

**BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT**

DATED: 30.04.2019

CORAM

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.MAHADEVAN**W.P (MD) No.11198 of 2019**

- 1.V.Selvaraj
- 2.V.Titus
- 3.S.Mercy Ramani Bai
- 4.S.Daisy Florence
- 5.S.Christel Sobitham

... Petitioners

Vs.

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Education Department,
Secretariat, St.George Fort,
Chennai.
- 2.The Director of School Education,
College Road, Nungambakkam,
Chennai - 600006.
- 3.The Chief Educational Officer,
Nagercoil, Kanyakumari District.
- 4.The District Educational Officer,
Kuzhithurai at Marthandam,
Kanyakumari District.
- 5.The Headmaster,
Government H.M. Elementary School,
Andukodu, Kuzhithurai,
Kanyakumari District.

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a writ of Certiorari Mandamus, calling for the records in Mu.Mu.No.1359/A1/2018, dated 05.07.2018 on the file of the fourth respondent and quash the same directing the respondents to regularize the service of the petitioner's brother namely V.George Wilson as Full-Time sweeper on the date of completion of ten years of part time service from 01.08.1983 and to pay time scale of pay and other benefits payable with effect from 01.08.1993 by counting the 50% of part time service for the purpose of pension to the petitioners.



For Petitioners : Mr.R.Maheswaran
For Respondents : Mrs.S.Srimathy,
Special Government Pleader.

WEB COPY

ORDER

The Writ Petition is filed to quash the communication of the fourth respondent in Mu.Mu.No.1359/A1/2018, dated 05.07.2018 and to direct the respondents to regularize the service of the petitioners' brother as Full-Time sweeper on the date of completion of ten years of part time service from 01.08.1983 and to pay time scale of pay and other benefits with effect from 01.08.1993 by counting 50% of his part time service, for the purpose of pension.

2. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and the learned Special Government Pleader, who takes notice for the respondents. By consent, the Writ Petition is taken up for final disposal at the stage of admission itself.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and the learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the respondents jointly submitted that the issue involved herein has already been decided by this Court in W.P.(MD)Nos.15808 and 15809 of 2018, dated 14.02.2019, wherein this Court has held as follows:

"5. In W.A.(MD)No.193 of 2018, dated 27.03.2018, the Division Bench of this Court has passed the following order:

"3.The writ Court, by the impugned order dated 26.10.2015, directed the appellant to regularise the services of the respondents in the permanent post from the date on which they were made as full time sanitary workers and to pay the regular time scale pay with all attendant, monetary, service benefits, terminal benefits and family pension. The second limb of the direction issued by the Writ Court was by directing the appellants to count 50% of the part time service rendered by the respondents/writ petitioners for the pension alone. The appellants are not aggrieved by the first limb of direction issuing a direction to the appellant to regularise the service of the respondents/writ petitioners from the date on which they were made as full time sanitary workers. The appellants are aggrieved by the second limb to count 50% of the part time services. The question is whether such services can be reckoned for the purpose of calculating pension. The answer to the question lies in the Rule 11 (4) of the Pension Rules which reads as



"(4) for half of the service rendered under the State Government in non-provincialised service, consolidated pay, honorarium or daily wages basis on or after first January 1961 in respect of Government employees absorbed in regular service before first April shall be counted for retirement benefits along with regular service, subject to three conditions, namely:-

(i) Service rendered in non-provincialised service, consolidated pay, honorarium or daily wages basis shall be in a job involving whole time employment;

(ii) Service rendered shall be on consolidated pay, honorarium or daily wages paid on monthly basis and subsequently absorbed in regular service under the State Government;

(iii) Service rendered in non-provincialised service, consolidated pay, honorarium or daily wages basis shall be followed by absorption in regular service before first April 2003 without a break;

Provided that this sub-rule is applicable to employees rendered service under the State Government in non-provincialised service, consolidated pay, honorarium or daily wages basis on or after first January 1961 and absorbed in regular service before first April 2003.

Provided further that whatever there was break in service before their absorption in regular service before first April 2003, the same shall be specially condoned by the orders of the Head of Departments, in which the employees were regularly absorbed and such period of break, shall not count for the purpose of pensionary benefits."

4. The learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the appellants submitted that writ petitioners were part time employees and the Rules 11 (4) will not apply. The learned Special Government Pleader relied on the judgment in the case of the **Secretary to Government Commercial Taxes and Registration Department, Secretariat and another v. A. Singamuthu** reported in **AIR 2017 SUPREME COURT 1304** and submitted that G.O.M.s.No.22 dated 28.02.2006, by which the Government of Tamil Nadu regularised the temporary employee and the said Government order will not apply to part time employee. Therefore, it is submitted that the writ Court has erred in issuing a direction to the appellant to count 50% of the part time services rendered by the respondents/writ petitioners for the purpose of calculating the payable length of service to compute the pension. All the writ petitioners were appointed in the existing vacancies which are approved



and vacancy have been caused on account of retirement or other factors. Therefore, for filling up those vacancies which had been sanctioned obviously the salary has to be disbursed on consolidated basis and the question of treating writ petitioners as part time employee is a misnomer. Two of writ petitioners namely, P. Lakshmi and M. Lakshmi Vasantha, have produced a Certificate from Head Master, where they worked last. They were full time employees, from the year 2008. The bonafide or veracity of the certificate cannot be doubted as it is being issued by the Head Master of the Government High School. In respect of the the writ petitioners viz., N.Little Flower and S.Lalithambika their services has already been regularised and 50 % of the past service has been reckoned and the pension also has been paid. All that is required is as to verify the above aspect as to appointment of the writ petitioners in a sanctioned post and that appears to have been satisfied with the case of writ petitioners.

5. For the above reasons, we find there is no error in the order passed by the writ Court. The writ appeal is dismissed. No Costs. Consequently, C.M.P. (MD) No.1063 of 2018 is closed."

6. In S.L.P. (C) No.23980 of 2018, dated 24.09.2018, the Honourable Supreme Court has held as follows:


"We are not inclined to interfere with the impugned judgment passed by the High Court.

The Special Leave Petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

Pending applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of."

7. In line with the judgment of the Division Bench of this Court as well as the order of the Honourable Supreme Court, the impugned orders dated 11.04.2017 are hereby set aside. The respondents are directed to pass appropriate orders in terms of the judgment passed by the Division Bench of this Court in W.A. (MD) No.193 of 2018, dated 27.03.2018, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners, within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/> 8. The Writ Petitions are disposed of with the above direction. No costs."



4. Following the aforesaid decision, the impugned order, dated 05.07.2018 is hereby set aside. The respondents are directed to pass appropriate orders, if the petitioner's brother is found eligible, in terms of the judgment passed by the Division Bench of this Court in W.A.(MD)No.193 of 2018, dated 27.03.2018, within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

5. The Writ Petition stands disposed of with the above direction. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (T & P)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar (CS)

ps

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
Education Department,
Secretariat, St. George Fort,
Chennai.
2. The Director of School Education,
College Road, Nungambakkam,
Chennai-600006.
3. The Chief Educational Officer,
Nagercoil, Kanyakumari District.
4. The District Educational Officer,
Kuzhithurai at Marthandam,
Kanyakumari District.

+1CC TO MR.R.MAHESWARAN, Advocate Sr. No.64176
+1CC TO THE SPECIAL GOVERNMENT PLEADER SR.No.64889

W.P (MD) No.11198 of 2019
30.04.2019

GKG (CO)
TR (21.05.2019) 5P 7C