAL

5 A.PULLAIAH

6 K. KARUPPAIYAN

7 C. VELLAMUTHI

8 V. DHARMALINGAM

9 G.V. SEGAR

10\. T. KUMARAVEL

11 K.T. NATARAJAN

12 D. ARAUGATHAI

13 P. DHANAPAL

14 M.MANI

15 B. SRINIVASAN

16 M. THANGARAJU

17 N. SIVAGNANAM

18 P. MARUTHAPILLA

19 R. DUARIRAJ

20. K. ELANGOVAN

21. P.MARIAALPHONSE

22 R.MOHAN

23 S.MANI

24. E.RAJU

25. A. SELLAMUTHU

26 R. GOVINDARAJAN

27 K.M.PONJAISANKAR

28 K. NATARAJAN

29 K. MURUGESAPANDIA

30 K. SUBRAMANIAN

31 T. GUNASEKAR

32 V. AYYAMPERUMAL

33 A. SRINIVASAN

34 P. GANESA BOOPATHI

35 P. PERIYASAMY

36 D. ANANDRAJ

37. P. SHANMUGAM

38. M.K. SHANMUGAM

39 A. RAJAGOPAL

40 N. TAMILVANAN

41 C. MOHANRAJ

42 T. SANTHANAM

43 K. ARUNCHONAN

44 S. SANKARAPANDIAN

45 D. CHANDRASEKAR

46 A. NALLASELVAN

47 E. DHANAPAL

48 M. JAYANATHAN

49 G. MANI

50 S. SELVARAJ

51 T. DURAISAMY

52 T. MEENAKSHISUNDARAM

53 G. KANDASAMY

54. N. DAMODARAN

55 N. KRISHNAN

56 P. CHINNASAMY

57 D. THIYAGARAJAN

58 C.A. PAUL DHANARAJ

59 A. UDAYAKUMAR

60 R. VIJAYARAGHAVAN

61 A. ARUMAIRAJ

62 S. VIJAYARAJAN

63 K. KARUPPIAH

64 K.S. KRISHNASAMY

65 T. PARTHASARATHY

66 A. MALAICHAMY

67 S. KALIMUTHU

68 R. MUTHAIYAN

69 S. KULASEKARAN

70 K. ILANGOVAN

71 N. SAMPATH

72 T. SUNDARAM

73 M. JAYAPERUMAL

74 R. SRINIVASAN

75 V. CHURULI

76 K. APPAVOO

77 S.P. RAMANATHAN

78 S. THIRUNAVUKKARASU

79 M. ADAIKKAPPAN

80 M. MARIMUTHU

81\. A. PONNUSWAMY

82 R. MUTHUMAHALINGAM

83\. U. KASTHURI

84\. K. JAGANATHAN

85 M. JEYAPANDIAN

86 M. RADHAKRISHNAN

87 R. EZHILSELVI

88 R. SREEDHARAN

89 R. KANNAN ..PETITIONERs in W.P.22343 of 2018.

1 LMW PENSIONERS WELFARE ASSO
REP.BY ITS PRESIDENT V.VELUCHAMY
... PETITIONER in WP No.30681 of 2018

1 D.SELVARAJ ... PETITIONER in WP No.30684 of 2018

1 K.SIVANANDAN ... PETITIONER in WP No.30688 of 2018

1 N.THULASIDAS

2 T.P.KESAVANUNNI

3 K.NAGARAJAN

4 S.MOHANAKUMAR

5 R.MUTHUSAMY

6 C.KANNAKUTTY

7 K.V.AMBUJAKSHAN

8 D.VENUGOPAL

9 C.VENUGOPALAN

10 R.VELUSAMY

11 A.PATRIC PAUL

12 R.RADHAKRISHNAN ... PETITIONERs in WP No.31347 of 2018

1 K.MAHADEVAN

2 K.PONNUSAMY

3 S. VENKATACHALAM

4 V.MAILVAHANAM

5 UDAYA KUMAR

6 SH.ABDUL RAZACK

7 M.RAJASEKARAN

... PETITIONERs in WP No.31358 of 2018

1 D.MOHAN RAJ

2 M.SELVARAJ

3 M.S.SUBRAMANIAN

4 N.SRIDHARAN

5 B.RANJAN

6 V.SUDARSAN

7 R.ANGAIARKANNI

8 R.SUMATHY

9 V.ARULNATHAN

10 P.GOVINDAN

11 A.SAMIYULLAH SHERIFF

12 S.MANOHARAN

13 P.SUBBIAH

14 R.KOTHANDAN

15 A.THANKARAJ

16 B.BASKARAN

17 P.KANAGASABAPATHY

18 K.C.RANJITH

19 K.GOPALAKRISHNAM

20 P.GOPI

21	N.SIVA
22	D.RAJESWARI
23	G.PAYANI
24	V.RAJESWARI
25	S.PETER GEMONIE
26	P.NARAYANAN
27	V.CHANDRALEKHA
28	R.GANESAN
29	D.S.LIAQUATH ALI KHAN
30	RITA RANI
31	C.KUMAR
32	P.RAJENDRAN
33	V.RAMALINGAM
34	V.SIVANANDAM
35	A.BOOPALAN
36	R.SANTHANALAKSHMI
37	D.ARULPRAGASAM
38	S.MUTHUSWAMY
39	K.ADIKESAVALU
40	E.SELVAMANI
41	S.VENU
42	N.GOWRI
43	B.SEKARAN
44	DEENADAYALAN

45	P.PALANISAMY
46	VIJAYABASKAR
47	M.SREERAMULU
48	Y.K.USHA
49	C.PANNEERSELVAM
50	RAJENDRAN
51	K.R.VASANTHI
52	R.JAYACHANDRA BABU
53	K.SWARNALATHA
54	I.ANNIE LOURDES
55	M.V.MOORTHY
56	V.ARUMUGAM
57	K.RAMA
58	A.KAMALAKANNAN
59	D.MADIVANAN
60	T.SIVAPRAGASAM
61	N.KRISHNAMURTHY
62	M.ANBALAGAN
63	V.KRISHNAN
64	P.THIRUNAVUKKARASU
65	ANURADHA
66	K.PANDURANGAN
67	VIJAYALAKSHMI
68	D.RAMAMOHAN RAO

69 J.V.R.K.SHARMA

70 VEERAIAH

71 RAKESH RAJ SHARMA

72 G.JAYASEELAN

73 K.ANANDA KUMAR

74 BISWANATH MITRA

75 M.DEVASAGAYAM

76 K.PALANICHAMY

77 P.B.R.SRINIVASAN

78 PARANTHAMAN

79 T.THIYAGARAJAN

80 S.LOUIS GEMONIE

81 S.A.THIYAGARAJ

82 P.R.GEETHA

83 M.KRISHNAN

84 M.N.NAGAPPAN

85 K.P.KAMALAKARAN

86 NSIC RETIRED EMPLOYEES WELFA
RE ASSOCIATION REP BY ITS PRESIDENT
... PETITIONERs in WP No.2429 of 2019

1 K.TEEKACHAR

2 S.SANKARI

3 G.INDUMATHY

4 R.BALASUNDARAM

5 N.SAMPATHKUMAR

6 K.L.BALASUBRAMANIAN

7 G.RAGHU

8 V.RENGANATHAN

9 C.VENKATA SWAMY

10 G.GOPALAKRISHNAN

11 G.HAIRDOSS

12 M.L.PRAKASHA

13 NSIC RETIRED EMPLOYEES WELFARE ASSOCIATION REP BY ITS PRESIDENT

... PETITIONERs in WP No.2433 of 2019

1 RATHNAKUMAR K.V

2 PASUVALINGAM.K.

3 VEERASAMY

4 KRISHNAN.T

5 PANNEERSELVAM.N

6 RENGASAMY.V

7 KARUPPUSAMY.P

8 ARCHUNAN.M

9 RAMANUJAM.V

10 JAFFAR HUSSAIN.G

11 JAGANNATHAN.S

12 MUTHUSAMY.S

13 MURUGASAMY.R

14 BALAKRISHNAN.S

15 KALIYAMOORTHY.R

16 MARIMUTHU.D.P.

17 MOHIDEEN BATCHA.S

18 SRIDHARAN.R

19 PALANISAMY.S

20 NATESAN.P

21 MADHAIYAN.K

22 SELVARAJU.A

23 KUMARESAN.S

24 VENKATARAMAN.J

25 KARUPPANAN.G

26 PATTAN.V

27 MYLWAGANAN.A

28 CHANDRASEKARAN.P

29 MUNIAPPAN.S

30 PALANISAMY.A

31 CHIDAMBARAM.S.P

32 MEIGNANAMURTHY.C

33 KATHIRVELU.M

34 SUBBAIYAN.P

35 THANGARAJU.K

36 SELVARAJ.P

37 RAMALINGAM.M

38 KANDASAMY.A

39 SEKARAN.C

40 BALAN.C

41 VEERAMANI .V

42 CHANDRASEKARAN.V.V

43 RENGASAMY.P

44 PONNUSAMY.G

45 SRINIVASAN.K

46 NATESAN.R

47 VENUGOPAL.N

48 SELLAPERUMAL.A

49 SHANMUGAM.K

50 CHINNASAMY.P

51 THANGARAJ.K

52 SINGARAN.M

53 MOHANAKRISHNAN.G

54 DHANASEKARAN.B

55 KUNJAPPAN.K

56 GUNASEKARAN.R

57 NAGARAJAN.K

58 KRISHNAMURTHI.R

59 ANNADURAI.V

60 SOUNDARARAJAN.S

61 VADIVELU.K.S.

62 SATYANARAYANA.T

63 K.ALGESAN

64	R.UTHIRAPATHY
65	MATHIYALAGAN.M.P.
66	SUNDARARAJAN.R
67	KALIYAPERUMAL.D
68	JAYARAMAN.R
69	K.NATARAJAN
70	SINGARAVELU.K.S.
71	SIVARAMAN.G
72	MURTHY RAJ.V
73	JEEVANANDAM.K.
74	VETHASIROMONY.C
75	KALAISELVAN.T
76	NAVANEETHAN.P
77	SADASIVAM.B
78	KITTAPPA.V
79	ANANDAN.N
80	RAMASAMY.M
81	KRISHNAMOORTHY.M
82	THANGAVEL.S
83	SUBBARAYAN.R
84	K.PITCHAIMUTHU
85	SEETHARAMAN.C
86	MANI.C
87	RAJENDRAN.P

88 YESUNATHAR.M

89 PERIASWAMY.R

90 KUMAR .P

91 SEERANGAN.P.

92 SUNDARARAJ .A.

93 SUBBAIYAN .R

94 SHANMUGAM .K.

95 VENKATESAN T.R.

96 SRINIVASAN .A.

97 ELUMALAI .R

98 ARUMUGAM .P.

99 PALANISAMY .V

100 RAMALINGAM .M

101 RAMASAMY M.

102 K.P.DURAISAMY

103 R. SEETHARAMAN

104 M.M.PALANISAMY

105 R.GOPALAN

106 K.PONNAMBALAM

107 A.KRISHNASWAMY

108 MATHESWRAN .M

109 P.GNANARAJ

110 K.RAGAVAN

111 SHAIK. ABDUL RASOOL

112 V.SELVARAJ

113 P.ARUNACHALAM

114 S.MATHIYALAGAN

115 K.P.PRAKASAM

116 K.MUNIYANDI

117 S.BALAN

118 G.VEERASAMY

119 M.KARUPPAIYAN

120 N.VISWANATHAN

121 C.P.VENAYAGEM

122 R.SELVARAJU

123 K.C.RAMASAMY

124 P.MOHAN

125 A.RAMASAMY

126 K.PALANISAMY

127 K.M.PALANISAMY

128 R.M.KUMAR

129 V.MOHAN

130 CH.SRIMURTHI

131 CH SREE RAMA RISHY

132 K.MOHAN

133 MUTHUSAMY .K.

134 V.P.RAJU

135 P. RASAPPAN

136 S. THANGARAJ.

137 P. SRINIVASAN

138 M. KOTTAICHAMI

139 K. KRISHNAMOORTHY

140 NALLAPPAN.M

141 G. VENKATACHALAM

142 S. SAMSAHAYAM JAYAKUMAR

143 N. MURALI

144 R. PAPPUDURAI

145 V. MASANAM

146 V. PAUL RAMASUBBU

147 S. NAZEER

148 M. MANI

149 SUBRAMANIAN K

150 G. NARAYANASAMY

151 A. PANNEERSELVAM

152 A.K. PITCHAI

153 P GANESAN

154 R. PANDIARAJAN

155 G.S VENKATESAN

156 V. GOVINDASAMY

157 M. CHINNAPPA RAJU

158 K. GOPALAN

159 T. ARUMUGAM

160 K. TAMILARASAN

161 M. GANESAN

162 K.N. PALANISAMY

163 A. THIYAGARAJAN

164 M. PERIASAMY

165 K.UDHAYAKUMAR

166 R. RAMAN

167 G. THOMAS

168 C. RAJENDRAN

169 S. KASHTHURI

170 U. ANTHONISAMY

171 P. SOLOMON

172 M.S. GOPAL

173 K. RATHINAM

174 S. GNANAMANI

175 DEVADOS

176 E. SAMBASIVAN

177 R. KALIAYAPERUMAL

178 S. MAHIZHMARAN

179 D.SESHACHALAM

180 T.R.KARTHIKEYAN

181 P.CHANDRASEKAR

182 J.MUTHU VENGADAPATHY

183 M.ZAFFAR ALI KHAN

184 V.KANAKARAJ

185 K.SIVAGURUNATHAN

186 G.RATHINA SABABATHI

187 A.PALANIAPPAN

188 K.MEGANATHAN

189 K.R.POONAMBALAM

190 R.MANICKAM

191 C.S.SWAMINATHAN

192 R.NALLASAMY

193 P.PERIYANNAN

194 R.PALANI

195 V.MURUGAN

196 M.GUNASEKARAN

197 S.KANDASAMY

198 Y.SREENIVASULU

199 A.MULLAINATHAN

200 R.MATHI

201 C.D.VENKATESAN

202 A.PRABAKARAN

203 S.K.MAJUNU

204 B.FAIYAZ KHAN

205 P.A.MOLIE YAZHAGAUR RAJ

206 S.SOUNDARARAJAN

207 K.CHANDRASEKARAN

208 V.SHREE RAMAMURTHY

209 P.KANAGARAJ

210 P.KRISHNAN

211 R.GOPALAKRISHNAN

212 M.CHINNIAH

213 P.SENGOTTIAYAN

214 K.POOMALAI

215 R.GURUSAMY

216 J.CHANDRAMOHAN

217 P.SHANMUGAM

218 A.SHANMUGAM

219 K.DHARAMALINGAM

220 N.RAJU

221 V.GANESAN

222 S.PONNUSAMY

223 P. MANOHARAN

224 S. MUTHUKUMARASAMY

225 N. KRISHNAN

226 G. MUTHUSAMY

227 K. KARUNANITHI

228 M. DHAMODARAN

229 M. VIVEKANANDAN

230 K. MEENAKSHISUNDARAM

231 THOMAS A CHAKO

232 N. SUBRAHMANYESWARA RAO

233 K. PREMKUMAR

234 E.KRISHNASWAMY.

235 A. MAHALINGAM

236 S.R. PALANISAMY

237 S. SEKAR

238 S. NARAYANAN

239 M. CHINNATHAMBI

240 R. KANDASAMY

241 N. PUSHKARAN

242 D. DHARMALINGAM

243 A. RAMASAMY

244 R. BALAKRISHNAN

245 P. ARUMUGAM

246 E. SUNKANNA

247 M. CHINNAPPAN

248 R. VISHWANATHAN

249 S. SANTHANAKRISHNAN

250 R. KRISHNAMOORTHY

251 VEERAN.M.

252 RAMALINGAM.N

253 ANNADURAI.R

254 SELVARAJ.P

255 MANOHARAN.M

256 DURAISAMY.L

257 SENGODAN.M

258 VENGIDUSAMY.N

259 KESAVAN.C

260 MANOHARAN.K

261 ANNAMALAI.K

262 PANNEER SELVAM.C.S

263 GOVINDARAJU.T

264 CHANDRASEKARAN.S

265 AZHAGAR.N. ... PETITIONERs in WP No.4308 of 2019

1 R.GOVINDARAJ

2 N.P.PRABHAKARAN

3 P.KUMAR

4 A.RANGANATHAN

5 M.SHANMUGAM

6 R.SUBRAMANIAN

7 C.SAROJA

8 N.BHADRAPPAN

9 R.VEERAN

10 K.RANGASAMY

11 V.RAMU

12 P.SELVARAJ

13 P.PALANISAMY

14 P.KUPPUSWAMY

15 M.THIRUMOORTHY

16 K.VELLINGIRI

17 P.SUBRAMANIAN

18 S.AGASTHIYA GURUMURTHY

19 K.A.HAMJA HUSSAIN

20 RAJAN THOMAS

21 K.SIVASANKARAN

22 H.ABDUL MAJEETH

23 V.GIREESAN ... PETITIONERs in WP No.4436 of 2019

1 GENERAL SECRETARY
THALEMA PODU THOLILAR SANGAM 5/243 JAGIR
AMMAPALAYAM NEAR MGR STATUE SALEM- 636005
... PETITIONER in WP No.5315 of 2019

1 S.JAYARAJ

2 K.M.ESAKKIAPPAN

3 N.GOMATHY

4 P.NALLATHAMBI

5 R.NACHIAPPAN

6 S.MANIAN

7 P.SRINIVASAN

8 R.SHANMUGAM

9 A.SAKUNTHALA

10 S.SARASWATHY

11 A.RAJENDRAN

12 P.SELVAMANI

13 G.INDRANI

14 P.THANGAVEL

15 D.RAMACHANDRAN

16 C.PAPANNA

17 M.GOVINDARAJU

18 R.HARIHARASUBRAMANIAN

19 P.GUNASEKARAN

20 N.NAGARAJAN

21 K.KRISHNAVENI

22 S.MALAYAMMAL

23 T.DURAIMANICKAM

24 Y.JUSTIN DEVADAS

25 P.KARUNAKARAN ... PETITIONERs in WP No.6289 of 2019

1 V.DURAI SUBRAMANIAN

2 R.PERIYASAMY

3 G.KARUNAKARAN ... PETITIONERs in WP No.6296 of 2019

1 R.RAGHUPATHY

2 S.M.ARUMUGAM

3 P.MANIVEL

4 S.KARUPPIAH

5 R.GANESAN

6 G.SESHAYEE

7 K.RAMASAMY

8 S.PERIYASAMY

9 L.PALANIVEL

10 K.DURAISAMY

11 P.MUTHUSAMY

12 C.ANNAMALAI

13 K.RAJENDRAN

14 A.MUTHUSAMY

15 N.VENKATESAN

16 N.JAMBULINGAM

17 M.THANGARAJ

18 P.MOHANASUNDARAM

19 P.RAVICHANDRAN

20 P.MUTHUSAMY

21 S.VEERAPANDIAN

22 P.RAJARAM

23 S.RAVI

24 D.UDAYAKUMAR

25 J.MADHAVAN

26 V.SUBRAMANIYAN

27 P.MURALEETHARAN ... PETITIONERs in WP No.6902 of 2019

1 BPCL PENSIONERS WELFARE ASSOCIATION REP. BY ITS PRESIDENT
... PETITIONER in WP No.26234 of 2017

1 O.N.G.C. OFFICERS ASSOCIATION (OOA) REP. BY ITS WORKING PRESIDENT
... PETITIONER in WP No.32879 of 2017

1 G.MURUGAIYAN

2 RR VISWANATHAN

3 T.SUBRAMAIAN

4 D.V. SRIDHARAN

5 M.SRIDHAR

6 V. JAYAPAL

7 KAREEMULLA KHAN

8 K.C. PASUPATHY

9 L. VELAYUDHAM

10 V. SWAMINATHAN

11 T. ARULDASS

12 G. ASOKAN

13 S. DEVARAJ

14 K. KRIBANANDAM

15 A. VENKATESAN

16 M. ANTHURAJ

17 R. SAMPATHKUMAR

18 V. NAGARAJAN

19 R. SHANTHA

20 R. RAMACHANDRAN

21 RAJARAM RAMESH

22 L. RAMALINGAM

23 C. ARUMUGAM

24 RUSSELL J LOWE

25 D. PRABHAKARAN

26	K. PICHAMUTHU
27	T. CHANDRAN
28	R. THANGARAJ
29	P. MUNUSWAMY
30	V.E. GEORGE ROYAL
31	J. SUBRAMANIAN
32	M ARUMUGHAM
33	MD. HUSSAIN MOULANA
34	A. THILAKAR
35	K. RENGARAJ
36	R. PONNURAJ
37	B.GRIJABAI
38	M. TEEKARAMAN
39	G. MOHANRAJ
40	S.VENKATESAN
41	G.KRISHNAN
42	N. JAYABALAN
43	T. PAKKIRISAMY
44	P.JAYA
45	K. ANANDAN
46	J. ALEXANDER
47	P. MAGIMAINATHAN
48	P.MANJAPPAN
49	K.KANDHI

50 B.THANIKESAN

51 S.DEVANBU

52 S.SUBRAMANIAM

53 R.S.AGORAM

54 R.SRIDHARAN

55 G.KANNAN

56 E.ETTIYAN

57 K.RAGHU

58 S.MURUGAN

59 V.MARGABANDU

60 B.MASTHAN

61 C.CHINNA RAJ

62 A.R.AMEERKHAN

63 R.CHANDRAN

64 A.SIRAJUDEEN

65 V. MOORTHY

66 T.M. MANICKAM

67 ARASAN BALAKRISHNAN

68 K.CHELLAN

69 R.PASUPATHY

70 R.ARIVANANDAM ... PETITIONERs in WP No.33605 of 2017

1 B.V. DURGAPRASAD

2 P. SRIRAMULU

3 C.RAJALINGAM

4	R.S.CHOKKANATHAN
5	R.K.MUNIRATHINAM
6	G.ASAITHAMBI
7	P.SIVARAJ
8	E.V.NAGABUSHANAM
9	A.RAMADASS
10	G.RUCKMANGATHAN
11	G. GUNATIVIYA
12	B.PITCHAIMUTHU
13	N. GOPALAKRISHNAN
14	R.SRIDHAR
15	M. SELVAM
16	M.KANNADASAN
17	D.MURTHY
18	P.DHANAPAL
19	K.KRISHNASWAMY
20	G.SUGUNADEVI NATARAJAN
21	I.SHUNMUGAM
22	A.CHANDRAN
23	G.MAIYALAGAN
24	M.MUNUSWAMY
25	M.KRISHNAN
26	M. SAMPATH
27	D.ANANDAN

28 B. DHANAPAL

29 I.SELVAM

30 G.RAJU

31 S.DHAKSHINAMURHY

32 M.K.MOHAMED RAFIC

33 P.SIVARAMA SUBRAMANIAN

34 J.JAYAKUMAR

35 A.V.ARJUNAN

36 K. VEERASWAMY

37 P. BALAKRISHNAN

38 M KANNAN

39 K. GURUNATHAN

40 D. JAGANATHAN

41 A.NARAYANAN

42 B.J. VIDYASAGAR

43 A.KESAVAN

44 A.S. CHANDRASEKAR

45 S. MURTHY

46 S. PANDURANGAN

47 JEYAPRADHA

48 D.VASUDEVAN

49 B. SRINIVASAN

50 D. SELVARAJ

51 B. DHANANJALIAN

52 C. ANBUSELVAN

53 G. PURUSHOTHAMAN

54 R. KRISHNAMURTHY

55 S. CHANDRASEKARAN

56 C.S. KUMAR

57 K. GURUVAIAH

58 I. SELVARAJ

59 E. BABUJI

60 N. MANOHARARAN

61 K. VASUDEVAN

62 K. YESUPATHAM

63 K. JEYAKUMAR

64 K.V. MAITHREYIE

65 K. SANKARANARAYANAN

66 L. RAJENDRAN

67 R. RETHINAM

68 R. KRISHNASAMY ... PETITIONERs in WP No.33606 of 2017

1 V.VIJAYAKUMAR

2 A.K. VIJAYARAGAVAN

3 H. V. SREEKANDASWAMY

4 A.SUKUMAR

5 R. SESHADRI

6 A. R. VARADARAJAN

7 S. NESAMONY

8	K. SANKARANARAYANAN
9	M. PEETHAMBARAM
10	G. SRIDHARAN
11	R. MOHANASUNDARAM
12	T. GUNASEKARAN
13	M. MURUGESAN
14	S. PARAMANANDAN
15	Y. RAMA RAO
16	P. GOVINDARAJ
17	A.ELUMALAI
18	A.CHELLAMUTHU
19	G. NATARAJAN
20	G. GOVINDARAJAN
21	R. SAYEE
22	K. PANDURANGAN
23	A.KANNIAYAN
24	M. SEKAR
25	A.PANNEERSELVAM
26	V. VENKATESAN
27	A.KASINATHAN
28	SARASA PARAMASIVAM
29	P. PALANIVEL
30	C. MUNUSAMY
31	P. BALAKRISHNAN

32 K. GNANASEKARAN

33 V. SUNDARAMURTHY

34 P. THAMBIDURAI

35 S. A. MANICKAM

36 K. RAJA

37 R. SUNDARAM

38 C. SUBRAMANI

39 R. SUKUMAR

40 V. M. VENKATAKRISHNAN

41 S. RAJASEKAR

42 S. SUBRAMANIAN

43 G. SUKUMAR

44 G. POONGAVANAM

45 E. JAYARAMAN

46 V. KANNIYAPPAN

47 P. VIJAYAKUMAR

48 K. MALLAYAN

49 S. NAYAGAM

50 N. MOHAN

51 P. SEETHARAMAN

52 S.JAYAVEERAPANDIAN

53 K.KALIAPERUMAL

54 N.ANBALAGAN

55 R.SELVARAJ

56 P.SUBRAMANIYAN

57 S.KRISHNAMOORTHY

58 P.KAMALA

59 G.PUSHPAVALLI

60 P.RAMAIYAN

61 P.RAJESWARY

62 M.RAJAGOPAL

63 B.RAMALINGAM

64 P. MOORTHY

65 B. CHELLAMMAL

66 KAMAKSHI A.S.

67 G.ANNAMALAI ... PETITIONERs in WP No.33607 of 2017

1 INDIAN OIL RETD. OFFR.WELFARE
ASSON.(SR) CHENNAI ... PETITIONER in WP No.34331 of 2017

Vs.

1 UNION OF INDIA
REP. BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT
NEW DELHI 110 001

...R1 in W.P. 14368, 10051, 10274, 10413 to 10415, 11609, 14145, 14189, 14736, 16229, 17170, 20458 to 20464, 22403, 23713, 24661 & 24662, 25483, 29512, 5405 to 5407, 5562 & 5563, 23131, 7126, 846, 909, 910, 22343, 30681, 30684, 30688, 31347, 31358/2018, 2429 & 2433/2019, 4308 & 4436/2019, 6902/2019, 26234/2017, 32879/2017, 33605/2017 to 33607/2017 & 34331/2017.

2 REGIONAL PF COMMISSIONER I
(PENSION) BHAVISHYA NIDHI BHAWAN 14
BHIKANJI CAMA PALACE NEW DELHI 110 066
..R1 in W.P.13308/2018
..R2 in W.P.14368, 10051, 10274, 14189, 14736, 16229, 30681, 30684, 30688, 26234 /2017 & 32879/2017.
..R3
..R4 in W.P.10413 to 10415, 11609 to 11612, 14145, 17170, 20458 to 20464, 22403, 23713, 24661 & 24662, 25483, 29512, 5405 to 5407, 23131, 7126, 846, 909, 910, 22343, 31358/2018, 2429 & 2433/2019, 4308/2019, 6289, 6296/2019, 6902/2019, 33605 to 33607/2019.

3 ADDL. CENTRAL PF COMMISSIONER
HQ (PENSION) EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANISATION BHAVISHYA NIDHI BHAWAN 14
BHIKANJI CAMA PALACE NEW DELHI 110 066
..R1 in W.P.5315/2019
..R2 in W.P.31347, 4436/2018, 6289 & 6296/2019.
..R3 in W.P.14368, 10051, 10274, 10413 to 10415, 11609 to 11612, 14145, 14189,14736, 16229, 17170, 20458 to 20464, 22403, 23713, 24661 & 24662, 25483, 29512, 5405 to 5407, 23131, 7126, 846, 909, 910, 22343, 31358/2018, 2429 & 2433/2019, 4308/2019, 6902/2019, 26234/2017 & 32879/2017, 33605 to 33607/2017.

4 REGIONAL PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER , EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANIZATION , EMPLOYEE PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER (EPFO) CHENNAI 14.
..R1, R2, R3 in W.P.5562, 5563/2018
..R4 in W.P.14368, 10051, 10274,14189, 14736, 16229, 26234/2017.
..R5 in W.P.23431/2018.
..R6 in W.P.10413 to 10415, 11609, 20458 to 20464, 23713, 24661 & 24662, 5405 to 5407, 7126, 846, 909, 910, 22343, 6902/2019, 33605 to 33607/2017.

5. CENTRAL PROVIDENT FUND COMMISSIONER
EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND ORGANIZATION
MINISTRY OF LABOUR LAW AND EMPLOYMENT
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, BHAVISHYA NIDHI BAWAN
NO.14 BHIKANJI CAMA PALACE
NEW DELHI-110 066.

..R1 in W.P. 4804, 6289 & 6296/2019.
..R2 in W.P.10413 to 10415, 11609 to 11612, 14145, 17170, 20458 to 20464, 22403, 23713, 24661 & 24662, 25483, 29512, 5405 to 5407, 23131, 7126, 846, 909,910, 22343, 31358/2018, 2429 & 2433/2019, 4308/2019, 6902/2019, 33605 to 33607/2017, 34331/2017.

6. ADDITIONAL CENTRAL PROVIDENT FUND COMMISSIONER
EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND ORGANISATION
37,ROYAPETTAH HIGH ROAD, CHENNAI 14.

..R5 in W.P.Nos. 10413 to 10415, 11609 to 11612, 14145, 17170, 20458 to 20464, 22403, 23713, 25483, 29512, 5405 to 5407, 7126, 846, 909, 910, 22343, 31358, 4308/2019, 6902/2019, 32879/2017, 33605 to 33607/2017

5 ASSISTANT PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER (EPFO) SUB REGIONAL OFFICE R
40 A TNHB OFFICE COMPLEX MUGAPPAIR ROAD
MUGAPPAIR (EAST) CHENNAI 37

..R5 in W.P.14368/2018

6 OIL AND NATURAL GAS CORP
LTD (ONGC) REP. BY ITS CHAIRMAN & MD ONGC
PANDIT DEENDAYAL UPADHYAYA URJA BHAVA
NELSON MANDELA MARG VASANT KUNJ 110 070

..R6 in W.P.14368/2018

7 ONGC LTD EMPLOYEES
CONTRIBUTORY PROVIDENT FUND TRUST REP. BY
ITS CHAIRMAN SHED NO. 21 TEL BHAWAN ONGC
DEHRADUN 248 003 ..R7 in W.P.14368/2018

REGIONAL PROVIDENT FUND COMMR
O/O.THE EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANISATION BHAVISHYA NIDHI BHAVAN NGO B
COLONY THIRUNELVELI-627 007 TN.
..R5 in W.P.10051/2018, 10274,
14189 & 16229/2018.

SECRETARY
M/S.SOUTHERN PETROCHEMICAL INDUSTRIES CORPON.
LTD. (SPIC) 88 MOUNT ROAD GUINDY CHENNAI-
600 032. ..R6 in W.P.10051/2018,
10274,14189 & 16229/2018

CENTRAL PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER EMPLOYEES PF ORGANISATION
MINISTRY OF LABOUR & EMPLOYMENT GOVT. OF
INDIA BHAVISHYA NIDHI BHAWAN 14 BHIKAJI
CAMA PLACE NEW DELHI
..R2 in W.P.10413 to 10415 and
11609 to 11612/2018.

REGIONAL PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER - I (PENSION) EMPLOYEES PF
ORGANISATION BHAVISHYA NIDHI BHAWAN 14
BHIKAJI CAMA PLACE NEW DELHI
..R4 in W.P.10413 to 10415 and
11609 to 11612/2018.

ADDL. CENTRAL PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANISATION 37 ROYAPETTAH HIGH ROAD
CHENNAI 14
..R5 in W.P.10413 to 10415 and
11609 to 11612/2018.

THE MANAGING DIRECTOR
TAMIL NADU CIVIL SUPPLIES CORP. 12
THAMBUSAMY ROAD KILPAUK CHENNAI 10
..R7 in W.P.10413 to 10415 and
11609 to 11612/2018.

THE MANAGING TRUSTEE
TNCSC EMPLOYEES CONTRIBUTORY PROVIDENT FUND
TRUST TAMIL NADU CIVIL SUPPLIES CORP. 12
THAMBUSAMY ROAD KILPAUK CHENNAI 10
..R5 in W.P.10413 to 10415 and
11609 to 11612/2018.

THE ASSISTANT PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANIZATION PB NO.3875 DR.BALASUNDARAM
ROAD COIMBATORE 641 018

SITRA CONTRIBUTORY PROVIDENT
FUND (TN/8012) 13/37 AVINASHI ROAD TNHB
COLONY CIVIL AERODROME POST NEHRU NAGAR
WEST COIMBATORE TAMIL NADU 641 014
..R2 & R3 in W.P.13308/2018.

REGIONAL PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER I EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANISATION POST BOX NO. 588 SHREE
COMPLEX D BLOCK 18 MADURAI ROAD
THIRUCHIRAPALLI – 620008
..R6 in W.P.14145/2018

TAMIL NADU NEWSPRINT AND
PAPERS LIMITED REP. BY ITS CHAIRMAN 67
MOUNT ROAD GUINDY CHENNAI – 32
..R7 in W.P.14145/2018

THE GENERAL MANAGER (HR)
TAMIL NADU NEWS PRINT AND PAPERS LTD.
KAGITHAPURAM - 639136 KARUR DIST.
..R8 in W.P.14145/2018

TNPL PROVIDENT FUND TRUST
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY KAGITHAPURAM - 639136
KARUR DIST. ..R9 in W.P.14145/2018

REGIONAL PF COMMISSIONER
OFFICE OF THE EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANISATION BHAVISHYA NIDHI BHAWAN NO.37
ROYAPETTAH HIGH RD AZAD NGR ROYAPETTAH
CHENNAI-14

REGIONAL PF COMMISSIONER
OFFICE OF THE EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANISATION NO.3 RAJAJI SALAI TAMBARAM
CHENNAI-45 ..R5 in W.P.14736/2018.

SECRETARY
M/S.SOUTHERN PETROCHEMICAL INDUSTRIES
CORPORATION LTD NO.88 MOUNT RD GUINDY
CHENNAI-32 ..R6 in W.P.14189,14736/2018

SENIOR V.P.INDIA LEGAR/
ETHIC & COMPLIANCE HEAD M/S.TECHNIP INDIA
LTD TECHNIP CENTRE NO.19 VELACHERY MAIN
RD GUINDY CHENNAI-32 ..R7 in W.P.14736/2018.

SECRETARY
M/S. GREENSTAR FERTILSERS LTD. 88 MOUNT
ROAD GUINDY CHENNAI – 600032
..7th Respondent in W.P.16629/2018.

REGIONAL PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER I EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANIZATION POST BOX NO.588 SHREE
COMPLEX D BLOCK 18 MADURAI ROAD
THIRUCHIRAPALLI 620008
..R5 in W.P.6289 & 6296/2019
..R6 in W.P.17170, 22430, 25483, 23131, 31358 & 4308/2019.

TAMIL NADU NEWSPRINT AND
PAPERS LIMITED REP. BY ITS CHAIRMAN 67
MOUNTROAD GUINDY CHENNAI 600032
..R6 & R7 in W.P.6289 & 6296/2019

THE GENERAL MANAGER (HR)
TAMIL NADU NEWS PRINT AND PAPERS LTD.
KAGITHAPURAM - 639136 KARUR DISTRICT
..R7, R8, R9 in W.P.17170, 22403, 25483, 23131, 31358/2018 & 4308/2019.

TNPL PROVIDENT FUND TRUST
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY KAGITHAPURAM 639136
KARUR DIST. ..R7 in W.P.6289 & 6296/2019.

7 THE REGIONAL PROVIDENT FUND
COMMR.-I EMPLOYMENT PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANISATION REGIONAL OFFICE AMBATTUR R40
1A TNHB OFFICE COMPLEX MOGAPPAIR RD
MOGAPPAIR EAST CHENNAI-37
..R7 in W.P.20458 to 20464, 24661 and 24662/2018.

THE CHAIRMAN SUNDARAM
CLAYTON LTD PADI CHENNAI 600 050
..R8 in W.P.20458/2018.

THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER
SUNDARAM CLAYTON EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
CORPORATE OFFICE JAYALAKSHMI ESTATE NO.29
HADDOWS ROAD CHENNAI 600 006
..9th Respondent in W.P.20458/2018

THE MANAGING DIRECTOR
TUBE PRODUCTS OF INDIA (A UNIT OF TUBE
INVESTMENT OF INDIA LTD) AVADI CHENNAI-54
..R8 & R9 in W.P.20459/2018

THE VICE PRESIDENT EMPLOYEES
PROVIDENT FUND TRUST TUBE PRODUCT OF INDIA
AVADI CHENNAI-54 ..9th Respondent in W.P.20459/2018.

THE CHAIRMAN
SUNDARAM FASTNERS LTD PADI CHENNAI-50

THE PRESIDENT FINANCE
CORPORATE OFFICE PF SECTION M/S.SUNDARAM
FASTNERS LTD 7TH FLOOR NO.98A DR.
RADHAKRISHNAN SALAI MYLAPORE CHENNAI-04
..Respondents 8 & 9 in
W.P.20460/2018.

THE CHAIRMAN
BEST & CROMPTON ENGINEERING LTD. NO. 28C
INDUSTRIAL ESTATE (NORTH) AMBATTUR
CHENNAI - 98

THE DIRECTOR
EXECUTIVE PROVIDENT FUND BEST & CROMPTON
ENGINEERING LTD. NO. 28C INDUSTRIAL ESTATE
(NORTH) AMBATTUR CHENNAI – 98 ...R8 & R9 in W.P.20461/2018

THE MANAGING DIRECTOR
GODREJ AGROVET LTD. 1B INDUSTRIAL ESTATE
AMBATTUR CHENNAI - 98

VICE PRESIDENT - HR
GODREJ AGROVET LTD. EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT
FUND TRUST PIROJSHA NAGAR VIKHROLL EAST
MUMBAI – 400079 ..Respondents in W.P.20462/2018.

THE CHAIRMAN
BRAKES INDIA LTD. PADI CHENNAI - 50

THE GENERAL MANAGER -
FINANCE EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND TRUST
BRAKES INDIA LTD. PADI CHENNAI – 50
.. R8 & R9 in W.P.20463/2018.

THE CHAIRMAN
TI DIAMOND CHAIN INDIA (A UNIT OF TUBE
INVESTMENT OF INDIA LTD.) PB NO. 11 CTH
ROAD AMBATTUR CHENNAI - 53

THE DIRECTOR
EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND TI DIAMOND CHAIN
INDIA PB NO. 11 CTH ROAD AMBATTUR
CHENNAI – 53 ..R8 & 9 in W.P.20464/2018.

THE MANAGING DIRECTOR
LUCAS TVS LTD. PADI CHENNAI-600 050.

THE HEAD-CORPORATE(IR)
LUCAS TVS PROVIDENT FUND TRUST PADI
CHENNAI-600 050. ..Respondents 8 & 9 in
W.P.No.23713 of 2018

THE MANAGING DIRECTOR
WHEELS INDIA LTD PADI CHENNAI 50

THE VICE PRESIDENT
(FINANCE) STAFF EMPLOYEE PROVIDENT FUND
WHEELS INDIA LTD PADI CHENNAI – 600050
..Respondents 8 & 9 in
W.P.24461/2018.

THE WHOLE TIME DIRECTOR
WABCO INDIA LTD PLANT I PLOT NO.3(SP) 3RD
MAIN ROAD AMBATTUR INDUSTRIAL ESTATE
CHENNAI -600 058

THE GENERAL MANAGER-FINANCE
EMPLOYEE PROVIDENT FUND TRUST WABCO INDIA
LTD PLANT I PLOT NO.3(SP) 3RD MAIN ROAD
AMBATTUR INDUSTRIAL ESTATE CHENNAI -600 058
..Respondents 8 & 9 in
W.P.24662/2018

TAMIL NADU SMALL INDUSTRIES
DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. REP. BY ITS
CHAIRMAN THIRU.VI.KA.INDUSTRIAL ESTATE
GUINDY CHENNAI-600032.

TAMIL NADU SIDCO PROVIDENT
FUND TRUST THIRU.VI.KA.INDUSTRIAL ESTATE
GUINDY CHENNAI-600 032. ..Respondents 6 & 7 in
W.P.29512/2018.

THE ASSISTANT PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANIZATION PB NO.3875 DR.BALASUNDARAM ROAD
COIMBATORE- 641 018

NTC (T&P) LTD MANAGERS
SUPERVISORS & HEAD OFFICE STAFF PF (TN7510)
NATIONAL TEXTILE CORPORATION LTD SOUTHERN
REGIONAL OFFICE 35 SOMASUNDARAM MILLS RD
COIMBATORE ..R2 & R3 in W.P.4804/2018

FOOD CORPORATION OF INDIA
(FCI) REP BY CHAIRMAN & MD 16-20
BARAKHAMBA LANE NEW DELHI-110 001

THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
(SOUTH) FOOD CORPORATION OF INDIA NO.3
HADDOWS ROAD CHENNAI-06

FCI PROVIDENT FUND TRUST
REP BY ITS SECRETARY FOOD CORPORATION OF
INDIA (FCI) 16-20 BARAKHAMBA LANE NEW
DELHI-110 001 ..Respondents 7,8,9 in
W.P.5405/2018 to 5407/2018

THE EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANISATION REP. BY THE CHIEF PROVIDENT
COMMISSIONER BHAVISHYA NIDHI BHAVAN 14
BHIKAJI CAMA PALACE NEW DELHI 110 066
...R2 in W.P.5562 & 5563/2018.

ASHOK LEYLAND LIMITED
1 SARDAR PATEL ROAD GUINDY CHENNAI 32
REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
..R3 & R4 in W.P.5562 & 5563/2018

THE MANAGING DIRECTOR
THE TAMIL NADU STATE APEX COOPERATIVE BANK
LTD. 233 (NEW NO. 4) NSC BOSE ROAD
CHENNAI 1

THE CHAIRMAN
THE TNSC BANK EPF TRUST 233 (NEW NO. 4)
NSC BOSE ROAD CHENNAI 1 ..Respondents 7 & 8 in W.P.7126/2018.

THE CHAIRMAN CUM MD
SHRI PUNEET AGARWAL THE HANDICRAFTS AND
HANDLOOMS EXPORTS CORPORATION OF INDIA LTD.
JAWAHAR VYAPAR BHAVAN ANNEXE 1 TOLSTOY
MARG NEW DELHI 110001

THE BRANCH-INCHARGE
THE HANDICRAFTS AND HANDLOOMS EXPORTS
CORPORATION OF INDIA LTD. SP 31-32
INDUSTRIAL ESTATE GUINDY CHENNAI 600032.

THE HHEC OF INDIA LTD.
PROVIDENT FUND TRUST REP. BY SECRETARY
JAWAHAR VYAPAR BHAVAN ANNEXE 1 TOLSTOY MARG
NEW DELHI 110001. ..Respondents 7,8 & 9 in W.P.846/2018

TAMIL NADU CEMENTS
CORPORATION LTD. REP. BY CHAIRMAN &
MANAGING DIRECTOR LLA BUILDINGS II FLOOR
735 ANNA SALAI CHENNAI 600002

TANCEM PROVIDENT FUND TRUST
REP. BY SECRETARY LLA BUILDINGS II
LOOR 735 ANNA SALAI CHENNAI 600002
..Respondents 7 & 8 in
W.P.909/2018, 6902/2019.

TAMIL NADU CEMENTS
CORPORATION LTD. REP. BY CHAIRMAN &
MANAGING DIRECTOR LLA BUILDINGS II FLOOR
735 ANNA SALAI CHENNAI 600002

TANCEM PROVIDENT FUND TRUST
REP. BY SECRETARY LLA BUILDINGS II
FLOOR 735 ANNA SALAI CHENNAI 600002.
...Respondents 7,8,9 in W.P.910/2018,
W.P.22343/2018.

THE REGIONAL PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER EMPLOYEE S PF ORGANIZATION DR.
BALASUNDARAM ROAD COIMBATORE-641 018
..R3 in W.P.30681, 30684, 30688/2018

THE ADDITIONAL CENTRAL PROVI
DENT FUND COMMISSIONER EMPLOYEE S PF
ORGANIZATION DR.BALASUNDARAM ROAD
COIMBATORE-641 018

THE ASSISTANT PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER(PENSION) EMPLOYEE S PF
ORGANIZATION DR.BALASUNDARAM ROAD
COIMBATORE-641 018

THE ASSISTANT PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER(ACCOUNTS) EMPLOYEE S PF
ORGANIZATION DR.BALASUNDARAM ROAD
COIMBATORE-641 018

LAKSHMI MACHINE WORKS LTD.
REP. BY MANAGING DIRECTOR HAVING THE
REGISTERED OFFICE AT PERIYANAICKEN PALAYAM
COIMBATORE-641 020 ..R4 to R7 in W.P.30681,30684
and 30688/2018.

REGIONAL PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANIZATIION EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
OFFICE BALASUNDARAM ROAD COIMBATORE

THE MANAGEMENT
ACC LIMITED REP. BY ITS MANAGER - HR
MADUKKARAI CEMENT WORKS
MADUKKARAI POST 641 105 COIMBATORE DISTRICT
...Respondents 3 & 4 in W.P.31347/2018

THE NSIC LIMITED
NSIC BHAVAN REP BY THE CHAIRMAN AND
MANAGING DIRECTOR OKHLA INDUSTRIAL ESTATE
NEW DELHI 110 020

THE NSIC EPF TRUST
REP BY THE EPF SECRETARY NSIC LTD. NSIC
BHAVAN OKHLA INDUSTRIAL ESTATE
NEW DELHI 110 020 ..Respondents 5 & 6 in W.P.2429/2019,
W.P.2433/2019.

REGIONAL PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANIZATION EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
OFFICE BALASUNDARAM ROAD COIMBATORE

THE MANAGEMENT
ACC LTD REP BY ITS MANAGER- HR MADUKKARAI
CEMENT WORKS MADUKKARAI POST- 641 105
COIMBATORE DT ..Respondents 3 & 4 in
W.P.4436/2019.

THE REGIONAL COMMISSIONER
REGIONAL OFFICE EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANISATION JAYALAKSHMI PLAZA SWONAPURI
SALEM-5

THE MANAGEMENT OF
THALEME ELECTRONICS INDIA PVT LTD
SURAMANGALAM   SALEM- 636005
..Respondents 2 & 3 in
W.P.5315/2019.

ASSISTANT PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER (EPFO) SUB REGIONAL OFFICE
R-40 A TNHB OFFICE COMPLEX MUGAPPAIR ROAD
MUGAPPAIR (EAST) CHENNAI 600 037

BHARAT PETROLEUM CORPORATION
LTD (BPCL) REP. CHAIRMAN & MD BHARAT
BHAVAN - 1 & 2 4 & 6 CURRIMBHOY ROAD
MUMBAI 400 001

INDIAN PROVIDENT TRUST
REP.BY ITS TRUSTEES BHARAT PETROLEUM
CORPORATION LTD (BPCL) BHARAT BHAVAN 4 & 6
CURRIMBHOY ROAD MUMBAI 400 001
..Respondents 5 to 7 in W.P.26234/2017

REGIONAL PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER-I REGIONAL OFFICE
BHAVISHYANIDHI BHAWAN VYOMPRASTH KANWALI
GMS ROAD DEHRADUN. ..R4 in W.P.32879/2017.

OIL AND NATURAL GAS
CORPORATION LTD (ONGC) REP. BY ITS CHAIRMAN
& MD ONGC PANDIT DEENDAYAL UPADHYAYA URJA
BHAVAN NELSON MANDELA MARG VASANT
KUNJ-110 070.

ONGC LTD EMPLOYEES
CONTRIBUTORY PROVIDENT FUND TRUST REP. BY
ITS CHAIRMAN SHED NO.21 TEL BHAWAN ONGC
DEHRADUN-248 003. ...R6 & R7 in W.P.32879/2017.

FOOD CORPORATION OF INDIA
REP. BY CHAIRMAN & MD 16-20 BARAKHAMBA
LANE NEW DELHI-1.

THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FOOD CORPORATION OF INDIA NO.3 HADDOWS ROAD
CHENNAI-6

FCI PROVIDENT FUND TRUST
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY FOOD CORPORATION OF
INDIA (FCI) 16-20 BARAKHAMBA LANE NEW
DELHI-110 001 ..Respondents 7 to 9 in
W.P.33605 to 33607/2017.

THE ASSISTANT PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANISATION REGIONAL OFFICE WAZIPUR
INDUSTRIAL AREA NORTH DELHI-110 052.
..R3 in W.P.34331/2017.

WP No.14368 of 2018, 11413 to 11415, 11609 to 11612/2018 and 26234/2017:

Writ Petitions are filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue Wrti of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records pertaining to the impugned letter issued by the second respondent in No. Pension - I/12/33/EPS Amendment / 96 Vol II, dated 31.05.2017 and quash the same and direct the respondents to grant pensioner benefits along with all consequential benefits and interest under EPS, 1995

WP No.10051 of 2018 & 32879/2017:

Calling for the records pertaining to the impugned letter issued by the second respondent in No. Pension-I/12/33/ EPS/Amendment/96 Vol.II dated 31.05.2017 and quash the same and consequently direct the 5th respondent to grant higher pensionary benefits to the members of the petitioner association under clause 11(3) of Employees pension scheme 1995, as interpreted, clarified and directed by Honourable Supreme Court in its Judgments dated 31.03.2016 and 04.10.2016 read with approval of the Ministry of Labour and employment dated 16.03.2017

WP No.10274 of 2018

Directing the 5th respondent to receive the net amounts receivable by them towards refund of Provident Fund amounts received and allow the petitioner to receive their respective pensions based on their actual salary as directed by the Honorable Supreme Court in its Judgment dated 31.03.2016 and 04.10.2016 read with approval of the Ministry of Labour and Employment dated 16.03.2017 and the circular of the 2nd respondent dated 31.05.2017

WP No.10413 to 10415, 17170, 20458 to 20464, 22403, 23713, 24661 & 24662/2018, 25483, 5405 to 5407, 23131, 7126, 846, 909, 910, 29512, 31358, 4308/2019, 33605 to 33607/2017:

calling for the records pertaining to the impugned letter issued by the 4th respondent in No.: Pension / I/ 12 / 33/ EPS Amendment / 96 Vol II dated 31.05.2017 and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to grant pension on higher wages under EPS, 1995

WP No.13308 of 2018 & 4804/2018:
calling for the records relating to the Circular No. Pension - I/ 12/ 33/ EPS/ Amendment / 96 / Vol. II dated 31.5.2017 issued by the 1st respondent, quash the same and direct respondents to sanction the enhanced pension on the actual pensionable salary to the members of the petitioner Association as ordered by the Honourable Supreme Court

WP No.14145 of 2018
calling for the records pertaining to the impugned letter issued by the 4th respondent in No. Pension / I / 12 / 33 / EPS Amendment / 96Vol-II, dt 31.5.2017 and quash the same and consequently, direct the respondents to grant pension on higher wages under EPS, 1995

WP No.14189 of 2018
Directing the 5h respondent to receive the net amounts receivable by them towards refund of Provident Fund amounts received and allow the petitioner to receive their respective pensions based on their actual salary as directed by the Honourable Supreme Court in its Judgment dated 31.03.2016 and 04.10.2016 read with approval of the Ministry of Labour and Employment dated 16.03.2017 and the circular of the 2nd respondent dated 31.05.2017

WP No.14736 of 2018
calling for the records pertaining to the impugned letter issued by the second respondent in No.Pension-I/12/33/ EPS/ Amendment/ 96 Vol.II dated 31.05.2017 and quash the same and consequently direct the 4th respondent to grant higher pensionary benefits to the members of the petitioner association after netting off the payable to the 5th respondent and receivable from the 5th respondent, under clause 11(3) of Employees Pension Scheme 1995, as interpreted, clarified and directed by Honourable Supreme Court in its judgments dated 31.03.2016 and 04.10.2016 read with approval of the Ministry of Labour and Employment dated 16.03.2017

WP No.16229 of 2018
Directing the 5th respondent to receive the net amounts receivable by them towards refund of Provident Fund amounts received and allow the petitioner to receive their respective pensions based on their actual salary as directed by the Honble Supreme Court in its Judgment dated 31.03.2016 and 04.10.2016 read with approval of the Ministry of Labour and Employment dated 16.03.2017 and the circular of the 2nd respondent dated 31.05.2017

WP No.5562 & 5563 of 2018
direct the respondents 2 and 3 or such other appropriate authorities under the Employees Provident Fund and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 and the Employees Pension Scheme, 1995 to revise and enhance the monthly pension paid to the petitioners by permitting them to remit back the 8.33% share of the employers contribution proportionate to the actual salary of the Petitioners in excess of Rs. 6500/- to the employees pension scheme of account from the date of commencement of the Scheme 1995 or from the date the salary of the petitioners exceeded 6500/- and disburse the recomputed pension with arrears calculated on the basic of average of 12 months salary exceeding the supposed ceiling limit immediately proceeding the date of retirement/ exit from the membership of the pension fund as granted vide jugdment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in S.L.P. 33032-33033 of 2015 and circular pension -I/12/33/EPSA Amendment/96/Vol II dated 23.03.2017.

WP No.22343 of 2018 & 6902/2019
To call for the records pertaining to the impugned circular bearing NO. Pension/ I/ 12/ 33/ EPS Amendment/ 96 Vol- II dated 31.05.2017 of the 4th respondent and quash the orders passed therein and consequently, direct the respondents to grant pension on higher wages under Employees Pension Scheme, 1995 as per the orders of the Honourable Supreme Court in Civil Appeal Nos. 10013-10014 of 2016 R.C.Gupta and others vs. Regional Provident Fund Commissioner Provident Fund Organisation & Ors., case, reported in 2016 SCC 1639,

WP No.30681 of 2018
directing the 3rd respondent to forthwith revise the pension to the eligible higher limit and also to pay the arrears of pension into the petitioner members banks account as furnished to them

WP No.30684 of 2018
calling for the records relating to impugned letter dated 25.10.2018 in reference No.CB/CBE/PPO/No.116095/2018 on the file 5th respondent and quash the same and consequently direct the 6th respondent to continue to remit the revised higher pension of the petitioner

WP No.30688 of 2018
calling for the records relating to impugned letter dated 25.10.2018 in reference No.CB/CBE/PPO/No.116507/2018 on the file 5th respondent and quash the same and consequently direct the 6th respondent to continue to remit the revised higher pension of the petitioner

WP No.31347 of 2018

Directing the 2nd respondent to process the applications of the Petitioners for revision of pension under Employee Pension Scheme, 1995 on actual (higher) wages exceeding the wage limit of Rs.6500/Rs.15000 per month submitted by the 4th Respondent along with its letter dated 30.06.2017 bearing dated MK/HRD/2017-2018/12 and letter dated 12.07.2017 bearing MK/HRD/2017-2018/13, in terms of the judgment of the Honorable Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No(s).10013-10014 of 2016 dated 04.10.2016 and the order of the 2nd Respondent dated 23.03.2017 bearing No.Pensioin-I/12/33/EPS Amendment/96/Vol.II/34007, arrive at the revised pension payable to the petitioners, arrive at the amount to be refunded by the Petitioners after deducting pension to be paid from the date of retirement and pay the revised pensio every month within the time stipulated.

WP No.2429 of 2019 & 2433/2019:

call for the records pertaining to the impugned Circular issued by the 4th and 3rd Respondents in No Pension-I/12/33/EPS Amendment/96 Vol-II, dated 31.05.2017 and No.Pension-I/12/33/EPS Amendment/96/Vol.II dated 23.03.2017 respectively and to QUASH the same and consequently directing the Respondents to grant pension to the Petitioners on higher wages with interest upto date of withdrawal of Provident Fund under Employee s Pension Scheme, 1995 by accepting the differential amount of EPF contribution on higher wages from the Petitioners with interest upto withdrawal of Provident Fund by the Petitioners, within a time frame to be fixed by this Honble Court

WP No.4436 of 2019

Directing the 2nd respondent to process the applications of the Petitioners for revision of pension under employees pension Scheme, 1995 on actual (higher) wages exceeding the wage limit of Rs.6500/ Rs.15000 per month submitted by the 4th respondent along with its letter dated 12/07/2017 bearing MK/HRD/2017-2018/13, Letter dated 15/10/2018 bearing MK/HRD/2018-2019, letter dated 24/10/2018 bearing MK/HRD/2018-2019 and letter dated 10/01/2019 bearing No.MK/HRD/OTO/EPS, in terms of the judgment of the Hon'ble Superme Court of India in Civil Appeal No.(S) 10013-10014 of 2016 dated 04.10.2016 and the order of the 2nd Respondent dated 23.03.2017 bearing No pension/I/12/33/EPS/Amendment 196/Vol II/134007, arrive at the revised pension payable to the Petitioners arrive at the amount to be refunded by the Petitioners after deducting pension to be paid from the date of retirement and pay the revised pension every month with the time frame.

WP No.5315 of 2019

Directing the Respondents to consider the Representation dated 23-7-2018 sent by the Petitioner union to extend the benefit of Employees Pension Scheme to all members of the Petitioner Union in the light of the Judgement made in the Case of R.C.GUPTA AND ORS VS Regional Provident Fund Commissioner Employees Provident Fund Organisation and ORS IN SLP NO 33032/2015 BY an order dated 4-10-2016 passed by the Honble Apex court.

WP No.6289 of 2019 & 6296/2019:

Calling for the records pertaining to the impugned letter issued by the 3rd respondent in No.Pension /I/12/33/EPS Amendment/ 96 Vol.II, dated 31.05.2017 and quash the same and consequently, direct the respondents to grant pension on higher wages under EPS, 1995

WP No.34331 of 2017

To call for the entire records of the 3rd respondent letter dated 04.08.2017 made in his proceedings by letter No.DC/ CPM/1338, since it is against the judgment of the Supreme Court of India made in S.L.P (Civil) Nos.33032 and 33033 of 2005 in Civil Appeal Nos.10013 and 10014 of 2016 dated 04.10.2016 and quash the same and consequently direct the 3rd respondent to give the pensionary benefits of the members of the petitioner Association as per the Judgment of the Supreme Court of India made in S.L.P (Civil) Nos.33032 and 33033 of 2015 in Civil Appeal Nos.10013 and 10014 of 2016 dated 04.10.2016

For Petitioners :

Mr.M.S.Krishnan Senior Counsel for M/s.Sarvabhaaman Associates in W.P.No.14368/2018.

Mr.V.Karthik Senior Counsel for M/s.Vedavallikumar in WP Nos.10051, 10274, 14189, 14736, 16229, 30681/18, 30684 and 30688/18.

M/s.A.Jenasenan and Arun Dhanapalan in WP Nos.33605 to 33607 of 2017, 10413 to 10415/18, 11609 to 11612/18, 20455 to 20464/18, 23713/18, 24661/18, 24662/18, 5405 to 5407/18, 7126/18, 846/18.

Mr.A.E.Ravichandran in
W.P.No.26234 & 32879 of 2017

M/s.S.Namasivayam,
in WP No.13308/18 and 4804/18.

Mr.B.Ramamoorthy in
W.P.No.34331 of 2017

Mr.K.Elangoo, in WP No.14145/18, 17170/18, 22403/18, 23131/18, 25483, 31358/18.

Mr.K.Govindarajan in WP No.29512/18

Mr.R.Sanjith, Assisted by M/s.Sindhu Krishnah for M/s.Chaly Associates in WP Nos.5562 and 5563/18

Mr.Yogesh Kannadasan in WP Nos. 909, 910/2018, 22343/18 and 6902/19

Mr.Balan Haridas in WP Nos.31347/18, and 4436/19

Mr.G.Sankaran in WP Nos.2429/19, and 2433/19

Mr.M.R.Raghavan in WP No.4308/19

Mr.A.Nagarathinam in WP No.5315/19

Mr.M.Purushothaman in WP No.6289 and 6296/19

For Respondents:

Mr.M/s.K.Raju, CGSC for R1 in WP Nos.14368/18, 11609 to 11612/18, 910/18

Mr.S.Makesh for R1 in WP Nos.10051/18, 10413 to 10415/18, 909, 10274 & for RR1 to 3 in WP Nos.14189/18, 23713/18, 6902/19

Mr.T.R.Sundaram, for RR2 to 5
in WP Nos.14368/18 & for
RR 2 to 5 in WP Nos.10051/18, 31358/18 & for
RR 2 to 6 in WP Nos.10413 to 10415/18, 11609 to 11612/18, 23131/18, 23713/18,

24661/18, 24662/18, 29512/18,7126/18,
846/18, 909, 910 & for
RR 4 & 5 in WP Nos.14189 of 2018, 6289/19,
6296/19 & for
RR 1 to 5 in WP Nos.14736/18
& for R1-Union of India
R1 in WP No.17170/4 (Union of India
Ministry of Labour & Employment,
New Delhi) & for
RR 1 to 6 in WP Nos.20458 to 20464/18,
5405/18 to 5407/18
& for RR 1 to 3 in WP No.5562/18,
& for RR 2 & 3 in WP No.5563/18.
And RR2 to 4 in WP 26234/17, 32879/17, &
for RR2 to 6 in WP
33605 to 33607/17 & for RR2 & 3
in WP 34331/17.

Mr.J.Sathyanarayanaprasad for
RR6 & 7 in WP Nos.14368/18, R7 in WP
No.20458, 20459, 20460, 20461, 20462,
20463, 20464, 23713/18, 24661/18, &
24662/18 and
for R5 in WP 26234 of 17

Mr.R.Veludas, CGC for R1 in
WP 26234/17, 33605 to 33607/17

Dr.R.Gowri Advocate for
RR7 & 8 in WP NO.10413 and 10414/18

Mr.J.Ramesh, Addl.G.P. for
RR 7 & 8 in WP Nos.11609 to
11612/18

Mr.R.Thirunavukarasu, for
RR1 & 2 in WP Nos.13308/18, 4804/18, & for
RR2 to 6 in WP Nos.30681/18, 30684 &
30688/18
R2 in WP No.4308/19 & for
RR2 & 3 in WP No.4436/19 & for
RR5 & 6 in WP No.6902/19 & for
R5 in WP 32879/17

Mr.N.Vijaya Baskar, Addl.C.G.S.C., for R1
in WP No.14145/18 and for
R7&8 in WP 33605 & 33607/17

M/s.V.J.Latha for RR 2 to 6
in WP Nos.14145/18, 17170/18, 22403/18,
25483 & 31358/18

M/s.Shivakumar & Suresh
for RR7 to 9 in WP Nos.25483/18, 14145/18,
17170/18, 22403/18, 31358/18 and 25483/18

Mr.K.Ramu Assisted by K.Vishnu
for R5 in WP No.14736/18

Mr.T.S.N.Prabhakaran, SCG for
RR1 to 5 in WP No.16229/18

Mr.Anand Goplan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan for RR
8 & 9 in WP Nos.20458/18, 20459/18 & for R4
in WP No.5562/18, 5563/18 & 31347/18 and
for R6 in
WP 26234/17
Mr.K.Thirukumaran, Addl.C.G.S.
for R1 in WP Nos.22403/18 & for
RR1 to 3 in WP Nos.6289 & 6296/19
and for R5 in WP 32879/17

Mr.B.K.Girish Neelakandan
for R1 in WP No.23131/18 and 4436/19

Mr.K.Seetha Ram, CGSC for
R1 in WP No.24661/18, 24662/18

Mr.K.Ramachandramurthy, CGSC
for R1 in WP No.25483/18 &
for R1 in WP No.32879/17

M/s.B.Ramaratnam, CGSC
for R1 in WP No.29512/18

M/s.K.M.Vijayan Associates
for R3 in WP No.4804 of 2018

Mr.S.Vijayakumar for
RR7 to 9 in WP No.5405/18
to 5406/18

Mr.N.Ramesh, CGSC
for R1 in WP No.5563/18

Mr.K.Raju, CGSC for R1
in WP No.7126/18

Mr.M.R.Raghavan
for RR7 & 8 in WP No.7126/18

Mr.P.Ayyaswamy, CGSC for
R1 in WP No.846/18, 535/19

Mr.K.S.Jeyaganesan, Senior Panel Counsel
for R1 in WP No.30681/18, 30684 and
30688/18
M/s.G.Baskaran for R1 to R3

COMMON ORDER

Since all the present Writ Petitions raise common issues and grounds, they are taken up together for final disposal as under:

2. There are two categories of the Writ Petitions pertaining to the employees from 'Exempted Establishments' under Section 17 of The Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (hereinafter, referred to as 'the Act') and 'Un-exempted Establishments, which are governed by the provisions of the Act.

3. The employees of both the above mentioned establishments are aggrieved by the denial of pension on the basis of their actual salaries received by them since the payment of pension was restricted to ceiling of salary as provided under the provisions of the Act and the Scheme framed therein. The dispute has its genesis, wherein, the Employees' Pension Scheme was introduced in 1995 in furtherance of Section 6A of the Act, which reads as under:

> "6-A. Employees' Pension Scheme.- (1) The Central Government may, by notification in the Official Gazette, frame a scheme to be called the Employees' Pension Scheme for the purpose of providing for-
>
> (a) Superannuation pension, retiring pension or permanent total disablement pension to the employees of any establishment or class of establishments to which this applies; and
>
> (b) Widow or widower's pension, children pension or orphan pension payable to the beneficiaries of such employees.
>
> (2) Notwithstanding anything contained in section 6, there shall be established, as soon as may be after framing of the Pension Scheme, a

Pension Fund into which there shall be paid, from time to time, in respect of every employee who is a member of the Pension Scheme. (a) Such sums from the employer's contribution under section 6m not exceeding eight and one- third per cent. Of the basic wages, dearness allowance and retaining allowance, if any, of the concerned employees, as may be specified in the Pension Scheme; (b) Such sums as are payable by the employers of exempted establishments under sub-section (6) of section 17; (c) The net assets of the Employees' Family Pension as on the date of the establishment of the Pension Fund; (d) Such sums as the Central Government may, after due appropriation by Parliament by law in this behalf, specify.

(3) On the establishment of the Pension Fund, the Family Pension Scheme (hereinafter referred to as the ceased scheme) shall ceased to operate and all assets of the ceased scheme shall vest in and shall stand transferred to, and all liabilities under the ceased scheme shall be enforceable against, the Pension Fund and the beneficiaries under the ceased scheme shall be entitled to draw the benefits, not less than the benefits, they were entitled to under the ceased scheme, from the Pension Fund.

(4) The Pension Fund shall vest in and be administered by the Central Board in such manner as may be specified in the Pension Scheme.

(5) Subject to the provisions of this Act, the Pension Scheme may provide for all or any of the matters specified in Schedule III.

(6) The Pension Scheme may provide that all or any of its provisions shall take effect either prospectively or retrospectively on such date as may be specified in that behalf in that scheme.

(7) A Pension Scheme, framed under sub-section (1) shall be laid, as soon as may be after it is made, before each House of Parliament, while it is in session, for a total period or thirty days which may be comprised in one session or in two or more successive sessions, and if, before the expiry of the session immediately following the session or the successive sessions aforesaid, both House agree in making any modification in the scheme or both House agree that the scheme should not be made, the scheme shall thereafter have effect only in such modified from or be of no effect, as the case may

> be; so, however, that any such modification or annulment shall be without prejudice to the validity of anything previously done under that scheme."

4. The Employees' Pension Scheme, 1995 (hereinafter referred to 'the Pension Scheme') was introduced with effect from 16.11.1995 and and wherever the Act is made applicable, the scheme was made compulsory covering all the employees employed in various establishments which are governed by the Act and the Pension Scheme.

5. The grievances of the employees are two fold, viz., firstly, in respect of unexempted establishments, the Employees Provident Fund Organization (in short, 'EPFO') has introduced a cut off date as 01.12.2004 for the purpose exercising option in terms of proviso introduced to Clause 11(3) of the Pension Scheme, as per which, the employees could contribute PF contribution on the basis of the actual salary drawn by them. The proviso 11(3) introduced on 28.02.1996 by GSR 134 was put into effect from 16.3.1996. Clause 11(3) along with proviso reads as under:

> "11. Determination of Pensionable salary.-
> (1) .....
> (2) .....
> (3) The maximum pensionable salary shall be limited to (Rupees six thousand and five hundred/Rs.6500/-) per month.
> Provided that if at the option of the employer and employee, contribution paid on salary exceeding (Rupees six thousand and five hundred/Rs.6500) per month from the date of commencement of this Scheme or from the date salary exceeds (Rupees six thousand and five hundred/Rs.6500) whichever is later, and 8.33 per cent, share of the employers thereof is remitted into Pension Fund, pensionable salary shall be based on such higher salary."

and secondly, in respect of exempted establishments, calculation for payment of pension on the basis of actual salary received by the employees, cannot be considered feasible since such contributions were made by the employees to the respective establishments which establishments had their own Provident Fund Trust and maintained by the respective exempted establishments. According to the employees, the above said grievances/issues are covered by various decisions of the High Courts, viz., Kerala, Rajasthan, Telengana and also a decision of the Hon'ble Supreme

Court of India. According to the employees, the EPFO was a party to the litigations before the various High Courts as indicated above and also before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and hence, the claim of these writ petitioners and the challenge to the denial of calculation of pension on the basis of actual salary received by them, is not open to any fresh adjudication, as according to them, the issues are no more res integra. This was particularly so that the EPFO itself and the Ministry concerned had recognized the right of the employees in regard to the subject claim and implemented the orders of the various High Courts as well as the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India by extending the benefit of higher pension to thousands of employees and therefore, it does not lie in the mouth of EPFO or the Government to resist the claim of the employees herein.

6. As regards the first point of grievance is concerned, i.e., the prescription of cut off date as 01.12.2004 for the purpose of exercising option with reference to Proviso to Clause 11(3) of the Pension Scheme, the learned Senior Counsels and the learned Counsels appearing for the employees in the Writ Petitions would draw the attention of this Court to the order passed by the Kerala High Court in W.P.(C) Nos.6643 & 9929 of 2007, dated 4.11.2011, wherein, a learned single Judge of the Kerala High Court dealt with various objections raised on behalf of the EPFO and also after adverting to the claims of the petitioners therein, has finally held that the fixation of cut of date, i.e. 01.12.2004 was invalid and the petitioners therein were entitled to avail the benefit under Proviso to Clause 11(3) of the Pension Scheme. The said detailed order passed by the learned single Judge dealing with every objection raised on behalf of the EPFO, has been brought to the attention of this Court, particularly the observation made in paragraphs 3 to 5 which are extracted hereunder:

> "3. I have considered the rival contentions in detail. Clause 11 of the Employees' Pension Scheme reads as follows:
>
> > "Determination of pensionable salary.- (1) Pensionable salary shall be the average monthly pay drawn in any manner including on piece-rate basis during the contributory period of service in the span of 12 months preceding the date of exit from the membership of the Employees' Pension Fund:
> >
> > Provided that if a member was not in receipt of full pay during the period of twelve months preceding the day he ceased to be the member of Pension Fund, the average of previous 12 months full pay drawn by him

during the period for which contribution to the pension fund was recovered, shall be taken into account as pensionable salary for calculating pension.

(2) If during the said span of 12 months there are non-contributory periods of service including cases where the member has drawn salary for a part of the month, the total wages during the 12 months' span shall be divided by the actual number of days for which salary has been drawn and the amount so derived shall be multiplied by 30 to work out the average monthly pay.

(3) The maximum pensionable salary shall be limited to rupees six thousand and five hundred /Rs.6,500/ per month. Provided that if at the option of the employer and employee, contribution paid on salary exceeding rupees six thousand and five hundred/Rs.6,500 per month from the date of commencement of this Scheme or from the date salary exceeds rupees six thousand and five hundred/Rs.6,500 whichever is later, and 8.33 per cent share of the employers thereof is remitted into the Pension Fund, pensionable salary shall be based on such higher salary." (underlining supplied)

Proviso to clause 11(3) was added by G.S.R. No.134, dated 28.2.1996 with effect from 16.3.1996. I do not find any merit in the contentions of the learned counsel for the Provident Fund Organization that the proviso is only prospective in nature. The proviso, which was added with effect from 16.3.1996 by G.S.R. Dated 28.2.1996, speaks of contributions on salary from the date of commencement of the Scheme, which is prior to 28.2.1996. Therefore, the very language of the proviso makes it explicitly clear that the proviso is intended to be operative retrospectively from the date of commencement of the Scheme, insofar as the Scheme came into force with effect from 16.11.1995. Therefore, the proviso is certainly retrospective in nature and consequently the petitioners are entitled to avail of the benefit of the proviso retrospectively, provided they are able to make good the arrears of contributions in respect thereof which they have agreed to be transferred from their Provident Fund account, which the Provident Fund Organization actually did. In fact, originally the Provident Fund Organization was also of the opinion that the proviso is retrospective in nature and that is why they permitted the petitioners to avail of the benefit of that proviso by paying off the arrears of contributions payable by transfer from their Provident Fund account. In fact even according to the Provident Fund Organisation for availing of the benefit retrospectively the cut off date has been fixed. As such, it is too late for the Provident Fund Organization to contend otherwise.

4. The second objection is regarding the cut off date fixed. According to the Provident Fund Organization a cut off date of 1.12.2004 has been fixed for applying for benefit of the proviso by changing over to payment of contributions on actual salary basis. But the Provident Fund Organization has not been able to produce any document by which such a cut off date has been fixed by anybody. The Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, the Employees' Provident Fund Scheme and the Employees' Pension Scheme do not contain any provision enabling the 2nd respondent or anybody else to fix a cut off date for the purpose of availing of the benefit of proviso to clause 11(3). Even assuming that anybody has any power to fix that cut off date, certainly it is not the 2nd respondent. As such I am convinced that the cut off date fixed by the 2nd respondent is clearly without jurisdiction. That being so, the benefits already granted to the petitioners under the proviso to clause 11(3) cannot now be reversed or withdrawn as done in this case.

5. The third contention is that under paragraph 26(6) of the Employees Provident Fund Scheme, the employees are required to file a joint application, which has not been done in this case. But, the interesting thing is that the 2nd respondent did not insist on the same, while permitting the petitioners to avail of the benefit of the proviso to clause 11(3). It is when these writ petitions came up that they have taken such a contention. Even assuming that it is so, nothing prevents the Provident Fund Organisation in directing the employer and employee to file a joint

application, which they have not done. Added to that, the employer is also a party to these writ petitions before me. They do not have any objection in the petitioners being the given benefit of the proviso to clause 11 (3) of the Employees' Pension Scheme. Therefore, that cannot now be held as ground for denying the benefit to the petitioners. If at all what they can do is to direct the employer and the employee to file a joint application, which is merely procedural in nature which defect can be cured at any time. In the above circumstances, I allow these writ petitions quashing the orders impugned in these two writ petitions. It is declared that the fixation of cut off date of 1.12.2004 is without jurisdiction and despite the fact that the petitioners have filed the applications for benefit under the proviso to clause 11(3), after the cut off date so fixed, the petitioners are entitled to avail of the benefit under the proviso to clause 11(3) of the Employees' Pension Scheme. As such I declare that the benefits was rightly given to the petitioners. Consequently, the arrears of contributions payable by the petitioners for availing of the benefit of the said proviso shall again to be transferred from the Provident Fund account of the petitioners to the Employees' Pension Fund account of the petitioners. Orders in this regard shall be passed, as expeditiously as possible, at any rate, within one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment."

7. As against the above order of the learned single Judge, a Writ Appeal in W.A.No.569 of 2012 was preferred before a Division Bench of Kerala High Court and by its judgment dated 5.3.2013, the Division Bench has confirmed the order passed by the learned Single Judge. The operative portion of the judgment passed by the Division Bench as found in paragraphs 9 to 12 is extracted as under:

"9. .... The learned Singe judge noticed that Proviso to clause 11 (3) was added by G.S.R. No.134, dated 28/2/2006 with effect from 16/3/1996. The learned Single Judge has given good reasons to turn down the contention that the proviso is only prospective in nature . As noticed by the learned Single Judge the proviso which was added with effect from 16/3/1996 by G.S.R. Dated 28/2/1996, speaks of contributions on salary from the date of commencement of the Scheme, which is prior to 28/2/1996. We also feel that the very language of the proviso makes it explicitly clear that the proviso is intended to be operative retrospectively from the date of the commencement of the Scheme, in so far as the scheme came into force with effect from 16/11/1995. When it is seen that the proviso is retrospective, consequently the writ petitioners will be entitled to avail of the benefit of the proviso retrospectively provided they are able to make good the arrears of contributions in respect thereof which they have agreed to be transferred from their Provident Fund Account which the Provident Fund Organization actually did. Originally the Provident Fund Organization was also of the opinion that the proviso is retrospective in nature and that is why they permitted the petitioners to avail of the benefit of that proviso by paying off the arrears of contributions payable by transfer from their Provident Fund Account. The contention of the Provident Fund Organistion is that for availing of the benefit retrospectively the cut off date has been fixed.

10. According to us, the learned Single Judge has correctly understood and decided the issue regarding the cut off date fixed. According to the Provident Fund Organisation, cut off date of 1/12/2004 has been fixed for applying for benefit of the proviso by changing over to payment of contributions on actual salary basis. It was noticed by the learned Single Judge that no document by which such a cut off date has been fixed by anybody is produced by the Provident Fund Organisation. The Employees' Provident Fund Scheme and the Employees' Pension Scheme also do not contain any provision enabling the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner or anybody else to fix a cut off date for the purpose of availing of the benefit of proviso to clause 11(3). According to us, the decision of the learned Single Judge that - even assuming that anybody has power to fix that cut off date, certainly such power is not with the 2nd respondent-Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, is quite correct.

11. We find that the learned Single Judge has considered the contention of the Provident Fund

> Organisation that the employers and the employee require to file a joint application which has not been done in this case. But as noticed by the learned Single Judge, the regional Provident Fund Commissioner did not insist on the same, while permitting the petitioners to avail of the benefit of the proviso to clause 11 (3). Hence, the non-filing of the joint application was rightly held to be not a ground for denying the benefit to the writ petitioners.
>
> 12. In short, in our opinion there is no infirmity in the leading common judgment and also in the separate judgments which are passed in terms of the leading common judgment. These appeals fail and will stand dismissed. The parties will suffer their respective costs."

8. The Division Bench has held that neither the Act nor the Pension Scheme would provide for any cut off date for the purpose of availing of the benefit of the Proviso to Clause 11 (3). In fact, the Division Bench has also upheld that in case of non-filing of joint application under Clause 11(3) was not a valid ground to deny the benefit of higher pension to the writ petitioners therein. In short, the Division Bench has confirmed the order of the learned Single Judge in toto. Thereafter, it appears that the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India was approached as against the judgment of the Division Bench of the Kerala High Court in SLP (C) No.7074 of 2014 and the Hon'ble Supreme Court has dismissed the same finding no legal or valid ground for interference, vide its order dated 31.3.2016.

9. The learned Senior Counsels would draw attention of this Court to an order dated 4.10.2016 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, which according to them, clinches the issue in favour of the employees. The order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court was rendered in Civil Appeal Nos.10013-10014 of 2016 arising out of SLP (C) Nos.33032 to 33033 of 2015 in "R.C.Gupta and others etc., versus Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, EPFO & Others", wherein, the Hon'ble Supreme Court was considering the Civil Appeals arose out of the order of the Division Bench passed by the Himachal Pradesh High Court reversing the order of the learned Single Judge, who directed that the employees would be entitled to the benefit of deposit of 8.33% of their actual salary in the Pension Fund irrespective of the ceiling limit. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has considered the submissions of the rival parties and held as under:

> "6. We have heard the learned counsels for the parties. We have read and considered the

orders of the High Court, the provisions of the Act, the Provident Fund Scheme as well as the relevant provisionsof the Pension Scheme.

7. Clause 11 (3) of the Pension Scheme is in the following terms :

> 11. Determination of Pensionable Salary.
>
> xxx xxx xxx
>
> (3) The maximum pensionable salary shall be limited to 1[rupees six thousand and five hundred/Rs.6,500/-] per month.
>
> [Provided that if at the option of the 1 Sub-section by G.S.R.774(E), dated 8th October, 2001 (w.e.f.1-6-2001) 2 Sub-section by G.S.R. 134, dated 28th February, 1996 (w.e.f. 16-3-1996) employer and employee, contribution paid on salary exceeding [rupees six thousand and five hundred/Rs.6,500/-] per month from the date of commencement of this Scheme or from the date salary exceeds [rupees six thousand and five hundred/Rs.6,500/-] whichever is later, and 8.33 per cent share of the employers thereof is remitted into the Pension Fund, pensionable salary shall be based on such higher salary.]

8. Reading the proviso, we find that the reference to the date of commencement of the Scheme or the date on which the salary exceeds the ceiling limit are dates from which the option exercised are to be reckoned with for calculation of pensionable salary. The said dates are not cut-off dates to determine the eligibility of the employer-employee to indicate their option under the proviso to Clause 11(3) of the Pension Scheme. A somewhat similar view that has been taken by this Court in a matter coming from the Kerala High Court, wherein the Special Leave Petition (C) No.7074 of 2014 filed by the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner was rejected by this Court by order dated 31.03.2016. A beneficial Scheme, in our considered view, ought not to be allowed to be defeated by reference to a cut-off date, particularly, in a situation where (as in the present case) the employer had deposited 12% of the actual salary and not 12% of the ceiling limit of Rs.5,000/- or Rs.6,500/- per month, as

the case may be.

9. A further argument has been made on behalf of the Provident Fund Commissioner that the appellant-employees had already exercised their option under paragraph 26(6) of the Employees' Provident Funds Scheme. Paragraph 26 (6) is in the following terms:

> "26. Classes of employees entitled and required to join the fund
>
> xxx xxx xxx
>
> (6) Notwithstanding anything contained in this paragraph, an officer not below the rank of an Assistant Provident Fund Commissioner may, on the joint request in writing, of any employee of a factory or other establishment to which this Scheme applies and his employer, enroll such employee as a member or allow him to contribute more than 3[six thousand five hundred rupees] of his pay per month if he is already a member of the fund and thereupon such employee shall be entitled to the benefits and shall be subject to the conditions of the fund, provided that the employer gives an undertaking in writing that he shall pay the administrative charges payable and shall comply with all statutory provisions in respect of such employee].

10. We do not see how exercise of option under paragraph 26 of the Provident Fund Scheme can be construed to estop the employees from exercising a similar option under paragraph 11 (3). If both the employer and the employee opt for deposit against the actual salary and not the ceiling amount, exercise of option under paragraph 26 of the Provident Scheme is inevitable. Exercise of the option under paragraph 26(6) is a necessary precursor to the exercise of option under Clause 11(3). Exercise of such option, therefore, would not foreclose the exercise of a further option under Clause 11 (3) of the Pension Scheme unless the circumstances warranting such foreclosure are clearly indicated.

11. The above apart in a situation where the deposit of the employer's share at 12% has been on the actual salary and not the ceiling

> amount, we do not see how the Provident Fund Commissioner could have been aggrieved to file the L.P.A. before the Division Bench of the High Court. All that the Provident Fund Commissioner is required to do in the case is an adjustment of accounts which in turn would have benefitted some of the employees. At best what the Provident Commissioner could do and which we permit him to do under the present order is to seek a return of all such amounts that the concerned employees may have taken or withdrawn from their Provident Fund Account before granting them the benefit of the proviso to Clause 11(3) of the Pension Scheme. Once such a return is made in whichever cases such return is due, consequential benefits in terms of this order will be granted to the said employees.
>
> 12. Consequently and in light of the above, we allow these appeals and set aside the order of the Division Bench of the High Court."

10. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, in the above decision, has categorically held that where the deposit of the employer's share at 12% has been made on the actual salary and not on the ceiling amount, the question of Provident Fund Organization being aggrieved by the order of the learned single Judge, does not arise at all. Once the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that the contribution if made, i.e. 12% on the actual salary drawn by the employer, it was not open to EPFO to deny the calculation and payment of pension on the basis of actual salary received by the pensioner and cannot insist in applying the ceiling limit as contemplated under the provisions of the Act and the Pension Scheme. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the final paragraph of the order, has held that it was only a matter of book adjustment and even in cases where the amounts were returned to the employees concerned on their retirement, the EPFO can always demand for return of those amounts to the extent of the enhanced PF contribution paid by the employer as well as employee on the basis of salaries received by them and such amounts being returned, pension can be calculated and paid to the employees on the basis of their actual salary received by them at the time of their retirement.

11. In similar circumstances, according to the learned Senior Counsels, the High Court of Telangana has allowed a batch of Writ Petitions in W.P.Nos.33804 of 2012, etc.,in favour of the employees, vide its order dated 24.9.2018 having held in paragraphs 12 to 14 as under:

"12. On plain reading of relevant paragraphs of the EPF Scheme 1952 and Pension Scheme 1995, I am of the considered opinion that no distinction can be drawn between exempted category employer and non exempted category employer for application of Pension Scheme 1995. Admittedly no exemption is granted to RTC from the 1995 pension scheme and its employees are enrolled and contributions are made under 1995 scheme. Further, it is categorical assertion of the respondent RTC that the entire information including higher contributions made based on the actual salary drawn by the petitioners was already furnished to the EPFO. It is not disputed that 8.33% of actual salary was being credited to EPFO all along. As noted above, it was not objected by EPFO. Thus, it is not open to EPFO to raise plea of non compliance of paragraph 26.6 at this distance of time and to deprive higher monthly pension drawable by the petitioners.

13. Pension Scheme 1995 is formulated by Government of India to enable employees working in the establishments where monthly pension system is not in vogue unlike in Government of India or State Government service and it enables the employees after termination of their service to draw some kind of monthly pension. It is a social welfare scheme to enable post retirement sustenance. Monthly pension is determined based on the amount accrued to the account of employee at the time of termination of service. It is not in dispute that the petitioners herein have made higher contribution than the ceiling limit imposed and amount is accrued to the account of EPFO. Thus, petitioners are entitled to draw higher pension based on the higher contribution made by them 8 than the minimum amount required. Even assuming that there was no compliance of paragraph 26.6 the employees cannot be deprived of their higher pension on this hyper technical ground.

14. Thus, the orders impugned in W P Nos. 32028, 33091 and 33094 of 2013 rejecting the request of the petitioners for higher pension and order in W.P. 33804 of 2012, to the extent of not sanctioning the higher pension to petitioner therein are set aside. The Employees Provident Fund Organisation is directed to work out the amount of pension payable to petitioners based on

the actual contribution made by them over and above ceiling of Rs.6500/- prescribed. The entire exercise shall be undertaken and completed and arrears and monthly pension shall be drawn and paid to petitioners within three months from the date of receipt of copy of this order. 15. Accordingly, the writ petitions are allowed. No costs. Miscellaneous petitions, if any pending, are closed."

12. Similarly, the High Court of Rajasthan, in a batch of Writ Petitions in S.B. Civil Writs No.17616 of 2017, etc. vide order dated 11.12.2018 also, has held in favour of the employees including the exempted establishments, as could be seen from paragraphs 13 to 24 of the order, which are extracted hereunder:

"13. In the case of State of Rajasthan and anr. Vs. Surendra Mohnot and ors: 2014(2) WLC (SC) Civil 358, the Apex Court was examining a similar issue where the order was passed on agreement of the counsel for the parties and the question arose was whether a review would be maintainable by one of the parties having conceded the decision before the Court. Examining the said aspect, the Apex Court held that it is well settled in law that there is no estoppel in law. The consent given in a Court that a controversy is covered by judgment which has no applicability whatsoever and pertains to a different field, cannot stop a party from raising the point that the same was erroneously cited.

14. In the case of Union of India Vs. Heera Lal: 1996(10) SCC 574, it has been held that the concession made by the Government Advocate on question of law could not be said to be binding upon the Government.

15. The power of review under Article 226 of the Constitution is an inherent power of the High Court as held by the Apex Court in the case of Shivdeo Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others: AIR 1963 (SC) 1909. The power can be exercised as plenary jurisdiction to prevent miscarriage of justice or to correct grave palpable errors committed by it. However, as a word of caution, it is to be noted that the power of review is not to be confused with the appellate power and a review by no means is an appeal in disguise. Finality of a judgment delivered by the

Court would not be reconsidered except where a glaring omission or patent mistake or like grave error has crept in earlier by judicial fallibility.

16. Keeping in view the aforesaid guidelines, this Court finds that the order passed by the Court dated 19/05/2017, while noticing the judgment passed by the Supreme Court in the case of R.C. Gupta & ors. (supra) and holding that the ratio of the said judgment is applicable, allowed the bunch of writ petitions. The facts of the cases were not noticed in view of the consent of counsel for both the parties. The respondents-review petitioners by way of these review petitions have sought to distinguish the case of the petitioners herein from the facts of the case in R.C. Gupta & ors. (supra) as a ground for review of the order. Thus, it would be appropriate to notice certain facts of the writ petitions. The petitioners in the writ petitions were employees of Instrumentation Limited, Kota and though the salary of the petitioners exceeded the limits as prescribed under Paragraph 2(f) of the Employees Provident Fund Scheme, 1952, as well as Clause 11 (3) of the Employees Pension Scheme, yet the employer made provident fund contributions calculating the employees' share and employers' share by reckoning the actual total salary without considering the ceiling limit. However, the amount remitted to the petitioners' pension account was the amount reckoning the pay limit to the ceiling prescribed i.e. Rs.6,500/-. The remaining amount remained with the PF Trust of the Instrumentation Limited which is one of the exempted institution in terms of Section 17 of the Act of 1952. Thus, 8.33% of the ceiling limit was deposited with the pension fund being regulated by the EPFO.

17. Similar situation was arising with the employees working in the Instrumentation Limited at Kota and the Kerala High Court in the matters of various employees passed a judgment in the case of M. Sreenivasan & ors. Vs. Union of India & ors. [W.P. (C) No.11183/2015], decided on 07/04/2015 directing as under:-

> 5. Following the binding precedents, this writ petition is also disposed of

> directing that the 8.33% of the employer's contribution, proportionate to the salary of the employee, in excess of Rs.6,500/-, shall now be credited to the Pension Scheme and orders passed in accordance with law. Needless to say, the interest accrued in the Provident Fund Account to that extent also will stand transferred to the Pension Account.
>
> 6. With respect to retired employees, who have drawn their retirement benefits by way of Provident Fund proportionate amounts along with interest accrued in the account as also that accrued after the withdrawal of the Provident Fund amounts, have to be refunded to the Provident Fund Organization. The retired employees shall submit joint applications, along with their employer wherever the same has not been done. The directions above noted shall be complied within three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this judgment.
>
> 7. It is also stated that the judgment passed in the same lines in other writ petitions were confirmed by a Division Bench in W.A No. 1442 of 2014. But, however, leaving the question open to be considered depending upon the result of the petitions filed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court. That reservation shall be there in the present writ petition also.

18. The SLP No.7074/2014 preferred was rejected by the Supreme Court vide its order dated 31/03/2016 and the aforesaid directions were upheld and the said aspect was noticed while delivering the judgment in the case of R.C. Gupta & ors. (supra). Thus, merely because the amount of PF is deposited in the PF Trust of the Exempted Organization and not with the EPFO, the ratio of the judgment passed in the case of R.C. Gupta & ors. (supra) would not alter and has to be applied equally to all the employees who may be either

depositing their share in the PF Trust of an exempted organization or with the EPFO directly. Accordingly, the claim of the review petitioners in the aforesaid review petitions that the order should be reviewed on the ground of the aforesaid distinction is not made out. It is not a case where a different judgment would be applicable to the facts of the case and this Court finds that the judgment passed in the case of R.C. Gupta & ors. (supra) would be squarely applicable to the facts of the present cases also.

19. The judgment passed by the Apex Court takes into its ambit and considering the fact that employees may have already received their provident fund amount and therefore, the directions have been issued accordingly taking into consideration all the aspects.

20. In the other writ petitions, which have been heard alongwith these review petitions, this Court finds that the only difference of facts is in relation to the respondents therein namely; RIICO and RSRTC which are also exempted organizations in terms of Section 17 of the Act of 1952. Further, once a judgment has been passed by the Supreme Court, it would have its applicability to all the organizations uniformly. Thus, it would be useful to quote the relevant paras of the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of R.C. Gupta & ors (supra) which are reproduced as under:-

> "8. Reading the proviso, we find that the reference to the date of commencement of the Scheme or the date on which the salary exceeds the ceiling limit are dates from which the option exercised are to be reckoned with for calculation of pensionable salary. The said dates are not cut-off dates to determine the eligibility of the employer-employee to indicate their option under the proviso to Clause 11(3) of the Pension Scheme. A somewhat similar view that has been taken by this Court in a matter coming from the Kerala High Court, wherein the Special Leave Petition (C) No. 7074 of 2014 filed by the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner was rejected by this Court by

order dated 31.3.2016. A beneficial Scheme, in our considered view, ought not to be allowed to be defeated by reference to a cut-off date, particularly, in a situation where (as in the present case) the employer had deposited 12% of the actual salary and not 12% of the ceiling limit of ' 5,000/- or ' 6,500/- per month, as the case may be.

9. A further argument has been made on behalf of the Provident Fund Commissioner that the Appellant-employees had already exercised their option under paragraph 26(6) of the Employees' Provident Funds Scheme. Paragraph 26(6) is in the following terms:

26. Classes of employees entitled and required to join the fund xxx xxx xxx (6) Notwithstanding anything contained in this paragraph, an officer not below the rank of an Assistant Provident Fund Commissioner may, on the joint request in writing, of any employee of a factory or other establishment to which this Scheme applies and his employer, enroll such employee as a member or allow him to contribute more than Subs. By Notification No. S350/2/2/96-SS II (sic S-35012/2/96- SS II), dated 4th May, 2001, for "rupees five thousand". Earlier the words "rupees five thousand were substituted by G.S.R. 718(E) dated 23rd September, 1994, for the words "rupees three thousand and five hundred" (w.e.f. 1.10.1994) [six thousand five hundred rupees] of his pay per month if he is already a member of the fund and thereupon such employee shall be entitled to the benefits and shall be subject to the conditions of the fund, provided that the employer gives an undertaking in writing that he shall pay the administrative charges payable and shall comply with all statutory provisions in respect of such employee].

10. We do not see how exercise of option under paragraph 26 of the Provident Fund Scheme can be construed to estop the employees from exercising a similar option

under paragraph 11(3). If both the employer and the employee opt for deposit against the actual salary and not the ceiling amount, exercise of option under paragraph 26 of the Provident Scheme is inevitable. Exercise of the option under paragraph 26(6) is a necessary precursor to the exercise of option under Clause 11(3). Exercise of such option, therefore, would not foreclose the exercise of a further option under Clause 11 (3) of the Pension Scheme unless the circumstances warranting such foreclosure are clearly indicated.

11. The above apart in a situation where the deposit of the employer's share at 12% has been on the actual salary and not the ceiling amount, we do not see how the Provident Fund Commissioner could have been aggrieved to file the L.P.A. before the Division Bench of the High Court. All that the Provident Fund Commissioner is required to do in the case is an adjustment of accounts which in turn would have benefited some of the employees. At best what the Provident Commissioner could do and which we permit him to do under the present order is to seek a return of all such amounts that the concerned employees may have taken or withdrawn from their Provident Fund Account before granting them the benefit of the proviso to Clause 11(3) of the Pension Scheme. Once such a return is made in whichever cases such return is due, consequential benefits in terms of this order will be granted to the said employees."

21. The said judgment is binding on all the parties.

22. It is also noticed that the Provident Fund Department, in these review petitions, itself has admitted of having released the amount in favour of 1175 pensioners upto 30/06/2017, hence no distinction can be drawn between the contributors to the Pension Scheme.

23. Thus viewed, the action of the respondents in denying the benefit to the

> pensioners who are members of the Pension Scheme, is held to be unjustified. While reiterating the order passed by this Court earlier, the petitioners are granted liberty to submit option before the Provident Fund Commissioner under Clause 11(3) of the Pension Scheme and the Provident Fund Commissioner shall thereafter obtain the amount from the respective PF Trust as per the said ratio of 8.55% and thereafter release all consequential benefits accordingly in terms of and as directed by the Apex Court hereinabove.
>
> 24. All the petitioners would have to submit an application for seeking of an option for receiving pension on the full salary and only after their depositing the PF amount which they have received from their concerned trust to the extent of 8.33% and the benefit of this judgment would be subject to their depositing the amount already received by them from PF Account of the PF Trust. Upon their depositing the said amount of 8.33% as calculated by the PF Trust, the PF Trust shall accordingly transfer the same to the EPFO Pension Fund and the pension shall accordingly be calculated and released. The exercise in this regard shall be completed by the respondents within a period of four months."

13. The Rajasthan High Court has, in fact, held that even the employees of exempted establishes are entitled to the benefit of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India rendered in “R.C.Gupta case”.

14. The learned counsels appearing for the petitioners would submit that in respect of the Writ Petitions, pertaining to the employees from the unexempted establishments, the issue has been settled by various High Courts and also by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the same were also implemented by the EPFO by extending the benefit to thousands of employees. Therefore, the resistance by the EPFO in respect of unexempted establishments was also discountenanced by various High Courts as well as the Hon'ble Supreme Court and therefore, it is no more open to the EPFO to offer fresh resistance before this Court as if that issue was not settled at all. Therefore, the learned counsels would submit that any rejection orders in respect of unexempted establishments or refusing to accept the option exercised by the employees on their retirement for calculation of pension on the

basis of their actual salaries, is required to be interfered with since their claims are squarely and fully covered which cannot be denied by the EPFO. In fact, the learned counsels would also point to the fact that after the orders passed by the Kerala High Court and particularly, the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in "R.C.Gupta case", a Circular was issued on 23.3.2017 wherein, a decision was taken to implement the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The said Circular is extracted here under:

CIRCULAR

No:Pension-I/33/EPSAmendment/96/VoI.II

Dated: 23-03-2017

To,

All Regional P.F. Commissioner,
Regional Office/Sub-Regional Office.

Subject:- Allowing members of the Employees' Pension Scheme, 1995 the benefit of the actual salary in the Pension Fund exceeding wage limit of either Rs. 5000/- or Rs. 6500 per month from the effective date respectively as per the Hon'ble Supreme Court's order in SLP No.33032-33033 of 2015 –Regarding.

Sir,

The matter of determination of pensionable salary exceeding statutory wages ceiling and exercise of option under deleted proviso to Para 11(3) of the EPS, 95 was examined in the light of the Hon'ble Supreme Court's Order in SLP No.33032-33033 of 2015.

2) The Hon'ble Apex court in SLP No.33032-33033 of 2015 observed that the reference to the date of commencement of the Scheme or the date on which the salary exceeds the ceiling limit are dates from which the option exercised are to be reckoned with for calculation pensionable salary. The said dates are not cut-off dates to determine the eligibility of the employer-employee to indicate their option under the proviso to Clause 11(3) of the Pension Scheme. It has further been observed that a beneficial Scheme, ought not to be allowed to be defeated by reference to a cut-off date, particularly, in a situation where (as in the present case) the employer had deposited 12% of the actual salary

and not 12% of the ceiling limited of Rs. 5000/- or Rs. 6500/- per month, as the case may be.

In a situation where the deposit of the employer's share at 12% has been on the actual salary and not the ceiling amount, the Provident Fund Commissioner could seek a return of all such amounts that the concerned employees may have taken or withdrawn from their Provident fund Account before granting them the benefits of the proviso to Clause 11(3) of the Pension Scheme. Once such a return is made in whichever cases is due, consequential benefits in terms of this order will be granted to the said employees.

Thus a member contributing to the Provident Fund on the wages exceeding the statutory ceiling or who had contributed to the Provident Fund on wages exceeding the Statutory ceiling cannot be debarred from exercising the option to contribute on such higher wages to the pension fund. (Copy of the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court enclosed).

3) Accordingly a proposal was sent to MOL&E to allow members of the Employees' Pension Scheme, 1995 who had contributed on higher wages exceeding the statutory wage ceiling of 6500/- in the Provident Fund to divert 8.33% of the salary exceeding Rs 6500/- to the Pension Fund with up to date interest as declared under EPF Scheme, 1952 from time to time to get the benefit of pension on higher salary on receipt of joint option of the Employer and Employee.

4) The MOL&E vide letter dated 03.2017 has conveyed its approval to allow members of the Employees' Pension Scheme, 1995 who had contributed on higher wages exceeding the statutory wage ceiling of Rs. 6500/- in the Provident Fund to divert 8.33% of the salary exceeding Rs.6500/- to the Pension Fund with up to date interest as declared under EPF Scheme, 1952 from time to time to get the benefit of pension on higher salary on receipt of joint option of the Employer and Employee. (copy enclosed for ready reference)

5) The officers in charge of all field offices are directed to take necessary action accordingly in accordance with the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP No.33032- 33033 of 2015 as approved by the Government and as per the provisions of the EPF & MP Act, 1952 and Schemes framed there under.

(This issues with the approval of CPFC.)

Yours faithfully,
(Dr. S.K. Thakur)
Addl. Central PF Commissioner,
HQ(Pension)"

15. In order to appreciate the stand of the EPFO as to how they rightly understood the legal implication of the orders passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, the learned counsels would submit that a conscious decision has been taken to implement the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, it is no more open to the EPFO to raise any kind of objection before this Court as they are estopped from making such objection in the circumstances of the case.

16. Apart from the issue pertaining to unexempted establishments, the real bone of contention in the present batch of Writ Petitions before this Court, is, in regard to the exempted establishments under Section 17 of the Act, as according to the EPFO, the decisions of the Kerala High Court and other High Courts and also the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in "R.C.Gupta case", there was no consideration of the employees' claim from exempted establishments. According to the EPFO, the employees of the exempted establishments stand on a different footing and they cannot maintain parity in treatment and claim for higher pensionary benefits on the basis of actual salary received by them. Since these establishments were not governed by the Act in view of the exemption granted to them and therefore, the payment of provident fund contribution on the basis of higher salary received by the employees did not arise since the Provident Fund Scheme, as per para 26(6) is not applicable to these establishments. Para 26(6) of the Pension Scheme is extracted hereunder:

"26.Classes of employees entitled and required to join the fund.-

(1) to (5) ....

(6) Notwithstanding anything contained in this paragraph [an officer not below the rank of an Assistant Provident Fund Commissioner] may, on the joint request in writing, of any employee of a

factory or other establishment to which this Scheme applies and his employer, enroll such employee as a member or allow him to contribute more than rupees [fifteen thousand rupees] of his pay per month if he is already a member of the Fund and thereupon such employee shall be entitled to the benefits and shall be subject to the conditions of the Fund, provided that the employer gives an undertaking in writing that he shall pay the administrative charges payable and shall comply with all statutory provisions in respect of such employee."

17. In the said circumstances, the EPFO has taken a conscious decision not to extend the benefit of the orders passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court to the employees of the exempted establishments and therefore issued instructions dated 31.5.2017, that no member of the Pension Scheme from the exempted establishments shall be eligible for the benefits as contemplated in the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in R.C.Gupta's case. The instructions dated 31.5.2017 are extracted as under:

CIRCULAR

No.Pension-I/12/33/EPS Amendment/96Vol.II

Dated : 31.05.2017

To
All Accs (Zonal Offices)
All Regional PF Commissioner (In-charge of Regions),
All Officers – in – charge of SROs.

Subject : Allowing members of the EPS' 95 the benefit of the actual salary in the pension fund exceeding wage limit of either Rs.5000/- or Rs.6500/- per month from the effective dated respectively as per the Hon'ble Supreme Court's order in Civil Appeal No (S) 10013-10014 of 2016 arising out of SLP No.3302-33033 of 2015-Reg.

Sir,

Please arrange to refer this office letter No.Pension 1/12 (33/EPF/Amendments /96/Vol.I dated 23.03.2017 on the above cited subject. Many references have been received from field officers to confirm to the aforesaid circular dated 23.03.2017 is applicable to employees of EPF exempted establishment in the context, it is informed as under.

i. Approval to comply with the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of Shri R.C.Gupta and others is only in respect of the Provident Fund & Pension members whose accounts are maintained by EPFO and whose PF contribution on higher wages has been received by EPFO.

ii. All the appellant employees in the aforesaid case before the Hon'ble Supreme Court were from unexempted establishment i.e., an establishment making P.F.Contributions in the statutory Provident Fund managed by EPFO. The employer's contribution of 12% under the Act in respect of the said employees was on actual salary and not on the ceiling limit of either Rs.5000/- or Rs.6,500/-.

iii. Exercise of option under para 26(6) of the EPF scheme, 1952 is a precursor to exercise of opinion under proviso to clause 11 (3) of the pension scheme. The appellant employees in the aforesaid case had exercised option under para 26 (6) of the EPF scheme and contribution on full salary was received in the statutory Provident Fund.

iv. Employee's pension scheme remittances are being made by the establishments and not by the exempted Trusts. As such if establishments with exempted trusts are allowed to make balance remittance on full salary to the Employees pension scheme afresh, the same will have to be considered for unexempted establishments also. It is not contemplated in the Judgment.

v. In the case of exempted establishments the Provident Fund and Pension Fund are managed by separate legal entitles. The Provident Fund of employees of exempted establishments are managed by exempted Trusts and pension fund is managed by EPFO. As such, adjustment of contribution from Provident Fund Account to Pension Accounts as contemplated in the Judgment is not possible.

The matter was placed in the 40th PEIC meeting. As decided in the 40th meeting of the PEIF the matter will be placed before the CBT. In the interim is a advised that no member of EPS 95 whose contribution of full salary has not been received on the account of the IPCO at the respective periods of contribution shall be eligible for the benefits contemplated in the

Judgment as per the aforesaid Hon'ble Supreme Court.

This issues with the approval of CPFC

Yours faithfully,
(Mukesh Kumar)
Regional PF Commissioner-I (Pension)"

18. According to the EPFO, in case of exempted establishments, the Provident Fund and the Pension Fund are managed by separate legal entitles, namely, the Provident Fund of employees of exempted establishments is managed by exempted Trusts and Pension Fund is managed by the EPFO and as such, adjustment of contribution from Provident Fund Account to Pension Accounts as contemplated in the Hon'ble Supreme Court's Judgment is not feasible or possible.

19. The above Circular/instructions issued by the EPFO is the subject matter to challenge in most of the present Writ Petitions filed by the employees of exempted establishments.

20. According to the learned Senior Counsels and the learned counsels appearing for the employees of the exempted establishments, the impugned Circular dated 31.5.2017 cannot be countenanced either in law or on facts for the simple reason that no matter whether PF trust is maintained by the respective establishments, the Pension Scheme 1995 is the same for all the employees and they formed a homogeneous group and it is not open to the EPFO to make an artificial classification as between the employees of the exempted establishments and the employees of the unexempted establishments. Moreover the Circular dated 31.5.2017 is without the authority of law and without consultation of the Government of India. The learned counsels would submit that it is an admitted case that even in respect of the exempted establishments, the contribution of 12% was paid on the basis of actual salaries received by the employees and a separate fund has been maintained by the respective establishments under the supervision and control of the EPFO. Although the establishment was allowed to maintain its own Trust in respect of Provident Fund contribution, in fact, it was under the control of EPFO as the Act and the Schemes have several provisions wherein the control of the EPFO on such private trust is real and actual. Therefore, the so called distinction between 'the exempted establishments' and the 'unexempted establishments' does not create any different set of employees for the purpose of calculation and payment of pension payable to the employees who formed a single class/group in the matter of

pensionary benefits. In fact, the private trust maintained by the respective exempted establishments in regard to the receipt of Provident Fund contribution, the same can be invested only as per the directives of the EPFO or as laid down by the Government of India, and the respective establishments have no independent power to invest the contribution on their own accord. Therefore, practically the exempted establishments are also under the control of the EPFO in respect of the Trust maintained by them in regard to Provident Fund contribution. In such scenario, it does not lie in the mouth of the EPFO to contend that the employees of the exempted establishments cannot be extended the benefit of calculation and payment for pension on the basis of actual salary received by them at the time of their retirement. The learned counsels would reiterate the fact that as far as the exempted employees are concerned, they had paid 10% or 12% of Provident Fund contribution as the case may be, towards their contribution on the basis of actual salary received by them from time to time and it was not on the basis of the ceiling limit of either Rs.5000/- which was in force from 15.11.1995 to 31.5.2001 and Rs.6500/- from 1.6.2001 to 31.08.2014 and Rs.15000/- from 1.9.2014 onwards.

21. Once the exempted establishments had received the higher contribution than the ceiling limit prescribed by the provisions of the Act, the employees cannot be at fault and cannot be denied higher pension. This is particularly so when the EPFO has not granted exemption to these establishments under the Pension Scheme and also has not accepted the option in terms of proviso to Clause 11(3). As held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and also by the other High Courts, it is always open to the EPFO to demand for return of the higher PF contribution paid to the employees at the time of retirement to the extent of contribution paid on the basis of their actual salaries and such amount can be adjusted and off set while calculating and paying the pension on the basis of actual salary received by them at the time of retirement.

22. Mr.Balan Haridoss, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners, would draw the attention of this Court to a decision rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in "(2018) 6 SCC 195 (Paradeep Phosphates Limited versus State of Orissa and others)" wherein, particularly, he would draw reference to paragraph 20, which is extracted hereunder:

> "20. Undoubtedly, it is a cardinal principle of law that beneficial laws should be construed liberally. The Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 is one of the welfare legislations which intends to provide and protect the benefits of the employees.

Hence, it shall be interpreted in a liberal and broad manner so that maximum benefits could reach to the employees. Any attempt to do strict interpretation would undermine the intention of the legislature. In a catena of cases, this Court has held that the welfare legislation shall be interpreted in a liberal way."

23. According to the learned counsel, the Act and the Scheme are beneficial piece of legislation and therefore, the Courts must always liberally construe the provisions in favour of the employees, any constricted construction of provisions would defeat the very scheme of such beneficial legislation. As regards the classification between the unexempted and exempted establishments, the learned counsel would rely on a decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in "(2013) 2 SCC 772 (Kallakkurichi Taluk Retired Offcials Association, Tamil Nadu and others versus State of Tamil Nadu, etc.) , wherein, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has has held in paragraphs 32 and 33 as under:

"32. First and foremost, it needs to be understood that the quantum of discrimination, is irrelevant to a challenge based on a plea of arbitrariness, under Article 14 of the Constitution of India. Article 14of the Constitution of India ensures to all, equality before the law and equal protection of the laws. The question is of arbitrariness and discrimination. These rights flow to an individual under Articles 14 and16 of the Constitution of India.

The extent of benefit or loss in such a determination is irrelevant and inconsequential. The extent to which a benefit or loss actually affects the person concerned, cannot ever be a valid justification for a court in either granting or denying the claim raised on these counts. The rejection of the claim of the by the High Court, merely on account of the belief that the carry home pension for employees who would retire after 1.6.1988, would be trivially lower than those retiring prior thereto, amounts to bagging the issue pressed before the High Court. The solitary instance referred to above, which is not a matter of dispute even at the hands of the first clearly demonstrates, that in a given situation, an employee retiring on or after1.6.1988 could suffer a substantial loss, in comparison to an employee retiring before 1.6.1988. We are, therefore satisfied, that the High Court clearly erred while determining the issue projected before it.

33. At this juncture it is also necessary to examine the concept of valid classification. A valid classification is truly a valid discrimination. Article 16 of the Constitution of India permits a valid classification(see, State of Kerala vs. N.M. Thomas (1976) 2 SCC 310). A valid classification is based on a just objective. The result to be achieved by the just objective presupposes, the choice of some for differential consideration/treatment, over others. A classification to be valid must necessarily satisfy two tests. Firstly, the distinguishing rationale has to be based on a just objective. And secondly, the choice of differentiating one set of persons from another, must have a reasonable nexus to the objective sought to be achieved.Legalistically, the test for a valid classification may be summarized as, a distinction based on a classification founded on an intelligible differentia, which has a rational relationship the object sought to be achieved. Whenever a cut off date (as in the present controversy) is fixed to categorise one set of pensioners for favourable consideration over others, the twin test for valid classification (or valid discrimination) must necessarily be satisfied."

24. The learned counsel would submit that the distinction sought to be made by the Organization is neither intelligible nor constitutionally valid and hence the impugned order of rejectiion by the EPFO has to be necessarily held to be invalid and void.

25. Mr.Karthick, learned Senior Counsel would add that a Division Bench of Kerala High Court in W.P.(C) No.13120 of 2015 was called upon to decide the amendment brought about by the Employees' Pension (Amendment) Scheme, 2014 by reviewing the proviso to Clause 11(3) of the Pension Scheme wherein, the ceiling limit has been brought in of Rs.15,000/- and proviso to Clause 11(3) providing for payment of contribution in regard to the pension on the basis of actual salary received by the

employees concerned stood deleted. The Division Bench of Kerala High Court has dealt with all the objections and finally held that the amendment brought in Employees' Pension (Amendment) Scheme, 2014 dated 22.8.2014 is invalid and such amendment was also set aside by the Division Bench. In that context, the learned Division Bench of Kerala High Court has dealt with entitlement of the pension on the basis of actual salary received by them and the observations and findings made by the Division Bench of Kerala High Court as found in paragraphs 32 to 38, are extracted hereunder:

> 32. The Apex Court has thus found the insistence on a date for exercise of the joint option to be without any justification. In other words, the proviso to paragraph 11 of the Pension Scheme does not stipulate a cut off date at all. Any such stipulation of a cut off date for conferring benefits under the Pension Scheme would have the effect of classifying the employees into persons who have retired before or after the said date.
>
> 33. As per the amendments, the maximum pensionable salary has been fixed at Rs.15,000/- thereby disentitling the persons who have contributed on the basis of their actual salaries to any benefits on the basis of the excess contributions made by them. The said provision is arbitrary and cannot be sustained. The employees, who have been making contributions on the basis of their actual salaries after submitting a joint option with their employers as required by the Pension Scheme, are denied the benefits of their contributions by the said amendments without any justification. Apart from the above, to cap the salary at Rs. 15,000/- for quantifying pension is absolutely unrealistic. A monthly salary of Rs.15,000/- works out only to about Rs.500/- per day. It is common knowledge that, even a manual labourer is paid more than the said amounts as daily wages. Therefore, to limit the maximum salary at Rs.15,000/- for pension would deprive most of the employees of a decent pension in their old age. Since the pension scheme is intended to provide succour to the retired employees, the said object would be defeated by capping the salary. The duty of the trustees of the Fund is to administer the same for the benefit of the employees - by wise investments and efficient management. They have no right to deny the pension legitimately due to them

on the ground that the fund would get depleted. The demand of additional payment of 1.16% of their salaries exceeding Rs.15,000/- is unsustainable for the reason that, Section 6A does not require the employees to make any additional contribution to constitute the Pension Fund. Nor does it empower the authorities to demand additional contribution. In the absence of any statutory backing, the said provision in the Pension Scheme is ultra vires. The amendment in so far as it stipulates the average monthly pay drawn over a span of 60 months preceding the date of exit as the pensionable service is also arbitrary for the reason that it deprives the employees of a substantial portion of the pension to which they would have been eligible had it not been for the amendment. The provision as it originally stood stipulated computation of pensionable salary on the basis of the monthly pay drawn over a period of 12 months prior to their exit. The reason for the amendments as disclosed by the counter affidavit filed is that payment of pension on the basis of the Scheme as it stood prior to the amendment would result in depletion of the Fund. Absolutely no material or data to support the above contention has been placed before us. On the contrary, placing reliance on a news report carried by "The Hindu" newspaper on 17.8.2014, it is contended by the petitioners that, a staggering amount of Rs.32,000 Crores of unclaimed amount is lying in various inoperative accounts across the country, as unclaimed pension as disclosed by the Central Provident Fund Commissioner at an interactive session with employees at Hyderabad. In the absence of any material to support the contention that the fund is likely to be depleted, we reject the said contention. Apart from the above, there is no provision in the Act that stipulates the pension payments to commensurate with the amounts actually remitted by an employee and his employer. It is also a fact that the administrators of the Fund invest the amounts and generate profit from such investments.

34. Apart from the above it is common knowledge that, the salary of all employees have gone up to such an extent that, at present even a Class-IV employee or a person employed in Menial jobs would be drawing salaries far in excess of the celing limit of Rs.6500/-. Therefore, to cap the

salary at Rs.6500/- for the purpose of contributions is unrealistic. The authorities are turning a blind eye to the realities in the society by doing so. The further contention that the ceiling limit was intended to cater to the lower wage earners also has to be rejected for the reason that no such intention is discernible from the provisions of the Act. There would be no employee below the said ceiling limit, at present. Consequently, the allegation that there would be reverse subsidization is ill conceived.

35. It cannot be disputed that, the work force in our country has only been growing in numbers with more and more establishments springing into existence and getting covered by the provisions of the EPF Act. The contributions paid by them on the basis of the actual salaries drawn by the employees are constantly adding to the base of the fund. Such process of accretion is a continuing phenomenon. Therefore, there is no evidence of the fact that the fund is getting depleted by the payment of pension, as alleged. At the same time, the Statistics only prove otherwise. It is commonly accepted that the fund base has only grown over the years by the accumulation of EPF contributions.

36. Considering the fact that, the pension fund is created for the purpose of providing succour to the employees in the their old age, taking into account the further fact that the fund is created by collecting contributions from the employers and employees, casting no financial burden on the State, it follows that no scheme that defeats the purpose of the enactment by reducing the pension payable to the employees in their old age to a ridiculously low amount, which is not sufficient even for ensuring a decent life to them, cannot be sustained. There is no justification for stealing bread from the mouths of the pensioners to secure the Pension Fund. Though the Fund is replenished by the present workers, its beneficiaries are the old and infirm former workers; the pensioners. The Fund is meant for their sustenance. It is the duty of the Central Board to administer the Fund efficiently and to augment the Fund through wise investments and professional management so as to ensure that it meets the commitment to pay pension to the

employees. The said amendments are therefore ultravires the power to frame schemes.

37. The stated objective of the amendments is to prevent depletion of the fund. The said apprehension is absolutely baseless for the reasons stated above. The number of persons who are contributing to the Provident Fund as well as the Pension Fund have only grown over the years. The work force in our country would only grow further in the future. It has to be stated here that in view of the increase in the number of workers over the years, the contributions would also grow. The phenomenon is only bound to continue in future. Therefore, even when payments of pension are made to the retired employees, the pension fund would continue to get replenished with the contributions of the new entrants. The said ongoing process would maintain the Fund in a stable condition. If at all, a situation where the Fund base gets eroded occurs, the situation could be remedied at that time by enhancing the rates of contributions of persons contributing to the Fund through a legislative exercise. The attempt to maintain the stability of the fund by reducing the pension would only be counter productive and would defeat the very purpose of the enactment.

38. As rightly contended by the counsel appearing for the petitioners, the effect of the amendments to the Pension Scheme is to create different classes of pensioners on the basis of the date, 1.9.2014, the date on which the amended Scheme came into force. Consequently, there would be -

(i) employees who have exercised option under the proviso to paragraph 11(3) of the 1995 Scheme and continuing in service as on 1.9.2014;

(ii) employees who have not exercised their option under the proviso to paragraph 11(3) of the 1995 Scheme, and continuing in service as on 1.9.2014;

(iii) employees who have retired prior to 1.9.2014 without exercising an option under paragraph 11(3) of the 1995 Scheme;

(iv) employees who have retired prior to 1.9.2014 after exercising the option under paragraph 11(3) of 1995 Scheme.

The rationale in so classifying the employees covered by the Pension Scheme on the basis of the above date is not forthcoming. The object sought to

> be achieved is stated to be prevention of depletion of the Pension Fund, which cannot be accepted as a justification to support the classification. Inasmuch as the statutory scheme is to make the Pension Fund enure to the benefit of the homogeneous class of the totality of employees covered by the Provident Fund, a further classification of the said class by formulating a Scheme is ultra vires the power available to the Central Government under Sections 5 and 7 of the EPF Act. Therefore, it has to be held that, the impugned amendments are arbitrary, ultra vires the EPF Act and unsustainable.
>
> For the foregoing reasons, the petitioners are entitled to succeed. The writ petitions are all allowed as follows:
>
> i) The Employee's Pension (Amendment) Scheme, 2014 brought into force by Notification No. GSR. 609(E) dated 22.8.2014 evidenced by Ext.P8 in W.P.(C) No. 13120 of 2015 is set aside;
>
> ii) All consequential orders and proceedings issued by the Provident Fund authorities/respondents on the basis of the impugned amendments shall also stand set aside.
>
> iii) The various proceedings issued by the Employees Provident Fund Organization declining to grant opportunities to the petitioners to exercise a joint option along with other employees to remit contributions to the Employees Pension Scheme on the basis of the actual salaries drawn by them are set aside.
>
> iv) The employees shall be entitled to exercise the option stipulated by paragraph 26 of the EPF Scheme without being restricted in doing so by the insistence on a date.
>
> v) There will be no order as to costs."

26. The learned Senior Counsel would submit that even the amendment which was brought about to Employees Pension Scheme 2014 that capped monthly salary to be considered for contribution to pension scheme at Rs.15000/- instead of the actual salary, came to be struck down by the Kerala High Court in the above mentioned judgment, as far as the present Writ Petitions are concerned when the proviso was in the scheme to Clause 11(3) providing for option exercisable by the employees and such option cannot be restricted by a cut off date which cut off date was found to be invalid and void and in such circumstances, the employees of the exempted establishments are

entitled to be treated on par with the employees of the unexempted establishments and any such discrimination cannot be countenanced constitutionally.

27. Per contra, the learned counsels appearing for the EPFO would primarily submit that first of all these writ petitioners/employees admittedly did not exercise their option under Section 26(6) of the Employees Provident Funds Scheme, 1952 and also under proviso to Clause 11(3) of the Pension Scheme. According to the learned counsels appearing for the EPFO, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in 'R.C.Gupta' case has clearly held that exercise of option under para 26(6) is a necessary pre-cursor to exercise optiion under proviso to Clause 11(3) of the Pension Scheme. As regards exempted establishments, the question of exercising option under para 26 (6) of PF Scheme does not arise as these establishments have their own PF Scheme managed by their own private Trust. Therefore, the employees of such establishments cannot exercise their option under proviso to Clause 11(3) of the Pension Scheme as per the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The learned counsels for the EPFO would uniformally contend that the issue of whether the employees of exempted establishments would also be covered by the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India was not raised before the other High Courts and even before the Hon'ble Supreme Court and thereby as on date, such an issue was not raised or answered. Therefore, the learned counsels for the EPFO would urge this Court to consider their objections that the employees of the exempted establishments are materially different and they cannot be treated on par with the employees of unexempted establishments. Factually whatever their contribution towards provident fund was made only to the private Trust maintained by the establishments and not by the EPFO. Such higher contribution was not passed on to the EPFO in respect of the Pension Scheme, since admittedly 8.33% contribution has been remitted by the exempted establishments to the Pension Fund only on the basis of ceiling limit of Rs.5000/-, 6500/- and 15000/- as the case may be. That being the case, the question of the EPFO extending the benefit of higher calculation for payment of pension on the basis of actual salary received by the employees would not arise. The question of book adjustment would not arise in this case since the EPF contribution and Pension Scheme are maintained by two different legal entitles, one private Trust and the other by the EPFO. Even assuming that the EPFO can demand for return of excess PF amount received by the retired employees to the extent of higher payment of contribution on the actual salary received by them, such return of the excess contribution would not materially ennure to the benefit of the pension fund maintained by the EPFO as that would only cause

considerable erosion of the corpus fund maintained by the EPFO. This is because of the fact that the actual contribution on the higher salary has not been remitted to the Pension Account maintained by the EPFO for all those years when the employees of the exempted estalishments were in service and in the absence of remittances, the EPFO was precludedfrom investing the money and prevented from generating more revenue in order to sustain the Fund. According to the learned counsels for the EPFO, that today, practically whatever money to be returned by the employees on the above lines would be too low in comparison to what they are entitled to receive arrears of pension on the basis of higher salary earned by them at the time of their retirement, in which event, there would be complete depletion of pension fund and in such scenario, the persons affected would be the existing employees of various establishments who make contributions on the ceiling limit as prescribed by the Scheme.

28. In one of the counter affidavits filed on behalf of the EPFO, the above scenario is succinctly expressed with illustration as follows:

> ""v. If these employees of exempted establishments could have complied in the initial days of beginning of Employees Pension Scheme 1995, the return on investment could have been on a much higher rate of return and for a longer period as the rate of interest in the late 1990's and early 2000's were around 12 to 14% whereas the current interest rate on investment is around 6%. Further, it would have yielded returns for future period also as EPFO investments are for longer tenure. As such deposit of the amount for past many years (having higher return regime) in the current low interest regime and paying pension on much higher wage for future (say 15 to 20 years) will be detrimental to the financial health of the pension fund. It is not just loss of past interest income, but erosion of corpus itself.
>
> vi. It is stated that if a member is allowed to give option to contribute on higher wages in the pension scheme, retrospectively, it will amount to enhancing monthly pension of the member manifold without getting any contribution from him towards increased pension. This will be evident from the following live example where the member retired on 31.03.2011 and subsequently remitted contribution on higher wages in 2016.

Calculation of Pension:

	Existing	Revised (on higher wages)
Pensionable Salary	6500	78106
Pension as per formula	1613*	19384
Past service benefit	313	313
Total pension	1926	19697

*including weightage

Amount remitted (contribution at 8.33% on higher wages with interest up to 10/2016 : Rs.7,64,971/-

Arrears of Pension paid : Rs.12,21,076/-

Thus in this case the member received an amount of Rs.4,56,105/- up front as arrears of pension and his monthly pension was increased 10 times from Rs.1926 to Rs.19697, without practically paying single Rupee towards the enhanced pension in the Pension Scheme. The liability of this enhanced monthly pension will be borne by the members who are presently contributing to the pension scheme."

29. From the above illustration, the learned counsels would submit that the employees herein would be practically paying nothing, but they would be paid enhanced pension and the liability of the enhanced pension will be borne by the members who are presently contributing the pension scheme. This would be unjust enrichment which cannot be allowed. The learned counsel would also submit that the employees who had foresight to contribute higher contribution on the basis of their salary and invested their money by such contribution cannot be placed on par with these employees who have not exercised their option at all during the period of their employment and these employees have woken up only when the orders were passed by the Kerala High Court and the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The present claim, if it is going to considered favourably, would completely unsettle the Pension Fund maintained by the EPFO and the maintenance of such fund would be challenging as the EPFO may have to look at the Government for budgetery allocation in case of huge deficit in the Corpus Fund. Therefore, the consideration of the petitioners' claim today is not either in the interest of the

industry or the employees concerned and therefore, urge this Court to dismiss atleast the claims of the employees who are from the exempted establishments.

30. Mr.Ramu, learned counsel appearing for the EPFO would particularly draw the attention of this Court that once a member has retired from service, he ceased to be a member of the Fund. He would refer to Clause 2(iv) of the Pension Scheme which deals with 'Contributory Service' and also Clause 2(vi) (ix), (xiii) and (xv), which are extracted hereunder:

> "2(iv) "Contributory service" means the period of 'actual service' rendered by a member for which the contributions to the fund have been 1[received or are receivable].
>
> "2(vi) "Existing Member" means an existing employee who is a "Member of the Employees' Family Pension Scheme, 1971";
>
> "2(ix) "Member" means an employee who becomes a member of the Employees' Pension Fund in accordance with the provisions of this Scheme.
>
> "2(xiii) "Pay" means basic wages, with dearness allowance, retaining allowance and cash value of food concessions admissible, if any.
>
> "2(xv) "pensionable service" means the service rendered by the member for which contributions have been received or are receivable."

31. The learnd counsel would also rely on Clauses 3 and 6A of the Pension Scheme, which are extracted as under:

> "3. Employees' Pension Fund.- (1) From and out of the contributions payable by the employer in each month under Section 6 of the Act or under the rules of the Provident Fund of the establishment which is exempted either under clauses (a) and (b) of sub-section (1) of Section 17 of the Act or whose employees are exempted under either paragraph 27 or paragraph 27-A of the Employees' Provident Fund Scheme, 1952, a part of contribution representing 8.33 per cent of the Employee's pay shall be remitted by the employer to the Employees' Pension fund within 15 days of the close of every month by a separate bank draft or cheque on account of the Employees' Pension Fund contribution in such manner as may

be specified in this behalf by the Commissioner. The cost of the remittance, if any, shall be borne by the employer.

(2) The Central Government shall also contribute at the rate of 1.16 per cent of the pay of the members of the Employees' Pension Scheme and credit the contribution to the Employees' Pension Fund: Provided that where the pay of the member exceeds 1[rupees six thousand and five hundred] per month the contribution payable by the employer and the Central Government be limited to the amount payable on his pay of 9[rupees six thousand and five hundred] only 9. Subs. by G.S.R.383 (E) dated the 24.5.2001 (w.e.f. 1.6.2001).

(3) Each contribution payable under sub-paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be calculated to the nearest rupee, fifty paise or more to be counted as the next higher rupee and fraction of a rupee less than fifty paise to be ignored. (4) The net assets of the Family Pension Scheme, 1971 shall vest in and stand transferred to the Employees' Pension Fund."

....

"6-A. Retention of membership: A member of the Employees' Pension Fund shall continue to be such member till he attains the age of 58 years or he avails the withdrawal benefit to which he is entitled under para 14 of the Scheme, or dies, or the pension is vested in him in terms of para 12 of the Scheme, whichever is earlier."

32. Relying on the above, Mr.Ramu, learned counsel would submit that these employees have ceased to be the members of the Pension Fund on their retirement and therefore, they cannot claim to have any right to exercise their option after their retirement since they were not treated as members of the Pension Fund Scheme in order to consider their option.

33. All the learned counsels appearing for the EPFO would also uniformally and vehemently contend that a conscious decision has been taken by the EPFO by taking into consideration actuarial liability and the consequence of such enhanced pension to be paid to these writ petitioners as well as in view of large

scale outflow of fund for the retired employees more than the inflow of the fund from them, a decision has been taken not to extend the benefit as per the order of the Hon’ble Supreme Court to the employees of the exempted establishments. In any event, such claim by the employees is incapable of compliance as it would expose the pension fund maintained by EPFO to depletion.

34. At this, the learned Senior Counsels as well as the other learned counsels appearing for the employes would submit that the question of financial implication need not be given undue importance for the simple reason that once the employees are entitled to be paid enhanced pension on the basis of right to be teated equally in terms of Article 14 of the Constitution of India, the question of consideration of financial implication would not be proper. Moreover, on behalf of the EPFO, nothing has been brought out in clear terms as to how the pension corpus would get depleted or eroded. No financial statement has ben filed in regard to the liability of the EPFO towards higher pension and what is inflow into the Pension Fund in regard to new employees being covered under the Pension Scheme as on date. In the absence of any such details, merely by showing a stray illustration in the couner affidavit, cannot form a basis for rejection of the employees claim on the ground of financial crisis. Moreover, the enhanced pension payable to each of the employee is only during life term of the employee and such life time being unpredictable and the enhanced pension cannot be denied on the basis of so-called actuarial liability and risk on such payment from the pension fund.

35. The learned counsels appering for the employees would therefore submit that both set of employees, one from the exempted establishments and another from unexempted establishments are entitled to be paid pension on exercising their option in terms of Proviso to Clause 11(3) of the Pension Scheme and the employees in order to receive higher pension are willing to return the excess provident fund contribution received by them to the extent which were contributed on the basis of their actual salaries received by them with reasonable interest. The learned counsels at the same time would also urge this Court that the EPFO may be directed to calculate the excess Provident Fund amoiunt to be returned with the interest to be fixed by this Court and on the basis of arrival at a particular figure, the amount to be returned by the employee concerned shall be be adjusted with the amount payable by the EPFO to the employees towards enhanced pension. In case the employees are required to pay more than what is to be paid to them by EPFO towards pension, the same may be directed to be returned and in

case the employees are to receive more quantum by way of arrears of pension than what is to be returned by them to EPFO, the same may be adjusted and the remaining amount to be paid to the respective employees.

36. Heard the learned Senior Counsels and the learned counsels appearing for the respective parties. On conclusion of the arguments, this Court has bestowed upon itself its anxious consideration to various submissions made on behalf of the writ petitioners/employees and also on behalf of the EPFO which would touch upon the following salient points for consideration of this Court, viz.,

> 1. Whether the employees of unexempted establishments are also entitled to higher pension on the basis of their contribution towards Provident Fund paid to them over and above the ceiling limit as prescribed in the Act, PF Scheme and the Pension Scheme without reference to the cut off date as 01.12.2004 for exercising the option by the employees?
>
> 2. Whether these employees' right to receive higher pension has crystallized by the legal principles as laid down by the various High Courts as aforementioned and also by the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in 'R.C.Gupta case?
>
> 3. Whether in regard to unexempted establishments, the issue is still open for adjudication by this Court in view of the law laid down by the various High Courts on the subject matter including the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in R.C.Gupta case?
>
> 4. Whether the writ petitioners who are from the exempted establishments are any way different from beneficiaries of the orders passed by the High Courts of Kerala, Telangana, Rajasthan and also the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India or they form a homogeneous group?
>
> (OR) whether the employees from the exempted establishements can be treated materially different within the frame work of EPF Act, PF Scheme 1952 and the Employees Pension Scheme 1995?

37. POINT NO.1:

> "Whether the employees of unexempted establishments are also entitled to higher pension on the basis of their contribution towards Provident Fund paid to them over and above the ceiling limit as prescribed in the Act and the Pension Scheme, PF Scheme and the Pension Scheme without reference to the cut off date as 01.12.2004 for exercising the option by the employees? ?"

In regard to the above issue, this Court has to consider as to what is the substance of the resistance to the claim of these employees by the EPFO. As far as this Court could see from the submissions and pleadings placed on record that the cut off date was prescribed by EPFO as 01.12.2004 for exercising the option in terms of proviso to Clause 11(3) of the Pension Scheme. The said cut off date was the subject matter of challenge inter alia before the Kerala High Court and a learned single Judge of Kerala High Court in his order dated 4.11.2011 has held that the scheme does not contain any provision enabling the EPFO to prescribe any cut off date. The particular paragraph, i.e. Para 4 in which such finding given by the learned single Judge of the Keral High Court is extracted herein once again for the purpose of giving a finding for the present claim.

> "4. The second objection is regarding the cut off date fixed. According to the Provident Fund Organization a cut off date of 1.12.2004 has been fixed for applying for benefit of the proviso by changing over to payment of contributions on actual salary basis. But the Provident Fund Organization has not been able to produce any document by which such a cut off date has been fixed by anybody. The Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, the Employees' Provident Fund Scheme and the Employees' Pension Scheme do not contain any provision enabling the 2nd respondent or anybody else to fix a cut off date for the purpose of availing of the benefit of proviso to clause 11(3). Even assuming that anybody has any power to fix that cut off date, certainly it is not the 2nd respondent. As such I am convinced that the cut off date fixed by the 2nd respondent is clearly without jurisdiction. That being so, the benefits already granted to the

petitioners under the proviso to clause 11(3) cannot now be reversed or withdrawn as done in this case.

38. Admittedly, the order of the learned Single Judge has been confirmed by the Division Bench of the Kerala High Court in W.A.No.569 of 2012 by its judgment dated 5.3.2013, holding that the learned single Judge has correctly understood and decided the issue regarding the cut off date. In fact, the Division Bench has also given a detailed reasoning as to how such a cut off date is legally impermissible in paragraph 10, which once again is extracted hereunder:

> "10. According to us, the learned Single Judge has correctly understood and decided the issue regarding the cut off date fixed. According to the Provident Fund Organisation, cut off date of 1/12/2004 has been fixed for applying for benefit of the proviso by changing over to payment of contributions on actual salary basis. It was noticed by the learned Single Judge that no document by which such a cut off date has been fixed by anybody is produced by the Provident Fund Organisation. The Employees' Provident Fund Scheme and the Employees' Pension Scheme also do not contain any provision enabling the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner or anybody else to fix a cut off date for the purpose of availing of the benefit of proviso to clause 11(3). According to us, the decision of the learned Single Judge that - even assuming that anybody has power to fix that cut off date, certainly such power is not with the 2nd respondent-Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, is quite correct.

39. The Division Bench order of the Kerala High Court ultimately was confirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India where SLP filed against the order came to be dismissed vide order dated 31.3.3016 finding that there was no valid ground for interference. Therefore, in all fours, the exclusion of the employees from unexempted establishments from the purview of grant of higher pension on the basis of actual salaries received by them, cannot be countenanced both in law and on facts.

40. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in R.C.Gupta case, has held that the beneficial scheme ought not be defeated by referring to cut off date particularly when the employer had deposited 12% of

the actual salary and not 12% of the ceiling limit of Rs.5000/- or Rs.6500/- per month, as the case may be. Once the cut off date has no sanctity in law and allowed the claim of the employees, the issue is no more res integra and therefore, it does not lie in the mouth of the EPFO today to argue against the grant of relief to the employees who are from unexempted establishments. Therefore, this Court hold the first Point in favour of the emplouyees from the unexempted establishments as the resistance put up by the EPFO has no legal legs to stand. Therefore, it is concluded that the employees of the unexempted establishments are entitled to higher pension on the basis of their contribution towards Provident Fund on the actual salaries received by them at the time of their retirement.

41. POINT NO.2:

> "Whether these employees' right to receive higher pension has crystallized by the legal principles as laid down by the various High Courts as aforementioned and also by the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in 'R.C.Gupta case?"

As regards the above issue is concerned, in view of the categoric pronouncement by a learned single Judge of the Kerala High Court which was confirmed by the Division Bench of the Kerala High Court and dismissal of the SLP preferred by the EPFO and the extension of benefits of higher pension to thousands of employees in pursuance of the orders of the Kerala High Court and of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the right of these employees from unexempted establishments has crystallized beyond any controversy or dispute. Once the Hon'ble Supreme Court has rendered a decisioin on the subject matter, which becomes the law of the land under Article 141 of the Constitution of India and such declaration of law would cover every employee in every corner of the country. Therefore, the writ petitioners from unexempted establishments have a right to claim enhanced pension if they are willing to exercise their option as per proviso to Clause 11(3) of the Pension Scheme. Denial of parity in this regard would offend Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

42. POINT NO.3:

> Whether in regard to unexempted establishments, the issue is still open for adjudication by this Court in view of the law laid down by the various High Courts on the

subject matter including the order passed by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in R.C.Gupta case?

Although stiff resistance was put up by the EPFO in regard to grant of relief to the employees even from the unexempted establishments as if these employees were different in status as that of employees covered by the orders passed by the Kerala High Court and the Hon’ble Supreme Court, the fact remains that these employees are not different from the employees who are the beneficiaries of the orders of the Kerala High Court as well as the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India. Therefore, this Court is unable to comprehend as to the legal basis for EPFO to question the claim of these writ petitioners when the EPFO itself was a party to all the litigations afore mentioned and the matter has reached its finality in favour of the employees. In fact, admittedly, the EPFO itself has extended the benefit in terms of the order of the High Courts and the Hon’ble Supreme Court to thousands of employees and therefore, any semblance of resistance put up by the EPFO against the claim of these categories of employees, is amounted to patent discrimination and violative of Article 14 of the Constitution.

In view of the above conclusion by this Court, the issue of grant of enhanced pension to this set of employees from unexempted establishments, is not still open for this Court to adjudicate as the dispute is no more alive seeking any further resolution of the same as the issue has already been settled categorically in favour of the employees, which means, the issue of grant of higher pension to the employees of unexempted establishments on the basis of their option for payment of higher contribution on the basis of actual salary received by them, is no more res integra and the writ petitioners who are the employees of the unexmpted establishments are also entitled to be treated on par with other similarly placed employees who are beneficiaries of order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in R.C.Gupta case for grant of enhanced pension.

44. POINT NO.4:

"Whether the writ petitioners who are from the exempted establishments are any way different from beneficiaries of the orders passed by the High Courts of Kerala, Telangana, Rajasthan and also the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India or they form a homogeneous group?

(OR) whether the employees from the exempted establishements can be treated materially different within the frame work of EPF Act, PF Scheme 1952 and the Employees Pension Scheme 1995?

As regards the employees of exempted establishments are concerned, the EPFO has vehemently opposed for grant of any relief to them on the basis of the orders passed by the Kerala High Court and also on the basis of the Hon’ble Supreme Court’s decision in R.C.Gupta case and also on the basis of other High Courts decisions, viz., Telengana, Rajasthan, etc. According to the learned counsels appearing for the EPFO, the issue of treating the employees of the exempted establishments on par with the employees of unexempted establishments was not specifically raised and answered by the Courts and therefore, the said issue needs to be examined by this Court. According to the learned counsels, the exempted establishements cannot be placed on par with the unexempted establishments for the various reasons as stated above and therefore, the employees of such exempted employees cannot draw parallel as to that of the employees of unexempted establishments in the matter of extension of benefit of higher pension. This Court, therefore, has to see whether the employees of the exempted establishments can be placed on par with the employees of unexempted establishments for the purpose of extending the benefit of higher pension and whether the parity as between the exempted and unexempted employees would be permissible within the constitutional frame work and statutory scheme. No doubt that the employees of the exempted establishments whose Provident Fund is maintained by Private Trust of the respective establishements and out of Provident Fund paid to the Private Trust, only 8.33% is remitted to the Pension Fund maintained by the EPFO on the basis of the ceiling limit of salary i.e. 5000/-, 6500/- or 15000/- per month as the case may be. However, ultimately, the essence of the scheme and the right of the employees need to be seen in the larger context of the Act, PF Scheme as well as the Pension Scheme.

45. As rightly contended by the learned counsels for the employees that although the exempted establishments are allowed to have their own Private Trust for their Provident Fund contribution, nevertheless such fund is essentially controlled and supervised by the EPFO under the Employees' Provident Funds Scheme, 1952. In fact, the exemption as given under Section 17 of the Act is only on the basis of the fact where the rates of

contribution were not less favourable than those specified in Section 6 of the Act. Section 17 along with proviso, is extracted as under:

> "17. Power to exempt.- (1) The appropriate Government may, by notification in the Official Gazette, and subject to such conditions as may be specified in the notification, exempt, whether prospectively or retrospectively, from the operation] of all or any of the provisions of any Scheme-
>
> (a) any establishment to which this Act applies if, in the opinion of the appropriate Government, the rules of its provident fund with respect to the rates of contribution are not less favourable than those specified in section 6 and the employees are also in enjoyment of other provident fund benefits which on the whole are not less favourable to the employees than the benefits provided under this Act or any Scheme in relation to the employees in any other establishment of a similar character; or
>
> (b) Any establishment if the employees of such establishment are in enjoyment of benefits in the nature of provident fund, pension or gratuity and the appropriate Government is of opinion that such benefits, separately or jointly, are on the whole not less favourable to such employees than the benefits provided under this Act or any Scheme in relation to employees in any other establishment of a similar character.
>
> Provided that no such exemption shall be made except after consultation with the Central Board which on such consultation shall forward its views on exemption to the appropriate Government within such time limit as may be specified in the Scheme.
>
> (1-A) where an exemption has been granted to an establishment under clause (a) of subsection (1)-
> (a) The provisions of section 6, 7A, 8 and 14B shall, so far as may be, apply to the employer of the exempted establishment in addition to such other conditions as may be specified in the notification grating such exemption, and where such employer contravenes, or make default in

complying with any of the said provisions or conditions or any other provisions of this Act, he shall be punishable under section 14 as if the said establishment had not been exempted under the said clause (a); (b) The employer shall establish a Board of Trustees for the administration of the provident fund consisting of such number of member as may be specified in the Scheme; (c) The terms and conditions of service of members of the Board of Trustees shall be such as may be specified in the Scheme; (d) The Board of Trustees constituted under clause (b) shall- (i) Maintain detailed accounts to show the contributions credited, withdrawals made and interest accrued in respect of each employee; (ii) Submit such returns to the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner or any other officer as the Central Government may direct from time to time; (iii) Invest the provident fund monies in accordance with the directions issued by the Central Government from time to time; (iv) Transfer, where necessary, the provident fund account of any employee; and (v) Perform such other duties as may be specified in the Scheme."

It is also relevant to extract the revised conditions for grant of exemption under Section 17 of the Act, which are found in Appendix -A of Section 27-AA of the Provident Funds Scheme, which read as under:

27AA. Terms and conditions of exemption.- All exemptions already granted or to be granted hereafter under section 17 of the Act or under paragraph 27A of the scheme shall be subject to the terms and conditions as given in the Appendix A.

APPENDIX "A"

1. The employer shall establish a Board of Trustees under his Chairmanship for the management of the Provident Fund according to such directions as may be given by the Central Government or the Central Provident Fund Commissioner, as the case may be, from time to time. The Provident Fund shall vest in the Board of Trustees who will be responsible for and accountable to the employees' Provident Fund

Organisation, inter alia, for proper accounts of the receipts into and payment from the Provident fund and the balance in the custody. For the purpose, the "employer" shall meani)

i) in relation to an establishment, which is factory, the owner or occupier of the factory; and

ii) In relation to any other establishment, the person who, or the authority, that has the ultimate control over the affarirs of the establishments.

2. The Board of Trustees shall meet atleast once in every three months and shall function in the accordance with the guidelines that may be issued from time to time by the Central Government/Central Provident Fund Commissioner (CPFC) or an officer authorized by him.

3. All employees, as defined in section 2(f) of the Act, who have been eligible to become members of the Provident Fund, had the establishment not been granted exemption, shall be enrolled as members.

4. Where an employee who is already a member of Employees' Provident Fund or a provident fund of any other emempted establishment is employed in his establishment, the employer shall immediately enroll him as a member of the fund. The employer should also arrange to have the accumulations in the provident fund account of such employee with his previous employer transferred and credited into his account.

5. the employer shall transfer to the Board of Trustees the contributions payable to the provident fund by himself and employees at the rate prescribed under the Act from time to time by the 15th of each month following the month for which the contributions are payable. The employer shall be liable to pay simple interest in terms of the provisions of section 7Q of the Act for any delay in payment of any dues towards the Board of Trustees.

6. The employer shall bear all the expenses of the administration of the Provident Fund and also make good any other loss that may be caused

to the Provident Fund due to theft, burglary, defalcation, misappropriation or any other reason.

7. Any deficiency in the interest declared by the Board of Trustees is to be made good by the employer to bring it up the statutory limit.

8. The employer shall display on the notice board of the establishment, a copy of the rules of the funds as approved by the appropriate authority and as and when amended thereto along with a translation in the language of the majority of the employees. 9. the rate of contribution payable, the conditions and quantum of advances and other matters laid down under the provident fund rules of the establishment and the interest credited to the account of each member, calculated on the monthly running balance of the member and declared by the Board of Trustees shall not be lower than those declared by the Central Government under the various provisions prescribed in the Act and the Scheme framed there under.

10. Any amendment to the Scheme, which is more beneficial to the employees than the existing rules of the establishment, shall be made applicable to them automatically pending formal amendment of the Rules of the Trust.

11. No amendment in the rules shall be made by the employer without the prior approval of the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner (referred to as RPFC hereafter). The RPFC shall before giving his approval give a reasonable opportunity to the employees to explain their point of view.

12. All claims for withdrawals, advance and transfer should be settled expeditiously, within the maximum time frame prescribed by the Employees' Provident Fund Organisation. 13. The Board of Trustees shall maintain detailed accounts to show the contribution credited, withdrawal and interest in respect of each employee. The maintenance of such records should preferably be done electronically. The establishments should periodically transmit the details of members' accounts electronically as and when direct by the CPFC/RPFC.

14. The Board of Trustees shall issue an annual statement of accounts or pass books to every employee within six months of the close of financial/accounting year free of cost once in the year. Additional printouts can be made available as and when the members want, subject to nominal charges. In case of passbook, the same shall remain in custody of employee to be updated periodically by the trustees when presented to them.

15. the employer shall make necessary provisions to enable all the members to be able to see their account balance from the computers terminals as and when required by them.

16. The Board of Trustees and the employer shall file such returns monthly/annually as may be prescribed by the Employees' Provident Fund Organization within the specified time-limit, failing which it will be deemed as a default and the Board of Trustees and employer will jointly and separately be liable for suitable penal action by the Employees' Provident Fund Organisation. Provided that above mentioned return shall be filed by the employer in electronic format also, in such form and manner, as may be specified by the Commissioner.

17. the Board of Trustees shall invest the monies of the provident fund as per the directions of the government from time to time. Failure to make investments as per directions of the Government shall made the Board of Trustees separately and jointly liable to surcharge as may be imposed by the Central Provident Fund Commissioner or his representative.

18. (a) The securities shall be obtained in the name of Trust. The securities so obtained should be in dematerialized (DEMAT) form and in case the required facility is not available in the area where the trust operates, the Board of Trustees shall inform the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner concerned about the same. b) the Board of Trustees shall maintain a script wise register and ensure timely realization of interest. c) The DEMAT Account should be opened through depository participants approved by Reserve Bank of India and Central Government in

accordance with the instruction issued by the Central government in this regard. d) The cost of maintaining DEMAT account should be treated as incidental cost of investment by the Trust. Also all types of Cost of investment like brokerage for purchase of securities etc. shall be treated as incidental cost of investment by the Trust.

19. All such investment6 made, like purchase of securities and bonds, should be lodged in the safe custody of depository participants, approved by reserve bank of India and Central Government, who shall be the custodian of the same. On closure of establishment or liquidation or cancellation of exemption from EPF Scheme, 1952, such custodian shall transfer the investment obtained in the name of the Trust and standing in its credit to the RPFC concerned directly on receipt of request from the RPFC concerned to that effect.

20. The exempted establishment shall intimate to the RPFC concerned the details of depository participants (approved by the Reserve Bank of India and Central Government), with whom and in whose safe custody, the investments made in the name of trust, viz., Investments made in securities, bonds, etc. have been lodged. However, the Board of Trustees may raise such sum or sums of money as may be required for meeting obligatory expenses such as settlement of claims, grant of advances as per rules and transfer of member's P.F. accumulations in the events of his/her leaving service of the employer and any other receipts by sale of the securities or other investments standing in the name of the Fund subject to the prior approval of the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner. 21. Any commission, incentive, bonus, or other pecuniary rewards given by any financial or other institutions for the investments made by the Trust should be credited to its account. 22. The employer and the members of the Board of Trustees, at the time of grant of exemption, shall furnish a written undertaking to the RPFC in such format as may be prescribed from time to time, inter alia, agreeing to abide by the conditions which are specified and this shall be legally binding on the employer and Board of Trustees, including

their successors and assignees, or such conditions as may be specified latter for continuation of exemption.

23. The employer and the Board of Trustees shall also give an undertaking to transfer the funds promptly within the time limit prescribed by the concerned RPFC in the event of cancellation of exemption. This shall be legally binding on them and will make them liable for prosecution in the event of any delay in the transfer of funds.

24. (a) The account of the Provident Fund maintained by the Board of Trustees shall be subject to audit by a qualified independent chartered accountant annually. Where considered necessary, the CPFC or the RPFC in-charge of the Region shall have the right to have the accounts re-audited by any other qualified auditor and the expenses so incurred shall be borne by the employer. (b) A copy of the Auditor's report along with the audited balance sheet should be submitted to the RPFC concerned by the Auditors directly within six months after the closing of the financial year from 1st April to 31st March. The format of the balance sheet and the information to be furnished in the report shall be as prescribed by the Employees' Provident Fund Organisation and made available with the RPFC Office in electronic format as well as a signed hard copy. (c) The same auditors should not be appointed for two consecutive years and not more than two years in a block of six years.

25. A company reporting loss for three consecutive financial years or erosion in their capital base shall have their exemption withdrawn from the first day of the next/succeeding financial year.

26. The employer in relation to the exempted establishment shall provide for such facilities for inspection and pay such inspection charges as the Central Government may from time to time direct under clause (a) of subsection (3) of section 17 of the Act within 15 days from the close of every month.

> 27. In the event of any violation of the conditions for grant of exemption, by the employer or the Board of Trustees, the exemption granted may be cancelled after issuing a show cause notice in this regard to the concerned persons.
>
> 28. In the event of any loss to the trust as a result of any fraud, defalcation, wrong investment decisions etc. the employer shall be liable to make good the loss.
>
> 29. In case of any change of legal status of the establishment, which has been granted exemption, as a result of merger, demerger, acquisition, sale amalgamation, formation of a subsidiary, whether wholly owned or not, etc., the exemption granted shall stand revoked and the establishment should promptly report the matter to the RPFC concerned for grant of fresh exemption.
>
> 30. In case, there are more than one unit/establishment participating in the common Provident Fund Trust which has been granted exemption, all the trustees shall be jointly and separately liable/responsible for any default committed by any of the trustees/employer of any of the participating units and the RPFC shall take suitable legal action against all the trustees of the common Provident Fund Trust.
>
> 31. The Central government may lay down any further condition for continuation of exemption of the establishments."

46. From the above, it could be seen that these establishments have rates of contribution towards Provident Fund more favourable to the employees than what is provided under the Act or atleast not less than what is provided under the Act in which extent, whether the employees of such establishments can be allowed to suffer disadvantageous position vis-à-vis the employees of the unexempted establishments in the matter of calculation and payment of pension under the Pension Scheme, the answer would be obviously ‘no’ for the following reasons, viz.,

Firstly, the fact of the matter is that Pension Fund maintained by the respective establishments cannot be independently handled or operated as the respective exempted establishments deem fit. The Fund is always subject to the pervasive control and supervision of the EPFO and operation of the same is also guided as per the provisions of the PF Scheme. Each and every action of the private Trust of the exempted establishments is to be scrutinized and monitored by the EPFO/Government. The control over such Trusts is not nominal but real and ubiquitous. In fact, the only palpable difference is that private Trust maintained by the respective establishements, absolves the EPFO of burden of maintaining the day-to-day accounts of such establishments. In the said circumstances, the exempted establishments cannot be treated differently for the purpose of extending the benefit of higher pension to the employees of such establishments. A differential classification of such establishments is a specious distinction which cannot stand the test of constitutional scrutiny.

Secondly, it is an admitted fact which cannot be disputed which this Court finds based on the materials produced that the employees of these establishments have paid contribution on the basis of actual salary received by them. It was not their fault that the respective private Trusts have not remitted the enhanced Provident Fund contribution to the Pension Fund maintained by the EPFO. Further, the exempted establishments even otherwise was prevented from time to time from making 8.33% remittances into the Pension Fund on the basis of higher contribution made by their employees, as no option was obtained by them under Clause 11(3) of the Pension Scheme. In any event, non-remittance by the exempted establishments into the Pension Fund on the basis of higher Provident Fund contribution by the employees commensurate with the actual salaries received by them, cannot result in negation of the employees' right to exercise their option for payment of enhanced pension with reference to Proviso to Clause 11(3) of the Pension Scheme.

Thirdly, the Employees Pension Scheme 1995 is the same for all the employees regardless of their employment in either exempted establishments or unexempted establishements. Once the Pension Scheme does not make a distinction as a whole, the question of treating the employees from the exempted establishments would be constitutionally impermissible and statutorily unacceptable. In fact, admittedly, these establishments from where the writ petitioners were employed were not exempted from the Pension Scheme under Section 39 of the Pension Scheme which is extracted hereunder:

> "39. Exemption from the operation of the Pension Scheme.-

The appropriate Government may grant exemption to any establishment or class of establishments from the operation of this Scheme, if the employees of the establishments are either members of any other pension scheme or proposed to be members of a pension scheme wherein the pensionary benefits are at par or more favourable than the benefits provided under this Scheme. Where exemption is granted to any establishment or class of establishments under this paragraph, withdrawal benefits available to the credit of the employees of such establishment(s) under the ceased Family Pension Scheme, 1971, shall be paid, subject to the consent of the employees, to the pension fund of the establishment(s) so exempted. An application for exemption under this paragraph shall be presented to the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner having jurisdiction by the establishment or class of establishments, together with a copy of the pension scheme of the establishment (s) and other relevant documents, as may be called for by him. On receipt of such an application, the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner shall scrutinise it, obtain the recommendations of the Central Provident Fund Commissioner and submit the same to the appropriate Government for decision, pending disposal of application for exemption under this paragraph employers' share of the contribution shall not be remitted to the pension fund as envisaged in sub-paragraph (1) of paragraph 3. An application for exemption presented under this paragraph shall be disposed of within a period of six months from the date of its receipt or such further time as may be extended for reasons to be recorded in writing. If the application for exemption is not disposed of within the period so specified, the exemption applied for shall be deemed to have been granted.

Explanation. - For the purpose of this paragraph, the period of six months will count from the date on which the application for exemption is given in compete form to the satisfaction of the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner."

In the absence of exemption to the Pension Scheme, all the establishments regardless of exemption granted under the Provident Funds Scheme or the Act, are to be treated alike and in which event, the employees of the exempted establishments cannot be placed on disadvantageous position in the matter of receipt of enhanced pension than the employees of the unexempted establishments. Once the Pension Scheme is same for all the employees, they formed a homogeneous group and any distinction to be drawn as between the same set of employees would amount to invidious discrimination and such attempted classification by the EPFO is unintelligible, irrational, arbitrary, unreasonable and cannot stand to the scrutiny of the mandate as provided under the Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

Fourthly, both the High Courts of Telengana and Rajasthan have dealt with the cases relating to the exempted establishments and the High Courts have held in favour of those employees in the matter grant of enhanced pension. In fact, in the earlier part of the decision, the finding of the Rajasthan High Court has been extracted in extenso in regard to the exempted establishments and the finding would be a fitting answer to the objections raised on behalf of the EPFO before this Court. The Rajasthan High Court has in fact, in respect of the exempted establishments has finally given directions as under in paragraphs 23 and 24, which are extracted as under:

> 23. Thus viewed, the action of the respondents in denying the benefit to the pensioners who are members of the Pension Scheme, is held to be unjustified. While reiterating the order passed by this Court earlier, the petitioners are granted liberty to submit option before the Provident Fund Commissioner under Clause 11(3) of the Pension Scheme and the Provident Fund Commissioner shall thereafter obtain the amount from the respective PF Trust as per the said ratio of 8.55% and thereafter release all consequential benefits accordingly in terms of and as directed by the Apex Court hereinabove.
>
> 24. All the petitioners would have to submit an application for seeking of an option for receiving pension on the full salary and only after their depositing the PF amount which they have received from their concerned trust to the extent of 8.33% and the benefit of this judgment would be subject to their depositing the amount already received by them from PF Account of the PF Trust. Upon their depositing the said amount of

> 8.33% as calculated by the PF Trust, the PF Trust shall accordingly transfer the same to the EPFO Pension Fund and the pension shall accordingly be calculated and released. The exercise in this regard shall be completed by the respondents within a period of four months."

In fact, the Telengana High Court has also dealt with the establishments which were exempted under the Act and the learned Judge of the Telengana High Court has clearly held in paragraph 12 as under:

> "12. On plain reading of relevant paragraphs of the EPF Scheme 1952 and Pension Scheme 1995, I am of the considered opinion that no distinction can be drawn between exempted category employer and non exempted category employer for application of Pension Scheme 1995. Admittedly no exemption is granted to RTC from the 1995 pension scheme and its employees are enrolled and contributions are made under 1995 scheme. Further, it is categorical assertion of the respondent RTC that the entire information including higher contributions made based on the actual salary drawn by the petitioners was already furnished to the EPFO. It is not disputed that 8.33% of actual salary was being credited to EPFO all along. As noted above, it was not objected by EPFO. Thus, it is not open to EPFO to raise plea of non compliance of paragraph 26.6 at this distance of time and to deprive higher monthly pension drawable by the petitioners."

From the above, it is very clear that the objections regarding exempted establishments was repeatedly discountenanced by the High Courts and therefore, it is too late in the day for the EPFO to sustain its objections before this Court.

Fifthly, the orders passed by the Kerala High Court inter alia covered the establishments including the establishments exempted by the Act. This fact has not been disputed by the EPFO in the counter affidavit. Only statement in the coutner affidavit in regard to the same is that the EPFO has implemented in respect of the exempted establishments because of the Courts' order and in the teeth of such factual position, this Court is unable to appreciate the kind of vehemence displayed by the EPFO in objecting to the grant of the relief to the employees of the exempted establishments. So much hue and cry was raised on behalf of the EPFO as if the issue considering the grant of benefit to the employees of the exempted establishments is to be examined by this Court as the issue was not the subject matter of the litigation before any other Court. But this Court finds such submission made on behalf of the EPFO is too hallow and unacceptable since already Telangana and Rajasthan High Courts have allowed the Writ Petitions in respect of the exempted establishments and even Kerala High Court has granted the relief to some of the exempted establishyments and the judgment of the Kerala High Court has been confirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

Sixthly, so much so is said about the financial implication and about the unjust enrichment of the employees who were already retired and gone. The learned counsels for the EPFO would also rely on several provisions of the Pension Scheme where, it is stressed that once the employee retired, he ceased to be the member of the Pension shcme and therefore, exercising his option does not arise. This Court is unable to appreciate such submissions made on behalf of the EPFO since the right of these employees to get enhanced pension has crystallized after the orders passed by the various High Courts as aforementioned and also the Hon'ble Supreme Court in 'R.C.Gupta case. Once the right to get enhanced pension has taken a concrete shape in support their claim, the employees cannot be denied their claim only on the basis of the so-called financial implications. The expression 'so-called' has been used consciously by this Court since on behalf of the Government or on behalf of the EPFO, no financial statement has been filed in clear terms as to what is going to be the inflow and outflow in case the present employees are given enhanced pension. No materials have been placed before this Court on behalf of the EPFO in support of their vehement objection in regard to depletion of the pension corpus and erosion of the fund. In fact, from their own statement in the counter affidavit, it appears that the period of deficit pension fund was over and the in the latest period, the fund has surplus amount. Though it is attributed to the admission of several lakh new members into the fund, nevertheless, the fund as such cannot be said to suffer depletion merely because small per centage of employees from the exempted establishments is paid enhanced pension for unpredictable life time. In fact, this Court is also of the view that the issue of grant of enhanced pension to the employees of the exempted establishments is also no more res integra in view of the various decisions of the High Courts and the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Even otherwise, this Court is of the considered view that assuming the objections of the EPFO in regard to the exempted establishments are considered afresh by this Court, the employees of the exempted establishments are part of homogeneous group of pensioners and any attempt by the EPFO to differentiate such homogenous group would only amount to unintelligible and unjust classification which cannot be countenanced in law or on facts.

Lastly, this Court is in agreement with the submissions made by the learned counsels for the writ petitioners that the Circular dated 31.5.2017 which is impugned in many of the Writ Petitions, appears to have been issued in haste without proper consultation with the Government of India. Ostensibly it was issued to ward off the claims of the employees from the exempted establishments. This Court is therefore of the view that the impugned Circular was a product of non-application of mind and hence, it has to go lock, stock and barrel.

46. In view of the above conclusion, this Court has to ultimately resolve as to what kind of the relief to be granted to all the writ petitioners. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in fact, in the final paragraph of the judgment has held that the employees may be directed to return their PF amount received by them before granting the benefit under the Proviso to Clause 11 (3) of the Pension Scheme. In case of the employees from the unexempted establishments, it is only a matter of book adjustment as per the dictum of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in 'R.C.Gupta case'. Even in cases where the employees have retired and received the PF contribution, the employees can be directed to return appropriate amoiunt. As regards the employees of the exempted establishements are concerned, the same yardstick may be adopted. After all the effect of return of contribution today is one and the same for both set of employees from unexempted as well as exempted establishments.

47. Pension is neither a charity nor a largesse to be claimed as a matter of concession. It is a right which is accrued to all the employees of pensionable service, as they toiled to the grind of employment for number of years of service. The minimum expectation of such employees in the evening of their life is to be compensated modestly. As one French Philospher, Albert Camus in 20th Century, said, "It is a kind of spritual snobbery that makes people thnik they can be happy without money". The profound statement of the Philospher is more true and apt today as the world around us is rotating on a materialistic axis and every humble citizen becomes vulnerable and exposed to harsh realities of life. Life always revolves around hope and for pensioners adequate pension is the only hope left in their remaining part of life. Without that hope, final phase of existence become too mundane and impoverished. Therefore, the right to receive adequate pension is implicit within the framework of the Constitution, particularly in terms

of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

48. In the above mentioned circumstances, this Court consider the following directions as expedient to resolve the issues as projected in the Writ Petitions.

i) Both the employees of the exempted and unexempted establishments are entitled to the benefit of enhanced pension on the basis of their contribution with reference to actual salary received by them to their Provident Fund accounts;

ii) The cut off date as prescribed i.e. 01.12.2004 is invalid in law and therefore, the same is held to be illegal and invalid;

iii) The employees, namely, the writ petitioners shall be permitted to exercise their option in terms of Proviso to Clause 11(3) of the Pension Scheme and while permitting so, the EPFO is at liberty to seek return of the higher Provident Fund contribution received by the respective employees with simple interest at the rate of 6% p.a. from the date of receipt of Provident Fund amount and till the date of payment;

iv) The amounts to be refunded by the employees concerned shall be verified by the EPFO in consultation with the respective establishments in which the employees were employed;

v) On refund of the verified amount with interest, the EPFO shall calculate and grant enhanced pension on the basis of actual salaries received by the employees with arrears of pension from the date of their retirement and continue to pay their monthly enhanced pension through out their life time;

vi) In case where the refund of the amount by any employee with interest is higher than the enhanced pension with arrears payable to him, the refund shall be insisted upon and in case where the refund, after calculation, is lower than the arrears of pension payable to the employee, the same shall be adjusted while disbursing the arrears to the employees concerned;

vii) The respective Managements of the exempted establishments which maintained the Private Trust are directed to cooperate with the EPFO and render all assistance in quantifying the amount to be refunded by the respective employees with interest at 6% p.a.on such refund;

viii) The entire exercise shall be initiated and completed by the individual Managements and the EPFO within a period of six months from the date of receipt of a copy of the order.

49.In the result, all the Writ Petitions are allowed on the above terms. The orders of rejection which are impugned in the respective Writ Petitions, are hereby quasahed and as regards the Writ Petitions pertaining to the grant of Writ of Mandamus to the authorities for grant of enhanced pension are concerned, the same are allowed as indicated above. No costs. Consequently, all connected WMPs are closed.

s/d-
Assistant Registrar(CS-III)

True Copy

Sub-Assistant Registrar

Suk

To

1 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
UNION OF INDIA MINISTRY
OF LABOUR AND DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT
SHRIRAM SHASKTHI BHAVAN
RAFIMARG NEW DELHI 110 001

2 THE REGIONAL PF COMMISSIONER I
PENSION BHAVISHYA NIDHI BHAWAN 14
BHIKANJI CAMA PALACE NEW DELHI 110 066

3 THE ADDL. CENTRAL PF COMMISSIONER
HQ (PENSION) EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANISATION BHAVISHYA NIDHI BHAWAN 14
BHIKANJI CAMA PALACE NEW DELHI 110 066

4 THE REGIONAL PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANIZATION EMPLOYEE PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER (EPFO) NO. 37 ROYAPETTAH HIGH
ROAD AZAD NAGAR CH

5 THE ASSISTANT PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER (EPFO) SUB REGIONAL OFFICE R
40 A TNHB OFFICE COMPLEX MUGAPPAIR ROAD
MUGAPPAIR (EAST) CHENNAI 37

6 THE CHAIRMAN & MD
OIL AND NATURAL GAS CORP LTD (ONGC)
PANDIT DEENDAYAL UPADHYAYA URJA BHAVA
NELSON MANDELA MARG VASANT KUNJ 110 070

7 THE CHAIRMAN
ONGC LTD EMPLOYEES
CONTRIBUTORY PROVIDENT FUND TRUST
SHED NO. 21 TEL BHAWAN ONGC
DEHRADUM 248 003

8 THE REGIONAL PF COMMISSIONER-I
(PENSION) O/O.THE EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANISATION (EPFO) BHAVISHYA NIDHI BHAWAN
NGO 'B' COLONY, TIRUNELVELI 627 007
TAMILNADU

9 THE SECRETARY
M/S. SOUTHERN PETROCHEMICAL INDUSTRIES CORPORATION LIMITED
SPIC 88 MOUNTROAD GUINDY CHENNAI 600 032.

10 CENTRAL PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER EMPLOYEES PF ORGANISATION
MINISTRY OF LABOUR & EMPLOYMENT GOVT. OF
INDIA BHAVISHYA NIDHI BHAWAN 14 BHIKAJI
CAMA PLACE NEW DELHI 110 066.

11 ADDL. CENTRAL PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANISATION 37 ROYAPETTAH HIGH ROAD
CHENNAI 14

12 THE MANAGING DIRECTOR
TAMIL NADU CIVIL SUPPLIES CORP. 12
THAMBUSAMY ROAD KILPAUK CHENNAI 10

13 THE MANAGING TRUSTEE
TNCSC EMPLOYEES CONTRIBUTORY PROVIDENT FUND
TRUST TAMIL NADU CIVIL SUPPLIES CORP. 12
THAMBUSAMY ROAD KILPAUK CHENNAI 10

14 REGIONAL PROVIDENT FUND
COMMR.I (PENSION) EPF ORGANISATION
BHAVISHYA NIDHI BHAWAN 14 BHIKAJI CAMA
PLACE NEW DELHI - 110 066

15 THE ASSISTANT PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANIZATION PB NO.3875 DR.BALASUNDARAM
ROAD COIMBATORE 641 018

16 SITRA CONTRIBUTORY PROVIDENT
FUND (TN/8012) 13/37 AVINASHI ROAD TNHB
COLONY CIVIL AERODROME POST NEHRU NAGAR
WEST COIMBATORE TAMIL NADU 641 014

17 REGIONAL PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER I EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANISATION POST BOX NO. 588 SHREE
COMPLEX D BLOCK 18 MADURAI ROAD
THIRUCHIRAPALLI - 620008

18 THE CHAIRMAN
TAMIL NADU NEWSPRINT AND
PAPERS LIMITED 67
MOUNT ROAD GUINDY CHENNAI - 32

19 THE GENERAL MANAGER (HR)
TAMIL NADU NEWS PRINT AND PAPERS LTD.
KAGITHAPURAM - 639136 KARUR DIST.

20 THE SECRETARY
TNPL PROVIDENT FUND TRUST
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY KAGITHAPURAM - 639136
KARUR DIST.

21 THE REGIONAL PROVIDENT FUND ORGANISATIION
O/O. THE EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANISATIION(EPFO)
NO.3, RAJAJI SALAI
TAMBARAM, CHENNAI 45, TAMILNADU.

22 REGIONAL PROVIDENT FUND
COMMISSIONER I EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANIZATION POST BOX NO.588 SHREE
COMPLEX D BLOCK 18 MADURAI ROAD
THIRUCHIRAPALLI 620008

23 THE REGIONAL PROVIDENT FUND
COMMR.-I EMPLOYMENT PROVIDENT FUND
ORGANISATION REGIONAL OFFICE AMBATTUR R40
1A TNHB OFFICE COMPLEX MOGAPPAIR RD
MOGAPPAIR EAST CHENNAI-37

24 TAMIL NADU SIDCO PROVIDENT
FUND TRUST THIRU.VI.KA.INDUSTRIAL ESTATE
GUINDY CHENNAI-600 032.

25 TAMILNADU SMALL INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
REP BY ITS CHAIRMAN
THIRU.VI.KA.INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, GUINDY, CHENNAI 32.

26.EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND ORGANISATIION
MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
BHAVISHYA NIDHI BHAVA
14, BHIKAIJI CAMA PALACE, NEW DELHI.

27. NTC (T&P) LTD MANAGERS
SUPERVISORS & HEAD OFFICE STAFF PF (TN7510)
NATIONAL TEXTILE CORPORATION LTD SOUTHERN
REGIONAL OFFICE 35 SOMASUNDARAM MILLS RD
COIMBATORE

28. FOOD CORPORATION OF INDIA
(FCI) REP BY CHAIRMAN & MD 16-20
BARAKHAMBA LANE NEW DELHI-110 001

29.THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR(SOUTH)(FCI)
3, HADDOWS ROAD, CHENNAI 6.

30. FCI PROVIDENT FUND TRUST
REP BY ITS SECRETARY FOOD CORPORATION OF INDIA (FCI) 16-20 BARAKHAMBA LANE NEW DELHI-110 001

31.THE CHIEF PROVIDENT COMMISSIONER
EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND ORGANISATION
BHAVISHYA NIDHI BHAWAN 14 BHIKAJI CAMA PLACE
NEW DELHI – 110066

32.THE REGIONAL PROVIDENT FUND COMMISSIONER
THE EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND ORGANISATION
CHENNAI.

33.THE BRANCE INCHARGE
THE HANDICRAFTS AND HANDLOOMS EXPORTS CORPORATION OF INDIA LTD, SP-31-32, INDUSTRIAL ESTATE GUINDY CHENNAI 32.

34.THE CHAIRMAN AND MANAGING DIRECTOR
TAMILNADU CEMENETS CORPORATION LTD
LLA BUILDINGS, II FLOOR
735, ANNA SALAI CHENNAI 600 002.

35.THE SECRETARY
TANCEM PROVIDENT FUND TRUST
LLA BUILDINGS II FLOOR
735 ANNA SALAI CHENNAI - 600 002.

36.THE REGISONAL PROVIDENT FUND COMMISSIONER
EMPLOYEES PF ORGANISATION
DR.BALASUNDARAM ROAD
COIMBATORE 641 018.

37.THE ADDITIONAL CENTRAL PROVIDENT FUND COMMISSIONER
EMPLOYEES PF ORGANISATION
DR.BALASUNDARAM ROAD
COIMBATORE 641 018.

38.THE ASSISTANT PROVIDENT FUND COMMISSIONER
(PENSION) EMPLOYEES PF ORGANISATION
DR.BALASUNDARAM ROAD
COIMBATORE 641 018.

39.THE REGIONAL COMMISSIONER
REGIONAL OFFICE
EPF ORGANISATION, JAYALAKSHMI PLAZA
SWONAPURI, SALEM 5

40.THE CHAIRMAN & MD
BHARAT PETROLEUM CORPORATION
LTD (BPCL) REP. CHAIRMAN & MD BHARAT
BHAVAN - 1 & 2 , No. 4 & 6 CURRIMBHOY ROAD
MUMBAI 400 001

41.THE INDIA PROVIDENT TRUST
REP BY ITS TRUSTEES(BPLC)
BHARAT BHAVAN, No. 4 & 6 CURRIMBHOY ROAD
MUMBAI 400 001

+36 Ccs to Mr.T.R.Sundaram, Sr. 29094 to 29098, 29562 to 29573, 30011, 30012, 30016 to 30021, 30023,30024, 29092, 29093, 29097, 30013, 30022, 30025, 30026, 30577, 30578 & 30580.

+1 CC to Mrs.Revathy,Advocate sr 29076.
+4 Ccs to Mr.M.Purushothaman, Advocate sr 29982, 29981.
+4 Ccs to Mr.R.Veludas, Advocate sr 29911, 29913, 29912, 29914.
+3 CCS to Mr.Shivakumar & Suresh, Advocate sr 28885, 28888, 28886
+2 CC to Mr.S.Namasivayam, Advocate sr 29246, 30148.
+4 Ccs to Mr.Yogesh Kannadasan,Advocate sr 29606, 29607, 29605, 29604.
+14 Ccs to Mrs.Vedavallikumar, Advocate sr 29256, 29251, 29253, 29257, 29258.
+3 Ccs to Mr.P.Ayyasamy, Advocate sr 28853, 28854, 28855.
+2 Ccs to Mr.Balan Haridas, Advocate sr 29088, 29090.
+2 CCS to Mr.A.E.Ravichandran, Advocate sr 29048, 29049.
+1 CC to Mr.A.Nagarathinam, Advocate sr 30330.
+1 CC to Mr.B.Ramamoorthy, advocate sr 29106.
+1 CC to Mr.J.Madana Gopal Rao, Advocate sr 28942.
+1 CC to Mr.G.Baskaran, Advocate sr 28804.
+1 CC to Mr.S.Vijayakumar, Advocate sr 29012.
+1 CC to Mr.N.Ramesh, Advocate sr 29616.
+1 CC to Mr.T.S.Gopalan & Co sr 28920.
+1 CC to Mr.K.M.Vijayan Associates , Advocate sr 28988.
+1 CC to Mr.K.Govindarajan, Advocate sr 28893.
+3 CCS to Mr.K.Elango, Advocate sr 28874.
+1 CC to Mrs.S.Meenakumari, Advocate sr 28981.
+1 CC to Mr.R.Thirunavukkarasu, Advocate sr 28948.
+1 CC to Mr.K.S.Jayachandran, Advocate sr 28784.
+1 CC to Mr.B.K.Ginish Neelakandan, Advocate sr 29442

+1 CC to Mr.K.Ramamoorthy, Advocate sr 30166.
+1 CC to M/s. Sarvabhuman Associates sr 30190
+1 CC to Mr.K.Ramu, Advocate sr 30105.
+2 CCS to Mr.J.Sathya Narayana Prasad, Advocate sr 29074
+1 CC to Mr.G.Sankaran, Advocate sr 29543.
+1 CC to Mr.C.V.Ramachandramurthy, Advocate sr 30006.
+1 CC to Mr.B.Ramarathnam, Advocate sr 29003.
+1 CC to Mr.K.Thirukumaran, Advocate s 30598.
+1 CC to Mr.M.R.Raghavan, Advocate sr 29014.
+1 CC to Mr.K.Elango, Advocate sr 30152(25/07/2019)
+4 Ccs to Ms.VJ.Latha, Advocate sr 29675(26/07/2019)
+12 Ccs to Vedavallikumar, advocate sr 29252, 29254, 29255 (06/08/2019)
+1 CC to Mrs.Revathy,Advocate sr 29075(16/10/2019)

WP.Nos.14368 of 2018, etc., etc.,

PVS, VGII, CA(CO)
SP(18/06/2019)