



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 26.08.2019

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P. (MD)No.18714 of 2013

WEB COPY

V.Krishnammal

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Secretary to Government,
Department of School Education,
Fort Saint George, Secretariate,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The Mamber/Secretary,
Teachers Recruitment Board,
EVK Sampath Maaligai,
DPI Campus, College Road,
Chennai-600 006.

3.The Director of School Education,
DPI Campus, College Road,
Nungambakkam,
Chennai-600 006.

4.The District Employment Officer,
Tirunelveli District,
Tirunelveli.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the Respondents to select and appoint the petitioner for the post of Secondary Grade Teacher in pursuance of the second respondent's proceedings in Memo No.5015/A4/2008 dated 14.05.2009 and R.C.No.5015/B4/2007 dated 17.09.2009 without reference to the Teachers Eligibility Test (TET) in conformity with the decision rendered by the Division Bench of this Hon'ble Court vide its order dated 09.07.2013 made in Rev.Application No.139 of 2012 and W.A.No.2121 of 2012 and W.P(MD) No.15487/2013 and Batch dated 19.09.2013 passed by this Hon'ble Court.

For Petitioner	: Mr.K.C.Ramalingam
For R1	: Mrs.S.Srimathy, Special Government Pleade
For R2 to R4	: Mr.VR.Shanmuganathan, Special Government Pleader

**ORDER**

The Call Letter, dated 14.05.2009 issued by the Teachers Recruitment Board for certificate verification, is under challenge in the present writ petition.

2.The writ petitioner states that she has completed Diploma in Teacher Training Education and thereafter, passed Bachelor Degree in Arts from Annamalai University Distance Education. The petitioner registered her name in the District Employment Exchange and she was sponsored for appointment to the post of Secondary Grade Teacher. The writ petitioner participated in the process of selection and she was called for certificate verification by the second respondent held on 5.6.2009. She appeared and produced all the original certificate as directed by the second respondent, however, no order of appointment was issued and therefore, the present writ petition is filed.

3.The writ petitioner has not passed the Teachers Eligibility Test. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents/Board also informed that the petitioner has not passed the Teachers Eligibility Test and the present writ petition is filed seeking exemption from passing of the Teachers Eligibility Test. In respect of the Teachers Eligibility Test, which is prescribed as a minimum qualification for appointment to the teaching post. The petitioner cannot be granted with any exemption and the said position is discussed by this Court also in W.P(MD)No.19687 of 2013, dated 13.08.2019 and the relevant paragraphs are extracted hereunder:-

"4.This Court is of the considered opinion that the issues regarding the minimum educational qualification prescribed for appointment to the post of Teachers are now settled by the Courts across the country. The special education is in the concurrent list of the Constitution of India. Thus, the Central Act will prevail over the State regulations. As per the provisions of the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education, 2009, the National Council for Teachers Education was constituted and regulations were issued fixing the minimum educational qualification for appointment to the Teachers' post across the country. The regulations issued by the National Council for Teachers Education are binding on all the authorities and the State of Tamil Nadu also had adopted the minimum educational qualification prescribed by the National Council of Teachers Education.

5.Thus, now it becomes compulsory for all the Teachers

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/> the Teachers appointed in Aided schools /



minority schools availing grant-in-aid and all other Government Schools. Thus, the uniformity in the matter of minimum educational qualification for appointment to the Teaching posts are now being followed consistently by the Government of Tamil Nadu. This being the factum, this Court is of the considered opinion that Teachers who have not passed the Teachers Eligibility Test are not eligible to secure appointment as Teachers.

6.This apart, once the minimum educational qualification is prescribed by the National Council for Teachers Education, such minimum educational qualification must be made applicable to all the Teachers who all are appointed in Government institutions, private aided schools and minority schools receiving grant-in-aid from the Government.

7.Consistency in the matter of minimum educational qualification is a constitutional requirement. It is not as if minority institutions and Government aided institutions can appoint teachers at their whims and fancies. When the Parliament thought fit and enacted a law in the matter of uniform national educational policy then, the same must be scrupulously followed in the matter of education to the Children of our great nation. Thus, no one can seek exemption from the regulations fixing minimum educational qualification for appointment to the teaching posts.

8.The learned Special Government Pleader contended that the fourth respondent school is also an aided school receiving the Government aid. The appointments of the management are to be approved by the Competent educational authorities. When certain conditions appointments were made that the teachers must pass the teachers eligibility test and in the event of not passing within the stipulated time granted by the Government, the authorities are bound to institute action for cancellation of appointment. Thus, there is no infirmity in the impugned order passed. To defend the grounds raised by the writ petitioner, learned Special Government Pleader contended as follows:

i) A teacher is eligible to be appointed only if the teacher has passed in "Teachers Eligibility Test" i.e., TET. This is the qualification prescribed in the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Act, 2009 (RTE).

ii) However, several judgments had held that TET is not applicable to minority institution, since it has been held in Paramati case that RTE Act is not applicable to minority institution.



iii) However in Paramati Case, the reference is made to see the validity of clause (5) of Article 15 of the Constitution inserted by the Constitution (Ninety-third Amendment) Act, 2005 with effect from 20.01.2006 and on the validity of Article 21A of the Constitution inserted by the Constitution (Eighty - Sixth Amendment) Act, 2002 with effect from 01.04.2010.

iv) The issue was that whether the inserting clause (5) in Article 15 and 21A is applicable to minority institutions. This amendment read with RTE Act has directed the school to admit 25% children belonging to weaker sections and disadvantaged groups in the neighbourhood and whether such direction shall be given to minority institutions. The Honourable Court has held that such directions cannot be issued since it alters basic structure of constitution.

v) The Honourable Supreme Court has not considered the issue whether the TET is applicable for minority institutions. In such circumstances, the Honourable Court ought to have held that TET is applicable to minority institutions. Under RTE Act there is no specific section for exemption from TET for minority institution.

vi) In TMA Pai case the Honourable Court has held that the government has authority to prescribe the qualification of the teachers and the same would be applicable to minority institutions also. The relevant portion is in Q.5(c) of the judgment. The Honourable Supreme Court has held that the State or other controlling authorities, however can always prescribe the minimum qualifications, salaries, experience and other conditions bearing on the merit of an individual for being appointed as a teacher of an educational institution. Therefore, the argument that TET is not applicable to minority institution is against the judgment of Constitution Bench rendered in TMA Pai case. The relevant portion is culled out hereunder:

"Q5(c) Whether the statutory provisions which regulate the facets of administration like control over educational agencies, control over governing bodies, conditions of affiliation including recognition / withdrawal thereof, and appointment of staff, employees, teachers and principals including their service conditions and regulation of fees etc. would interfere with the right of administration of minorities?

A. So far as the statutory provisions regulating the



facets of administration are concerned, in case of an unaided minority educational institution, the regulatory measure of control should be minimal and the conditions of recognition as well as conditions of affiliation to a university or board have to be complied with, but in the matter of day-to-day management, like appointment of staff, teaching and non-teaching and administrative control over them, the management should have the freedom and there should not be any external controlling agency. However a rational procedure for selection of teaching staff and for taking disciplinary action has to be evolved by the management itself. For redressing the grievances of such employees who are subjected to punishment or termination from service, a mechanism will have to be evolved and in our opinion, appropriate tribunals could be constituted and till then such tribunal could be presided over by a judicial officer of the rank of District Judge. The State or other controlling authorities, however can always prescribe the minimum qualifications, salaries, experience and other conditions bearing on the merit of an individual for being appointed as a teacher of an educational institution."

vii) If the argument of TET is not applicable to minority institutions is accepted, then there would be clear discrimination arises amongst the teachers. On one hand the teachers in non-minority institutions are facing a situation to lose job without TET, on the other hand the teachers in minority institutions are claiming salary, incentive increments and other service benefits without TET. The same is against Article 14 of the Constitution.

4. In view of the fact that the writ petitioner was not even selected nor appointed on the ground that she has not passed the Teachers Eligibility Test, now the relief as such sought for to quash the Call Letter cannot be considered. Accordingly, the writ petition is devoid of merits and stands dismissed. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-II)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar (CS)



To

1.The Secretary to Government,
Department of School Education,
Fort Saint George, Secretariate,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The Mamber/Secretary,
Teachers Recruitment Board,
EVK Sampath Maaligai,
DPI Campus, College Road,
Chennai-600 006.

3.The Director of School Education,
DPI Campus, College Road,
Nungambakkam,
Chennai-600 006.

4.The District Employment Officer,
Tirunelveli District,
Tirunelveli.

+1 CC to SPL GP SR-83538.

W.P. (MD) No.18714 of 2013
26.08.2019

CS (09.09.2019) 6P 6C