WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 17.11.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P.Nos.19939 of 2014 And 36827 of 2016
and
W.M.P.Nos.31625 of 2016 and 22183 of 2021

WP No.19939 of 2014:

1.R.Prema Latha
2.S.Shanthi
3.A.Mekala
4.A.Balamurugan
5.M.Muruga Dhas
6.K.Kennedy
7.G.Rameshkannan ... Petitioners

Vs.

1.The State Of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by the Secretary to Government
Higher Education Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The Director Of Collegiate Education,
College Road, Chennai-600 006.

3.The Registrar
University Of Madras,
Chennai-600 005.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

4.The Commissioner of Police
Chennai-600 008.

5.S.Jeyachandran

6.Mr.palaniappan

7.Pachaiyappa's Trust Board,
Pachaiyappa's College Campus,
Chennai – 600 030.
Rep. by its Secretary.

8.C.Sundaramurthy
9.Sheela
10.S.Malarvizhi
11.G.Sathyadevi
12.P.Ramesh
13.S.Uthamakumar
14.S.Meena
15.G.Anitha
16.S.Sunithaanilkumar
17.S.Ulaganathan
18.P.Vasanthakumar
19.K.Subapriya
20.A.Asaithambi
21.K.R.Vijaya
22.R.Ganapathyraman
23.S.Chandrasekaran
24.P.Elangovan
25.V.Sivamurugan
26.T.K.Sunitha
27.R.Ganeshkumar
28.P.Karthikeyan
29.N.Santhi
30.P.S.Sathyanarayanan

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

31.H.Thilagam
32.R.Saravanan
33.R.Siva
34.V.Ganesan
35.G.Kumararaja
36.V.Srinivasan
37.R.M.Thirumaran
38.R.Latha
39.R.Maheshwari
40.A.Rajalakshmi
41.K.Saravanaperumal
42.P.Vimala
43.S.Kanimozhi
44.P.Thenmozhi
45.S.Hemalatha
46.S.Susa
47.M.Ramadevi
48.S.Shyamalagowri
49.D.Rajakumari
50.P.Karkuzhali
51.M.Chitra
52.B.Radha
53.S.Senthilkumari
54.K.Chithra Devi
55.D.Sasikala
56.G.Sivagami
57.S.Archana
58.C.Sampath
59.M.Thirumalai
60.G.R.Ramkumar
61.P.Srinivasan
62.S.Hariharan
63.R.Rasheethabanu
64.M.Sivasankari
65.R.Selvarasu
66.V.Arul

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

67.R.Sakthivel
68.Kannan
69.A.Prakasam
70.M.Renugadevi
71.G.Selvi
72.K.Anbarasu
73.R.Kamalakannan
74.A.Saravanan
75.M.Najeema
76.T.Suganya
77.K.K.Gomathy
78.J.K.Gandhimathy
79.S.Jeyalakshmi
80.A.Anbuselvi
81.M.Mahalakshmi
82.S.Vijayalakshmi
83.T.Uma
84.G.Kavitha
85.M.S.Sumathy
86.P.Lavanya
87.D.Uma Maheswari
88.S.Karthikeyan
89.R.S.Uthayakumar
90.P.Muthusamy
91.L.S.Thirumalai
92.N.Senthilkumar
93.M.Thangaraj
94.M.Savithri
95.N.Jothyrama
96.A.Kavitha
97.Y.Karnan
98.P.Prayer Elmoraj
99.P.Kannaki
100.S.Shanmugapriya
101.G.Uthra
102.G.Gandhimathi

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

103.R.Sakthivel
104.D.Arumainayagam
105.G.Mangalam
106.D.Sivanesan
107.R.Sunitha
108.P.Gathrin
109.K.Ponnarasi
110.R.Hariharan
111.S.Ayyampillai
112.V.Sivasankar
113.M.Sathiyanathan
114.M.Gopalakrishnan
115.M.Koteeswari
116.M.Prabhakaran
117.N.Karpagam
118.M.Elamvazhuthy
119.S.Syamala Gowri
120.S.P.Sujatha
121.N.Akila
122.P.Mahalakshmi
123.R.Sakthikumar
124.P.Priya
125.S.Sumathy
126.M.Senthamarai
127.A.S.Andal
128.D.Chidhambaram
129.R.Amudhabose
130.C.Maykrishnan
131.Saravanakumar
132.R.Vimala Devi
133.K.Bhuvaneswari
134.S.Yogeshwari
135.S.Shyamala Devi
136.S.Ananda Priya
137.C.Revathi
138.Z.Ayesha Siddiqha

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

139.A.Subashini
140.D.Sasikala
141.G.Lakshmi Sai
142.T.Kumari Subitha
143.M.A.B.Saraswathi
144.K.Kalpana
145.K.B.Latha
146.S.Indhumathy
147.M.R.Selvarani
148.E.Kumar
149.S.Arun
150.U.Chandrakumar
151.K.Gowrisankar
152.P.Ananadhan
153.P.Suresh
154.M.Sagadevan
155.M.Arulmozhi
156.R.Rajini
157.S.Prasad
158.S.Gopalakrishnan
159.M.Boopalan
160.P.Prabu
161.G.R.Learnal Sudhakar
162.J.Selvanathan
163.R.Harikrishnan
164.A.Sureshbabu
165.R.Raveenthar
166.R.Muthuraman
167.V.Raja
168.R.Periasamy
169.L.Sivaramakrishnan
170.C.Panneerselvam
171.M.B.S.Rani
172.R.Nimmy
173.M.Maria Belcy Rajathy
174.S.Kalaiselvi

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

175.P.Deepa
176.R.Meenakshi
177.S.Sangeetha
178.T.Jayasheela
179.G.Vimala
180.S.Uthayanila
181.Dr.S.subburani
182.N.Uma
183.G.Jayachitra
184.R.Pazhaniammal
185.V.Suyambuthangam
186.D.Maheshwari
187.K.Anbarasi
188.D.Muthumari
189.M.R.Shabegam
190.R.Shanmugapriya
191.S.Sumathy
192.S.Sangeetha
193.K.Kadhambari
194.S.Jancy Sophiya
195.V.Kalpana
196.M.Ezhilbama
197.A.Sridevi
198.P.Amudhavalli
199.R.Kunaguma Priya
200.V.Anitha ... Respondents

[R7 impleaded as per order dated 13.10.2014 in MP.No.2 of 2014 in W.P.No.19939 of 2014]

[R8 to R200 impleaded as per order dated 27.11.2017 in WMP.No.30460 of 2017 in WP.No.19939 of 2014]

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, direction in the nature of a writ

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

appointing a Special team to enquire into the appointments of Assistant Professors appointed by the Pachaiyappa's Trust Board in (1) Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30, (2) C.Kandaswami Naidu College for Men, Anna Nagar, Chennai-40, (3) Chellamal College for Women, Guindy, Chennai, (4) Pachaiyappa's College for Men, Kancheepuram, (5) Pachaiyappa's College for Women and (6) C.Kandasami Naidu College for Women, Cuddalore pursuant to the Advertisements dated 12.12.2013 and 18.02.2014 and to initiate criminal action against those found guilty.

For Petitioners	: Mr.P.Chandrasekar
For Respondents For R1 &R2	: Mr.D.Ravi Chander Special Government Pleader Assisted by Mr.C.Jayaprakash Government Advocate
For R3	: Mr.M.Palanimuthu
For R4	: Mr.S.Rajesh Government Advocate
For R7	: Mr.K.V.Sundararajan
For R8 & R178	: Mr.V.M.Nagarajan
For R5	: Mr.M.A.Gouthaman
For R10, 42, 44, 45, 48 & 133	: Mr.G.Sankaran

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

For R33, 37 & 44 : Mr.N.R.Anantharam Krishnan

For R46 & R137 : Mr.M.Ravi

For R56, 64 & 144 : Mr.R.Bharanidharan

For R36, 38, 73, 92, 93, 96, 131, 141, 148, 153, 156, 168 & 172, 129 : Mrs.G.Thilagavathi Senior Counsel For Mr.R.Gopinath

For R179 : Mr.M.Gnanasekar

For R9, R11 to R16, 18, 19, 21 to 32, 34, 35 39, 40, 43, 49, 51 to 55, 57 to 63, 66, 67, 70, 71, 72, 76 to 78, 80, 81, 83, 84, 86 to 91, 94, 95, 99, 100, 101, 103 to 125, 127, 130, 135, 138 to 140, 142, 145 to 147, 149 to 152, 155, 157, 159 to 167, 169, 170, 174 to 176, 180, 189, 192 & 194 to 200 : Mr.A.Ajoy Khose

For R17, 20, 50, 97 & 98 : Mr.R.M.D.Nasrullah

For R47, 132 & 134 : Mr.N.Alagurnarayanan For M/s.RRN Legal

For R177 : Mr.A.S.Balaji and Mr.M.Jothikumar

For R85 : Mrs.Selvi George

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

For R143 : Mr.T.Sundaravadhanan

For R6, 65, 74, 82, 102, 126, 128, 136, 143, 154, 158, 190, 191 & 193 : No Appearance

For R68, 69, 75, 79, 171 & 173 : Not Ready in Notice

WP No.36827 of 2016:

1.R.Prema Latha
2.S.Shanthi
3.A.Mekala
4.A.Balamurugan
5.M.Muruga Dhas
6.G.Rameshkannan ... Petitioners

Vs.

1.The State Of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by the Secretary to Government
Higher Education Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The Director Of Collegiate Education,
College Road, Chennai-600 006.

3.The Registrar
University Of Madras,
Chennai-600 005.

4.The Registrar
Thiruvalluvar University,

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Vellore, Vellore District.

5.The Pachaiyappa's Trust Board
Pachaiyappa's College Campus,
Chennai 600 030.
Rep. by its Secretary.

6.S.Jeyachandran

7.The Principal
Pachaiyappa's College,
Chennai-600 030.

8.The Principal
Chellamal College for Women,
Guindy,
Chennai.

9.The Principal
C.Kandaswamy Naidu College For Men
Anna Nagar,
Chennai-600 040

10.The Principal
Pachaiyappa's College for Men,
Kancheepuram,
Kancheepuram District.

11.The Principal
C.Kandaswamy Naidu College for Women,
Cuddalore,
Cuddalore District.

12.S.Uma
13.R.Vimala
14.M.Vihashmunoth

11/196

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

15.R.Devi
16.S.Vijayalakshmi
17.M.Indhumathy
18.R.Sheelarani
19.Dr.Swarnalatha
20.R.Sidheshwaran
21.V.Vinothkumar
22.K.Rameshbabu
23.R.Prasad
24.J.Kavina
25.N.Amutha
26.Ms.Jayapriya
27.Dr.S.Ramu
28.Dr.B.Devan
29.V.M.Mahalakshmi
30.P.Sathyamurthy
31.E.Jerish Immanuel
32.Dr.A.D.Revathy
33.G.Sivabalan
34.O.Vijayalakshmi
35.T.V.Swaminathan
36.M.Roopa
37.Dr.S.Vanitha
38.Dr.D.Manimegalai
39.M.Karthik
40.Mr.Gokul
41.Ms.Prema
42.Dr.Thennarasu
43.Vinayagamurthy
44.Venkatesan
45.Ms.Selvi
46.Ms.Mahalakshmi
47.Dr.N.Srinivasan
48.Mr.Gunaseelan
49.Mr.Manikandan
50.Dr.S.Poompozhil

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

51.Dr.T.Kavitha
52.Ms.S.Saranya
53.Dr.C.Naveena
54.Dr.Ramya
55.Ms.Anbujebamalar ... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, direction in nature of writ appointing a special team to enquire into the appointments of respondents 12 to 55 as Assistant Professors appointed by the Pachaiyappa's Trust Board in (1) Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30, (2) C.Kandaswami Naidu College for Men, Anna Nagar, Chennai-40, (3) Chellamal College for Women, Guindy, Chennai, (4) Pachaiyappa's College for Men, Kancheepuram, (5) Pachaiyappa's College for Women and (6) C.Kandaswami Naidu College for Women, Cuddalore pursuant to the advertisements dated 02.12.2015 and declare the selection of respondents 12 to 55 and their appointment as illegal and void.

For Petitioners : Mr.P.Chandrasekar

For Respondents
For R1 &R2 : Mr.D.Ravi Chander
Special Government Pleader
Assisted by Mr.C.Jayaprakash
Government Advocate

For R3 : Mr.M.Palanimuthu

For R5 : Mr.K.V.Sundararajan

13/196

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

For R26, 31 & 35 : Mrs.G.Thilagavathi
Senior Counsel
For Mr.R.Gopinath

For R13 to 16, 21 to 23, 25, 27 to 30, 32 to 34, 42 to 44, 46 to 55 : Mr.A.Ajoy Khose

For R36 & 37 : Mr.G.Sankaran

COMMON ORDER

PRELUDE :

"We the People of India" resolved equal opportunity in public employment under the Constitution. Inequality in public employment violates social justice. Corruption in the process of selection is anti developmental. Misplaced sympathy or leniency, while dealing with illegality, corrupt practices in the process of selection by the State or by the Courts amount to abating unconstitutionality. The Authority of the State or the Authority of the Courts are bound by the constitutional mandates and principles. Remaining as silent spectator on illegality and corruption is the worst form of unconstitutionality. Easy approach by the State or by the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Courts undoubtedly resulted in spreading of large scale corruption in this country in the matter of public appointments. The extent of illegality, corrupt activities in the process of selection plays pivotal role in setting aside the process of selection as a whole.

2. Lakh and lakh of meritorious youth of this country are longing to secure public employment through Open Competitive Process. Their confidence in the system is demolished if the State and the Courts allow the illegality and corrupt activities in the process of selection. Are those meritorious candidates are sinners? What is the duty of the Constitutional Authorities and the State to deal with such situations, where large scale corruption in the process of selection is traced out. Equality clause enunciated how long be allowed to remain in Constitution Book in this country, even after completion of 75 years of independence. Growing trend of corruption is the agony. The working of constitution and the Courts in this regard must be looked into seriously.

3. The greatest negativeness is that greedy people are adopting

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

delay tactics in order to cover up the illegalities and corrupt practices by keeping the issues pending either before the State or before the Court of Law, which gave them strength for escaping from consequences. “Justice delayed is justice denied” is the old theory and even in case of delay, justice must prevail.

4. Recruitment to public services must command public confidence. Where the entire process of selection is to be flawed, its cancellation is inevitable. Hardship caused to few untainted is unavoidable.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND :

5. The writ petitions are filed to declare the selection and appointment as null and void.

6. Pachaiyappa's Trust Board [hereinafter referred to as the 'Board', in short] is controlling several Institutions in Chennai, Kancheepuram, Cuddalore etc. Pachaiyappa's Trust Board by an advertisement dated 12.12.2013 called for applications to fill up 82 posts of

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Assistant Professors under various disciplines for six Colleges under the control of the Board. Similarly by an advertisement dated 18.02.2014, the Board called for applications to fill up 119 posts of Assistant Professors. As against 83 vacancies advertised by Notification dated 12.12.2013, the Board has filled up 80 posts. Pursuant to the Notification dated 18.02.2014, the Board filled up 113 posts. WP No.19939 of 2014 has been filed by the writ petitioners in respect of appointments made pursuant to the advertisements dated 12.12.2013 and 18.02.2014.

7. The Board by an advertisement dated 02.12.2015 called for applications to fill up 66 posts. The petitioners also participated in the process of selection. University Grants Commission (UGC) Regulations on minimum qualifications for appointment in Universities and Affiliated Colleges as amended on 30.06.2010 and 13.06.2013 govern appointments. The University Grants Commission (UGC) has made it clear that all appointments shall be in accordance with the qualification prescribed by the UGC Regulations only.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

8. The contention of the petitioners is that all appointments have been made in gross violation of Regulations framed by the UGC, which was adopted by the Government of Tamil Nadu. Though applications were invited in On-line process, the results were not published and kept as secret. The petitioners submitted the representation on 07.12.2015 to the Hon'ble Chief Minister and to other Authorities. On coming to know about appointment of the contesting respondents, the petitioners submitted representation objecting their appointments. The appointed candidates do not possess the requisite qualifications. The petitioners referred certain appointees.

9. Two nominees appointed by the Government and two nominees appointed by the Vice Chancellor, participated in the selection process. The Principals of the respective Colleges (6 Colleges), Heads of Departments of the concerned subjects were not part of the Selection Committee. The College Committee was not represented in the Selection Committee. The College Committee has not appointed the Assistant

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Professors. There was no interview for selection in accordance with the Regulations. The Committee has totally abdicated its responsibility. The selected candidates have been picked up by a person not involved in the selection process. There is fraud and corruption in appointing the candidates for the post of Assistant Professors.

10. The order passed by the High Court in WP Nos.4420 and 6445 of 2011 is misused by the University to approve the appointment of unqualified persons. The said judgment, cited supra, is in respect of Notification dated 19.12.2010 and it has nothing to do with the Notifications dated 12.12.2013, 18.02.2014 and 02.12.2015.

11. Several representations have been made with specific allegation that there is bribery and corruption in the matter of appointments and the nature of illegality is such that without the active connivance of the political leadership, this would not have happened. However, there is no response. There was an agitation by the students and teachers and several newspapers and periodicals have reported massive corruption in the matter

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

of appointments. However, no enquiry has been ordered. The total appointments made pursuant to the Notifications dated 12.12.2013, 18.02.2014 and 02.12.2015 are said to be around 237. The allegation is that for appointments money amounting to lakhs of rupees have been collected. The Government of Tamil Nadu has not taken any action in respect of the allegations though a former Minister has been specifically named. Thus fraud and corruption vitiates the entire selection and appointment.

12. The selected candidates have paid huge amount for their appointments. In WP No.36827 of 2016, the first petitioner has worked for 12 years in the Board, the fourth petitioner has put in 10 years of service, the fifth petitioner has put in 6 years of service and sixth petitioner has 7 years of service. All the petitioners belong to poor families and they cannot afford to pay such a huge money as demanded. Thus the petitioners are constrained to file the present writ petitions for setting aside the process of selection and appointment.

13. The respondents have objected the contentions raised on

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

behalf of the petitioners by stating that the procedures as contemplated in the Recruitment Notifications were followed. The contesting respondents have pleaded that they are not at fault and thus they cannot be penalised. The petitioners were unsuccessful candidates and there is no locus standi to challenge the process of selection and appointment. Even as per the decision of the Courts, an unsuccessful candidate cannot challenge the process of selection conducted in accordance with the Recruitment Notifications.

14. At the outset, the respondents have stated that they are innocent persons selected and appointed in accordance with the procedures as contemplated and therefore their selection and appointment cannot be interfered with.

SUBMISSION ON COUNSELS:

15. The petitioners' counsel contended that the entire process of selection and appointment are tainted with malpractices, illegalities and corruption. Huge amount of money played the role in the matter of selection and appointment. The UGC procedures were tampered with. Selection was

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

conducted by an improper Committee. Persons who bribed the Members/ Trustees of the Board and the political persons could secure appointments. The learned petitioners' counsel further contended that the petitioners are not having sufficient proof to establish the alleged transaction of monetary consideration. However, there are widespread allegations through reliable sources and the manner in which the selection and appointment are self-evident to establish the corrupt practices in the matter of selection. The circumstances would prove that the selection is vitiated on account of corrupt practices. Thus Court has to examine the manner in which the selection procedure was conducted and the credentials, eligibility and the other criteria of the appointed candidates, so as to find out the illegalities and irregularities at large.

16. The learned counsel for the State contended that the Government of Tamil Nadu adopted the UGC Regulations for appointment of College Teachers. Under the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Private Colleges Regulation Act, educational qualifications and other criterias are mandatory and there cannot be any violation. The Selections are to be

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

conducted in accordance with the procedures contemplated and the Notifications issued in consonance with the UGC Regulations.

17. The learned counsels appearing on behalf of the selected candidates forcibly contended that the selected candidates are fully qualified in accordance with the UGC Regulations. They have not committed any mistake. The selected candidates participated in the process of selection and got selected on merits. All the selected candidates were appointed and working for about 6 to 8 years. Thus, their appointments cannot be now called for in question. In the event of interfering with their selection, the appointed candidates would be prejudiced and they have not committed any irregularity or illegality.

18. The learned counsels appearing on behalf of the respondents contended that the writ petitions are not maintainable and the petitioners were unsuccessful candidates in the selection and thus no locus standi to question the selection and appointment of the candidates. An unsuccessful candidate cannot challenge the procedure. The Administrator

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

of the Board has not scrutinised the procedures properly and there is a discrepancy in the report of the Administrator and the report of the Director of Collegiate Education submitted pursuant to the interim directions of this Court. If at all there are few unqualified candidates, their appointment alone is to be cancelled and cancelling the entire selection would be abuse of law.

CERTAIN CONDITIONS IN RECRUITMENT NOTIFICATION:

19. Recruitment Notifications were issued by the Board through the Board Notification Nos.03/2013, 01/2014 and 01/2015 respectively dated 12.12.2013, 18.02.2014 and 02.12.2015.

20. Paragraph-1 of the Notification reveals that the Board has decided to make appointment against approved vacancies permitted to be filled up by the Director of Collegiate Education, Chennai in various subjects as per present UGC Regulations and recruitment procedures prevails/applicable as on the date. The posts will be filled up on the basis of the weightage marks to be awarded for (a) teaching experience; (b) higher educational qualifications in the subjects and (c) marks to be awarded in the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

interview.

21. Paragraph 4.1 of the Notification speaks about "Arts and Science" as follows:-

"(a) All candidates other than SC/ST : Pass in Post Graduate Degree in the relevant subject with a minimum of 55% marks and a pass in the UGC/CSIR/JRF/NET/SLET/SLST/SET as per UGC Norms in the relevant subject.

(or)

Pass in Post Graduate Degree in the relevant subject with a minimum of 55% marks and Ph.D in the relevant subject.

(b) For SC/ST candidates and all Physically Handicapped Candidates :

Pass in Post Graduate Degree in the relevant subject with a minimum of 50% marks and a pass in the UGC/ CSIR/ JRF /NET/ SLET/ SLST/SET as per UGC Norms in the relevant subject.

(or)

Pass in Post Graduate Degree in the relevant subject with a minimum of 50% marks

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

and Ph.D in the relevant subject."

22. Paragraph-4.4 of the Notification states "General" as follows:

> *"(a) Candidates should possess the educational qualification prior to the last date of submission of application.*
>
> *(b) Candidates should possess the Bachelor's degree from a recognised University, under 10+2+3 pattern alone. No other order / pattern will be accepted.*
>
> *(c) Preference / Priority will be given for the candidates who obtained UG/PG Degree in the same discipline for the relevant post for which his/her candidature applied for.*
>
> *(d) UG/PG Degree / M.Phil Degree obtained through correspondence / Distance Mode will not be considered for award of any weightage marks irrespective of their possessing requisite qualification."*

23. Paragraph-11.1 of the Notification speaks about

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

"Experience" as under:

> *"The teaching experience will be taken into account only from the date of possession of requisite qualification i.e., PG Degree with UGC/ CSIR/ JRF/ NET/ SLET/ SLST/ SET/Ph.D., and authenticated Proof should be produced at the time of certificate verification."*

24. Paragraph-13 of the Notification states about the "Teaching Experience Certificate (Counter signing Authority)" as follows:

> *"(a) The experience certificates will have to be furnished as supporting documents and produced at the time of certificate verification.*
>
> *(b) The experience certificate of Candidates who worked / are working in Govt./Aided/Self financing Engineering Colleges should be countersigned by the respective educational authorities / affiliating universities authorities.*
>
> *(c) Teaching experience in colleges for the relevant subject handled alone will be considered. The Teaching experience will be reckoned from the date of passing of P.G.Degree with UGC/*

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

CSIR/JRF/NET/SLET/SLST/SET/ Ph.D. In case of any false certificate, Pachaiyappa's Trust Board will initiate legal proceedings against the Individual and the Countersigning Authority. All experience Certificates will be verified by a Competent authority of the Pachayappa's Trust Board on the date of certification verification. The responsibility of authentication and genuineness of the certificates rests with the candidates. The decision of selection committee on the genuineness of the certificates produced will be final."

ACTION OF THE ADMINISTRATOR MR. JUSTICE P.SHANMUGAM (RETIRED HIGH COURT JUDGE)

25. Due to dispute between the Trustees/Members in Pachaiyappa's Trust Board litigations are instituted. The High Court appointed Retired High Court Judge Hon'ble Mr. Justice P.Shanmugam as an Interim Administrator to govern the Pachaiyappa's Board Trust. The issue was taken up before the Interim Administrator, who in turn called for

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

the records pertaining to the selection process and appointment and thoroughly scrutinised with reference to the allegations of irregularities, illegalities and corrupt practices in appointments. The Interim Administrator thoroughly conducted an enquiry with reference to the large scale allegations in the process of selection, which led to denial of equal opportunity to meritorious candidates participated in the selection process large in number from all over the country.

26. The rowing enquiry conducted by the Administrator resulted in issuance of show cause notice to the appointed candidates, who were fond to be tainted. It seems that the Interim Administrator issued show cause notice for more than 150 candidates selected from and out of 254. On receipt of show cause notices, the appointed candidates submitted their objections by stating that they are innocent and not connected with any illegality or corrupt practices. On account of certain compelling circumstances, the Interim Administrator at that point of time resigned his post. Thereafter the Board has not passed any final orders pursuant to the show cause notices issued to the appointed candidates. The selection was

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

subjudiced before this Court in the present writ petitions. When it stands as it is, the High Court appointed AG&OT to administer the Pachaiyappa's Trust Board. The AG&OT took charge and reiterated the veracity of the irregularities, illegalities and corrupt practices in the process of selection and appointment based on the findings of the Administrator Mr.Justice P.Shanmugam. A report was also filed by the Administrator before the High Court in the other proceedings.

27. The findings of the Administrator are as under:-

"Proceedings of the President, Pachaiyappa's Trust Board, Chennai-30

Present: Mr. Justice P.Shanmugam,

Judge, High Court of Madras (Retd.,)

President

==========

Rc.No.A1/1141/2020 *Date: 31.07.2020*

By Speed Post

Sub:Aided Colleges – under the Management of Pachaiyappa's Trust Board – Appointment of Assistant Professors made during the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 by Pachaiyappa's Trust Board – Patent Illegalities found – Cancellation of Appointment Orders – Show cause Notices –

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Issued

Read:

1. *Section 15 of the Tamil Nadu Private /colleges (Regulation) Act 1976 read with Rule 11(3) of The Tamil Nadu Pricate College (Regulation) Rules 1976.*
2. *UGC (Minimum Qualification Required for the Appointment of Teachers and other academic staff in Universities and Colleges and Other Measures for the Maintenance of Standard in Higher Education) Regulation 2010.*
3. *Hon'ble High Court judgment in P.Susheela and others v UGC(2015) 8 SCC 129 dated 6/12/2010*
4. *Hon'ble Supreme Court judgment in P.Susheela and others v UGC (2015) 8 SCC 129 dated 16/03/2015.*
5. *Hon'ble High Court judgment in G.Muthulakshmi vs The State of T.N and others W.P.No.8205 / 2016 Dt.8/11/2017.*
6. *Hon'ble High Court judgment in Dr.C.Senthamarai Vs. The Secretary, Pachaiyappa's Trust and others W.P.No.6455/2018, dt.20.9.2018.*
7. *Hob'ble High Court judgment inR.Subramanian vs The T.N in W.P.No.29313 / 2019 Batch, dated 21/11/2019.*
8. *PTB Notification, dated 12.12.2013 for direct recruitment for 83 posts of Assistant Professors & Ots.*
9. *PTB Notification, dated 18.02.2014 for direct recruitment for 123 Posts for Assistant Professors & Ots.*
10. *PTB Notification dated 02.12.2015 for direct recruitment for 66 posts of Assistant Professors & Ots.*

*** *** ***

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Order:

The Pachaiyappa's Trust Board(PTB), a Public Charitable Trust manages the following six Colleges as per the New Scheme for Management made by this Hon'ble High Court and now modified. The Colleges are Aided and are governed by the Tamil Nadu Private Colleges (Regulation) Act 1976 and the Rules. The PTB is the "Educational Agency" and is treated as one unit under the Act. They are also governed by UGC Regulations 2010 for the purpose of prescription of qualifications, selection and appointments:

i). Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30, ii).C. Kandaswamy Naidu College for Men, Chennai-102, ili). Chellammal Women's College, Guindy, Chennai-32, iv). Pachaiyappa's College for Men, Kanchipuram, V).Pachaiyappa's College for Women, Kanchipuram, vi).C. Kandaswamy Naidu College for Women, Cuddalore.

In order to fill up the vacancies in the above colleges to the posts of Assistant Professors/Librarian/Physical Directors by direct recruitment, the above referred Notifications/Advertisements were issued.The Notifications besides stating that UGC Regulations will be followed have inter alia stipulated detailed requirements like Educational Qualifications, General conditions, Scheme of selection, Teaching experience, Interview and others.

Some of the applicants made as against earlier Notifications, dated 04.05.2008, 20.08.2009, issued for the direct recruitment the posts of Assistant Professors/Librarian/Physical Directors by then management during the relevant period viz., A.G. &0.T. and Pachaiyappa's Trust Board, moved the Hon'ble High Court of Madras and High court was pleased to issue directions to consider their applications as per UGC Regulations 2006 qualifications.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

The 18.02.2014 Notification and the Proceedings Pachaiyappa's Trust Board, dated 19.05.2014 referred to these directions issued by the Hon'ble High Court exempting 16 candidates from. the qualifications prescribed as per 2010 UGC Regulations. All other candidates had to be selected as per the present UGC norms and conditions of selection and qualifications.

The interviews for the posts 2014-2015 were conducted on 21.01.2014 and 19.05.2014. The actual appointments made for the January 2014 are 73 and for May 2014 are 115. The interviews for the posts 2015-2016 were conducted on 17.02.2016. The actual appointments were made for February 2016 is 46 totalling 234 for 13 subjects.

The requisite educational qualifications prescribed for the post of Assistant Professor/Librarian/Physical Directors as per the preamble to the Notification/Advertisement, dated 18.02.2014 and 02.12.2015 and prescriptionis similar namely in brief:

P.G. Degree in the relevant subject with 55% marks and a pass in the UGC/CSIR/JRF/NET/SLET/SLST/SET as per UGC norms or P.G. Degree in the relevant subject with 55% marks and Ph.D. in the relevant subject 2010 UGC Regulations have exempted pre 2009 Ph.D degree holders from SLET etc.,) All others should have cleared NET.

***General Conditions** as per Cl.4.4 states that candidates should possess Bachelor's Degree in 10+2+3 pattern alone. It further mandates that UG/PG/M.Phil Degree through Distance mode or Correspondence will not be considered for award of marks.*

*Regarding **Experience** it is stated that their teaching experience in the relevant subject and will be taken into*

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

account only from the date of possession requisite qualification i.e., P.G.Degree with UGC/CSIR/JRF/NET/SLET/SLST/SET/Ph.D as per UGC Norms.

***Certificate verification**: Candidates will have to be ranked Subject wise/Community wise based on information furnished.*

*It further states that **Selection committee** shall be constituted as per the provisions of UGC regulations.*

*The **General Instructions** to the candidates in clause (e) states that they have to ascertain their full eligibility for the post and **if any mistake on their eligibility is detected at any stage during or after the recruitment their candidature shall be liable for cancellation.***

The appointment of Proceedings of the Combined College Committee stipulates certain terms and conditions should be incorporated in the orders of the appointments:

1. ***The Board has got every right to cancel the order of appointment if the candidate does not satisfy the conditions stated if the candidates do not have the Prescribed /Requisite/Possession of qualification to hold the respective post.***
2. ***It further states that the order of appointment is issued subject to the condition of eligibility criteria, lack of requisite qualification or on administrative grounds the service will be terminated.***

The Proceedings of the Member secretary issued as per the directions of the Combined College Committee for the appointment of teachers have incorporated all the conditions stated in the College committee resolutions.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

After the above selections large number of unsuccessful applicants, individuals and Association representations directly to TB and through Hon'ble Chief Minister Cell, Paper and Press Reports and Notices from Hon'ble High Court on Writ Petitions challenging the above selections and appointments were received. Considering the serious allegations the records relating to the above selections were thoroughly scrutinised. It is found 152 candidates are unqualified out of 234 candidates selected. The qualified candidates are only 60 [excluding exempted candidates by the Hon'ble High Court and for other reasons.]

From the records the following illegalities are found in the selection and appointments:

1. Candidates with UG/PG Degree/M.Phil Degree obtained through Correspondence / Distance Mode were selected and appointed.
2. Candidates with PG degree without pass in UGC/CSIR/JRF/NET/SLET/SLST/SET with post 2009 Ph.D. Were selected and appointed.
3. Candidates with Ph.D Degree without UGC / CSIR / JRF / NET / SLET / SLST / SET (The UGC Regulations 2009 and 2010 should have passed NET or equal eligibility as compulsory requirement as minimum qualification).
4. Teaching experience taken into account without reference to the date of acquiring the minimum educational qualification.

UGC Regulations 2010, dated 28.06.2010

•3.3.0. The minimum requirements of a good academic record, 55% marks (or an equivalent grade in a point scale wherever grading system is followed at the master's level and qualifying in the National Eligibility

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Test (NET), or an accredited test (State Level Eligibility Test - SLET / SET), shall remain for the appointment of Assistant Professors.

•3.3.1. NET / SLET / SET shall remain the minimum eligibility condition for recruitment and appointment of Assistant Professors in Universities / Colleges / Institutions. Provided however, that candidates, who are or have been awarded a Ph.D. Degree in accordance with the University Grants Commission (Minimum Standards and Procedure for Award of Ph.D. Degree) Regulations, 2009, shall be exempted from the requirement of the minimum eligibility condition of NET / SLET / SET for recruitment and appointment of Assistant Professor or equivalent positions in Universities / Colleges / Institutions.

•4.4.0. Assistant Professor

•4.4.1. Arts, Humanities, Sciences, Social Sciences, Commerce, Education, Languages, Law, Journalism and Mass Communication.

•i. Good academic record as defined by the concerned university with at least 55% of marks (or an equivalent grade in a point scale wherever grading system is followed) at the Master's Degree level in a relevant subject from an Indian University, or an equivalent degree from an accredited foreign university.

•ii. Besides fulfilling the above qualification, the candidate must have cleared the National Eligibility Test (NET) conducted by the UGG, CSIR or similar test accredited by the UGC like SLET / SET.

•iii. Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-clauses (1) and (il) to this Clause 4.4.1, candidates, who are, or have been awarded a Ph.D. Degree in accordance with the University Grants Commission ***(Minimum Standards and Procedure for Award of Ph.D. Degree)***

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Regulations, 2009, shall be exempted from the requirement of the minimum eligibility condition of NET / SLET / SET for recruitment and appointment of Assistant Professor or equivalent positions in Universities / Colleges / Institutions.

•iv. NET / SLET / SET shall also not be required for such Masters Programmes in disciplines for which NET / SLET / SET is not conducted.

The selection and appointments made in the light of lack of educational qualifications, experience and other basic requirements are patently illegal void abintio and are liable to be cancelled on the grounds that the candidates have failed to satisfy:

1. *The UGC prescribed qualifications viz lack of NET / SLET / SET with post Ph.D. 2009.*
2. *U.G. & P.G. through Correspondence Course.*
3. *U.G. & P.G. subjects with Cross Major.*
4. *Allotment of marks without experience, less experience drastically changing the ranking in the selection.*
5. *The terms of the Notifications and the conditions of appointments.*

It is seen that about 4300 candidates have responded to the Notification made on All India basis and through Employment Exchanges directly and through online. About 2000 candidates attended the Interview.

However, the illegalities in the Selection have denied hundreds of deserving candidates their right of equality and proper selection and appointment. The education of thousands students coming from economically weaker sections from qualified teachers, for whose benefit the Public Trust was conceived by Vallal late Pachaiyappa have been compromised. The illegal selection has betrayed the Tamil

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Nadu Government, UGC, Universities, Education Departments and the public confidence and the reputation to the name of Pachaiyappa's. Teaching is a noble profession moulding the future generation. The continuance of illegal appointees will misguide and set a bad precedent and blot on the fair and equal selection and morale of the students and society for generations.

For all the above grounds, after thorough examination of records, it is proposed to cancel the appointments of the fallowing candidates as per the list enclosed with the particulars and reasons given in the column against their names [V J. The candidates are directed to showcause as to why their selection and appointments should not be cancelled within seven days from the receipt of this notice, failing which the matter will be decided in accordance with law.

JUSTICE P.SHANMUGAM
President"

Names of Assistant Professors whose selection and appointment during January 2014 is illegal due to the reasons set out in the last column

Sl. No.	***Subject***	***Name and College to which the candidate is appointed***	***EducationalQualification***					***Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled***
			UG	***PG***	***M.Phil***	***SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET***	***Ph.D.***	
			a	***b***	***c***	***d***	***e***	
01.	Commerce	R.Maheshwari Pachaiyappa's	B.Com Com	M.Com Com	Nil	Nil	Ph.D May	U.G.P.G & Ph.D (Regular)

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
		College, Chennai-30					2011 Regular	M.Phil-Nil Ph.D. Passed in May 2011, without SLET/NET. Experience 7 years & 5 months, 4 marks awarded.
02.	Chemistry	R.Ganesh Kumar Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.Sc Che	M.Sc Che	M.Phil Che D.M.	Nit	Ph.D May 2012 Reg	U.G.P.G.(Regular)-M.Phil (Distance Mode & Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D. Passed in May 2012, without SLET/Net. Experience -Nil-But 2 marks awarded
03	Chemistry	V.Sivamurugan Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.Sc Che	M.Sc Che	M.Phil	Nil	Ph.D. November2006 Regular	U.G.P.G.M.Phil & Ph.D.(Regular Ph.D. Passed in Nov 2006, hence, passing of SLET/NET

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	Subject	Name and College to which the candidate is appointed	EducationalQualification					Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled
			UG	PG	M.Phil	SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET	Ph.D.	
			a	b	c	d	e	
								is exempted. Experience -Nil – But 6 marks awarded
04.	Chemistry	M.Chitra Chellammal Women's College, Chennai-32	B.Sc Che	M.Sc Che	M.Phil Che	Nil	Ph.D. May 2012 Regular	U.G.P.G.M.Phil & Ph.D. (Regular) Ph.D.passed in May 2012, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 11 years, but 4 marks awarded.
05.	Chemistry	S.Hariharan C.Kandasawami Naidu College for Men, Chennai-102	B.Sc Che	M.Sc Che	Nil	Nil	Ph.D. Nov 2012 Regular	U.G.P.G & Ph.D.(Regular) Ph.D.passed in Nov 2012, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed Nil.
06.	English	D.Rajakumari Chellammal	B.A. Eng	M.A. Eng	M.Phil	Nil	Ph.D. Dec	U.G.P.G. M.Phil & Ph.D

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
		Women's College, Chennai-32			Eng		2013 Regular	(Regular) Ph.D. Passed in Dec 2013, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed NIL
07.	English	B.Vasantha Kumar, Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.A. Eng	M.A. Eng	M.Phil Eng	Nil	Ph.D. Oct 2013 P.T	U.G.P.G.M.Phil (Regular) & Ph.D (Part Time) Ph.D. Passed in Oct 2013, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 4 years, but marks not awarded
08.	English	S.Archana C.Kandasawami Naidu College for Men, Chennai-102	B.A. Eng	M.A. Eng	M.Phil Eng	SLET August 2011	Nil	U.G.P.G.M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D -Nil SLET passed

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								Experience claimed 2 years, but 6 marks awarded
09.	English	R.Sunitha Anil Kumar Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.A. Eng	M.A. Eng	M.Phil Eng	Nil	Nil	U.G.P.G.M.Phil (Regular) & Ph.D Ph.D. Passed in Aug 2013, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 9 years, but 4 marks awarded
10.	English	D.Suganya Pachaiyappa's College for Women, Kanchipuram	B.Sc Agr	M.A. Eng	M.Phil Eng	NET Nov 2012 & SET Oct 2012	Ph.D. Sep 2012	U.G.[B.Sc., Agriculture]-Regular-P.G.& M.Phil(both obtained by Distrance Mode) & Ph.D (Part Time) NET & SET passed. But in U.G.cross major and P.G

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	Subject	Name and College to which the candidate is appointed	EducationalQualification					Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled
			UG	PG	M.Phil	SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET	Ph.D.	
			a	b	c	d	e	
								and M.Phil degrees obtained by Distance Mode. Experience claimed 1 year & 3 months, but 2 marks awarded
11.	English	E.Asaithambi Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.A. Eng	M.A. Eng	M.Phil Eng	SET Oct 2012 & NET Dec 2012 & June 2013	Nil	U.G.P.G.M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D-Nil SET/NET passed. Experience claimed -Nil- But 2 marks awarded
12.	Economics	S.Kalaiselvi Pachaiyappa's College for Women, Kanchipuram	B.A. Eco	M.A. Eco	M.Phil Eco	Nil	Ph.D. Dec 2013 Regular	U.G.P.G.M.Phil (Regular) & Ph.D.(Part Time) Ph.D. Passed in Dec 2013,

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 10 years, but no certificate enclosed, marks not awarded
13.	Economics	A.Rasheetha Banu C.Kandasawami Naidu College for Men, Chennai-102	B.A. Eco	M.A. Eco D.M.	M.Phil Eco	Nil	Ph.D. Dec 2011 Regular	U.G. M.Phil (Regular) & Ph.D.Regular P.G., obtained by Distance Mode. Ph.D.,passed in Dec 2011, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 2 years & 1 month, but 4 marks awarded. Change of name M.S.Babitha

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								changed to A.Rasheetha Banu, as per the Gazette dated 1st March 2012.
14.	Economics	G.Kavitha C.Kandasawami Naidu College for Men, Cuddalore	B.A. Eco	M.A. Busi	M.Phil Eco	Nil	Ph.D. Dec 2012 Regular	U.G.P.G.M.Phil &Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D., passed in Dec 2012, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 1 year & 6 months, but 2 marks only awarded.
15.	Economics	C.K.Gomathi Pachaiyappa's College for Women, Kanchipuram	B.A. Eco	M.A. Eco D.M.	M.Phil Eco D.M.	Nil	Ph.D. April 2012 P.T	U.G. (Regular) P.G. M.Phil (both Degrees obtained by Distance Mode) Ph.D., passed in April 2012, without SLET/NET.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								P.G. M.Phil Both Degrees obtained by Distance Mode. Experience claimed 2 years & 7 months, certificate not enclosed, but 2 marks awarded.
16.	History	V.Ganesan Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.A. His	M.A. His	M.Phil His	Nil	Ph.D. July 2012 Regular	U.G. P.G. M.Phil, Ph.D. (Regular) Ph.D.,passed in July 2012, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 1 year & 2 months, 2 marks awarded.
17.	History	K.Anbarasu Pachaiyappa's College, for Men, Kanchipuram	B.A. His	M.A. His	M.Phil His	Nil	Ph.D. April 2013	U.G.P.G.M.Phil &Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D., passed in April 2013, without

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								SLET/NET. Experience claimed 6 months, but 2 marks awarded.
18.	History	G.Selvi Pachaiyappa's College, for Men, Kanchipuram	B.A. His	M.A. His	M.Phil His	Nil	Ph.D. Dec 2013 P.T.	U.G.,P.G ., M.Phil (Regular) & Ph.D.(Part Time) Ph.D.,passed in Dec 2013, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 10 years & 2 month2, but 2 marks only awarded.
19.	History	R.Saravanan Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.A. His	M.A. His D.M.	Nil	Nil	Ph.D. Jan 2009 Regular	U.G.(Regular), P.G.,obtained in Distance Mode. Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D., passed in Jan 2009,

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								hence passing of SLET/NET is exempted. Experience claimed Nil.
20.	Maths-4	M.Thirumalai C.Kandasawami Naidu College for Men, Chennai-102	B.Sc Math	M.Sc Math	M.Phil Math	Nil	Ph.D. April 2011 Regular	U.G. P.G.,M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D.Regular Ph.D.,passed in April 2011, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 2 years, but 4 marks awarded.
21.	Maths	S.Chandrasekaran Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.Sc Math	M.Sc Math	M.Phil Math D.M	Nil	Ph.D. April 2012 Regular	U.G.P.G.(Regular) M.Phil(obtained by Distance Mode) Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D., passed in April 2012,

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 1 year & 9 months, 2 marks awarded.
22.	Maths	R.Ganapathy Raman Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.Sc Math	M.Sc Math	M.Phil Math D.M	Nil	Ph.D. Oct 2010 PT	U.G.& P.G (Regular) M.Phil (obtained by Distance Mode) Ph.D (Part Time) Ph.D.passed in Oct 2010, without SLET/NET Experience claimed 8 years but certificate not enclosed -marks not awarded.
23.	Tamil-19	G.Sathyadevi Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.A. Tam	M.A. Tam	M.Phil Tam	NET June 2012	Ph.D. Sept 2012 Regular	U.G.(Regular) P.G.(obtained by Distance Mode)

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								M.Phil & Ph.D.(Regular) NET passed P.G.,obtained by Distance Mode Experience claimed 2 years & 5 months, but only 2 marks awarded.
24.	Tamil	S.Susa Chellammal Women's College, Chennai-32	B.A Tam	M.A. Tam	Nil	NET June 2012 & JRF July 2012	Nil	U.G.& P.G (both obtained by Distance Mode) M.Phil & Ph.D-Nil NET passed but marks not awarded. U.G & P.G. Obtained by Distance Mode, hence not qualified.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								Experience claimed 4 months.
25.	Tamil	D.Sheela Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.A Tam	M.A. Tam	M.Phil Tam	Nil	Ph.D. July 2010 Regular	U.G.(Regular) P.G (obtained by Distance Mode) M.Phil & Ph.D.(Regular) Ph.D.passed in July 2010, without SLET/NET. P.G.obtained by Distance Mode. Experience claimed 5 years & 8 months-but 6 marks awarded.
26.	Tamil	S.Uhamkumar Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.A Tam	M.A. Tam	M.Phil Tam	Nil	Ph.D. Dec 2012 Regular	U.G.,P.G., M.Phil & Ph.D.(Regular) Ph.D.,passed in Dec 2012,

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 2 years, but 2 marks awarded.
27.	Tamil	M.Ramadevi Chellammal Women's College, Chennai-32	B.A Tam	M.A. Tam	M.Phil Tam	NET June 2009	Ph.D. Dec 2013 P.T.	U.G.,P.G.,M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D.(Part Time) NET passed. Copies of certificates not enclosed. Experience claimed 3 years & 3 months, 6 marks awarded.
28.	Tamil	K.Ramesh Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.A Tam D.M	M.A. Tam D.M.	M.Phil Tam D.M	Nil	Ph.D. Sept 2012 PT	U.G., P.G., M.Phil (obtained by Distance Mode) Ph.D.,(Part Time).

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								Ph.D.,passed in Sep 2012, without SLET/NET. U.G., P.G., M.Phil obtained by Distance Mode Experience claimed Nil
29.	Tamil	R.Selvarasu Pachaiyappa's College, for Men, Kanchipuram	B.A Tam	M.A. Tam	M.Phil Tam	Nil	Ph.D. Dec 2011 Regular	U.G,P.G.,M.Phil &Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D., passed in Dec 2011, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 3 years & 4 months, but 4 marks awarded.
30.	Tamil	S.Kanimozhi Chellammal Women's College,	B.A Tam D.M	M.A. Tam D.M.	M.Phil Tam D.M	NET Nov 2011	Ph.D. Aug 2010 Regular	U.G., P.G., M.Phil (obtained by Distance Mode)

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
		Chennai-32						Ph.D.(Regular) NET passed. U.G., P.G.,M.Phil obtained by Distance Mode Experience claimed 10 years -6 marked awarded.
31.	Tamil	C.Malarvizhi Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.Sc Che	M.A. Tam D.M	M.Phil Tam D.M.	NET June 2007	Nil	U.G., Cross Major/P.G. & M.Phil (obtained by Distance Mode) Ph.D. Nil NET passed. U.G., Cross Major/P.G. & M.Phil obtained by Distance Mode Experience

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								claimed -7 months – 1 mark awarded.
32.	Tamil	P.Vimala Chellammal Women's College, Chennai-32	B.A. Tam D.M.	M.A. Tam D.M.	M.Phil Tam	NET June 2011	Nil	U.G., P.G. (obtained by Distance Mode) & M.Phil(Regular) Ph.D. Nil NET passed U.G.,& P.G. obtained by Distance Mode Experience claimed 4 years & 3 months – 4 mark awarded.
33.	Zoology-6	B.Radha Chellammal Women's College, Chennai-32	B.Sc Zoo	M.Sc. Zoo	M.Phil Zoo	Nil	Ph.D. Sept 2010 Regular	U.G., P.G.,M.Phil & Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D., passed in Sept 2010, without SLET/NET.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	***Subject***	***Name and College to which the candidate is appointed***	***EducationalQualification***					***Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled***
			UG	***PG***	***M.Phil***	***SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET***	***Ph.D.***	
			a	***b***	***c***	***d***	***e***	
								Experience claimed 7 years & 6 months-but 1 mark only awarded.
34.	Zoology	P.C.Sathyanarayanan Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.Sc Zoo	M.Sc. Zoo	M.Phil Zoo	Nil	Ph.D. June 2012 Regular	U.G., P.G.,M.Phil & Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D., passed in June 2012, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 5 years & 6 months-12 marks awarded.
35.	Zoology	S.Sangeetha Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.Sc Zoo	M.Sc. Zoo	M.Phil Zoo D.M	Nil	Ph.D. May 2012 Regular	U.G.,P.G.,(Regular) & M.Phil (obtained by Distance Mode) Ph.D. (Regular) Ph.D., passed in May 2012, without SLET/NET.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								Experience claimed - Nil
36.	Zoology	A.Anbuselvi Pachaiyappa's College, for Women, Kanchipuram	B.Sc Zoo	M.Sc. Zoo	Nil	Nil	Ph.D. Nov 2011 Regular	U.G., P.G. & Ph.D (Regular) M.Phil-Nil Ph.D., passed in Nov 2011, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed -Nil.

Names of Assistant Professors Whose Selection and appointment during May 2014 is illegal due to the reasons set out in the last column

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
01.	Botany	M.Sathiyanathan Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.Sc Bot	M.Sc Bot D.M	M.Phil Mic.Bio D.M.	SET Oct 2012	Nil	U.G.(Regular) P.G., & M.Phil(both degrees obtained by Distance Mode) Ph.D.-Nil SET passed. P.G., & M.Phil obtained by Distance Mode. Experience claimed 8 years & 2 months, 15 marks awarded.
02.	Botany	M.Gopalakrishnan Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.Sc Bot	M.Sc Bot	M.Phil Bio	Nil	Ph.D Nov 2013 Reg	U.G.,P.G., M.Phil & Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D. Passed in Nov 2013, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 1 year

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								& 6 months but 15 marks awarded
03	Botany	A.Sridevi C.Kandasawami Naidu College for Women, Cuddalore	B.Sc Che	M.Sc Che	M.Phil Bio	Nil	Ph.D. April 2013 Regular	U.G.P.G.M.Phil & Ph.D.(Regular) Ph.D. Passed in April 2013, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed-Nil, but 10 marks awarded.
04.	Botany	M.Prabhakarn Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.Sc Mic.Bot	M.Sc Bot	M.Phil Bot	Nil	Ph.D. Aug 2013 Regular	U.G.P.G.M.Phil & Ph.D. (Regular) Ph.D.passed in Aug 2013, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed -Nil, but 12 marks awarded.
05.	Botany	S.Shyamala	B.Sc	M.Sc	Nil	Nil	Ph.D.	U.G.P.G &

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
		Gowri, Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	Plant Bio & Bio Tech	Plant Sci			Sept 2013 Regular	Ph.D.(Regular) M.Phil-Nil Ph.D.passed in Sep 2013, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed -Nil, but 10 marks awarded.
06.	Botany	M.Kotteswari Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.Sc. Bot	M.Sc. Bot	M.Phil Bot	Nil	Ph.D. June 2013 PT	U.G.,P.G., M.Phil (Regular) & Ph.D (Part Time) Ph.D. Passed in June 2013, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 7 years & 6 months, 14 marks awarded.
07.	Botany	P.Amuthavalli C.Kandasawami Naidu	B.Sc. Bot	M.Sc. Bot	M.Phil Bot D.M.	Nil	Ph.D. Feb 2014	U.G., P.G.(Regular) M.Phil

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
		College for Women, Cuddalore					Regul ar	(Distance Mode) Ph.D.(Regular) Ph.D.passed in Feb 2014, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed -Nil but 10 marks awarded.
08.	Botany	N.Karpagam Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.Sc. Bot	M.Sc. Bot	Nil	Nil	Ph.D. Aug 2011 Regul ar	U.G.,P.G.,& Ph.D (Regular) M.Phil-Nil Ph.D. Passed in Aug 2011, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 5 years & 11 months, but 14 marks awarded.
09.	Botany	M.Ezhil Bama C.Kandasawa	B.Sc. Bot	M.Sc. Bot	M.Phil Bot	SET Octber2	Ph.D. March	U.G.,P.G.,& M.Phil

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
		mi Naidu College for Women, Cuddalore				012	2014 PT	(Regular) Ph.D.(Part Time) SET Passed Experience claimed -Nil, but 14 marks awarded. Note: Experience column filled paper is not found in the application & Experience certificate also not enclosed in the application.
10.	Botany	M.Elamvaluthi Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.Sc. Bot	M.Sc. Aply Plant Sci	Nil	Nil	Ph.D. July 2006 Regular	U.G.,P.G.,& Ph.D (Regular) M.Phil-Nil Ph.D. Passed in July 2006,hence passing of SLET/NET is exempted.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								Experience claimed -Nil, but 15 marks awarded.
11.	Botany	T.Kumaresubitha Chellammal Women's College, Chennai-32	B.Sc. Bot	M.Sc. Bot D.M	M.Phil Bot D.M.	Nil	Ph.D. March 2013 Regualr	U.G.(Regular) P.G.,& M.Phil-(both obtained by Distance Mode) Ph.D (Regular) P.G.,& M.Phil-both obtained by Distance Mode Ph.D. Passed in March 2013, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 8 years & 8 months, 15 marks awarded.
12.	Chemistry	S.Iyyampillai Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.Sc. Chem	M.Sc. Chem	Nil	Nil	Ph.D July 2013 Regul	U.G.,P.G.,& Ph.D (Regular) M.Phil-Nil

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
							ar	Ph.D. Passed in July 2013,without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 10 months, but ... marks awarded.
13.	Chemistry	R.Hariharan Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.Sc. Chem	M.Sc. Chem	M.Phil Chem D.M.	Nil	Ph.D August 2013 PT	U.G.,P.G.(Regular) M.Phil-(Distance Mode) Ph.D(Part Time) Ph.D. Passed in August 2013, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 4 years & 5 months, but ... marks awarded.
14.	Chemistry	S.Ananda Priya	B.Sc. Chem	M.Sc. Chem	Nil	Nil	Ph.D Dec	U.G.,P.G.(Regular)

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
		Chellammal Women's College, Chennai-32					2010 P.T.	M.PhilNil Ph.D(Part Time) Ph.D. Passed in December 2010, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 13 years & 7 months, but ... marks awarded.
15.	Chemistry	C.Revathi Chellammal Women's College, Chennai-32	B.Sc. Chem	M.Sc. Chem	Nil	Nil	Ph.D April 2010 Regular	U.G.,P.G. & Ph.D (Regular) M.Phil-Nil Ph.D. Passed in April 2010, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 3 years & 6 months. Certificate not enclosed, but ... marks awarded.
16.	Chemistry	S.Prasad	B.Sc.	M.Sc.	Nil	Nil	Ph.D	U.G.,P.G. &

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	***Subject***	***Name and College to which the candidate is appointed***	***EducationalQualification***					***Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled***
			UG	***PG***	***M.Phil***	***SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET***	***Ph.D.***	
			a	***b***	***c***	***d***	***e***	
		Pachaiyappa's College for Men, Kanchipuram	Chem	Chem			Nov 2012 Regular	Ph.D (Regular) M.Phil-Nil Ph.D. Passed in November 2012, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed-Nil, but....marks awarded.
17.	Chemistry	M.Boopalan Pachaiyappa's College for Men, Kanchipuram	B.Sc. Chem	M.Sc. Chem	Nil	Nil	Ph.D August 2013 Regular	U.G.,P.G. & Ph.D (Regular) M.Phil-Nil Ph.D. Passed in August 2013, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 2 years, but ... marks awarded.
18.	Chemistry	N.Srinivasan Pachaiyappa's College for Men, Kanchipuram	B.Sc. Chem	M.Sc. Chem	M.Phil Chem	Nil	Ph.D May 2012 Regular	U.G.,P.G., M.Phil & Ph.D. (Regular) Ph.D. Passed in

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	***Subject***	***Name and College to which the candidate is appointed***	***EducationalQualification***					***Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled***
			UG	***PG***	***M.Phil***	***SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET***	***Ph.D.***	
			a	***b***	***c***	***d***	***e***	
								May 2012, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 2 years & 2 months, but ... marks awarded.
19.	Chemistry	G.Vimala Pachaiyappa's College for Women, Kanchipuram	B.Sc. Chem	M.Sc. Chem	M.Phil Chem	Nil	Ph.D August 2013 Regular	U.G.,P.G., M.Phil & Ph.D. (Regular) Ph.D. Passed in August 2013, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed -Nil, but ... marks awarded.
20.	Chemistry	S.Jancy Sophia CKNC for Women, Cuddalore	B.Sc. Chem	M.Sc. Chem	M.Phil Chem D.M.	Nil	Ph.D August 2013 Regular	U.G.,P.G.(Regular) M.Phil-(Distance Mode) Ph.D.(Part Time)

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	***Subject***	***Name and College to which the candidate is appointed***	***EducationalQualification***					***Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled***
			UG	***PG***	***M.Phil***	***SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET***	***Ph.D.***	
			a	***b***	***c***	***d***	***e***	
								Ph.D. Passed in April 2013, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 15 years & 9 months, but... marks awarded.
21.	Chemistry	V.Kalpana CKNC for Women, Cuddalore	B.Sc. Chem	M.Sc. Chem	Nil	Nil	Ph.D Dec 2013 Regular	U.G.,P.G. & Ph.D (Regular) M.Phil-Nil Ph.D. Passed in December 2013, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 5 months, but ... marks awarded.
22.	Commerce	R.Meenakshi Pachaiyappa's College for Women, Kanchipuram	B.A. Corp Secy Ship	M.Com Com D.M.	M.Phil Corp Secy Ship D.M.	Nil	Ph.D Cot 2013 P.T.	U.G.(Regular) M.Phil (Cross Major Distance Mode) P.G.(Distance Mode)

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								Ph.D.(Part Time) Ph.D. Passed in Oct 2013, without SLET/NET. P.G. & M.Phil Distance Mode Experience claimed 6 years & 9 months, 12 marks awarded.
23.	Commerce	L.Sivaramakrishnan Pachaiyappa's College for Men, Kanchipuram	B.Com Com	M.Com Com D.M.	M.Phil Com D.M.	NET Oct 2010	Nil	U.G.(Regular) P.G., M.Phil (Distance Mode) Ph.D.-Nil NET passed P.G. & M.Phil both degrees obtained by Distance Mode Experience claimed 11

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								years & 6 months, 15 marks obtained.
24.	Commerce	T.Jayasheela Pachaiyappa's College for Women, Kanchipuram	B.Com Com	M.Com Com	M.Phil Com	Nil	Ph.D Nov 2012 P.T.	U.G.,P.G., M.Phil & (Regular) Ph.D.(Part Time) Ph.D. Passed in November 2012, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed 16 years & 5 months, 15 marks awarded.
25.	Economics	R.Muthuraman Pachaiyappa's College for Men, Kanchipuram	B.A. Eco	M.A. Eco	M.Phil Eco D.M.	Nil	Ph.D Oct 2013 P.T.	U.G.,P.G.,(Regular) M.Phil (obtained by Distance Mode)/ Ph.D.(Part Time) Ph.D. Passed in Oct 2013, without

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								SLET/NET. Experience claimed 3 years & 10 months, but 12 marks awarded.
26.	Economics	P.Deepa Pachaiyappa's College for Women, Kanchipuram	B.A. Eco	M.A. Eco	M.Phil Eco	SET March 2006	Nil	U.G. P.G M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D.- Nil SET Passed. Experience claimed 1 year & 5 months, but 15 marks awarded.
27.	Economics	C.Mayakrishnan Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.A. Eco	M.A. Applied Eco	M.Phil Eco	Nil	Ph.D Feb 2008 Regular	U.G. P.G M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D passed in Feb 2008, hence passingof SLET / NET is exempted.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								Experience claimed 5 years but 15 marks awarded.
28.	Economics	V.Raja Pachaiyappa's College for Men, Kanchipuram	B.A. Eco	M.A. Eco	M.Phil Eco D.M.	SET August 2011	Nil	U.G. P.G . (Regular) / M.Phil (Distance Mode) Ph.D.- Nil SET passed. Experience claimed 4 years & 7months, but 15 marks awarded
29.	Economics	D.Chidambaram Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.A. Eco	M.A. Eco	M.Phil Eco	Nil	Ph.D Mar 2011 Regular	U.G. P.G M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D passed in March 2011, without SLET / NET. Experience claimed 9 years,

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								but 15 marks awarded
30.	Economics	D.Sasikala Chellammal Women's College, Chennai-32	B.A. Eco	M.A. Eco	M.Phil Eco	SET Octber2012	Nil	U.G. P.G M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D.-Nil SET passed. Experience claimed Nil, but 14 marks awarded
31.	English	P.Ananthan Pachaiyappa's College for Men, Kanchipuram	B.A. Eng	M.A. Eng	M.Phil Eng	SET Octber2012	Nil	U.G. P.G M.Phil (Regular) PH.D.- Nil SET Passed. Experience claimed 5 years, but 12 marks awarded
32.	English	K.R.Vijaya Pachaiyappa's College,	B.A. Eng	M.A. Eng	M.Phil Eng	Nil	Ph.D Mar 2011	U.G. P.G. (Regular) / M.Phil

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
		Chennai-30					Regular	(Distance Mode) Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D passed in March 2011, without SLET / NET. Experience claimed 3 years but 15 marks awarded.
33.	English	M.Sagadevan Pachaiyappa's College for Men, Kanchipuram	B.A. Eng D.M.	M.A. Eng	M.Phil Eng	SET Aug 2011	Nil	U.G. (Cross major by Distance Mode) / P.G. & M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D.-Nil U.G. (Cross Major by Distance Mode / SET passed. Experience claimed 6 years but 10 marks awarded.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	***Subject***	***Name and College to which the candidate is appointed***	***EducationalQualification***					***Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled***
			UG	***PG***	***M.Phil***	***SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET***	***Ph.D.***	
			a	***b***	***c***	***d***	***e***	
34.	English	M.Savitri Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.A. Eng	M.A. Eng	M.Phil Eng D.M.	Nil	Ph.D Sep 2011 P.T.	U.G. P.G . (Regular) & M.Phil (Distance Mode) Ph.D (Part Time) Ph.D passed in Sept 2011, without SLET/ NET. Experience claimed 10 years & 8 months, 15 marks awarded.
35.	English	U. Chandrakumar Pachaiyappa's College for Men, Kanchipuram	B.A. Eng	M.A. Eng	Nil	SET Aug 2011	Nil	U.G. P.G . (Regular) M.Phil & Ph.D – Nil SET passed. Experience claimed – Nil but 12 marks awarded.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	***Subject***	***Name and College to which the candidate is appointed***	***EducationalQualification***					***Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled***
			UG	***PG***	***M.Phil***	***SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET***	***Ph.D.***	
			a	***b***	***c***	***d***	***e***	
36.	English	K.Gowrisankar Pachaiyappa's College for Men, Kanchipuram	B.A. Eng	M.A. Eng	Nil	SLET Octber2012	Nil	U.G. P.G . (Regular) M.Phil & Ph.D – Nil SLETpassed. Experience claimed 1 year & 1 month – but 10 marks awarded.
37.	English	M.Maria Felci Rajathi Pachaiyappa's College for Women, Kanchipuram	B.A. Eng	M.A. Eng	M.Phil Eng	SET Octber2012	Nil	U.G. P.G M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D – Nil SET passed. Experience claimed 1 year & 9 months, but 12 marks awarded.
38.	English	S.Saranya C.Kandasawami Naidu College for Women,	B.A. Eng	M.A. Eng	Nil	SET Octber2012	Nil	U.G. P.G . (Regular) M.Phil & Ph.D – Nil

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
		Cuddalore						SET passed Experience claimed 9 months – but 15 marks awarded.
39.	English	D.Muthumari C.Kandasawami Naidu College for Women, Cuddalore	B.A. Eng D.M.	M.A. Eng D.M.	M.Phil Eng D.M.	Nil	Ph.D Jan 2014 P.T.	U.G. (Regular) / P.G & Mphil (Distance Mode) Ph.D (Part Time) Ph.D passed in Jan 2014, without SLET / NET. Experience claimed 9 years 15 marks awarded.
40.	English	P.Suresh Pachaiyappa's College for Men, Kanchipuram	B.A. Eng D.M.	M.A. Eng	M.Phil Eng	Nil	Nil	U.G. (Distance Mode) / P.G. & Mphil (Regular) Ph.D.-Nil U.G obtained

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	***Subject***	***Name and College to which the candidate is appointed***	***EducationalQualification***					***Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled***
			UG	***PG***	***M.Phil***	***SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET***	***Ph.D.***	
			a	***b***	***c***	***d***	***e***	
								by Distance Mode and Ph.D / SLET / NET.- Nil Experience claimed 8 years, certificate not enclosed, 15 marks awarded
41.	English	N.Jothi Rama Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.A. Eng	M.A. Eng	M.Phil Eng	Nil	Ph.D May 2012 Regular	U.G. P.G. M.Phil & Ph.D. (Regular) Ph.D passed in May 2012, without SLET / NET Experience claimed 9 years & 10 months, 15 marks awarded.
42.	English	P.Prayer Elmo Raj Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.A. Eng	M.A. Eng	M.Phil Eng D.M.	SET August 2011	Ph.D Dec 2013 P.T.	U.G. P.G . (Regular) / M.Phil (Distance Mode)

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								Ph.D – (Part time) SET passed. Experience claimed 1 year & 10 months, certificate not enclosed, 15 marks awarded.
43.	English	R.Sha Begum C.Kandasawami Naidu College for Women, Cuddalore	B.A. Eng	M.A. Eng	M.Phil Eng	Nil	Ph.D Jan 2014 Regular	U.G. P.G M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D -(part time) Ph.D passed in Jan 2014, without SLET / NET. Experience claimed 6 years& 7 months, 15 marks awarded.
44.	English	S.Shyamala Devi	B.A. Eng	M.A. Eng	M.Phil Eng	Nil	Ph.D April2	U.G. P.G (Regular) /

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
		Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30			D.M.		013 P.T.	M.Phil (Distance Mode) Ph.D (Part Time) Ph.D passed in April 2013, without SLET / NET. Experience claimed 10 years & 9 months, 15 marks awarded.
45.	History-5	A.Suresh Babu Pachaiyappa's College for Men, Kanchipuram	B.A. His	M.A. His	M.Phil His	Nil	Ph.D April 2014 Regular	U.G. P.G. M.Phil & Ph.D. (Regular) Ph.D passed in April 2014, without SLET / NET. Experience claimed 12 years, 15 marks awarded.
46.	History	R.Raveenthar Pachaiyappa's	B.A. His	M.A. His	M.Phil His	SET Octber2	Nil	U.G. P.G M.Phil

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
		College for Men, Kanchipuram				012		(Regular) Ph.D.- Nil SET passed. Experience claimed Nil but 3 marks awarded.
47.	History	M.A.B.Saraswathi Chellammal Women's College, Chennai-32	B.A. His	M.A. His	M.Phil Eng	Nil	Ph.D Aug 2013 Regular	U.G. P.G. M.Phil & Ph.D. (Regular) Ph.D passed in Aug 2013, without SLET / NET. Experience claimed – Nil, but 15 marks awarded.
48.	History	S.Sumathi Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.A. His	M.A. His	M.Phil His	Nil	Ph.D Mar 2014 Regular University,	U.G. P.G. M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D passed in March 2014, without SLET /

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	***Subject***	***Name and College to which the candidate is appointed***	***EducationalQualification***					***Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled***
			UG	***PG***	***M.Phil***	***SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET***	***Ph.D.***	
			a	***b***	***c***	***d***	***e***	
							dt 17.03. 2014	NET. Ph.D Degree certificate is not enclosed, she is qualified as per the University of Madras letter, dated 17.03.2014. Experience claimed 14 years, 15 marks awarded.
49.	Maths-11	S.Sangeetha C.Kandasawami Naidu College for Women, Cuddalore.	B.Sc Maths	M.Sc Maths	M.Phil Maths	Nil	Ph.D April2013 P.T.	U.G. P.G. M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D (Part Time) Ph.D passed in April 2013, without SLET / NET. Experience claimed 4 years & 9 months,

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								14marks awarded.
50.	Maths	M.Kannan Pachaiyappa's College for Men, Kanchipuram	B.Sc Maths	M.Sc Maths	M.Phil Maths D.M.	Nil	Ph.D Sept 2012 P.T.	U.G. P.G . (Regular) / M.Phil (Distance Mode) Ph.D (Part Time) Ph.D passed in September 2012, without SLET / NET. Experience claimed 16 years & 3 months, 15 marks awarded.
51.	Maths	P.Kannagi Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.Sc Maths	M.Sc Maths	M.Phil Maths	SLST Sept 1990	Nil	U.G. P.G. & M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D. - Nil SLST passed. Experience

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								claimed 1 year & 5 months, 15 marks awarded.
52.	Maths	Kanianoor Balakrishnan Latha C.Kandasawami Naidu College for Men, Chennai-102	B.Sc Maths	M.Sc Maths	M.Phil Maths	Nil	Ph.D Sept 2011 P.T.	U.G. P.G . (Regular) / M.Phil (Distance Mode) / Ph.D (Part Time) Ph.D passed in September 2011, without SLET / NET. Experience claimed 12 years & 5 months, 15 marks awarded.
53.	Maths	G.Uthra Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.Sc Maths	M.Sc Maths	M.Phil Maths	Nil	Ph.D Feb 2011 P.T.	U.G. P.G M.Phil (Regular) / Ph.D (Part Time) Ph.D. Passedin Feb 2011, without SLET / NET.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								Experience claimed 11 years, 15 marks awarded.
54.	Maths	R.Sakthivel Pachaiyappa's College for Men, Kanchipuram	B.Sc Maths	M.Sc Maths	M.Phil Maths	Nil	Ph.D Feb 2014 Regular	U.G. P.G. M.Phil & Ph.D. (Regular) Ph.D passed in Feb 2014, without SLET / NET Experience claimed 3 years & 7 months, 15 marks awarded.
55.	Maths	S.Sumathy C.Kandasawami Naidu College for Women, Cuddalore	B.Sc Maths	M.Sc Maths	Nil	Nil	Ph.D April 2010 Regular	U.G. P.G. & Ph.D. (Regular) M.Phil – Nil Ph.D passed in April 2010, without SLET / NET. Experience claimed 3 years

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								& 8 months, 10 marks awarded.
56.	Maths	G.Gandhimathy Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.Sc Maths	M.Sc Maths	M.Phil Maths	Nil	Ph.D Feb 2014 Regular	U.G. P.G.M.Phil & Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D passed in Feb 2014, without SLET / NET Experience claimed – Nil, but 15 marks awarded.
57.	Physics-8	G.Mangalam Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.Sc. Phy	M.Sc. Phy	M.Phil Phy P.T.	Nil	Ph.D Feb 2012 P.T.	U.G. P.G (Regular) M.Phil & Ph.D. (Part Time) Ph.D passed in Feb 2012, without SLET / NET. Experience claimed 13 years, but---- marks awarded.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
58.	Physics	T.Sivanesan Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.Sc. Phy	M.Sc. Phy D.M.	M.Phil Phy D.M.	Nil	Ph.D Aug 2012 P.T.	U.G. (Regular) & P.G & M.Phil. (Distance Mode) Ph.D (Part Time) P.G & M.Phil both Degrees obtained by Distance Mode / Ph.D.passed in Aug 2012, without SLET / Net. Experience claimed 6 years & 3 months, but --- marks awarded.
59.	Physics	R.Sunitha Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.Sc. Phy	M.Sc. Phy	M.Phil Phy	Nil	Ph.D May 2012 Regular	U.G. P.G M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D passed in

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								May 2012, without SLET / NET. Experience claimed 1 year & 6 month, but –marks awarded.
60.	Physics	T.Arumanayagam Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai	B.Sc. Phy	M.Sc. Phy	M.Phil Phy D.M.	Nil	Ph.D Feb 2013 Regular	U.G. P.G (Regular) /M.Phil (Distance Mode) Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D passed in Feb 2013, without SLET / NET. Experience claimed 1 year & 3months, but ---- marks awarded.
61.	Physics	K.Ponnarasi Pachaiyappa's	B.Sc. Phy	M.Sc. Phy	M.Phil Phy	Nil	Ph.D May	U.G. P.G M.Phil

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
		College, Chennai					2012 Regular	(Regular) Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D passed in May 2012, without SLET / NET. Experience claimed 10 months, but --- marks awarded.
62.	Physics	A.Prakasam Pachaiyappa's College for Men, Kanchipuram	B.Sc. Phy	M.Sc. Phy	M.Phil Phy D.M.	Nil	Ph.D April 2013 P.T.	U.G. P.G . (Regular) / M.Phil (Distance Mode) Ph.D (Part Time) Ph.D passed in April 2013, without SLET, NET. Experience claimed 5 years, but --- marks

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								awarded.
63.	Tamil	K.Anbarasi C.Kandasawami Naidu College for Women, Cuddalore	B.A. Tam	M.A. Tam	M.Phil Tam	NET June 2012	Nil	U.G. P.G . & M.Phill (Regular) Ph.D. Nil NET passed. Experience claimed – Nil but 15 marks awarded.
64.	Tamil	G.Jeyachitra C.Kandasawami Naidu College for Women, Cuddalore	B.A. Tam	M.A. Tam	M.Phil Tam	Nil	Ph.D Mar 2014 P.T.	U.G. P.G. & M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D – Nil NET passed. Experience claimed – Nil but 15 marks awarded.
65.	Tamil	P.Muthusamy Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai-30	B.A. Tam	M.A. Tam	M.Phil Tam	NET June 2012	Nil	U.G. P.G. & M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D -Nil

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								NET passed Experience claimed Nil, but 15 marks awarded
66.	Tamil	S.Yogeswari Chellammal Women's College, Chennai – 32.	B.A. Tam	M.A. Tam	M.Phil Tam	NET March 2013	Nil	U.G. P.G & M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D- Nil NET passed. Experience claimed – Nil but 15 marks awarded.
67.	Tamil	V.Suyambu Thankam C.Kandaswami Naidu College for Women, Cuddalore.	B.A. Tam	M.A. Tam D.M.	M.Phil Tam	SET Oct 2012	Nil	U.G & M.Phil (Regular) P.G. (Distance Mode) Ph.D – Nil SET passed but P.G. Obtained by Distance Mode.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								Experience claimed Nil, but 15 marks awarded.
68.	Tamil	D.Maheswari C.Kandaswami Naidu College for Women, Cuddalore.	B.A. Tam	M.A. Tam	M.Phil Tam	SET March2006 & NET June 2005	Nil	U.G. P.G & M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D – Nil NET & SET passed. Experience claimed 2 years & 10 months, but 15 marks awarded.
69.	Tamil	N.Senthil Kumar Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai – 30.	B.A. Tam	M.A. Tam	M.Phil Tam	Nil	Nil	U.G. P.G & M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D – Nil Ph.D / SLET / NET / SET – Nil Experience

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								claimed 10 years, 15 marks awarded.
70.	Tamil	R.Vimala Devi Chellammal Women's College, Chennai – 32.	B.A. Zoo	M.A. Tam D.M.	M.Phil Tam D.M.	NET DecNil 2008	Ph.D December2013 Regular	U.G. (Cross Major) / P.G. & M.Phil (both Distance Mode) Ph.D (Regular) NET passed. P.G. and M.Phil both Degrees obtained by Distance Mode. Experience claimed 5 years but 15 marks awarded.
71.	Tamil	R. Pazhaniammal C.Kandaswami Naidu College for Women, Cuddalore.	B.A. Eco	M.A. Tam	M.Phil Tam	Nil	Ph.D Nov 2007 Regular	U.G. (Cross Major) / P.G & M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D (Regular) P.D. Passed in Nov 2007, hence passing

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								of SLET / NET is exempted. U.G. is corss major. Experience claimed 5 years & 5 months, but 15 marks awarded.
72.	Zoology 14	G.R.Learnal Sudhakar Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai – 30.	B.Sc. Zoo	M.Sc. Zoo	M.Phil Costal Aquac ul	Nil	Ph.D July 2012 Regul ar	U.G. P.G & M.Phil (Costal Aqua Culture) (Regular) Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D passed in July 2012, without SLET / NET. Experience claimed – Nil, but 15 marks awarded.
73.	Zoology	B.Mahalaxmi Pachaiyappa's College,	B.Sc. Zoo	M.Sc. Zoo	M.Phil Zoo	Nil	Ph.D July 2011	U.G. P.G & M.Phil (Regular)

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
		Chennai – 30.						Ph.D (Highly commended) Ph.D passed in July 2011, without SLET/ NET. Experience claimed – Nil, but 15 marks awarded.
74.	Zoology	R. Sathikumaran Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai – 30.	B.Sc. Zoo	M.Sc. Zoo	M.Phil Zoo D.M.	SET OCT 2012	Nil	U.G. & P.G. (Regular) & M.Phil (Distance Mode) Ph.D – Nil SET passed. Experience claimed – Nil, but 12 marks awarded.
75.	Zoology	P.Prabhu Pachaiyappa's College for	B.Sc. Zoo	M.Sc. Zoo	M.Phil Zoo	Nil	Ph.D June 2009	U.G. P.G. & M.Phi (Regular)

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	***Subject***	***Name and College to which the candidate is appointed***	***EducationalQualification***					***Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled***
			UG	***PG***	***M.Phil***	***SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET***	***Ph.D.***	
			a	***b***	***c***	***d***	***e***	
		Men, Kanchipuram.					Regular	Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D passed in June 2009, passing of SLET / NET is exempted Experience claimed 4 years but 15 marks awarded
76.	Zoology	R.Kungumapriya C.Kandaswami Naidu College for Women, Cuddalore.	B.Sc. Zoo	M.Sc. Zoo	Nil	Nil	Ph.D November2006 Regular	U.G. & P.G (Regular) M.Phil – Nil Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D passed in Nov 2006, passing of SLET / NET is exempted. Experience claimed 2 years & 8 months, 15 marks awarded.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
77.	Zoology	L.B.Sujatha Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai – 30.	B.Sc. Zoo	M.Sc. Zoo	Nil	Nil	Ph.D November2007 Regular	U.G. & P.G. (Regular) M.Phil – Nil Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D passed in Nov 2007, hence passing of SET / NET / SLET is exempted. Experience claimed 1 year, but 14 marks awarded.
78.	Zoology	A.Subashini Chellammal Women's College, Chennai – 32.	B.Sc. Zoo	M.Sc. Zoo	M.Phil Zoo	Nil	Ph.D Aug 2009 Regular	U.G. P.G & M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D passed in Aug 2009, hence passing of SET / NET / SLET is

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								exempted. Experience claimed 1 year, 15 marks awarded.
79.	Zoology	U.Anitha C.Kandaswami Naidu College for Women, Cuddalore.	B.Sc. Zoo	M.Sc. Zoo	M.Phil Zoo D.M.	Nil	Ph.D May 2013 Regular	U.G. P.G & Ph.D. (Regular) M.Phil (Distance Mode) Ph.D passed in May 2013, without SLET / NET. Experience claimed – Nil, but 12 marks awarded.
80.	Zoology	S.Indumathi C.Kandaswami Naidu College for Men, Chennai-102.	B.Sc. Zoo	M.Sc. Zoo	Nil	Nil	Ph.D March 2011 Regular	U.G. P.G & Ph.D (Regular) M.Phil – Nil Ph.D passed in March 2011, without SLET /

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								NET. Experience claimed – Nil, but 15 marks awarded.
81.	Zoology	H.Thilagam Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai – 30.	B.Sc. Zoo	M.Sc. Zoo	Nil	Nil	Ph.D Aug 2003 Regular	U.G. P.G & Ph.D (Regular) M.Phil – Nil Ph.D passed in Aug 2003, hence passing of SET / NET / SLET is exempted. Experience claimed – 4 years & 10 months, but 15 marks awarded.
82.	Zoology	J.Selvanathan Pachaiyappa's College for Men, Kanchipuram.	B.Sc. Zoo	M.Sc. Zoo	Nil	Nil	Ph.D Aug 2012 Regular	U.G. P.G & Ph.D (Regular) M.Phil – Nil Ph.D passed in Aug 2012,

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								without SLET / NET. Experience claimed – Nil, but 14 marks awarded.
83.	Zoology	N.Akila Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai – 30.	B.Sc. Zoo	M.Sc. Zoo	Nil	Nil	Ph.D July 2013 Regular	U.G. & P.G. (Regular) M.Phil – Nil Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D passed in July 2013, without SLET / NET. Experience claimed – Nil, but 15 marks awarded.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Names of Assistant Professors whose selection and appointment during February 2016 is illegal due to the reasons set out in the last column

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
01.	Botany	S.Poompozhil Pachaiyappa's College for Women, Kanchipuram.	B.Sc Bot	M.Sc Bot	M.Phil Bot	Nil	Ph.D June 2015 Part Time	U.G.P.G & M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D (Part Time) Ph.D. Passed in June 2015, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed – Nil, but 12 marks awarded.
02.	Chemistry	Z.Ayesha Siddiqha Chellammal Women's College,	B.Sc Che	M.Sc Che	Nil	NET Dec 2014	Nil	U.G.P.G.(Regular)-M.Phil & Ph.D (Nil) NET passed.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
		Chennai.						But certificate not produced for NET. Experience claimed – Nil, but 12 marks awarded.
03	Chemistry	R.Prasath Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai – 30.	B.Sc Che	M.Sc organic Che	Nil	Nil	Ph.D. Oct 2014 Regular	U.G.P.G.(Regular Ph.D. Passed in October 2014, without SLET / NET. Experience claimed -Nil but 14 marks awarded.
04.	Chemistry	K.Ramesh Babu Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai – 30.	B.Sc Che	M.Sc Che	Nil	Nil		U.G.P.G. (Regular) Ph.D.passed in 2015, hence passsing of SLET / NET is exempted. Experience claimed 4 years,

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	***Subject***	***Name and College to which the candidate is appointed***	***EducationalQualification***					***Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled***
			UG	***PG***	***M.Phil***	***SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET***	***Ph.D.***	
			a	***b***	***c***	***d***	***e***	
								but 12 marks awarded.
05.	Chemistry	R.Ramya C.Kandaswami Naidu College for Women, Cuddalore.	B.Sc Che	M.Sc Che	M.Phil Che	Nil	Ph.D. Aprilv 2014 Part Time	U.G. P.G & M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D (Part Time) Ph.D.passed in April 2014, without SLET/NET. Experience claimed for 1 year & 2 months but 12 marks awarded.
06.	Chemistry	G.Thennarasu C.Kandaswami Naidu College for Men, Chennai.	B.Sc Che	M.Sc Che	Nil	Nil	Ph.D. Dec 2013 Regular	U.G. & P.G. (Regular) M.Phil -Nil Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D. Passed in Dec 2015, without SLET/NET.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								Experience not claimed but 12 marks awarded.
07.	Chemistry	S.Uthayanila Pachaiyappa's College for Women, Kanchipuram.	B.Sc Che	M.Sc Che	M.Phil Chem	CSIR Chem Dec 2014	Nil	U.G. P.G & M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D – Nil CSIR passed. Experience not claimed but 14 marks awarded.
08.	Chemistry	P.Vinayagamoorthy C.Kandaswami Naidu College for Men, Chennai.	B.Sc Che	M.Sc Che	M.Phil Chem	Nil	Ph.D Dec 2014 Regular	U.G. P.G & M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D passed in Dec 2014, without SLET / NET. Experience claimed 7 months but 14 marks awarded.
09.	Commerce	G.Sivabalan Pachaiyappa's College,	B.Com Com	M.Com Com D.M.	M.Phil Com	SET oct 2012	Nil	U.G. (Regular) P.G. & M.Phil (Distance

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
		Chennai – 30.						Mode) Ph.D – Nil P.G & M.Phil both Degrees obtained by Distance Mode. Experience claimed 12 years & 7 months.
10.	Commerce	L.Venkatesan C.Kandaswami Naidu College for Men, Chennai.	B.Com Com	M.Com Com	M.Phil Com D.M.	Nil	Ph.D Feb 2014 Part Time	U.G. & P.G. (Regular) M.Phil (Distance Mode) Ph.D (Part Time) M.Phil through Distance Mode. Ph.D passed in Feb 2014, without SLET / NET.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	***Subject***	***Name and College to which the candidate is appointed***	***EducationalQualification***					***Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled***
			UG	***PG***	***M.Phil***	***SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET***	***Ph.D.***	
			a	***b***	***c***	***d***	***e***	
								Experience claimed 12 years.
11.	Commerce	O.Vijaylakshmi Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai – 30.	B.C.S	M.C.S	M.Phil C.S	SET Oct 2012	Nil	B.C.S (Corporate Secretaryship) M.C.S (Master of Corporate Secretaryship) Ph.D- Nil SET passed. Post called for is Commerse but Secretaryship was selected. Experience claimed 13 years & 5 months, 15 marks awarded.
12.	English	K.Nalini Selvi C.Kandaswami Naidu College for	B.A. Eng	M.A. Eng	M.Phil Eng	SET Oct 2012	Nil	U.G. P.G M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D-Nil

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	***Subject***	***Name and College to which the candidate is appointed***	***EducationalQualification***					***Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled***
			UG	***PG***	***M.Phil***	***SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET***	***Ph.D.***	
			a	***b***	***c***	***d***	***e***	
		Women, Cuddalore.						SET passed. Experience claimed – Nil, but 12 marks awarded.
13.	English	S.Uma Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai – 30.	B.A. Eng D.M.	M.A. Eng D.M	Nil	SET Aug 2011	Nil	U.G. P.G. (both Distance Mode) M.Phil & Ph.D not done. SET passed. U.G. & P.G. Both obtained by Distance Mode. Experience claimed – Nil, but 12 marks awarded.
14.	English	R.Vimala Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai – 30.	B.A. Eng	M.A. Eng D.M.	M.Phil Eng D.D	Nil	Ph.D Oct 2015 Part Time	U.G. P.G M.Phil (3 Degrees obtained by Distance Mode), Ph.D (Part

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								Time) Ph.D passed in October 2015 without SLET / NET. Three Degress obtained by Distance Mode. Experience claimed 6 years & 10 months but 14 marks awarded.
15.	Economics	S.Ramu Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai – 30.	B.A. Eco	M.A. Eco	M.Phil Eco	Nil	Ph.D May 2013 Regular	U.G. P.G M.Phil., & Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D passed in May 2013, without SLET / NET. Experience claimed 7 ½ years. ----marks warded. But certificates not produced for

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								education & experience.
16.	History	R.Jayapriya Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai – 30.	B.A. His	M.A. His	M.Phil His	Nil	Ph.D Sept 2015 Regular	U.G. P.G M.Phil., & Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D passed in September 2015, without SLET / NET. Experience claimed – Nil, but 14 marks awarded.
17.	History	C.Naveena Devi C.Kandaswami Naidu College for Women, Cuddalore.	B.A. His	M.A. His	Nil	Nil	Ph.D March 2011 Regular	U.G. P.G & Ph.D (Regular) M.Phil – Nil Ph.D passed in March 2011, without SLET / NET. Experience claimed 1 year but 14 marks awarded.
18.	History	T.Sarala Devi C.Kandaswam	B.A. His	M.A. His	M.Phil	SET oct	Nil	U.G. P.G & M.Phil

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
		i Naidu College for Men, Chennai.			His	2012		(Regular) Ph.D – Nil SET passed. Experience claimed 2 years & 8 months but 14 marks awarded.
19.	Librarian	A.Anbu Jebamalar C.Kandaswami Naidu College for Women, Cuddalore.	BLIS D.M.	MLIS D.M.	M.Phil D.M.	SET Oct 2012	P.H.D Aug 2015 Regular	U.G. (D.E) P.G (D.E) M.Phil (D.E) – All degree obtained by Distance Mode. SET passed. But, all Degrees obtained by Distance Mode. Experience claimed 7 years but, 14 marks awarded.
20.	Librarian	T.Kavitha Pachaiyappa's College for	B.Sc. Com.Sc	MLIS	M.Phil LIS	Nil	Ph.D Nov 2011	U.G. (Cross Major)

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
		Women, Kanchipuram.					Regular	P.G. M.Phil & Ph.D (Regular), Ph.D passed in Nov 2011, without SLET / NET U.G. Cross Major. Experience claimed 2 years & 9 months. But 14 marks awarded. Certificate not produced.
21.	Librarian	S.Mahalakshmi C.Kandaswami Naidu College for Men, Chennai.	BLIS D.M.	MLIS D.M.	Nil	SET Oct 2012	Nil	U.G. & P.G. (Distance Mode) M.Phil & Ph.D – Nil SET passed U.G & P.G both obtained by Distance Mode. Experience

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								claimed – Nil but 14 marks awarded.
22.	Librarian	D.Manimegalai Chellammal Women's College, Chennai.	BLIS D.M.	MLIS D.M.	M.Phil D.M.	Nil	Ph.D Aug 2015 P.T	U.G. P.G. & M.Phil (Degree Distance Mode) Ph.D (Part Time) Ph.D passed in Aug 2015, without SLET / NET. U.G. P.G & M.Phil Three degree obtained by Distance Mode. Experience claimed 12 years, 14 marks awarded.
23.	Maths	R.Devi Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai – 30.	B.Sc. Maths	M.Sc. Maths	M.Phil Maths	Nil	Ph.D September2013 Regular	U.G. P.G. Mphil & Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D passed in Sept 2013,

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								without SLET / NET. Experience claimed – Nil but 12 marks awarded.
24.	Philosophy	B.Devan Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai – 30.	B.Sc. Zoo	M.A. Philosophy	M.Phil Philosopphy	Nil	Ph.D April 2013 P.T	U.G. (Cross Major) P.G. & M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D (Part Time) Ph.D passed in April 2013, without SLET / NET. U.G. Cross Major. Experience claimed 9 years & 7 months – 15 marks awarded.
25.	Philosophy	V.M. Makhalakshmi Pachaiyappa's College,	B.A. Phil	M.A. Phil	Nil	Nil	Ph.D Aug 2013 Regular	U.G. P.G & Ph.D (Regular) M.Phil- Nil

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
		Chennai – 30.						Ph.D. Passed in Aug 2013, without SLET / NET. Experience claimed – NIL, but 12 marks awarded. Change of Initial and Names as per Tamil Nadu Gazatte 29th September, 2004. M.Mahalakshmi changed her name as V.M.Makha Lakshmi.
26.	Philosophy	A.D.Revathy Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai.	B.Sc. Zoo	M.A. Phil	M.Phil Phil	Nil	Ph.D Sept 2007 Regular	U.G. (Cross Major) P.G., M.Phil & Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D passed in Sept 2007,

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								hence, passing of NET / SLET is exempted. Cross major in U.G. Experience claimed 6 years & 8 months, 14 marks awarded.
27.	Philosophy	P.Sathiyamoorthy Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai.	B.A. Phil	M.A. Phil	M.Phil Phil	NET Dec 2000	Nil	U.G., P.G., M.Phil (Regular) Ph.D-Nil NET passed. Experience Claimed 9 months. But 14 marks awarded.
28.	Physics	R.Gunaseelan Pachaiyappa's College for Men, Kanchipuram.	B.Sc. Phy	M.Sc. Phy	M.Phil Phy	Nil	Ph.D Nov 2012 Regular	U.G., P.G, & M.Phil. (Regular) Ph.D. (Regular) Ph.D passed in

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								Nov 2012, without SLET/ NET. Experience claimed 3 years & 5 months but 12 marks awarded.
29.	Physics	A.Manigandan Pachaiyappa's College for Men, Kanchipuram.	B.Sc. Phy	M.Sc. Phy	M.Phil Phy D.M	Nil	Ph.D Aug 2010 Regular	U.G. & P.G (Regular) M.Phil (Distance Mode) Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D passed in Aug 2010' without SLET / NET. Experience claimed 6 years – 12 marks awarded.
30.	Tamil	M.Roopa Chellammal Women's	B.Sc. Che	M.A. Tam D.M.	M.Phil Tam	NET June 2011	Nil	U.G.(Crosss Major) P.G. & M.Phil

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	***Subject***	***Name and College to which the candidate is appointed***	***EducationalQualification***					***Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled***
			UG	***PG***	***M.Phil***	***SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET***	***Ph.D.***	
			a	***b***	***c***	***d***	***e***	
		College, Chennai.			D.M	SET Aug 2011		(Distance Mode) Ph.D – Nil NET & SET passed. Cross Major in U.G. & P.G with M.Phil. Both obtained by Distance Mode. Experience claimed for 8 years & 6 months, 15 marks awarded.
31.	Tamil	S.Vanitha Chellammal Women's College, Chennai – 32.	B.A. Tam D.M.	M.A. Tam D.M.	M.Phil Tam	Nil	Ph.D March 2014 Regular	U.G. P.G. Both obtained by Distance Mde M.Phil & Ph.D (Regular) Ph.D passed in March 2014, without SLET / NET.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								U.G. & P.G both obtained by Distance Mode Experience claimed 7 years, 14 marks awarded.
32.	Zoology	N.Amudha Pachaiyappa's College, Chennai – 30.	B.Sc. Zoo	M.Sc. Zoo	M.Phil Bio Tech D.M	Nil	Ph.D December2014 P.T	U.G. & P.G (Regular) M.Phil (Bio Tech-Distance Mode) Ph.D (Part Time) Ph.D passed in Dec 2014 without SLET / NET.
33.	Zoology	S.Subarani Pachaiyappa's College for Women, Kanchipuram.	B.Sc Zoo	M.Sc Zoo	M.Phil Zoo D.M	Nil	Ph.D Dec 2013 Regular	U.G. & P.G (Regular) M..Phil (D.M) Ph.D. (Regular) Ph.D passed in

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Sl. No.	*Subject*	*Name and College to which the candidate is appointed*	*EducationalQualification*					*Grounds for the illegality in the selection. Hence their appointments are liable to be declare void and cancelled*
			UG	*PG*	*M.Phil*	*SLET/ NET/ CSIR/ SLST/ UGC/ JRF/ SET*	*Ph.D.*	
			a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	
								Dec 2013, without SLET / NET. Experience claimed 2 years, certificate not produced, but 12marks awarded.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF COLLEGIATE EDUCATION:

28. With a view to ascertain the views of the Director of Collegiate Education, who is the Competent Authority under the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Private Colleges (Regulation) Act, 1976, this Court further directed the Director of Collegiate Education to verify the educational qualifications and the eligibility of the selected candidates.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

29. The Colleges functioning under the Pachaiyappa's Trust Board are governed under the Provisions of the Tamil Nadu Private Colleges (Regulation) Act, 1976. Chapter IV stipulates terms and conditions of service of teachers and other persons employed in private Colleges and Section 15 and 16 are relevant which reads as under:

> *"15. Qualifications of teachers and other persons employed in private colleges- [(1)[The University may make regulations, statutes or ordinances specifying the qualifications required for the appointment of teachers [***] employed in any private college.*
>
> *[(2)] The Government may make rules specifying the qualifications required for appointment to any post, other than teachers, in any private college].*
>
> *NOTES*
>
> *By virtue of sub-section (1), the University may make regulations, statues or ordinances specifying the qualifications for appointment of teachers in private colleges. The Government is empowered to make rules for appointment to any post, other than teachers, in any private college*

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

under sub-section (2) of Section 15.

16. Appointment of teachers and other persons in private colleges- (1) No person who does not possess the qualifications specified under Section 15 shall, on or after the date of commencement of this Act, be appointed as teacher or other employee in any private college.

(2) Nothing contained in this Section or any regulation, statute or ordinance made under Section 15 shall apply to any person who, on or before the date of commencement of this Act, is employed as teacher or other employee in any private college.

NOTES

Section 16 lays down that only a qualified person as specified in sub-section (2) of Section 16 should be appointed in the private colleges. The persons who were appointed earlier to the commencement of the Act i.e. 21st November, 1975 are, however, saved from the rigour of sub-section (1).”

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

30. Section 16(1) contemplates that no person who does not possess the qualification specified under Section 15 shall be appointed as teacher. Section 15 stipulates that the Government may make Rules specifying the qualifications and in the present case, the Government of Tamil Nadu adopted the qualifications and criteria fixed by the University Grants Commission in its regulations and a Government Order in this regard was issued in G.O.Ms.No.111, Higher Education (H1) Department, dated 24.03.1999, which would be applicable with reference to the recruitment process conducted by the Pachaiyappa's Trust Board during the relevant point of time.

31. The Director of Collegiate Education scrutinised the educational qualifications and the weightage marks awarded to the selected candidates based on the documents submitted by the candidates before the Director of Collegiate Education. However, the learned Special Government Pleader, appearing on behalf of the State, clarified that the Director of Collegiate Education has not scrutinised the original records relating to the entire selection process from the beginning. The Director of Collegiate

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Education found that there are large scale discrepancies in awarding marks for teaching experience. Thus, those candidates were held as unqualified in his report. As per the Director of Collegiate Education, the ineligibility of the candidate occurs on account of irregular awarding of marks for teaching experience for which the particular candidate is not eligible. Thus in the column, the Director of Collegiate Education has stated as "unqualified".

32. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appointees contended that there are discrepancies in the findings of the Administrator and in the report of the Director of Collegiate Education. This Court found that the discrepancy is artificially created by the respondents and on perusal of both the reports independently in its own way one can understand that the evaluations are made based on the records placed before the respective Administrator and the Director of Collegiate Education. Thus each report is to be seen in its own context to know about the extent of irregularities and illegalities in the process of selection.

33. The extract report of the Director of Collegiate Education is

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

under:

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Report on candidates who have been Selected and Appointed based on their Educational Qualification:

1.	Total number of qualified candidates for the post of Assistant Professor based on the educational qualification.	**218**
2.	Total number of unqualified candidates for the post of Assistant Professor based on the educational qualification.	**01** Respondent No.192 in W.P.No.19939 of 2014 S.Sangeetha, Assistant Professor, Department of Mathematics C.Kandaswamy Naidu College for Women, Cuddalore – 607 001. **Ph.D Degree certificate submitted by the candidate is identified as bogus** as per reference no.918/DARE/Ph.D/2022, dated: 08.11.2022 of the Controller of Examinations Annamalai University.
3.	Total number of candidates who were appointed to Government Colleges through TRB.	**02** (Respondent Nos. 68, 69 in W.P.No. 19939 of 2014)
4.	Long absentees / Resinged / Cancellation of Appointment	**03** (Respondent Nos: 102, 126, 128 in W.P.No.19939 of 2014)
5.	Total number of Candidates who are appointed but qualification approval not given by the University and Appointment approval proposals not received to the RJD because of pending court cases	**09** (Respondent Nos: 12, 17 18, 19, 20, 24, 39, 40, 41 in W.P.No.36827 of 2016 and Respondent Nos.32 in W.P.No.19939 of 2014
6	Total number of candidates who have acquired eligible qualification after the date of Notification and before the date of Interview.	**03** Respondent Nos: 71, 125 in W.P.No.19939 of 2014 & Respondent Nos: 42 in W.P.No.36827 of 2016
	Total	**236**

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Report Based on Teaching Experience and other Eligibility Criteria:

1.	Total Number of candidates without any discrepancies with regard to Teaching Experience	60 (Respondent Nos: 08, 09, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 70, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82, 83, 84, 88, 89, 90, 107, 108, 132, 133, 140, 142, 147, 166, 167, 174, 183, 197, in W.P.No.19939 of 2014 & Respondent No: 44 in W.P.No.36827 of 2016)
2.	Total number of candidates having eligible qualifying service but do not have Teaching Experience Certificate counter signed by competent Education Authority.	15 Respondent Nos: 16, 26, 29, 36, 43, 52, 66, 80, 91, 94, 163, 171, 177 in W.P.No.19939 of 2014 & Respondent Nos: 28, 35 in W.P.No.36827 of 2016
3.	Total number of candidates for whom weightage marks awarded without any Qualifying Teaching Experience.	47 Respondent Nos: 10, 13, 19, 20, 25, 55, 72, 74, 105, 109, 114, 116, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 131, 134, 138, 143, 146, 149, 150, 157, 158, 161, 162, 165, 179, 181, 185, 187, 191, 193, 198, 200 in W.P.No.19939 of 2014 & Respondent Nos: 14, 15, 23, 26, 29, 31, 46, 50, 52 in W.P.No.36827 of 2016
4.	Total Number of candidates for whom weightage marks awarded more than Qualifying Teaching Experience.	91 Respondent Nos: 17, 21, 30, 31, 40, 41, 42, 44, 56, 57, 59, 64, 65, 67, 85, 86, 87, 92, 93, 95, 96 ,97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 104, 106, 110, 111, 112, 113, 115, 124, 127, 129, 130, 135, 136, 137, 139, 141, 144, 145, 151, 152, 123, 154, 155, 156, 159, 160, 169, 172, 193, 175, 176, 178, 180, 182, 184, 186, 188, 189, 190, 194, 195, 196, 199 in W.P.No.19939 of 2014 & Respondent Nos: 13, 16, 21, 22, 25, 27, 30, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 43, 45, 47, 48, 49, 51, 53, 54, 55 in W.P.No.36827 of

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

		2016
5.	Total number of candidates for whom correctness of weigtage marks could not be ascertained due to non submission of Selection Committee Report.	01 Respondent No: 117 in W.P.No.19939 of 2014
6.	Total number of candidates who have acquired eligible qualification after the date of Notification and before the date of Interview.	03 Respondent Nos: 71, 125 in W.P.No.19939 of 2014 & Respondent Nos: 42 in W.P.No.36827 of 2016
7.	Total number of candidates for whom correctness or comunal reservation could not be ascertained as their names are not mentioned in the roster register.	04 Respondent Nos: 148, 164, 168, 170 in W.P.no.19939 of 2014
	Total	221 (Except 01 Bogus Certificate + 09 Court Case + 05 Absent / Relieved / Cancellation of Appointment)

34. The learned Special Government Pleader, appearing on behalf of the State, with reference to the above report contended that the Recruitment Notification stipulates preference/priority will be given for the candidates who obtained UG/PG Degree in the same discipline for the relevant post for which his/her candidature applied for. However, such preference has not been considered by the Selection Committee and many number of candidates, who had studied cross major subjects were selected and appointed. Thus the conditions stipulated in the Notification regarding

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

preference/priority for the candidates who studied both Under Graduation and Post Graduation in the same discipline was denied, which caused an irregularity in the process of selection.

35. The learned Special Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the State, contended that the UG/PG Degree /M.Phil Degree obtained through Correspondence/Distance Mode will not be considered for award of any weightage marks irrespective of their possessing requisite qualification. In awarding weightage marks, large scale discrepancies are found. There is no thorough verification of mode of education undergone by the respective candidates and in this regard, there is a discrepancy between the findings of the Administrator and the Director of Collegiate Education. Discrepancy aroused because the Administrator has noted down that the candidates, who have undergone UG and PG Degrees through Distance Education Mode and through Correspondence Course. However, the Director of Collegiate Education has recognised the Distance Education Mode and Correspondence Education Mode as a valid one for the purpose of educational qualification.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

36. Regarding the procedures, the Director of Collegiate Education in awarding weightage marks has adopted the procedures being adopted by Teachers Recruitment Board which was followed based on the Government Order issued in G.O.Ms.No.412, Higher Education Department, dated 04.12.2009 and also G.O.Ms.No.32, Higher Education Department, dated 08.03.2013. In any event, there are discrepancies found both by the Administrator and also by the Director of Collegiate Education.

37. The report of the Director of Collegiate Education reveals that excess marks were awarded for teaching experience, one bogus certificate was traced out in respect of Respondent No.192 – Smt.Sangeetha.

38. The objections raised by the learned counsels for the selected candidates are that the remark made by the Director of Collegiate Education 'as the candidates are unqualified' is incorrect. The weightage mark for teaching experience is not essential and not a requisite

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

qualification contemplated under the Recruitment Notification. The selected candidates possessed the requisite educational qualifications and therefore, the weightage marks and its discrepancies as stated by the Director of Collegiate Education cannot be a disqualification.

39. The learned Special Government Pleader clarified by stating that the weightage marks for teaching experience plays a pivotal role in arriving a final conclusion regarding the select list, since the award of marks will deprive many candidates from securing selection. Therefore, they have stated as unqualified only with reference to the weightage marks awarded and they have not referred the educational qualification. However, the scheme of selection contemplates that the educational qualification along with teaching experience are to be taken into account cumulatively for the purpose of preparation of final select list based on the ranking. In the event of separating the weightage marks, it will result in deprival of an opportunity to the other candidates, who secured more marks in teaching experience and in respect of the preferences contemplated for the candidates who studied Under Graduate and Post Graduate in the same discipline.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

40. The learned counsel for the petitioners in response to the reports contended that the respondents 92, 93, 96, 131, 141, 148, 153, 156, 168 and 172 are not possessing NET/SLET/SET/Ph.d., as on 18.02.2014 on the date of recruitment notification issued by the Pachaiyappa's Trust Board. However, the Director of Collegiate Education has taken a different stand in view of the fact that on the ground that as on the date of the Government Order issued in G.O.Ms.No.311, it is only discretion of the recruiting authorities and therefore, the Director of Collegiate Education has not taken this aspect as a discrepancy. 19 candidates possessing cross major subjects in Under Graduate and Post Graduate were selected. 30 candidates, who possessed the UG/PG degree through distance mode were selected. It is further contended that five candidates were appointed against roster as per the records available. Another five candidates terminated from College for long time. Therefore, large scale irregularities and illegalities were found in the process of selection and it is impossible to segregate the candidates for the purpose of upholding the validity of selection conducted by the Trustees of the Pachaiyappa's Trust Board.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

POSITION OF LAW

41. In the case of **Sachin Kumar and Others vs. Delhi Subordinate Service Selection Board (DSSSB) and Others [(2021) 4 SCC 631]**, the principles prevailing fore more than five decades are considered.

42. In deciding this batch of SLPs, we need not reinvent the wheel. Over the last five decades, several decisions of this Court have dealt with the fundamental issue of when the process of an examination can stand vitiated. Essentially, the answer to the issue turns upon whether the irregularities in the process have taken place at a systemic level so as to vitiate the sanctity of the process. There are cases which border upon or cross over into the domain of fraud as a result of which the credibility and legitimacy of the process is denuded. This constitutes one end of the spectrum where the authority conducting the examination or convening the selection process comes to the conclusion that as a result of supervening

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

event or circumstances, the process has lost its legitimacy, leaving no option but to cancel it in its entirety. Where a decision along those lines is taken, it does not turn upon a fact-finding exercise into individual acts involving the use of malpractices or unfair means. Where a recourse to unfair means has taken place on a systemic scale, it may be difficult to segregate the tainted from the untainted participants in the process. Large-scale irregularities including those which have the effect of denying equal access to similarly circumstanced candidates are suggestive of a malaise which has eroded the credibility of the process. At the other end of the spectrum are cases where some of the participants in the process who appear at the examination or selection test are guilty of irregularities. In such a case, it may well be possible to segregate persons who are guilty of wrongdoing from others who have adhered to the rules and to exclude the former from the process. In such a case, those who are innocent of wrongdoing should not pay a price for those who are actually found to be involved in irregularities. By segregating the wrongdoers, the selection of the untainted candidates can be allowed to pass muster by taking the selection process to its logical conclusion. This is not a mere matter of administrative procedure but as a

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

principle of service jurisprudence it finds embodiment in the constitutional duty by which public bodies have to act fairly and reasonably. A fair and reasonable process of selection to posts subject to the norm of equality of opportunity under Article 16 (1) is a constitutional requirement. A fair and reasonable process is a fundamental requirement of Article 14 as well. Where the recruitment to public employment stands vitiated as a consequence of systemic fraud or irregularities, the entire process becomes illegitimate. On the other hand, where it is possible to segregate persons who have indulged in malpractices and to penalise them for their wrongdoing, it would be unfair to impose the burden of their wrongdoing on those who are free from taint. To treat the innocent and the wrongdoers equally by subjecting the former to the consequence of the cancellation of the entire process would be contrary to Article 14 because unequals would then be treated equally. The requirement that a public body must act in fair and reasonable terms animates the entire process of selection. The decisions of the recruiting body are hence subject to judicial control subject to the settled principle that the recruiting authority must have a measure of discretion to take decisions in accordance with law which are best suited to

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

preserve the sanctity of the process. Now it is in the backdrop of these principles, that it becomes appropriate to advert to the precedents of this Court which hold the field.

43. Over four decades ago, in **Bihar School Examination Board vs. Subhas Chandra Sinha [Bihar School Examination Board vs. Subhas Chandra Sinha, (1970) 1 SCC 648]** , a three-Judge Bench of this Court dealt with a case involving a challenge to the decision to cancel the annual secondary school examination in relation to a particular centre in a district in Bihar. The irregularities at the centre were summarised in the following extracts contained in the judgment of this Court : (SCC p. 650, para 5)

> *"5. The Tabulators of the Hanswadih Centre reported that the percentage of successful examinees was as high as 80% whereas the average at the Arrah, Dalippur Centre was only 50%. They were therefore asked to prepare percentage subject-wise. All the Tabulators submitted these percentages. The matter was referred to the Unfair Means Committee of the Board. The Committee in its turn asked the*

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Moderators to look into all the answer books where the percentage was 80% or more. They reported unfair means on a mass scale. The Chairman then passed an order on 30-8-1969 cancelling the examination in all subjects at the Hanswadih Centre allowing the examinees to re-appear at the Supplementary Examination in September 1969 without payment of fresh fees. The Headmasters of the three schools concerned were also informed by registered letters. The action of the Chairman was placed before the Board at its meeting on 9-9-1969 and was approved. It was stated in the return that a complaint was received from one Satnarain Singh of Jagdishpur, who, however, wrote a letter that he had made no such complaint."

44. The High Court had quashed the action on the ground that the examinees were not furnished with a show-cause and the materials on which the Chairperson relied to pass the order were not disclosed. M. Hidayatullah, C.J. speaking for the Court, noted that "the results speak for themselves : whereas at other centres the average of successful candidates was 50%, at one particular centre the percentage of successful candidates

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

ranged from 70% to 100% in individual subjects. In this context, the Court observed : **(Subhas Chandra Sinha case [Bihar School Examination Board vs. Subhas Chandra Sinha, (1970) 1 SCC 648]** , SCC p. 652, para 13)

> *"13. This is not a case of any particular individual who is being charged with adoption of unfair means but of the conduct of all the examinees or at least a vast majority of them at a particular centre. If it is not a question of charging any one individually with unfair means but to condemn the examination as ineffective for the purpose it was held. Must the Board give an opportunity to all the candidates to represent their cases? We think not. It was not necessary for the Board to give an opportunity to the candidates if the examinations as a whole were being cancelled. The Board had not charged any one with unfair means so that he could claim to defend himself. The examination was vitiated by adoption of unfair means on a mass scale. In these circumstances it would be wrong to insist that the Board must hold a detailed inquiry into the matter and examine each individual case to satisfy itself*

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

which of the candidates had not adopted unfair means. The examination as a whole had to go."

The Court distinguished an earlier decision observing that : **(Subhas Chandra Sinha case [Bihar School Examination Board v. Subhas Chandra Sinha, (1970) 1 SCC 648]** , SCC pp. 652-53, para 14)

"14. Reliance was placed upon Ghanshyam Das Gupta [Board of High School & Intermediate Education vs. Ghanshyam Das Gupta, AIR 1962 SC 1110] to which we referred earlier. There the examination results of three candidates were cancelled, and this Court held that they should have received an opportunity of explaining their conduct. It was said that even if the inquiry involved a large number of persons, the Committee should frame proper regulations for the conduct of such inquiries but not deny the opportunity. We do not think that that case has any application. Surely it was not intended that where the examination as a whole was vitiated, say by leakage of papers or by destruction of some of the answer books or by discovery of unfair means practised on a vast scale that an inquiry would be made giving a chance to every

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

one appearing at that examination to have his say? What the Court intended to lay down was that if any particular person was to be proceeded against, he must have a proper chance to defend himself and this did not obviate the necessity of giving an opportunity even though the number of persons proceeded against was large. The Court was then not considering the right of an examining body to cancel its own examination when it was satisfied that the examination was not properly conducted or that in the conduct of the examination the majority of the examinees had not conducted themselves as they should have. To make such decisions depend upon a full-fledged judicial inquiry would hold up the functioning of such autonomous bodies as Universities and School Board. While we do not wish to whittle down the requirements of natural justice and fair-play in cases where such requirement may be said to arise, we do not want that this Court should be understood as having stated that an inquiry with a right to representation must always precede in every case, however different. The universities are responsible for their standards and the conduct of

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

examinations. The essence of the examinations is that the worth of every person is appraised without any assistance from an outside source. If at a centre the whole body of students receive assistance and are managed to secure success in the neighbourhood of 100% when others at other centres are successful only at an average of 50%, it is obvious that the University or the Board must do something in the matter. It cannot hold a detailed quasi-judicial inquiry with a right to its alumni to plead and lead evidence, etc. before the results are withheld or the examinations cancelled. If there is sufficient material on which it can be demonstrated that the university was right in its conclusion that the examinations ought to be cancelled then academic standards require that the university's appreciation of the problem must be respected. It would not do for the Court to say that you should have examined all the candidates or even their representatives with a view to ascertaining whether they had received assistance or not. To do this would encourage indiscipline if not also perjury."

(emphasis supplied)

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

45. The decision of a three-Judge Bench of this Court in **Anamica Mishra vs. U.P. Public Service Commission [Anamica Mishra v. U.P. Public Service Commission, 1990 Supp SCC 692 : 1991 SCC (L&S) 461]** ("**Anamica Mishra**") involved recruitment to various posts in the educational services of the State of Uttar Pradesh. There was a two-stage recruitment involving a written test and interview. It was found that after the written examination, due to the improper feeding of data into the computer, some candidates who had a better performance in the written examination were not called for interview and candidates who secured lesser marks were not only called for the interview but were finally selected. The entire process was cancelled by the Public Service Commission. Dealing with the situation, this Court observed : (SCC p. 693, para 4)

> *"4. We have heard the counsel for the parties and are of the view that when no defect was pointed out in regard to the written examination and the sole objection was confined to exclusion of a group of successful candidates in the written examination from the interview, there*

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

> *was no justification for cancelling the written part of the recruitment examination. On the other hand, the situation could have been appropriately met by setting aside the recruitment and asking for a fresh interview of all eligible candidates on the basis of the written examination and select those who on the basis of the written and the freshly-held interview became eligible for selection."*

The case is, therefore, representative of a situation where the cancellation of the entire recruitment process was held not to be justified since there was no systemic flaw in the written test, and the issue was only with regard to calling the candidates for the interview. The situation could have been remedied by setting aside the selection made after the interview stage and calling for a fresh interview of all eligible candidates. This is the ultimate direction which was issued by the Court.

46. In **Madhyamic Shiksha Mandal, M.P. vs. Abhilash Shiksha Prasar Samiti [Madhyamic Shiksha Mandal, M.P. vs. Abhilash Shiksha Prasar Samiti, (1998) 9 SCC 236]**, the High Court had interfered

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

with the decision of the M.P.Madhyamic Shiksha Mandal to cancel the entire examination, following the report of the Naib Tahsildar who found that students had been indulging in mass copying. The report of the Naib Tahsildar showed that during the course of a visit to the centre, students were indulging in copying even before the question papers were distributed indicating that there was leakage of the question paper. The teachers had not objected to the students entering the examination hall with books and copying material, indicating their complicity. Holding that the view of the High Court to set aside the cancellation was unsustainable, this Court held : (SCC p. 237, para 2)

> *"2. ... In the face of this material, we do not see any justification in the High Court having interfered with the decision taken by the Board to treat the examination as cancelled. It is unfortunate that the student community resorts to such methods to succeed in examinations and then some of them come forward to contend that innocent students become victims of such misbehaviour of their companions. That cannot be helped. In such a situation the Board is left with no alternative but to cancel the examination. It is*

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

extremely difficult for the Board to identify the innocent students from those indulging in malpractices. One may feel sorry for the innocent students but one has to appreciate the situation in which the Board was placed and the alternatives that were available to it so far as this examination was concerned. It had no alternative but to cancel the results and we think, in the circumstances, they were justified in doing so."

47. On the other hand, the judgment of a two-Judge Bench of this Court in **Union of India vs. Rajesh P.U. [Union of India vs. Rajesh P.U., (2003) 7 SCC 285 : 2003 SCC (L&S) 1048]** involved a situation where a selection list consequent to a written examination, interview and physical fitness test for filling up the posts of constables in the CBI was cancelled, due to allegations of favouritism on the part of the officers conducting the physical efficiency test and irregularities in the written examination. A challenge to the cancellation failed before the Tribunal upon which proceedings were initiated before the High Court. A committee had been appointed by the Director, CBI, which upon meticulous examination

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

found that 31 candidates who were otherwise ineligible were included in the selection list and an equal number of eligible candidates was ousted. In this backdrop, the High Court found **[Rajesh vs. Union of India, 2001 SCC OnLine Ker 531]** that there was no justification to cancel the entire selection when the impact of irregularities which had crept into the evaluation of merits could be identified specifically and was found on verifying the records to have resulted in 31 candidates being selected undeservedly.

48. Upholding the view of the High Court, a two-Judge Bench of this Court held : **(Rajesh P.U. Case [Union of India vs. Rajesh P.U., (2003) 7 SCC 285 : 2003 SCC (L&S) 1048]** , SCC p. 290, para 6)

> *"6. ... In the light of the above and in the absence of any specific or categorical finding supported by any concrete and relevant material that widespread infirmities of an all-pervasive nature, which could be really said to have undermined the very process itself in its entirety or as a whole and it was impossible to weed out the beneficiaries of one or the other*

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

irregularities, or illegalities, if any, there was hardly any justification in law to deny appointment to the other selected candidates whose selections were not found to be, in any manner, vitiated for any one or the other reasons. Applying a unilaterally rigid and arbitrary standard to cancel the entirety of the selections despite the firm and positive information that except 31 of such selected candidates, no infirmity could be found with reference to others, is nothing but total disregard of relevancies and allowing to be carried away by irrelevancies, giving a complete go-by to contextual considerations throwing to the winds the principle of proportionality in going farther than what was strictly and reasonably to meet the situation. In short, the competent authority completely misdirected itself in taking such an extreme and unreasonable decision of cancelling the entire selections, wholly unwarranted and unnecessary even on the factual situation found too, and totally in excess of the nature and gravity of what was at stake, thereby virtually rendering such decision to be irrational."

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

49. The decision in **Inderpreet Singh Kahlon vs. State of Punjab [Inderpreet Singh Kahlon vs. State of Punjab, (2006) 11 SCC 356 : (2007) 1 SCC (L&S) 444] ("Inderpreet Singh Kahlon")**, again of a two-Judge Bench, involved a case where it was alleged that the Chairperson of the Punjab Public Service Commission (PSC) had got a large number of persons appointed on the basis of extraneous considerations between 1998 and 2001. The State Government cancelled the entire selection for recruitment to the PSC (Executive Branch) and Allied Services 1998. Two Scrutiny Committees were appointed and on the acceptance of their reports, the services of those who were appointed on the basis of the selection made by the Commission against vacancies for 1998 — 2000 came to be terminated. The Full Bench of the High Court dismissed the writ petitions filed by the selected candidates. In appeal before this Court, S.B. Sinha, J. enunciated in the course of his judgment the basis on which the services of persons who had put in some years of service could be validly terminated : (SCC p. 383, para 41)

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

"41. If the services of the appointees who had put in few years of service were terminated, compliance with three principles at the hands of the State was imperative viz. (1) to establish satisfaction in regard to the sufficiency of the materials collected so as to enable the State to arrive at its satisfaction that the selection process was tainted; (2) to determine the question that the illegalities committed go to the root of the matter which vitiate the entire selection process. Such satisfaction as also the sufficiency of materials were required to be gathered by reason of a thorough investigation in a fair and transparent manner; (3) whether the sufficient material present enabled the State to arrive at a satisfaction that the officers in majority have been found to be part of the fraudulent purpose or the system itself was corrupt."

50. The Court noted that there were serious imputations against the Chairperson who was at the helm of affairs of the State Public Service Commission, and all decisions made during his tenure were yet to be set

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

aside. The Court noted that : **(Inderpreet Singh Kahlon case [Inderpreet Singh Kahlon vs. State of Punjab, (2006) 11 SCC 356 : (2007) 1 SCC (L&S) 444]** , SCC p. 384, para 45)

> *"45. If fraud in the selection process was established, the State should not have offered to hold a reselection. Seniority of those who were reselected ordinarily could not have been restored in their favour. Such an offer was evidently made as the State was not sure about the involvement of a large number of employees."*

In the above backdrop, S.B. Sinha, J. drew a distinction "between a proven case of mass cheating for a board examination and an unproven imputed charge of corruption where the appointment of a civil servant is involved" (Inderpreet Singh Kahlon case [Inderpreet Singh Kahlon vs. State of Punjab, (2006) 11 SCC 356 : (2007) 1 SCC (L&S) 444] , SCC p. 384, para 46)."

51. The Court noted inter alia the decision in **Anamica Mishra [Anamica Mishra vs. U.P. Public Service Commission, 1990 Supp SCC**

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

692 : 1991 SCC (L&S) 461] where tainted cases were separated from the non-tainted ones and only where it is found impossible or highly improbable could "en masse orders of termination have been issued". Hence, in the view of this Court, an effort should have been made to segregate the tainted from the non-tainted candidates. The decided cases were broadly categorised along the following lines : **(Inderpreet Singh Kahlon case [Inderpreet Singh Kahlon vs. State of Punjab, (2006) 11 SCC 356 : (2007) 1 SCC (L&S) 444]** , SCC pp. 385-86, para 52)

> *"52. ... (i) Cases where the "event" has been investigated:*
>
> *(a) State (UT of Chandigarh) vs. Dilbagh Singh [State (UT of Chandigarh) vs. Dilbagh Singh, (1993) 1 SCC 154 : 1993 SCC (L&S) 144] , SCC, paras 3 and 7.*
>
> *(b) Krishan Yadav vs. State of Haryana [Krishan Yadav vs. State of Haryana, (1994) 4 SCC 165 : 1994 SCC (L&S) 937] , SCC, paras 12, 15 and 22.*
>
> *(c) Union of India vs. Anand Kumar Pandey [Union of India vs. Anand Kumar*

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Pandey, (1994) 5 SCC 663 : 1994 SCC (L&S) 1235] , SCC, para 4.

(d) Hanuman Prasad vs. Union of India [Hanuman Prasad vs. Union of India, (1996) 10 SCC 742 : 1997 SCC (L&S) 364] , SCC, para 4.

(e) Union of India vs. O. Chakradhar [Union of India vs. O. Chakradhar, (2002) 3 SCC 146 : 2002 SCC (L&S) 361] , SCC, para 9.

(f)B. Ramanjini vs.State of A.P. [B. Ramanjini vs. State of A.P., (2002) 5 SCC 533 : 2002 SCC (L&S) 780] , SCC, para 4.

(ii) Cases where CBI inquiry took place and was completed or a preliminary investigation was concluded:

(a) O.Chakradhar [Union of India vs. O. Chakradhar, (2002) 3 SCC 146 : 2002 SCC (L&S) 361]

(b) Krishan Yadav [Krishan Yadav vs. State of Haryana, (1994) 4 SCC 165 : 1994 SCC (L&S) 937]

(c) Hanuman Prasad [Hanuman Prasad vs. Union of India, (1996) 10 SCC 742 : 1997 SCC (L&S) 364]

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

(iii) Cases where the selection was made but appointment was not made:

(a) Dilbagh Singh [State (UT of Chandigarh) vs. Dilbagh Singh, (1993) 1 SCC 154 : 1993 SCC (L&S) 144] , SCC, para 3.

(b) Pritpal Singh vs. State of Haryana [Pritpal Singh vs. State of Haryana, (1994) 5 SCC 695 : 1994 SCC (L&S) 1239]

(c) Anand Kumar Pandey [Union of India vs. Anand Kumar Pandey, (1994) 5 SCC 663 : 1994 SCC (L&S) 1235] , SCC, para 4.

(d) Hanuman Prasad [Hanuman Prasad vs. Union of India, (1996) 10 SCC 742 : 1997 SCC (L&S) 364]

(e) B.Ramanjini [B. Ramanjini vs. State of A.P., (2002) 5 SCC 533 : 2002 SCC (L&S) 780] , SCC, para 4.

(iv) Cases where the candidates were also ineligible and the appointments were found to be contrary to law or rules:

(a) Krishan Yadav [Krishan Yadav vs. State of Haryana, (1994) 4 SCC 165 : 1994 SCC (L&S) 937]

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

(b) Pramod Lahudas Meshram vs. State of Maharashtra [Pramod Lahudas Meshram vs. State of Maharashtra, (1996) 10 SCC 749 : 1996 SCC (L&S) 1487] wherein appointments had been made without following the selection procedure.

(c) O.Chakradhar [Union of India vs. O. Chakradhar, (2002) 3 SCC 146 : 2002 SCC (L&S) 361] wherein appointments had been made without typewriting tests and other procedures of selection having not been followed."

(emphasis supplied)

52. The decision in **Inderpreet Singh Kahlon [Inderpreet Singh Kahlon vs. State of Punjab, (2006) 11 SCC 356 : (2007) 1 SCC (L&S) 444]** emphasises that when the services of employees are terminated on the ground that they may have aided and abetted corruption, the Court must satisfy itself that conditions for this exist. The Court while setting aside a selection "may require the State to establish that the process was so tainted that the entire selection process is liable to be cancelled." Dalveer Bhandari, J. in a separate opinion, held that where the basis of a termination

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

of service involves serious allegations of corruption, it is imperative that the principles of natural justice must be fully complied with. The judgment of Bhandari (at SCC p. 414, para 119) emphasises the "*peculiar facts of the case which ... were that some of the candidates had worked for about three years and their services were terminated only on the basis of the criminal investigation which was at the initial stage. The termination of their services, as a consequence of the cancellation of selection would not only prejudice their interest seriously but would ruin their entire future career*." (emphasis supplied)". Both the judgments concurred in issuing a direction to the High Court to consider the matters afresh and for the constitution of two committees—one related to the executive officers and the other related to judicial officers for segregating the tainted from the untainted officers. Consequential directions were also issued for compliance with the principles of natural justice.

53. While analysing the decision in **Inderpreet Singh Kahlon [Inderpreet Singh Kahlon vs. State of Punjab, (2006) 11 SCC 356 : (2007) 1 SCC (L&S) 444]**, it needs to be emphasised that it involved a

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

situation where persons who had been appointed were sought to be terminated after several years of service on the ground that their selection had been tainted by a fraud tracing its origin to the Chairperson of the Public Service Commission. It was, in other words, as S.B. Sinha, J. termed it "an unproven imputed charge of corruption where the appointment of a civil servant is involved". Dalveer Bhandari, J. also emphasised "the peculiar facts of this case" where persons who were appointed to the services of the State were sought to be terminated on serious charges of corruption involving a stigma. Having made this distinction, it must also be noted that the judgment emphasises that where it is possible to segregate tainted from untainted candidates, the State must make an effort to do so. Both the Judges in fact observed that performing this task was not impossible in that case. In that context the final directions to do so were issued.

54. The sequel to the decision **Inderpreet Singh Kahlon [Inderpreet Singh Kahlon vs. State of Punjab, (2006) 11 SCC 356 : (2007) 1 SCC (L&S) 444]** is another two-Judge Bench decision in

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Joginder Pal vs. State of Punjab [Joginder Pal vs. State of Punjab, (2014) 6 SCC 644 : (2014) 2 SCC (L&S) 333] ("Joginder Pal"). After the decision in **Inderpreet Singh Kahlon [Inderpreet Singh Kahlon vs. State of Punjab, (2006) 11 SCC 356 : (2007) 1 SCC (L&S) 444]**, a Committee of Three Judges of the High Court was constituted to separate the tainted from non-tainted candidates. As this Court noted in **Joginder Pal [Joginder Pal vs. State of Punjab, (2014) 6 SCC 644 : (2014) 2 SCC (L&S) 333]**, the Committee "could pinpoint those candidates who had got selected were selected for oblique considerations". In other words, candidates against whom no taint was found had been selected on merits on their performance in the written examination and interview. Yet the Committee came to the conclusion that the entire process of selection was a product of "a well-planned scheme of deception, forgery and fraud" and, therefore, deserved to be set aside in its entirety. As a result of this report, the original writ petitions were reheard following the remand by this Court in **Inderpreet Singh Kahlon [Inderpreet Singh Kahlon vs. State of Punjab, (2006) 11 SCC 356 : (2007) 1 SCC (L&S) 444]** and were referred **[Amarbir Singh vs. State of Punjab, 2003 SCC OnLine P&H 851** (3-Judge Bench)] to a

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

five-Judge Bench. The writ petitions of the tainted candidates were dismissed **[Amarbir Singh vs. State of Punjab, 2013 SCC OnLine P&H 11542** (5-Judge Bench)] by the High Court but even in the case of non-tainted candidates, it was held that the Government was entitled to cancel the entire selection process, once it was found to be vitiated by deception, forgery and fraud. The conclusion of the High Court in regard to the tainted candidates was affirmed in the judgment of this Court in **Joginder Pal [Joginder Pal vs. State of Punjab, (2014) 6 SCC 644 : (2014) 2 SCC (L&S) 333]** , authored by Justice A.K. Sikri. The judgment of this Court held that by the directions which were issued in **Inderpreet Singh Kahlon [Inderpreet Singh Kahlon vs. State of Punjab, (2006) 11 SCC 356 : (2007) 1 SCC (L&S) 444]** , an effort was required to be made to segregate the tainted from non-tainted candidates. Sikri, J. held **[Joginder Pal vs. State of Punjab, (2014) 6 SCC 644 : (2014) 2 SCC (L&S) 333]** that two conclusions **[Amarbir Singh vs. State of Punjab, 2003 SCC OnLine P&H 851 (3-Judge Bench)], [Amarbir Singh vs. State of Punjab, 2013 SCC OnLine P&H 11542** (5-Judge Bench)] of the High Court were "antithetical" : once it was found that segregating the tainted from non-

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

tainted candidates is possible and was also achieved, the other conclusion (to set aside the entire process) was incompatible. The Court held that the issue of the entire selection process being vitiated would have arisen only if the findings of the Committee were that it was not possible to distinguish the cases of the tainted from the non-tainted candidates. The Court held that the reasons for holding the entire process should be vitiated were the same as those which had been urged before the High Court earlier. Moreover, a crucial development which had taken place after the remand was that the State had come forward and indicated its willingness to take back candidates who were not tainted and were selected on the basis of merit. In this backdrop, the order **[Amarbir Singh vs. State of Punjab, 2013 SCC OnLine P&H 11542** (5-Judge Bench)] passed by the High Court was set aside.

55. The decision in **All India Railway Recruitment Board vs. K. Shyam Kumar [All India Railway Recruitment Board vs. K. Shyam Kumar, (2010) 6 SCC 614 : (2010) 2 SCC (L&S) 293]** ("*Railway Recruitment Board*") involved a case where the Board had invited

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

applications for Group D posts in the South Central Railway. As many as 10.02 lakh applications were received of which 5.86 lakh applicants were found eligible. The eligible candidates were required to appear at a written test. 3.22 lakh candidates appeared of whom 2690 were selected and called for the physical efficiency test. Those who qualified were called for verification of original certificates. At that stage, it was noticed that certain malpractices took place during the written examination inter alia involving mass copying, leakage of question papers and impersonation. The Vigilance Department recommended that the matter be referred to the Central Bureau of Investigation. The Railway Recruitment Board decided to conduct a retest. This decision was challenged by certain candidates who had taken the first written examination, before the Tribunal. The Tribunal rejected the plea. While considering a challenge to the decision of the Tribunal, the High Court held **[K. Shyam Kumar vs. Indian Railways, 2005 SCC OnLine AP 201]** that there was no reasonable basis to cancel the first selection and directed the Board to finalise the selection on the basis of the first written test save and except for 62 candidates against whom there were allegations of impersonation.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

56. In appeal, this Court noted the report of the Vigilance Department which indicated that:

(1) Several candidates were suspected to have obtained answers for the questions a few hours before the examination through a middleman who had accepted a bribe.

(2) In respect of 62 candidates, there were serious allegations of impersonation and on close scrutiny it was found that at least 6 candidates had adopted unfair means to secure qualifying marks in the written test. The investigation prima facie established a leakage of question papers to a sizable number of candidates.

(3) This seemed to be pre-planned and the possibility of the involvement of the staff of the Board could not be ruled out.

57. In this backdrop, this Court considered whether the High Court was justified in interfering with the decision of the Board to conduct a retest for those who had obtained minimum qualifying marks in the first written test. During the pendency of the proceedings before this Court, the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Board was directed to declare the result of the second test and to appoint the selected candidates subject to the result of the appeals. K.S.P. Radhakrishnan, speaking for a two-Judge Bench emphasised that three options were available to the Railway Recruitment Board : **(K. Shyam Kumar case [All India Railway Recruitment Board vs. K. Shyam Kumar, (2010) 6 SCC 614 : (2010) 2 SCC (L&S) 293]** , SCC p. 624, para 20)

> *"20. ... (1) to cancel the entire written test, and to conduct a fresh written test inviting applications afresh; (2) to conduct a retest for those candidates who had obtained minimum qualifying marks in the first written test; and (3) to go ahead with the first written test (as suggested by the High Court), confining the investigation to 62 candidates against whom there were serious allegations of impersonation."*

58. The Court held that the High Court had misdirected itself in directing the Board to accept the third option and had transgressed the limitations on the power of judicial review. The Court emphasised that the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

first alternative would have been time consuming and expensive. If the Board believed that the best option was to conduct a retest for candidates who had obtained minimum qualifying marks in the first written test, the decision of the Board was fair and reasonable. The decision of the High Court, it was held, would only perpetuate an illegality since there were serious allegations of the leakage of question papers, large scale impersonation of candidates and mass copying in the first test. Upholding the decision of the Railway Recruitment Board, the judgment of the High Court was set aside.

59. A more recent decision of a two-Judge Bench was in **State of T.N. vs. A Kalaimani [State of T.N. vs. A Kalaimani, (2021) 16 SCC 217 : 2019 SCC OnLine SC 1002] ("Kalaimani")**. The Teachers Recruitment Board in the State of Tamil Nadu had invited applications for selection to the posts of lecturers in Government Polytechnic Colleges. The written examination was of an objective type and candidates were required to fill up OMR sheets. There were allegations of large-scale malpractices in the written examination involving tampering of the OMR sheets. After re-

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

evaluation, discrepancies were found in the entries pertaining to 196 candidates who were beneficiaries of a fraudulent alteration of marks. A decision was taken to cancel the examination which was conducted for selection to the posts of lecturers as the Board was of the view that there were chances of more malpractices being unearthed at a later stage and there was a serious doubt about the purity of the process. The Division Bench of the High Court held **[A. Kalaimani vs. State of T.N., 2019 SCC OnLine Mad 4435]** that the fabrication of the records pertained only to 196 candidates and when a segregation was possible, the entire examination ought not to be cancelled.

60. In appeal, this Court adverted to the decision in **Inderpreet Singh Kahlon [Inderpreet Singh Kahlon vs. State of Punjab, (2006) 11 SCC 356 : (2007) 1 SCC (L&S) 444]** as well as the view which was taken in **Gohil Vishvaraj Hanubhai vs. State of Gujarat [Gohil Vishvaraj Hanubhai vs. State of Gujarat, (2017) 13 SCC 621 : (2018) 1 SCC (L&S) 80] ("Gohil")** where it was held : **(A Kalaimani case [State of T.N. vs. A Kalaimani, (2021) 16 SCC 217 : 2019 SCC OnLine SC 1002]** , SCC

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

para 15)

"15. ... '21. Purity of the examination process — whether such examination process pertains to assessment of the academic accomplishment or suitability of candidates for employment under the State — is an unquestionable requirement of the rationality of any examination process. Rationality is an indispensable aspect of public administration under our Constitution [Ramana Dayaram Shetty vs. International Airport Authority of India, (1979) 3 SCC 489] . The authority of the State to take appropriate measures to maintain the purity of any examination process is unquestionable. It is too well settled a principle of law in light of the various earlier decisions of this Court that where there are allegations of the occurrence of large-scale malpractices in the course of the conduct of any examination process, the State or its instrumentalities are entitled to cancel the examination [Per Chelameswar, J. : [Nidhi Kaim vs. State of M.P., (2016) 7 SCC 615 at para 23 : 7 SCEC 611 : (SCC pp. 639-40)]"23. Even otherwise, the argument of the appellants is

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

required to be rejected for the following reasons : under the scheme of our Constitution, the executive power of the State is coextensive with its legislative power. In the absence of any operative legislation, the executive power could certainly be exercised to protect the public interest. The right of each one of the appellants herein for admission to the medical colleges in the State of Madhya Pradesh is itself an emanation of the State's executive action. No doubt, even executive action of the State can create rights. Unless there is something either in the Constitution or law which prohibits the abrogation or abridgment of rights, it is permissible for the State to do so by executive action in accordance with some specified procedure of law. No doubt, that the overarching requirement of the Constitution is that every action of the State must be informed with reason and must be in public interest. Nothing has been brought to our notice which prohibits the impugned executive action. If it is established that the adoption of unfair means on large scale resulted in the contamination of the entrance

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

examination (PMT) process of successive years, the State undoubtedly would have the power to take appropriate action to protect the public interest. I, therefore, reject the submission of the appellants.”; In Union of India vs. Anand Kumar Pandey, (1994) 5 SCC 663 : 1994 SCC (L&S) 1235 large-scale cheating occurred in the Railway Recruitment Board Examination, specifically in two rooms of a centre. The Board took a decision to subject the successful candidates from that centre to a re-examination. This was set aside by the Central Administrative Tribunal on the ground that such a decision was taken in violation of the principles of natural justice. It was held that there cannot be any straitjacket formula for the application of the principles of natural justice. This Court did not find any fault with the decision to conduct a fresh examination.;In All India Railway Recruitment Board vs. K. Shyam Kumar, (2010) 6 SCC 614 : (2010) 2 SCC (L&S) 293, large-scale malpractices surfaced in the written test. The recruitment board ordered a retest, which was challenged in the Central Administrative

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Tribunal. The Tribunal held that a retest was valid. The High Court reversed invoking the Wednesbury's principles of reasonableness. This Court held that in the face of such large-scale allegations supported by reports of the Vigilance Department and CBI, the High Court was wrong in reversing the tribunal's decision.]] . This Court has on numerous occasions approved the action of the State or its instrumentalities to cancel examinations whenever such action is believed to be necessary on the basis of some reasonable material to indicate that the examination process is vitiated. They are also not obliged to seek proof of each and every fact which vitiated the examination process [Nidhi Kaim vs. State of M.P., (2016) 7 SCC 615 see paras 42.1 and 42.2 at p. 649 : 7 SCEC 611] .' (Gohil Vishvaraj Hanubhai case [Gohil Vishvaraj Hanubhai vs. State of Gujarat, (2017) 13 SCC 621 : (2018) 1 SCC (L&S) 80] , SCC pp. 628-29, para 21)

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

It was further held in the said judgment as follows : **(Gohil Vishvaraj Hanubhai case [Gohil Vishvaraj Hanubhai vs. State of Gujarat, (2017) 13 SCC 621 : (2018) 1 SCC (L&S) 80]** , SCC pp. 631-32, para 30)

> *"30. Identifying all the candidates who are guilty of malpractice either by criminal prosecution or even by an administrative enquiry is certainly a time-consuming process. If it were to be the requirement of law that such identification of the wrongdoers is a must and only the identified wrongdoers be eliminated from the selection process, and until such identification is completed the process cannot be carried on, it would not only result in a great inconvenience to the administration, but also result in a loss of time even to the innocent candidates. On the other hand, by virtue of the impugned action, the innocent candidates (for that matter all the candidates including the wrongdoers) still get an opportunity of participating in the fresh examination process to be conducted by the State.' "*

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

61. L. Nageswara Rao, J. held that the view of the Division Bench of the High Court was unsustainable and observed : **(A Kalaimani case [State of T.N. vs. A Kalaimani, (2021) 16 SCC 217 : 2019 SCC OnLine SC 1002]** , SCC para 14)

> *"14. In the instant case, the Board initially conducted an inquiry on its own regarding the allegations pertaining to manipulation of the OMR answer sheets. The Board found that a few people benefited due to the tampering of the OMR answer sheets. On a deeper scrutiny sufficient material was found against 196 persons who were beneficiaries of the fraud in the alteration of marks. The Board was convinced that there were chances of more people being involved in the manipulation of marks for which reason a decision was taken to cancel the entire examination. A bona fide decision taken by the Board to instill confidence in the public regarding the integrity of the selection process could not have been interfered with by the High Court. Sufficiency of the material on the basis of which a decision is taken by an authority is not within the purview of the High Court in exercising its power of judicial*

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

review. More material is being unearthed in the investigation and several people have been arrested. The investigation is in progress."

The Court noted that candidates who had a chance of being selected and appointed as lecturers in Government Polytechnic Colleges on the basis of the results of the written examination may be inconvenienced "but a serious doubt entertained by the Board about the magnitude of the manipulation of the examination has to be given due weightage". The judgment of the High Court was accordingly set aside.

62. The decisions in **Railway Recruitment Board [All India Railway Recruitment Board vs. K. Shyam Kumar, (2010) 6 SCC 614 : (2010) 2 SCC (L&S) 293] , Gohil [Gohil Vishvaraj Hanubhai vs. State of Gujarat, (2017) 13 SCC 621 : (2018) 1 SCC (L&S) 80]** and **Kalaimani [State of T.N. vs. A Kalaimani, (2021) 16 SCC 217 : 2019 SCC OnLine SC 1002]** all go to emphasise that a recruiting authority is entitled to take a bona fide view, based on the material before it, that the entire process stands vitiated as a result of which a fresh selection process should be initiated.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

The integrity of the selection process cannot be lightly disregarded by the High Court substituting its own subjective opinion on the sufficiency of the material which has been taken into account by the decision making authority. Undoubtedly, fairness to candidates who participate in the process is an important consideration. There may be situations where candidates who have indulged in irregularities can be identified and it is then possible for the authority to segregate the tainted from the untainted candidates. On the other hand, there may be situations where the nature of the irregularities may be manifold and the number of candidates involved is of such a magnitude that it is impossible to precisely delineate or segregate the tainted from the untainted. A considered decision of the authority based on the material before it taken bona fide should not lightly be interfered in the exercise of the powers of judicial review unless it stands vitiated on grounds of unreasonableness or proportionality.

FINDINGS:

I. Students Welfare:

63. Teaching is a noble profession. Constitutional Courts time

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

and again reiterated that, no compromise in selections for teaching posts. Imparting education is a skill. Youth of our Great Nation are backbone for development. Guiding or shaping youths are greater task. Men of ability skill in high standards, if appointed would thrive hard to achieve constitutional goals.

64. Tainted Lecturers if appointed the morale of education would collapse. The corrupt appointees lose their morale to mould the students. Thus, the importance of selection for teaching posts is of paramount.

65. Youth man power is dominant in our Great Nation. Potential usage of strength of youth would lead our country as Masters at Global level. Public money is spent to larger extent. Thus, extreme care and vigilant are required in the matter of selection and appointment of teachers in colleges. The tainted teachers cannot impart quality education.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

66. Imparting education in colleges cannot be compromised. Both parents and teachers are duty bound to create better citizen for leading our Great Nation.

II. Regarding the reports of the Administrator and the Director of Collegiate Education:

67. The Administrator undoubtedly conducted a roving enquiry regarding the selection process by scrutinizing all the original documents available in the Board. The Administrator has taken note of the UGC Regulations, Recruitment Notification, Application submitted by the candidates and the manner in which the selections were made by the Selection Committee. The Administrator ultimately found that the selection and appointments made in light of lack of educational qualifications, experience and other basic requirements are patently illegal, void ab initio and are liable to be cancelled on the ground that the candidates have failed to satisfy:

(1) The UGC prescribed qualifications viz lack of NET / SLET / SET with post Ph.D.2009.

(2) U.G. and P.G. through Correspondence Course.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

(3) U.G. and P.G. subjects with Cross Major.

(4) Allotment of marks without experience, less experience drastically changing the ranking in the selection.

(5) The terms of the Notifications and the conditions of appointments.

68. Near about 4,300 candidates have responded to the Notification made on All India basis and through Employment Exchanges directly and through On-line. About 2,000 candidates attended the Interview. However, the illegalities in the selection have denied hundreds of deserving candidates of their right of equality and proper selection and appointment. **The education of huge number of students coming from economically weaker sections for whose benefits the Public Trust was conceived by 'Vallal Late Pachaiyappa' have been compromised**. The illegal selection has betrayed the Tamil Nadu Government, UGC, Universities, Education Departments and the public confidence and the reputation to the name of Pachaiyappa's. Teaching is a noble profession moulding the future generation. The continuance of illegal appointees will misguide and set a bad precedent and blot on the fair and equal selection

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

and morale of the students and society for generations.

69. The above findings of the Administrator are serious and cannot be kept aside. Thus, the findings of the Hon'ble Mr. Justice P.Shanmugam, in the matter of selection are to be considered in the public interest. Public Law remedy would be apt in present circumstances. The Administrator found near about 152 candidates are tainted and a specific observation made is that *"Allotment of marks without experience, less experience drastically changing the rank in the selection"*. The findings infringed the rights of hundreds of meritorious candidates participated in the process of selection. Those, candidates were deprived of equal opportunity as enshrined under the Constitution of India. When the mandate of the Constitution is violated by the public authority at large, then segregating untainted becomes difficult. The larger impact, deeply rooted illegality and irregularity in awarding marks to the candidates, not only affect the untainted candidates, but goes to the root of the matter, affecting the entire selection process as a whole. When right of all the participated candidates are infringed, then segregation of untainted candidates would result in vain

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

and lead to miscarriage of justice.

70. How to fit in or take out the candidates in such circumstances, when the award of marks itself is found to be irregular and illegal. Therefore, the primacy of the report of the Administrator plays vital role in deciding the issues and to form an opinion, whether untainted candidates can be segregated.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

71. As far as the report of the Director of Collegiate Education is concerned, there is no factual controversy. The method adopted for preparing the repost is slightly different. However, it corroborates with the findings of the Administrator in the matter of award of experience marks in an irregular manner to large number of the selected candidates. Even as per the report of the Director of Collegiate Education, the total number of candidates for whom weightage marks awarded more than qualifying teaching experience are 91. The total number of candidates for whom weightage marks awarded without any qualifying teaching experience are 47 in number. Thus, even as per the report of the Director of Collegiate Education, many of the candidates were found unqualified in awarding marks for teaching experience. However, the Director of Collegiate Education has not segregated the candidates, who studied through Distance Mode of Education, Correspondence Courses. But the Administrator has segregated all these aspects in a clear manner.

72. The Director of Collegiate Education has approved the appointment of selected candidates. Naturally, he will be conscious that he

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

should not be trapped in the allegation of illegality and irregularity in the process of selection. Therefore, he has cautiously made an attempt only by verifying the marks awarded by the Selection Committee of the Pachiayappa's Trust Board and cautiously taken an effort to ensure that the Collegiate Education Department is not trapped into the allegation of illegalities and corrupt activities. Therefore, the Director of Collegiate Education technically prepared the columns for the verification of educational qualification and marks awarded for teaching experience. He has not spoken about any other aspects of the selection and this cannot be taken undue advantage by the selected candidates.

73. The arguments by the respondents' counsel for the appointed candidates that there are discrepancies between the two reports are incorrect and ultimately both the report jointly explicit the irregularities and illegalities, which has gone into the root of the selection process.

74. This Court put primacy on the findings of the Administrator, which is meticulous and contains the defects regarding the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

large scale irregularities and illegalities.

III. Locus Standi of the Petitioners:

75. The learned counsels for the selected candidates raised a ground that the petitioners have no locus standi to challenge the process of selection, since they have participated and became unsuccessful. It is contended that the petitioners, who have partaken in the selection process cannot later on challenge after became unsuccessful.

76. There are catena of judgments on this principle of estoppel. However, the underlying object of all the principles of estoppel is to prevent candidates from trying another shot on consideration, and to avoid an impasse, wherein every disgruntled candidates having failed the selection, challenges it in the hope of getting a second chance.

77. However, this Court is bound to differentiate from this principle insofar as the candidate by agreeing to participate in the selection process only to assess the prescribed procedure and not the illegality in it. In

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

a situation, where a candidate alleges misconstruction of statutory rules and discriminatory consequences arising there from, the same cannot be condoned merely because a candidate has partaken in it. The Constitutional Scheme is sacrosanct and its violation in any manner is impermissible. In fact, a candidate may not have locus to assail the incurable illegality or derogation of the provisions of the Constitution, unless he / she participates in the selection process.

78. Locus in the present case is immaterial, since the petitioners have partaken in the process of selection. After completion of selection process, they came to know that the selected candidates are tainted. Illegalities, irregularities and corrupt practices were found in large, affecting the entire process of selection and thus, chosen to approach the High Court. Thus, the ground of locus standi is misconceived and not available to the selected candidates, who all are said to be largely tainted with reference to the large scale irregularities in awarding marks for teaching experience and not giving preference / priority for the candidates, who studied both U.G. and P.G. on the same discipline and not following the roster properly. Thus,

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

the ground of locus standi is held against the selected candidates.

IV. Whether it is Possible to Segregate Tainted and Untainted?

79. The findings of the Administrator of the Board revealed an act of illegality, favouritism and the selection was conducted without proper interview and even as per the petitioners, the constitution of Selection Committee itself was irregular. Thus, they have raised a ground that entire selection was vitiated even in respect of the appointed candidates, who all are working few years.

80. In this context, in the case of **Union of India and Others vs. O.Chakradhar [(2002) 3 SCC 146]**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that **"The extent of illegalities and irregularities committed in conducting a selection have to be scrutinised in each case, so as to come to a conclusion about future course of action is to be adopted in the matter. If the mischief played is so widespread and all pervasive, affecting the result, so as to make it difficult to pick out the persons, who have been unlawfully benefited or wrongfully deprived of their**

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

selection, in such cases, it will neither be possible nor necessary to issue individual show cause notices to each selectee. The only way out would be to cancel the whole selection. Motive behind the irregularities committed also has its relevance.''

81. Even in the present case, illegality and irregularity are so intermixed with the whole process of the selection that it becomes impossible to sort out the right from the wrong or vice versa. The Result of such a selection cannot be relied or acted upon.

82. In the present case, the selected candidates pleaded that they were appointed and working for about 6 to 8 years and therefore, they should not be disturbed. The undue lenient view of the Courts on the basis of human considerations in regard to selection of candidate for public appointments by adopting illegal means on the apart of the authorities has served to create an impression that even where an advantage is secured by stratagem and trickery, it could be rationalised in Courts of Law. Courts do and should take human a sympathetic view of matters. That is the very

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

essence of justice. But considerations of Judicial Policy also dictate that a tendency of this kind, where undue advantage gained by illegal means is permitted to be retained will jeopardise the purity of selection process itself. Engender cynical disrespect towards the judicial process and in the last analyses embolden errant authorities and candidates into a sense of complacency and impunity that gains achieved by such wrong could be retained by an appeal to the sympathy of the Court. Such instances reduce the jurisdiction and discretion of Courts into private benevolence.

83. Thus, the entire selection is to be set aside, if the selection is conceived in fraud and delivered in deceit. Awarding of irregular marks, selection of less meritorious candidates in adopting a trickery method are also corrupt practices, the entire selection is liable to be set aside.

84. The plea that innocent candidates should not be disturbed for the misdeeds of others, is not applicable in such cases. In such circumstances, even the candidates, who have been selected need not be impleaded or told, since it is clear that they were also party to the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

manipulated selections. But for their active connivance, they would not have been selected, since it is found that there are large scale irregularities in assessing the candidates in the process of selection.

85. It is highly regrettable that the holders of public offices, both big and small, have forgotten that the offices entrusted to them are Sacred Trusts. Such offices are meant for use and not for abuse. From a Minister to a menial everyone has been dishonest to gain undue advantages. The whole process of selection turned out to be farcical exhibiting base character of those, who have been responsible for this sordid episode. It shocks conscience of the Court to come across such a systematic fraud.

86. On seeing the serious findings of the Administrator, who is a retired Judge of the High Court and after analysing the factual matrix, what are we to do? The only proper course open to this Court is to set aside the entire selection.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

87. The plea was made that innocent candidates should not be penalised for the misdeeds of tainted candidates. This Court is unable to accept this argument. When the entire selection is stinking, conceived in fraud and delivered in deceit, individual innocence has no place as "fraud unravels everything". The entire selection is arbitrary. It is that which is faulted and not the individual candidates.

V. Whether appointed candidate can be terminated after few years of service?

88. The classic case on the point is **Inderpreet Singh Kahlon vs. State of Punjab**. The allegation in the said case was that the Chairperson of the Punjab Public Service Commission (PPSC) has got a large number of persons appointed on the basis of extraneous considerations between 1998 and 2001. The State Government cancelled the entire selection for recruitment to the Public Service Commission.

89. In the said context, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India held that if the services of the appointees, who had put in few years of

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

service, were terminated, compliance with the three principles at the hands of the State was imperative viz:

(1) To establish satisfaction in regard to the sufficiency of the materials collected, so as to enable the State to arrive at its satisfaction that the selection process was tainted;

(2) To determine the question that the illegalities committed go to the root of the matter, which vitiate the entire selection process. Such satisfaction as also the sufficiency of materials were required to be gathered by reason of a thorough investigation in a fair and transparent manner;

(3) Whether the sufficient material present enabled the State to arrive at satisfaction that the officers in majority have been found to be part of the fraudulent purpose or the system itself was corrupt.

90. It is always desirable to segregate the tainted and untainted and accordingly, grant relief. Untainted candidates are normally not disturbed, but if the illegality, corrupt practices in the process of selection goes to the root of the matter and it is impossible to segregate the tainted and untainted, then setting aside the entire selection is inevitable and is the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

natural consequences. When the process of selection violates the basic Constitutional principles and the illegality infringes, the rights of large scale candidates participated in the selection process, then setting aside the selection is the only available course of action and segregation exercise would went in vain.

91. This Court in the case of **C.Aravindhan and Another vs. State of Tamil Nadu [2018 Lab IC 3579]**, considered the validity of the recruitment process conducted by the Teachers Recruitment Board for direct recruitment of Lecturers in Government Polytechnic Colleges. This Court following the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of **Inderpreet Singh Kahlon vs. State of Punjab**, cited supra, held that the illegality was largely found and it is impossible to segregate the tainted and untainted and accordingly, set aside the entire process of selection, which was upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of **State of Tamil Naadu Vs. A.Kalaimani [(2021) 16 SCC 217]**.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

92. In the present cases, as per the findings of the Administrator, more than 152 candidates are found unqualified and in respect of several other candidates, they have possessed UG and PG degrees in cross major and several candidates studied either UG or PG through Distance Mode of Education or through Correspondence Courses. As per the Director of Collegiate Education, the degree obtained through Correspondence Course and Distance Mode of Education through the regular pattern of 10+2+3 is valid and there is no impediment to consider such qualifications as valid for appointments. However, in the Recruitment Notification issued in the present cases by the Board, it is clearly stated that preference / priority will be given to the candidates, who have studied UG / PG in the same discipline and such preferences / priorities were not granted to the candidates, who acquired the educational qualifications of UG / PG in the same discipline, which caused discrimination in the matter of assessing the eligibility and suitability of the candidates in the process of selection. It affected the ranking of the candidates cumulatively and with reference to the marks awarded for teaching experience.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

93. The findings of the Administrator further states that hundreds of deserving candidates were deprived of their opportunity to secure employment. Equal opportunity has not been provided on account of large scale irregularities and illegalities. Though the monitory corruptions are not proved the nature of illegalities committed in award of marks by the Interviewing Committee would pave way to draw factual inference that there is a probability of serious corrupt activities.

94. Even as per the report of the Director of Collegiate Education, weightage marks are granted in an irregular manner and beyond the eligibility of the candidates and the Director of Collegiate Education found those candidates are unqualified, since they were awarded weightage marks for which they are not entitled as per the UGC Regulations and Recruitment Notifications.

95. Under these circumstances, the appointed candidates cannot claim any priority and as per the principles laid above, the litigious employment of those selected candidates would not protect their selection.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

All the appointed candidates are working during the pendency of the present writ petitions. Thus, these litigious employment always subject to the orders of the Court. Therefore, lenient view if taken would result in miscarriage of justice. Compromise on constitutional mandates is an assault to the Fundamental Rights ensured to the citizen. Courts are not empowered to show any misplaced sympathy, when the Fundamental Rights of the citizen are violated. If any leniency is shown to few candidates merely on the ground that they are continuing in service, the High Court would be failing in its duty to protect the constitutional principles, philosophy, ethos and mandates. Therefore, the appointed candidates cannot claim any advantage merely because they are continuing in service and such continuance is only a litigious continuance and would not protect their selection, which is otherwise found to be illegal and not in accordance with law.

96. The legal principles in relation to the appointment is that, appointment can never be claimed as a matter of legal right. The candidates, who appeared in the process of selection, cannot claim appointment as a right. All appointments to the public posts are to be made only under the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

constitutional schemes and by following the recruitment rules in force. Equal opportunity in public employment is a constitutional mandate. The State, being a model employer, must ensure such an equal opportunity by conducting the process of selection in a free, fair and reasonable manner. The concept of equal opportunity is to be ensured and the same can be done only by following the recruitment rules in force and by conducting the selection process in a transparent and fair manner. Thus, in the event of any malpractice, irregularity or illegality in the process of selection or if any prima facie materials are found establishing such irregularities, illegalities or malpractices, then the State should initiate appropriate action without any delay. In the event of the availability of prima facie factual materials in respect of such irregularity, malpractice or corrupt activities, then the apt course would be to cancel the entire selection. If tainted and non-tainted are unable to be segregated, then it is preferable to cancel the entire selection so as to ensure the correctness in the process of selection.

97. In the present cases, the petitioners have repeatedly approached the Competent Authorities of the State for conducting an

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

enquiry and to initiate action regarding the allegations of corrupt practices, illegalities and irregularities. Unfortunately, the State has failed to look into the issues. The petitioners have stated in their affidavit that they named the Minister for his involvement in corruption and even then, there is no action by the State. Thus, they approached the Court in the year 2014 itself. During the pendency of these writ petitions, the selected candidates were allowed to continue in service knowing the fact that the selection is under challenge.

98. In our country, there is misconception that illegalities can be buried by prolonging the litigation. Longevity in deciding the matters would not be a blockade for justice. Longevity or prolongation or pendency of the litigation, at no circumstances, would save a person from illegality or fraud. Thus, the misconception cannot be approved by showing misplaced sympathy by the Constitutional Courts. Therefore, the contentions in this regard are untenable and deserve no acceptance.

99. In the present cases, tainted and untainted are unable to be segregated. The irregularities and illegalities in the selection process are

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

deeply rooted and setting aside the entire process of selection is inevitable.

CONCLUSION:

100. Accordingly, the following orders are passed:

(1) The selection and appointment of the candidates made pursuant to the Pachaiyappa's Trust Board Notification Nos.03/2013 dated 12.12.2013, No.01/2014 dated 18.02.2014 and No.01/2015 dated 02.02.2015 are declared as null and void.

(2) The Management of the Pachaiyappa's Trust Board is directed to terminate the services of all the appointed candidates forthwith.

(3) The Management of the Pachaiyappa's Trust Board is directed to conduct a fresh selection by following the procedures as contemplated and conclude the same within a period of three (3) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

(4) As an interim measure, the Management of the Pachaiyappa's Trust Board shall allow the appointees to continue as Guest Lecturers for a period of three months or until the fresh selections are made on need basis.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

(5) The Government of Tamil Nadu and the Director of Collegiate Education, are directed to pay salary to the Guest Lecturers as per University Grants Commission (UGC) fixation, as applicable for Guest Lecturers.

(6) If the appointed candidates are not willing to continue as Guest Lecturers, Pachaiyappa's Trust Board is directed to engage any other Guest Lecturers from open market, so as to ensure that students studying in the colleges are not affected.

101. With the abovesaid directions, these Writ Petitions are allowed. However, there shall be no orders as to costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

17.11.2022

Index : Yes / No
Internet: Yes/No
Speaking order / Non-speaking order
Ssr/Jeni/Svn

194/196

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

To

1.The Secretary to Government
The State Of Tamil Nadu
Higher Education Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The Director Of Collegiate Education,
College Road, Chennai-600 006.

3.The Registrar
University Of Madras,
Chennai-600 005.

4.The Commissioner of Police
Chennai-600 008.

5.The Secretary,
Pachaiyappa's Trust Board,
Pachaiyappa's College Campus,
Chennai – 600 030.

6.The Registrar
Thiruvalluvar University,
Vellore, Vellore District.

7.The Principal
Pachaiyappa's College,
Chennai-600 030.

8.The Principal
Chellamal College for Women,
Guindy,
Chennai.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

Ssr/Jeni/Svn

9.The Principal
C.Kandaswamy Naidu College For Men
Anna Nagar,
Chennai-600 040

10.The Principal
Pachaiyappa's College for Men,
Kancheepuram,
Kancheepuram District.

11.The Principal
C.Kandaswamy Naidu College for Women,
Cuddalore,
Cuddalore District.

W.P.Nos.19939 of 2014
and 36827 of 2016

17.11.2022

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis