



WEB COPY



WP Nos.3277, 3281, 3284, 3289, 3292,3295,
3297, 3302, 3304 and 3309 of 2019

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 24-11-2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

**WP Nos.3277, 3281, 3284, 3289, 3292, 3295,
3297, 3302, 3304 and 3309 of 2019**

R.Gnanasekaran	..	Petitioner in WP No.3277/2019
T.Achariam	..	Petitioner in WP No.3281/2019
N.Saraswathi	..	Petitioner in WP No.3284/2019
K.Dhanapal	..	Petitioner in WP No.3289/2019
R.Jeganathan	..	Petitioner in WP No.3292/2019
M.Ravichandran	..	Petitioner in WP No.3295/2019
S.Rajendran	..	Petitioner in WP No.3297/2019
N.Chinnadurai	..	Petitioner in WP No.3302/2019
R.Rajeswari	..	Petitioner in WP No.3304/2019
P.Srinivasan	..	Petitioner in WP No.3309/2019

VS.

The Government of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Secretary,
School Education Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai-600 009.

.. R-1 in all WPs



WP Nos.3277, 3281, 3284, 3289, 3292,3295,
3297, 3302, 3304 and 3309 of 2019

The Director of School Education,
Chennai-600 006. .. R-2 in all WPs

The Joint Director-Vocational
Chennai-600 006. .. R-3 in all WPs

The Chief Educational Officer,
Kanchipuram District. .. R-4 in WP 3277 of 2019

The Chief Educational Officer,
Trichy District. .. R-4 in WPs 3281,3284, 3289, 3292,
3295, 3297, 3302 and 3304 of 2019

The Chief Educational Officer,
Namakkal District. .. R-4 in WP 3309 of 2019

The Secretary,
Ponniah Higher Secondary School,
Palakarai,
Trichy District. .. R-5 in WPs 3277 and 3289 of 2019

The Secretary,
R.C. Higher Secondary School,
Trichy District. .. R-5 in WP 3281 of 2019

The Secretary,
L.N.P Girls Higher Secondary School,
Lalgudi,
Trichy District. .. R-5 in WP 3284 of 2019

The Secretary,
Bishop Heber Higher Secondary School,
Puthur,
Trichy District. .. R-5 in WP 3292 of 2019



WP Nos.3277, 3281, 3284, 3289, 3292,3295,
3297, 3302, 3304 and 3309 of 2019

The Head Master,
Government Higher Secondary School,
Poovalur,
Trichy District. .. R-5 in WP 3295 of 2019

The Head Master,
Government Boys Higher Secondary School,
Karungulam,
Trichy District. .. R-5 in WP 3295 of 2019

The Head Master,
Government Syed Muthursa Boys Higher Secondary School,
Trichy District. .. R-5 in WP 3302 of 2019

The Secretary,
Girls Higher Secondary School,
Srirangam,
Trichy District. .. R-5 in WP 3304 of 2019

The Head Master,
Government Boys Higher Secondary School,
Vennandur,
Namakkal District. .. R-5 in WP 3309 of 2019

WP 3277 of 2019 is filed Under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to take into account of the service rendered by the petitioner from initial appointment till regularization (i.e. 26.11.1983 to 31.03.1990) for the purpose of retirement benefits, including pension.



WP Nos.3277, 3281, 3284, 3289, 3292,3295,
3297, 3302, 3304 and 3309 of 2019

WEB COPY

WP 3281 of 2019 is filed Under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to take into account of the service rendered by the petitioner from initial appointment till regularization (i.e.06.10.1986 to 15.10.1992) for the purpose of retirement benefits, including pension.

WP 3284 of 2019 is filed Under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to take into account of the service rendered by the petitioner from initial appointment till regularization (i.e.15.07.1985 to 15.10.1992) for the purpose of retirement benefits, including pension.

WP 3289 of 2019 is filed Under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to take into account of the service rendered by the petitioner from initial appointment till regularization (i.e.04.07.1984 to 31.03.1990) for the purpose of retirement benefits, including pension.



WP Nos.3277, 3281, 3284, 3289, 3292,3295,
3297, 3302, 3304 and 3309 of 2019

WEB COPY

WP 3292 of 2019 is filed Under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to take into account of the service rendered by the petitioner from initial appointment till regularization (i.e.15.09.1980 to 31.03.1990) for the purpose of retirement benefits, including pension.

WP 3295 of 2019 is filed Under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to take into account of the service rendered by the petitioner from initial appointment till regularization (i.e.04.10.1989 to 20.12.1994) for the purpose of retirement benefits, including pension.

WP 3297 of 2019 is filed Under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to take into account of the service rendered by the petitioner from initial appointment till regularization (i.e.16.08.1988 to 15.10.1992) for the purpose of retirement benefits, including pension.



WP Nos.3277, 3281, 3284, 3289, 3292,3295,
3297, 3302, 3304 and 3309 of 2019

WEB COPY

WP 3302 of 2019 is filed Under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to take into account of the service rendered by the petitioner from initial appointment till regularization (i.e.22.08.1988 to 15.10.1992) for the purpose of retirement benefits, including pension.

WP 3304 of 2019 is filed Under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to take into account of the service rendered by the petitioner from initial appointment till regularization (i.e.27.06.1990 to 22.09.1994) for the purpose of retirement benefits, including pension.

WP 3309 of 2019 is filed Under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to take into account of the service rendered by the petitioner from initial appointment till regularization (i.e.24.10.1983 to 31.03.1990) for the purpose of retirement benefits, including pension.



WP Nos.3277, 3281, 3284, 3289, 3292,3295,
3297, 3302, 3304 and 3309 of 2019

For Petitioner in all WPs : Mr.R.Saravanakumar

For Respondents-1 to 4 in
all WPs : Mrs.S.Mythreye Chandru,
Special Government Pleader.

For Respondent-5 in all WPs: No Appearance

COMMON ORDER

The relief sought for in all these writ petitions is for a direction to direct the respondents to take into account of the services rendered by these writ petitioners in the post of Vocational Instructors and accordingly, calculate their qualifying services for grant of pensionary benefits.

2. The writ petitioners in WPs No.3277, 3289, 3295 and 3297 of 2019 state that they were initially appointed on 26.11.1983, 04.07.1984, 04.10.1989, 16.08.1988 respectively as Single Part-time Vocational Teachers and subsequently converted as Double Part-time Vocational Teacher on 12.12.1983, 26.03.1986. The writ petitioners in WPs 3281,



WP Nos.3277, 3281, 3284, 3289, 3292,3295,
3297, 3302, 3304 and 3309 of 2019

3284, 3292, 3302, 3304 and 3309 of 2019 state that they were initially appointed as Double Part-time Vocational Teachers on 06.10.1986, 15.07.1985, 15.09.1980, 22.08.1988, 27.06.1990 and 24.10.1983 respectively.

3. Considering the long services, the Government passed orders, regularizing the services of these Part-time Vocational Instructors in the sanctioned post and they were brought under the regular establishment with effect from 01.04.1990. Thereafter, the writ petitioners are working as regular Vocational Instructors.

4. The grievances of the writ petitioners are that the Part-time services rendered by them as Part-time Vocational Instructors has not been taken into consideration for the purpose of counting the qualifying services for grant of pensionary benefits and thus, they have approached the authorities for counting of 50% of the services as per the amended Rule 11(4) of the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules. Since the claim of the writ petitioners were not considered, they have approached this Court.



WP Nos.3277, 3281, 3284, 3289, 3292,3295,
3297, 3302, 3304 and 3309 of 2019

WEB COPY

5. The learned counsel for the petitioners made a submission that the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court has considered the claim of the Part-time Vocational Instructors and granted the relief for counting of 50% of the services.

6. More than one Division Bench judgments are delivered in this aspect. The scope of amended Rule 11 (4) of the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules was referred to the Full Bench of this in the case of **Secretary to Government and two others vs. R.Kaliyamoorthy [decided on 03.12.2019 in W.A.No.158 of 2016 etc batch of cases]**, wherein the amended Rule 11(4) of the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules, 1978 was upheld and whoever is complying with the conditions stipulated in the amended Rule alone are eligible for counting of 50% of the services for grant of pensionary benefits.

7. Subsequently, another Division Bench passed an order on 13.08.2020 in W.A.(MD).No.517 of 2020, referring the Full Bench



WP Nos.3277, 3281, 3284, 3289, 3292,3295,
3297, 3302, 3304 and 3309 of 2019

WEB COPY

judgment, rejected the appeal filed by the Education Department.

8. The learned counsel for the petitioners made a submission that the relief was granted to several Part-time Vocational Instructors and therefore, the petitioners are also to be treated on par with other Part-time Vocational Instructors.

9. The learned Special Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the respondents to 1 to 4 in all these writ petitions, objected the said contention by stating that the Part-time Vocational Instructors are not eligible to avail the benefit under the amended Rule 11 (4) of the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules, since their initial appointment was to the post of Part-time Vocational Instructor and part-time services are not covered under Rule 11(4) of the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules. At one point of time, the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court fixed a cut-off date on 06.04.2018 and held that anybody approaching the Court thereafter, is not entitled for the relief. However, the other Division Bench considered the case based on the earlier judgments and granted the relief subsequently in the year 2020.



WP Nos.3277, 3281, 3284, 3289, 3292,3295,
3297, 3302, 3304 and 3309 of 2019

WEB COPY

10. Therefore, an anomalous situation is created, whether the petitioners are entitled for the benefit of Amended Rule 11(4) of the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules or not. When conflicting judgments are placed and reliefs' are granted to one group of people and it was declined to other group through various judgments, then this Court is of an opinion that the Statutes and Rules must be looked into for the purpose of conferring the benefit to the person, who is approaching the Court.

11. It is not in dispute that the Full Bench settled the issue and the Rule 11 of the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules, 1978 was upheld. Therefore, the Rules are to be followed in respect of the Part-time Vocational Instructors for the purpose of counting of 50% of the services. When discretionary relief is granted in favour of few persons, Courts are not expected to follow the judgments in a mechanical manner. Similarity if raised, is to be ascertained with reference to the facts and circumstances of each case. Application of mind with reference to the facts are of paramount important, while exercising the powers of judicial review.



WEB COPY



WP Nos.3277, 3281, 3284, 3289, 3292,3295,
3297, 3302, 3304 and 3309 of 2019

12. Question arises, whether a part-time employee is entitled for counting of 50% of the services based on Rule 11 of the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules, 1978.

13. Rule 11 (2) (i) of the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules, 1978 states as follows:

“11.(1).....

(2).....

(i) Service paid from contingencies shall be in a job involving whole time employment and not part time for a portion of the day.”

14. As per the Rule stated above, part-time employees are not eligible to avail the benefit of counting of half of the services.

15. The Full Bench also held that as per Rule 11, the conditions stipulated are to be complied with for the purpose of getting the benefit. Therefore, this Court is of an opinion that the Rule contemplates that the



WP Nos.3277, 3281, 3284, 3289, 3292,3295,
3297, 3302, 3304 and 3309 of 2019

WEB COPY

part-time employees are not eligible for claiming counting of 50% of the services rendered by them.

16. Regarding the similar orders passed earlier by the Courts and the petitioners claiming that they cannot be discriminated in view of Article 14 of the Constitution of India, the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in the case of **Director of Sericulture Department vs. K.Kumar [2015 (4) CTC 241]**, considered the binding nature of the orders, relying on the judgment of Honourable Supreme Court, which reads as under:

"34. It is true that consistency helps the parties to a litigation to know where they stand. But, when it is brought to the notice of the Court that on most of the earlier occasions, several similarly placed employees obtained orders at the stage of admission, on the ground that the issue is already covered by a decision of this Court and that it was only in this manner that several employees got a benefit that was not legitimately due to them, the Court cannot shut its eyes and choose to prefer maintenance of discipline rather



WEB COPY



WP Nos.3277, 3281, 3284, 3289, 3292,3295,
3297, 3302, 3304 and 3309 of 2019

than upholding public interest.

35. As a matter of fact, the greatness of the Court lies only in its courage and ability to correct its mistakes. Justice is more precious than discipline. This was the principle that the Supreme Court highlighted in A.R.Antulay vs. R.S.Nayak [AIR 1988 SC 1531]. It was observed in the said decision that "in rectifying an error, no personal inhibitions should debar the Court because no person should suffer by reason of any mistake of the Court." The Supreme Court focused on the elementary rule of justice that no party should suffer due to the mistake of the Court. Therefore, this Court should not feel shackled either by the rules of procedure or by the principles of propriety, when it is so glaring that a gross injustice has been done to the State (1) by writ petitions getting allowed at the stage of admission and (2) by getting those orders implemented under threat of contempt. This is especially so when the earliest decision that was followed in all other cases, did not decide the scale of pay to be granted for Selection and Special Grades. Hence, the second contention of the writ



WEB COPY



WP Nos.3277, 3281, 3284, 3289, 3292,3295,
3297, 3302, 3304 and 3309 of 2019

petitioners is also liable to be rejected.

41. In Union of India v. Kartick Chandra Mondal [(2010) (2) SCC 422], the Supreme Court, relying upon its previous decisions in various cases including the one in State of Bihar v. Upendra Narayan Singh [(2009) 5 SCC 69], held that Article 14 is a positive concept and that it cannot be enforced in a negative manner. The Court further held that if an illegality or irregularity has been committed in favour of any individual or a group of individuals or a wrong order has been passed by a judicial forum, others cannot invoke the jurisdiction of the higher or superior Court for repeating or multiplying the same irregularity or illegality or for passing a wrong order. Interestingly, the decision of the Supreme Court in Kartick Chandra Mondal was subsequent to the decision in Maharaj Krishan Bhatt and the decision in Maharaj Krishan Bhatt is also referred to in Kartick Chandra Mondal."

17. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of



WP Nos.3277, 3281, 3284, 3289, 3292,3295,
3297, 3302, 3304 and 3309 of 2019

Basawaraj and Another vs. Special Land Acquisition Officer [2013 14

SCC 81] held in unambiguous terms that *“it is a settled legal proposition that Article 14 of the Constitution is not meant to perpetuate illegality or fraud, even by extending the wrong decisions made in other cases. The said provision does not envisage negative equality but has only a positive aspect. Thus, if some other similarly situated persons have been granted some relief/ benefit inadvertently or by mistake, such an order does not confer any legal right on others to get the same relief as well. If a wrong is committed in an earlier case, it cannot be perpetuated. Equality is a trite, which cannot be claimed in illegality and therefore, cannot be enforced by a citizen or court in a negative manner. If an illegality and irregularity has been committed in favour of an individual or a group of individuals or a wrong order has been passed by a Judicial forum, others cannot invoke the jurisdiction of the higher or superior court for repeating or multiplying the same irregularity or illegality or for passing a similarly wrong order.”*

18. Thus, the Courts are bound to consider the Statute and Rules, while considering the similar orders passed by the Courts.



WP Nos.3277, 3281, 3284, 3289, 3292,3295,
3297, 3302, 3304 and 3309 of 2019

Mechanical approach, no doubt, would result in miscarriage of justice. In the present cases, the Rule contemplates that part-time employees are not entitled for counting of 50% of the services. Whether the petitioners have rendered part-time or not, has to be decided by the competent authorities with reference to the Service Records available.

19. In the present cases, the petitioners themselves have stated that they were appointed as Double part-time and Single part-time Vocational Instructors respectively. However, the time and workload cannot be a ground to alter the conditions of appointment. In public services, time cannot be a criteria for the purpose of ascertaining the nature of appointment.

20. In public services, employees are bound to work beyond working hours in the interest of public and on necessity. Therefore, the public service, which is a solemn function, cannot be compared with the other services in a private sector. For example, a Teacher may bound to take some additional classes in the interests of children during exam time.



WP Nos.3277, 3281, 3284, 3289, 3292,3295,
3297, 3302, 3304 and 3309 of 2019

Merely because a Teacher served extra time, he/she cannot claim that he/she is a regular Teacher or full-time Teacher. The conditions stipulated in the appointment order alone is to be taken into consideration for the purpose of determining the nature of appointment and its conditions.

21. High Court cannot interfere with the conditions of appointment and form an opinion that the part-time teachers are working extra hours and therefore, they should be converted as full-time teachers. So long as the appointment conditions remains as it is, the terms and conditions are binding on the part-time employees. In public interest, few part-time Vocational Instructors would have worked extra time and that will not confer any additional right for the purpose of grant of regularization or counting of 50% of the services under Rule 11 of the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules, 1978.

22. The Full Bench judgment of this Court in the case of **Secretary to Government and two others vs. R.Kaliyamoorthy**, cited supra, considered the scope of Rule 11(4) of the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules,



WP Nos.3277, 3281, 3284, 3289, 3292,3295,
3297, 3302, 3304 and 3309 of 2019

WEB COPY

1978 and the Rule was upheld. Thus, the said Rule is to be implemented with reference to the conditions stipulated therein. Rule 11 (2) the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules, 1978 stipulates that Part-time employees are not entitled for counting of the services for grant of pensionary benefits. Thus, earlier orders, if at all passed contrary to the Rule 11 (2) of the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules, 1978, the same cannot be followed as a precedent and those orders are to be confined only with reference to the parties to the litigation and non-consideration of Rule 11 (2) of the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules, 1978, which resulted in financial loss to the State Exchequer, cannot be continued in perpetuity.

23. In the case of **Madhya Pradesh vs. Ramesh Chandra Pajpai [(2009) 13 SCC 635]**, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India held that Article 14 of the Constitution carries with it a positive concept of equality. That article cannot be invoked for perpetuating illegality. An illegal or wrong order passed in one case cannot be made the basis for compelling a public authority to pass similar order in other cases. Even if the State implements an erroneous order passed by the Court, it cannot be



WP Nos.3277, 3281, 3284, 3289, 3292,3295,
3297, 3302, 3304 and 3309 of 2019

precluded from challenging similar order passed in another case, simply because appeal was not preferred in the earlier case.

24. The terms and conditions of appointment alone would prevail over. The High Court cannot declare that the particular employee is a Full Time employee or a Part-Time employee and it is not within the purview of the powers of judicial review to be exercised under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

25. The power of Judicial Review is to be exercised to scrutinise the processes through which a decision is taken by the Competent Authorities in accordance with the Statutes and the Rules, but not the decision itself. Thus designation, nomenclature, terms and conditions of the appointment must be decided based on the appointment order issued to an employee concerned and the High Court cannot adjudicate the nature and working hours or otherwise, for the purpose of declaring that the particular employee is a Part-time employee or Full Time employee and such an exercise is beyond the scope of the powers of judicial review under Article



WP Nos.3277, 3281, 3284, 3289, 3292,3295,
3297, 3302, 3304 and 3309 of 2019

226 of the Constitution of India.

WEB COPY

26. In view of the facts and circumstances, the respondents are directed to verify the Service Records of the petitioners and if the petitioners were appointed as Part-time Vocational Instructors, then they are not eligible for counting of 50% of the services for the purpose of grant of pensionary benefits. Only if they are appointed as Regular Vocational Instructors as full time employees, then alone, they are eligible for counting of 50% of the services as per Rule 11 of the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules. Part-time Vocational Instructors accepted the terms and conditions applicable to the post of Part-time Instructors and therefore, they cannot turn around and claim the benefit of full-time employee, which is impermissible.

27. With the abovesaid clarifications, all the writ petitions stand disposed of. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

24-11-2022

Index : Yes/No.

21/23



WP Nos.3277, 3281, 3284, 3289, 3292,3295,
3297, 3302, 3304 and 3309 of 2019

Internet : Yes/No.

Speaking Order/Non-Speaking Order.

Svn

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

Svn

To

- 1.The Secretary,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
School Education Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The Director of School Education,
Chennai-600 006.
- 3.The Joint Director-Vocational
Chennai-600 006.
- 4.The Chief Educational Officer,
Kanchipuram District.
- 5.The Chief Educational Officer,
Trichy District.
- 6.The Chief Educational Officer,
Namakkal District.

WPs 3277, 3281, 3284, 3289,
3292, 3295, 3297, 3302,
3304 and 3309 of 2019



WEB COPY



WP Nos.3277, 3281, 3284, 3289, 3292,3295,
3297, 3302, 3304 and 3309 of 2019

24-11-2022