



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.17304 & 17307 of 2019

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 28.11.2022

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P.Nos.17304 & 17307 of 2019

G.Chandran ... Petitioner in W.P.No.17304 of 2019

V.Dilli ... Petitioner in W.P.No.17307 of 2019

-Vs-

1. The State of Tamil Nadu ,
Rep by its Secretary,
Adi Dravidar Welfare and Tribal Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.
 2. The Director of Adi Dravidar Welfare and Tribal Officer,
Ezhilagam Chepauk,
Chennai-600 005.
 3. The District Adi Dravidar Welfare and Tribal Officer,
Thiruvallur, Thiruvallur District.
 4. The Headmaster,
Government Adi Dravidar Welfare,
Middle School, Minjur,
Ponneri Taluk, Thiruvallur District.
- ... Respondents in both the Writ Petitions.



W.P.Nos.17304 & 17307 of 2019

Common Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue Writ of Mandamus, to direct the respondents to extend the benefits as per G.O.Ms.No.210, School Education (G1) Department, dated 14.08.2009 for the fixation of Selection / Special Grade scale of pay in the post of middle School Head Master by counting lower grade service in the post of Secondary Grade Teacher.

For Petitioner in
both the Writ Petitions : Mr.Gunashekar K.R.

For Respondents in
both the Writ Petitions : Mrs.C.Sangamithirai, Spl.G.P.

COMMON ORDER

The writ petitioners filed the present writ petitions after a lapse of several years from the date of their retirement. The petitioners worked as Head Masters and retired from service. The claim of the writ petitioners is that the monetary benefits granted through G.O.Ms.No.210, School Education Department, dated 14.08.2009, are to be extended to them and accordingly, revised scale of pay is to be granted and consequently the pension is also to be re-fixed and arrears have to be paid.



W.P.Nos.17304 & 17307 of 2019

2. The petitioners have approached this Court after several years and in such circumstances, the writ petition is liable to be rejected on the grounds of laches. More so, the issue relating to the G.O.Ms.No.210, and the extension of its benefit has been considered by this Court elaborately in ***W.P.(MD).No.3186 and 3187 of 2016*** and an order was passed on ***25.01.2022***. The relevant paragraphs of the order are extracted here under:

"7. The concept of selection / special grade is that the government employees are entitled to "selection grade" if the person is stagnating in the same post without promotion for 10 years and entitled to "special grade" if the person is stagnating in the same post without promotion for 20 years. The G.O. Ms. No. 666 Finance (Pay Commission) dated 27.06.1989 was issued cancelling the selection / special grade. Thereafter the scheme of granting selection/special grade was reintroduced vide G.O. Ms. No. 304 Finance (Pay Commission) Department dated 28.03.1990. In partial modification in paragraph 9 of the G.O. 666, the G.O. 304 was issued granting the selection / special grade.

8. In Education Department prior to 01.06.1988 the post of Secondary Grade Teacher and Primary



W.P.Nos.17304 & 17307 of 2019

School Headmaster in Government Schools and Panchayat Union Schools are interchangeable and considered as same post. The grade pay of the Secondary Grade Teacher and the grade pay of the Primary School Headmaster are same, with an additional special pay to the Headmaster. After 01.06.1988 the post of Headmaster is a promotion post and in V pay Commission the Headmaster were paid Rs. 1400-2600 without special pay and the Secondary Grade Teacher were paid 1200-2040. The teachers who had worked in the Panchayat Schools / Government Schools in Secondary Grade Post were allowed to serve as Headmaster of Primary School with extra allowance to the post of Headmaster post. After 01.06.1988 the post of Headmaster is made as promotion post. Therefore a claim was submitted to add the service of Secondary Grade Post and Headmaster of Primary School for calculating the selection grade and special grade. The government issued G.O. Ms. No. 1381 Education Department dated 05.10.1990 wherein selection / special grade was granted to teachers who were holding the HM post on 01.06.1988 be awarded selection/special grade in the revised scales on or after 01.06.1988 by computing the "Secondary Grade Teacher and Primary School HM prior to 01.06.1988".



W.P.Nos.17304 & 17307 of 2019

The G.O. also states that "at the post of HM carries higher scale of pay above that of the Secondary Grade Teachers, those promoted as HM after 01.06.1988 shall be allowed fixation of pay in the post of HM as provided under Fundamental Rules 22B. The persons promoted after 01.06.1988 opposed to fix under Fundamental Rules 22B and they prayed to grant selection/special grade as granted to HM by taking both secondary grade service and HM post. Since the same was declined, those persons filed petition before Tribunal in O.A. No. 2899, 3009 and 3010 of 1989 and the Tribunal has held that the classification is wrong and set aside the paragraph 3 and 4 of the G.O. Ms. No. 1381.

9. Hence the Government issued a G.O. Ms. No. 300 Education, Science and Technology Department dated 07.04.1994 wherein the grant of selection / special grade in G.O. 1381 was quashed and the benefit already disbursed were ordered for recovery. In the G.O. it has been categorically stated that the service of HM post alone will be taken for granting selection / special grade. In other words, the Secondary Grade post will not be taken into account while counting the service for Primary School HM. Unfortunately, the G.O. Ms. No.300 dated 07.04.1994 was not brought to the



knowledge of this Court at the earliest point of time and there was total mess in this issue.

10. In the meanwhile, the government issued G.O. Ms. No. 216 Finance (Pay Commission) Department dated 22.03.1993, extending the selection / special grade to the "Secondary Grade Teachers in Middle School", since they will not be having any promotional opportunities. It is pertinent to note that the G.O. is not stating to calculate both the Secondary Grade post + Primary School HM post to grant selection / special grade. It simply states to grant selection / special grade to Secondary Grade Teachers working in Middle School, since they are not having promotional opportunities. Until this period the issue was settled, however later point of time this G.O. 216 dated 22.03.1993 was misinterpreted.

11. Thereafter, the issue started exploding when the teachers in order to retain the wrong benefits granted under G.O. 1381 (which G.O. was quashed by Tribunal) started filing writ petitions and the wrong started perpetuating. Writ petition was filed in W.P. No. 8079/2005 and vide order dated 28.04.2008 the writ petitions were allowed. In another writ petition vide order dated 18.04.2001 the government was directed to consider the claim. Since several writ petitions were



filed and allowed, helplessness griped the government. Hence pending writ petitions the government issued G.O. Ms. No. 207 School Education (G2) Department dated 30.09.2008 and G.O. states that pension benefits shall be granted and the government would incur an additional expenditure of Rs.1,87,93,225/- and this is subject to the out come of the pending writ petitions.

12. Then the issue turned to an extreme level wherein the G.O. Ms. No. 210 School Education (G2) Department dated 14.08.2009 was issued. In this the teachers prayed to calculate the Secondary Grade Post service + Primary School HM service and thereafter fix the service in Middle School HM post and grant Selection Special Grade. The said G.O. granted the benefits to the persons mentioned in the G.O. Then in G.O. Ms. No. 190 School Education (G1) Department dated 12.07.2010 was issued extending to some more persons by taking the Secondary Grade post + Primary School HM and grant selection / special grade in Middle School HM post. A correction G.O. was issued in G.O. Ms. No. 230 School Education (G1) Department dated 10.08.2010. Then G.O. Ms. No. 146 School Education (G1) Department dated 19.06.2012 was issued to some more persons to calculate Secondary Grade post + Primary School HM was taken to grant



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.17304 & 17307 of 2019

Middle School HM selection/special grade. In this G.O. it has been stated that more than six crores would be the financial implications for the 260 teachers. As pointed out supra the employee is entitled to selection / special grade if a person is "stagnating" in the same post. But now the teachers would be promoted as Primary School HM, then also they will demand to calculate the period of service in Primary School HM post. Then again the person would be promoted to Middle School HM, then also the person will demand to calculate both the secondary service + primary school HM and fix the same in Middle School HM post and grant selection / special grade. In short the entire service should be taken into account to grant selection / special grade. That too "along with promotion", that is the high light of the issue.

13. Thereafter numerous government orders were passed. This Court has passed an order in W.P. No. 29644/2003 and 29645 / 2003 dated 21.03.2008 covering 61 persons and to implement the order the G.O. Ms. No. 234 School Education (G2) Department dated 10.09.2009 was issued wherein, the Secondary Grade post + Primary School HM was calculated. Again based on court's order G.O. Ms. No. 270 School Education (G2) Department dated 20.09.2010 was



issued. Likewise based on court's order, G.O. Ms. No. 216 School Education (G2) Department dated 30.12.2011, G.O. Ms. No. 179 School Education (Elementary2) Department dated 06.09.2013, G.O. Ms. No. 180 School Education (S.E. 3(1)) Department dated 06.09.2013, G.O. Ms. No. 181 School Education (S.E.3(1)) Department, dated 06.09.2013 were issued, wherein the Secondary Grade post+Primary School HM was calculated.

14. These G.O. were passed in a fond hope that this issue will come to an end, but the issue could not see the end at all, inspite of so many G.Os.

15. This Court has allowed several petitions and the government finally filed review application in Rev. Appl. No. 227/2015 and the same was referred to Full Bench. The review application was taken up along with several writ appeals and writ petitions, wherein it was held the issue cannot be reagitated again and has held that the benefits shall be notionally calculated and the monetary benefits shall be payable on and from 01.03.2017.

16. This Court rejected the claims in several petitions and one such case is the order dated 09.12.2015 passed in W.A. (MD) No. 312/2011 in Division Bench headed by Justice V. Ramasubramanian



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.17304 & 17307 of 2019

and Justice N. Kirubakaran has held in paragraph 5, "that the employees who were in service in 1997-1998 as well as in the year 2002 did not rise a little finger either at the time of when the original applications were filed in the year 1997-1998 or at the time when the original application were allowed by the Tribunal in the year 2002". And rejected the dead and stale claims.

17. Thereafter the Rev. Appl. (MD) No. 35/ dated 19.03.2018, W.A. 34 / 2017 dated 03.01.2019 and W.A. 73/2016 dated 03.01.2019 was passed dismissing the review applications/ writ appeals filed by the government.

18. Under this background the present two writ petitions are considered. In W.P.(MD)No.3186/2016 the petitioner has attained superannuation and retired in the year 2006 and has filed the present writ petition in the year 2016, after a lapse of 10 years from the date of retirement. The petitioner in W.P.(MD)No.3187/2016 attained superannuation and retired in the year 2006 and has filed the present writ petition in the year 2016, after a lapse of 10 years from the date of retirement. Hence this Court following the order dated 09.12.2015 passed in W.A. (MD) No. 312/2011, rejects the claim of the petitioner on the ground of delay and latches, since the dead and stale claims cannot be entertained.



19. *The petitioners relied on G.O. Ms. No. 210, 190 and 146 and these G.O.s are passed in order to implement the orders of this Court. The petitioners ought to establish their right based on any provisions of law, rules, regulations and any government order passed based on the any policy decision of the government. In other words, if the government order is passed on the basis of the policy decision of the government i.e. G.O. passed in rem is applicable to all. The petitioners cannot claim any right to any government order which were passed in order to obey the orders of the Court i.e. government order passed to person specific / "in persona" cannot be cited to claim any right. In fact several writ petitions are filed citing the G.O.s which were to obey the orders of this Court, if that is discouraged then pendency of the writ petitions would be considerably reduced.*

20. *This Court is of the considered opinion each case ought to be dealt with on its own merits. In the present case, the writ petitioner in W.P.(MD)No. 3186/2016 was regularized on 08.07.1977 in School Assistant Teacher post, had received Selection Grade on 08.07.1987 in the School Assistant Teacher post. Then promoted as Middle School HM on 12.10.1988. Then the petitioner received Selection Grade on*



12.10.1998 in the post of Middle School HM. Then the petitioner is eligible for Special Grade on 12.10.2008, but since the petitioner retired on 30.04.2006, two years before the eligibility for Special Grade. Now the petitioner is seeking to take the two years from School Assistant Teacher post and grant Special Grade in the post of Middle School HM. Incidentally the petitioner has already received Selection Grade in the post of School Assistant Post. If the claim of the petitioner is accepted then the claim would be two selection grade for the same period which is absolutely illegal claim. Moreover as stated supra the selection / special grade cannot be granted once the promotion is granted to the petitioner.

21. The petitioner in W.P.(MD) No. 3187/2016 was appointed as B.T. Assistant on 11.01.1982, received Selection Grade in the B.T. Assistant post on 10.01.1992 and the said disbursement of selection grade itself is wrong, since the petitioner was already promoted as Middle School HM on 21.12.1988. If the 1988 is taken as promotion date, then the petitioner is eligible for selection grade in the Middle School HM post on 21.12.1998, since the earlier selection grade fixation is wrong, this selection grade was not granted to the petitioner. The petitioner would be eligible for



special grade on 21.12.2008, but the same was not granted, since two years prior to eligibility for special grade the petitioner retired from service on 20.12.2006. Moreover as stated supra the selection / special grade cannot be granted once the promotion is granted to the petitioner. Therefore, this Court is of the definite opinion that the petitioners are not eligible to get selection grade/ special grade after promotion by taking both "pre promotion" post and "post promotion" post and the claim is illegal and unjust enrichment.

22. In fact the Tribunal has rightly held at the earliest point of time while considering G.0.1381 that when the scale of pay is different for two services, then both services cannot be taken for calculating 10 years / 20 years, more so when one service has less pay and the other service has more pay. The Secondary Grade Teacher has less pay and the primary school Headmaster has higher pay and Middle school Headmaster has still more higher pay. Then, any two services or any three services cannot be taken to calculate 10 years or 20 years to grant selection grade or special grade respectively.

23. The teachers are seeking to grant selection grade and special grade by calculating the service in Secondary Grade Teacher post and the promoted post



of Primary School Headmaster. Also claiming to calculate the Secondary Grade post and Primary School Headmaster post along with the Middle Headmaster post and grant special grade. In short the teachers are claiming both the promotion and as well as selection grade and special grade for their entire service. The concept has entirely changed by this plea to calculate the entire service including the promotion post. The claim to grant Selection Grade / Special Grade after availing promotion is illegal and unjust enrichment. The basic concept of Selection Grade / Special Grade is tampered with to obtain illegal claim. The very concept of granting selection grade and special grade is buried by these kind of writ petitions. This Court is of the considered opinion that the teachers are either eligible for promotion or for Selection Special Grade and the teachers are not eligible for both.

24. The wrong claim of selection grade / special grade by calculating two or three different services were the subject matter from 1991 onwards, the Government passed several orders to put an end to the claim, this Court passed orders to put an end to the claim, but still several claims are arising until 2022. Therefore, this Court is of the considered opinion that illegal claim should end and this Court is putting a big



W.P.Nos.17304 & 17307 of 2019

full stop to the illegal claims by this order."

WEB COPY

3. On merits also the petitioners are not entitled to claim the benefit for revision of pension or otherwise and the writ petitions are hit by the principles of laches.

4.(a) In the case of ***Chairman / Managing Director, Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Limited and Others Vs. Ramgopal*** reported in ***[(2020) SCC Online SC 101]***, the Three Judges Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India held as follows:

“ it is true that limitation does not strictly apply to proceedings under Articles 32 or 226 of the Constitution of India, nevertheless, such rights cannot be enforced after an unreasonable lapse of time. Consideration of unexplained delays and inordinate laches would always be relevant in writ actions, and writ courts naturally ought to be reluctant in exercising their discretionary jurisdiction to protect those who have slept over wrongs and allowed illegalities to fester. Fence-sitters cannot be allowed to barge into courts and cry for their rights at their



convenience, and vigilant citizens ought not to be treated alike with mere opportunists. On multiple occasions, it has been restated that there are implicit limitations of time within which writ remedies can be enforced.”

(b) In the case of ***P.S. Sadasivaswamy Vs. State of Tamil Nadu***, reported in ***[(1975) 1 SCC 152]***, held as follows:

“2. ... One cannot sleep over the matter and come to the Court questioning that relaxation. In effect he wants to unscramble a scrambled egg. It is not that there is any period of limitation for the Courts to exercise their powers under Article 226 nor is it that there can never be a case where the Courts cannot interfere in a matter after the passage of a certain length of time. But it would be a sound and wise exercise of discretion for the Courts to refuse to exercise their extraordinary powers under Article 226 in the case of persons who do not approach it expeditiously for relief and who stand by and allow things to happen and then approach the Court to put forward stale claims and try to unsettle settled matters.....”



WEB COPY (c) In the case of ***SS Balu Vs. State of Kerala***, reported in [(2009)

2 SCC 479], the Court observed thus:

“17. It is also well-settled principle of law that “delay defeats equity”. ...It is now a trite law that where the writ petitioner approaches the High Court after a long delay, reliefs prayed for may be denied to them on the ground of delay and laches irrespective of the fact that they are similarly situated to the other candidates who obtain the benefit of the judgment.”

(d) In the case of ***Vijay Kumar Kaul Vs. Union of India***, reported in [(2012) 7 SCC 610], held as follows:

“27. ...It becomes an obligation to take into consideration the balance of justice or injustice in entertaining the petition or declining it on the ground of delay and laches. It is a matter of great significance that at one point of time equity that existed in favour of one melts into total insignificance and paves the path of extinction with the



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.17304 & 17307 of 2019

passage of time.”

It is also pertinent to mention that neither has it been pleaded nor is it apparent from the material on record that the Respondent was unable to approach the court-of-law in time on account of any social or financial disability. Had such been the case, he ought to have availed free legal aid and should have ventilated his grievances in a timely manner.”

5. (a) In the case of ***State of Uttar Pradesh and Others Vs. Arvind Kumar Srivastava and Others*** reported in ***[(2015) 1 SCC 347]***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India held as follows:

“(2) However, this principle is subject to well recognized exceptions in the form of laches and delays as well as acquiescence. Those persons who did not challenge the wrongful action in their cases and acquiesced into the same and woke up after long delay only because of the reason that their counterparts who had approached the Court earlier in time succeeded in their efforts, then such employees cannot claim that the benefit of the



judgment rendered in the case of similarly situated persons be extended to them. They would be treated as fence-sitters and laches and delays, and/or the acquiescence, would be a valid ground to dismiss their claim.”

(b) In the case of ***Rushibhai Jagdishbhai Pathak Vs. Bhavnagar Municipal Corporation*** reported in [2022 SCC Online SC 641], held as follows:

“The courts have expressed the view that the law of limitation rests on the foundations of greater public interest for three reasons

(a) that long dormant claims have more of cruelty than justice in them

(b) that a Defendant might have lost the evidence to disapprove a stale claim

(c) that persons with good causes of action should pursue them with reasonable diligence

The normal Rule is that when a particular set of employees is given relief by the court, all other identically situated persons need to be treated alike by extending that benefit. However, this principle is subject to well-recognised exceptions in the form of



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.17304 & 17307 of 2019

latches and delays as well as acquiescence.

“Those persons who did not challenge the wrongful action in their cases and acquiesced into the same and woke up after long delay only because of the reason that their counterparts who had approached the court earlier in time succeeded in their efforts, then such employees cannot claim that the benefit of the judgment rendered in the case of similarly situated persons be extended to them. They would be treated as fence-sitters and laches and delays, and/or the acquiescence, would be a valid ground to dismiss their claim””

6. Therefore, the petitioners are not eligible to claim the benefit after many years now and even on merits, the claim of the petitioners deserve no merit consideration. The writ petitions stand **dismissed**. There shall be no order as to costs.



W.P.Nos.17304 & 17307 of 2019

28.11.2022

Index : Yes

*Speaking order
sha*

To

1. The State of Tamil Nadu ,
Rep by its Secretary,
Adi Dravidar Welfare and Tribal Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.
2. The Director of Adi Dravidar Welfare and Tribal Officer,
Ezhilagam Chepauk,
Chennai-600 005.
3. The District Adi Dravidar Welfare and Tribal Officer,
Thiruvallur, Thiruvallur District.
4. The Headmaster,
Government Adi Dravidar Welfare,
Middle School, Minjur,
Ponneri Taluk, Thiruvallur District.



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.17304 & 17307 of 2019

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM.J.,

sha

W.P.Nos.17304 & 17307 of 2019

28.11.2022