



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 16.03.2021

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH**

W.P(MD)No.5786 of 2021

and W.M.P.(MD).No.4551 of 2021

C.Michael Britto

...Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Chief Educational Officer,  
Sivagangai, Sivagangai District.

2.The District Educational Officer,  
Sivagangai, Sivagangai District.

3.The Correspondent,  
St. Mary's Higher Secondary School,  
Rajakembiram - 630 609,  
Sivagangai District.

... Respondents

**PRAYER:** Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records relating to the impugned proceedings issued by the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent, District Educational Officer, in A.Thi.Mu.No.297/a5/2021, dated --.02.2021, quash the same and further direct the respondents 1 and 2 herein to sanction forthwith the annual increments and other allowances towards the salary of petitioner as BT Assistant Maths in the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent school from the date of his appointment i.e. 06.12.2017.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Amala

For Respondents : Mr.N.Shanmugaselvam, for R1 & R2  
Additional Government Pleader

### **O R D E R**

The petitioner herein is a B.T. Assistant under the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent school and in view of the proceedings of the District Educational Officer, the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent School was approved to be a minority institution. The petitioner's claim for conferment of yearly increments and other service benefits from her date of appointment has been rejected by the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent herein on the ground that the petitioner had not qualified herself in the Teacher Eligibility Test (TET). The requirement of a pass in TET came up for



consideration in many cases before this Court, wherein this Court held that such a requirement was not mandatory for the purpose of extending the service and monetary benefits. One such order is in the case of **Banu Vs State of Tamil Nadu represented by its Secretary, School Education Department** in W.P(MD)No.1336 of 2019, etc., dated 05.01.2021, which reads as follows:

"3. The issue involved in these writ petitions pertains to Teachers, who hail from Non-Minority School. The only issue involved in these writ petitions is as to whether the Teacher Eligibility Test (TET) qualification for the Teachers is a mandatory condition for consideration of disbursement of the yearly increment as well as other monetary and service benefits.

4.The aforesaid issue is no more res integra. The provisions of the 'Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act' (in short 'RTE Act') was already put under challenge, which came to be upheld by the Hon'ble Apex Court holding that the provisions of the RTE Act are not applicable to the minority institution. Following the same, the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court, in the case of **Secretary to Government, Government of Tamil Nadu, Education Department, Fort St.George, Chennai Vs., S.Jeyalakshmi** reported in (2016) 5 CTC 639 had held that the provisions of the RTE Act are not applicable to the minority Aided School, insofar as it relates to Teachers appointed prior to 15.11.2011. The Government in G.O.Ms.No.181, School Education (C2) Department, dated 15.11.2011 had specified that the teachers, who do not possess the minimum qualification of pass in the TET, shall acquire the same within a period of five years. While construing G.O.Ms.No.181, a learned Single Judge of this Court, in a batch of writ petitions in W.P(MD).No.5626 of 2017 etc., dated 16.03.2019, had held that, the cut off date for acquiring the TET qualification would be the date of notification for appointment and that, the Teachers who were appointed prior to that date need not pass the TET examination. The relevant portion of the said order reads as follows:-

'10.However, there is no cut off date specified in the said G.O.Ms.No. 181, with regard to acquiring the qualification of pass TET to continue in service as B.T Assistants /Secondary Grade Teachers, who are working as such in the respondent Schools. In this regard, a cursory glance at Clause (5) of the notification dated 23.08.2010 and its amended notification dated 29.07.2011 issued by the NCTE, the contents of which are reproduced at paragraph Nos.8.2 and 8.4 above, would reveal that if the process of appointment of teachers was initiated prior to



the date of notification by issuing advertisement, such appointments have to be made in accordance with NCTE (Determination of Minimum Qualifications for Recruitment of Teachers in Schools) Regulations, 2001 and the same was amended with effect from 29.07.2011. As per the said NCTE Regulations 2001, there is no qualification prescribed with regard to possession of TET certificate, for appointment to the post of B.T Assistant and Secondary Grade Teachers. The qualification of passing TET was first introduced by the notification dated 23.08.2010 and it was amended vide notification dated 27.09.2011. Thus, it could be inferred that the cut off date for acquiring the TET qualification is 27.09.2011 and the teachers, who were appointed prior to that date need not pass TET and even in the case of the teachers who were appointed after that date, if the advertisement to initiate the process of appointment of teachers was made prior to that date, then, their appointments also can be in accordance with the NCTE Regulations 2001 and they need not acquire the TET qualification. '

5. In the instant case, all the Teachers have been appointed prior to 15.11.2011 and by applying the ratio laid down by this Court in the aforesaid order dated 16.03.2019 and by taking into consideration that these teachers were also appointed prior to the notification of their appointments, it has to be held that, the requirement of a pass in TET examination, is not necessary. As such, denial of the service and monetary benefits on the ground that the concerned Teachers have not passed the TET examination is not sustainable. By applying the ratio laid down in the aforesaid decision, this Court is of the affirmed view that the petitioners would be entitled for disbursement of all the service and monetary benefits, without reference to their non-passing of the TET examination, from the date of their appointment."

2.The aforesaid order is self explanatory. As such the impugned order passed by the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent, rejecting the petitioner's claim for the increments and other benefits cannot be sustained on the ground that the petitioner has not qualified herself in TET. Accordingly, the order of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent in A.Thi.Mu.No.297/a5/2021, dated --.02.2021, stands quashed.

3.At this juncture, the learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents submitted that though the petitioner herein has been disqualified from claiming service and monetary benefits on the ground that she has not qualified in TET, there can



be other factors, which might require consideration for the purpose of extending other benefits.

4.In this background the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent herein is granted liberty to re-present the application to 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent seeking for extension of service and monetary benefits insofar as the petitioner herein is concerned and the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent shall consider the same on its own merits without reference to her failure to qualify in the TET and pass appropriate orders within a period of twelve weeks therefrom.

5.The writ petition stands ordered accordingly. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar ( )

// True Copy //

/ /2021

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

To

1.The Chief Educational Officer,  
Sivagangai, Sivagangai District.

2.The District Educational Officer,  
Sivagangai, Sivagangai District.

+1 CC to M/s.A.AMALA, Advocate ( SR-11440[F] dated 16/03/2021 )

+1 CC to M/s.SPL GP ( SR-12285[F] dated 18/03/2021 )

**W.P(MD)No.5786 of 2021**

**16.03.2021**

(CO)

HB(24.04.2021) 4P 5C