



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 09.11.2021

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE TMT.JUSTICE PUSHPA SATHYANARAYANA

and

THE HONOURABLE THIRU.JUSTICE P.VELMURUGAN

W.A(MD)No.1995 of 2021

and

CMP(MD)No.9159 of 2021

WEB COPY

1)The State of Tamilnadu,
Represented by its Principal Secretary,
Department of School Education,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.

2)The Director of School Education,
O/o. The Director of School Education,
DPI Campus, College Road, Chennai-600 006.

3)The Joint Director of School Education (Vocational)
O/o The Joint Director of School Education (Vocational),
Chennai-6.

4)The Chief Educational Officer,
O/o. The Chief Educational Officer,
Madurai, Madurai District. ... Appellants/Respondents 1 to 4

vs.

1)P.Venkataraman ...1st Respondent/Writ Petitioner

2)The Secretary,
TVS Higher Secondary School,
Lakshmi poram, madurai District.

3)The Principal Accountant General (A&E),
O/o. Principal Accountant General (A&E),
361, Anna Salai,
Chennai-600 018. ... 2&3 Respondents/5&6 Respondents

Appeal filed under Clause 15 of Letters Patent, against the
order dated 11.09.2020 in W.P(MD)No.11442 of 2020.

Prayer in WP(MD). 11442/ 2020 :

Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the
Constitution of India, praying this Court To issue a Writ of
Mandamus or any other Order or Direction in the nature of Writ,
directing the respondents No.3 and 4 to count 50 percentage of the
Part time service rendered by the petitioner for 19.09.1984 to
31.03.1990 along with regular service for the purpose of
calculation of qualifying service for pension with all other



consequential benefits by considering the representation of the petitioner dt 11.09.2019.

For Appellants : Mr.P.Subbaraj,
Government Advocate

WEB COPY

JUDGMENT

**(Judgment of the Court was made by
PUSHPA SATHYANARAYANA, J.)**

The appeal is preferred by the State against the order passed in W.P(MD)No.11442 of 2020, dated 11.09.2020.

2.The writ petitioner who is the 1st respondent herein was a Vocational Instructor joined the service on 19.09.1984. His services were regularised only on 01.04.1990 and he attained the age of superannuation on 30.11.2015. When the pensionary benefits were extended to him, the services rendered by him only from 01.04.1990 till his date of retirement was taken into account. His services from the date of joining till the date of regularisation was omitted to be considered. Hence, the Mandamus was filed to count atleast 50% of the part time services rendered by the writ petitioner along with the regular services, for the purpose of calculation of qualifying service for pension. The learned single Judge has placed reliance on a judgment in W.P(MD) Nos.16864 and 16926 of 2018, dated 31.07.2018 (S.Venkatachalam vs. The Principal Secretary to the Government, Department of School Education and others) and allowed the writ petition directing the authorities to consider the period from the date of joining, that is, from 19.09.1984 till 31.03.1990, the date of regularisation for the purpose of calculating the pensionary benefits. Aggrieved by the same. the above writ appeal is preferred.

3.The learned Government Advocate appearing for the appellants would argue that the case of the writ petitioner cannot be considered in view of the Full Bench decision of this Court in W.A.No.158/2016 etc., batch, dated 03.12.2019 (The Government of Tamil Nadu and 2 others vs. R.Kaliyamoorthy and others). He also placed reliance on the Division Bench judgment in W.A.No.882/2017 etc., batch dated 06.04.2018 (The Government of Tamil Nadu and 2 others vs. The Chief Educational Officer, Villupuram District, Villupuram and others). Though the abovesaid Division Bench judgment is in favour of the writ petitioner, the said judgment had given a cut off date, within which, the writ petitioner/1st respondent does not come and therefore, he is guilty of delay and laches. However, subsequently, the Full Bench in W.A.No.158/2016 etc., batch, dated 03.12.2019 has held as follows:-



45. In the light of the above, we answer the reference as follows:-

(i) Those who are freshly appointed on or after 01.04.2003 are not entitled to pension in view of W.A.No.158 of 2016 etc., batch proviso to Rule 2 of Tamil Nadu Pension Rules, 1978 inserted by G.O.Ms.No.259 dated 06.08.2003.

(ii) Those government servants/employees appointed prior to 01.04.2003 whether on temporary or permanent basis in terms of Rule 10 (a) (i) of Tamil Nadu State and Subordinate Service Rules will be entitled to get pension as per the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules, 1978.

(iii) In case, a government employee/servant had also rendered service in non-provincialised service, or on consolidated pay or on honorarium or daily wage basis and if such services were regularised before 01.04.2003, half of such service rendered shall be counted for the purpose of conferment of pensionary benefits.

(iv) Those government servants who were appointed in the aforesaid four categories before the cut off date and later appointed under Rule 10 (a) (i) of Tamil Nadu State and Subordinate Service Rules before 01.04.2003 and absorbed into regular service after 01.04.2003 will not be entitled to count half of their past service for the purpose of determination of qualifying service for pension.

(v) Those government servants who were appointed in the aforesaid four categories before 01.04.2003 but were absorbed in regular service after 01.04.2003 will not be entitled to count half of their past service for the purpose of determination of qualifying service for pension."

4.The learned Government Advocate though argued that the case of the writ petitioner does not fall in any of the above mentioned categories, he is unable to demonstrate before this Court, as to how the writ petitioner is not entitled to the relief. It was argued that the part time Vocational Instructors are not at all entitled to count half of the part time services, for the purpose of calculating the qualifying service, for pension, as the nomenclature indicates it is only a part time job. Though it is a part time job, the writ petitioner was regularised in the year 1990 and the services rendered prior to that, was the same even after regularisation. Therefore, the writ petitioner is entitled for the benefits of the service period prior to regularisation to be counted in the manner prescribed. Hence, we see no merits in the arguments of the learned Government Advocate. We do not want to interfere with the order passed by the learned single Judge.



5. Accordingly, this Writ Appeal is dismissed. Consequently, CMP(MD)No.9159 of 2021 is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-I)

WEB COPY

// True Copy //

/ /2021

Sub Assistant Registrar (CS)

bala

To

- 1) The Principal Secretary,
State of Tamilnadu,
Department of School Education,
Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009.
- 2) The Director of School Education,
O/o. The Director of School Education,
DPI Campus, College Road, Chennai-600 006.
- 3) The Joint Director of School Education (Vocational)
O/o The Joint Director of School Education (Vocational),
Chennai-6.
- 4) The Chief Educational Officer,
O/o. The Chief Educational Officer,
Madurai, Madurai District.

+1 CC to M/s.SPL.GP (SR-33939[F] dated 10/11/2021)

W.A(MD)No.1995 of 2021

DATED : 09.11.2021

RK/PM(19/11/2021) 4P 6C