



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

RESERVED ON : 01.11.2021

PRONOUNCED ON : 17.02.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.SARAVANAN

W.P.NO.23573 OF 2021

(Through Video Conferencing)

S.Saravanan

... Petitioner

vs

1. State of Tamil Nadu, rep.by its
Additional Chief Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu
Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai 600 009.
2. The Director of Town Panchayats,
Urban Administration Department Buildings,
No.75, Santhome High Road,
M.R.C.Nagar, Chennai 600 028.
3. The Assistant Director of Town Panchayats,
Cuddalore.
4. The Executive Officer,
Ulundurpet Town Panchayat,
Ulundurpet, Kallakuruchi.

... Respondents

Prayer: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Certiorari Mandamus, calling for the records in pursuant to the impugned order passed by the 4th respondent in proceedings Na.Ka.No.932/2006/A1 dated 09.07.2021 and quash the same and to consequently direct the respondents to regularize the petitioner's service on completion of 480 days of continuous service in 24 calendar months commencing from the date of the initial appointment i.e., 01.01.1992 as per the order passed by the Inspector of labour dated 06.06.1997 and in the light of the order of this Court in W.P.No.40499 of 2002 dated 18.09.2007 with all consequential service and monetary benefits including pensionary benefits under the Tamil nadu Pension Rules.



WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr.Prem Narayan for
for Mr.K.Rathinavel

For Respondents : Mr.L.S.M.Hasan Fizal
Government Advocate.

O R D E R

This writ petition has been filed for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records in pursuant to the impugned order passed by the 4th respondent in its Na.ka.No.932/2006/A1 dated 09.07.2021 and quash the same and to consequently direct the respondents to regularize the petitioner's service on completion of 480 days of continuous service in 24 calendar months commencing from the date of the initial appointment i.e., 01.01.1992 as per the order passed by the Inspector of Labour dated 06.06.1997 and in light of the order of this Court in W.P.No.40499 of 2002 dated 18.09.2007 with all consequential service and monetary benefits including pensionary benefits under the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules.

2. By the impugned order, the 4th respondent has rejected the request of the petitioner for granting pension under the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules, 1978, on the ground that the petitioner was appointed only on 12.09.2008 pursuant to the order dated 16.12.2020 of this Court in W.P.No. 20156 to 20164 of 2014 and in the light of the decision of the Full Bench of this Court in W.A.No.158 of 2016 and etc., batch vide order dated 03.12.2019.

3. The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner was appointed as a Sweeper on 01.01.1992 with the 4th respondent on daily wage basis as Nominal Muster Roll (NMR).

4. It is the further case of the petitioner that apprehending threat of removal from service of the petitioner and six others, they had filed I.D.No.1040 of 1996 before the Inspector of Labour, Villupuram District for making the petitioner as permanent employees under the provision of the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status) Act, 1981 and the said petition was allowed by holding that the petitioner and six others were entitled for Permanent Status on completion of 480 days of service in two calendar years with all attendant and consequential benefits.

5. After the 4th respondent invited names from the District Employment Exchange for appointment to the post of Pump Operator, the petitioner also participated in the interview held on 25.05.1998 and that the petitioner along with 12 others were



WEB COPY

appointed as the Pump Operators with the 4th respondent Town Panchayat on basic pay of Rs.2,610/-. However, after appointing the petitioner on 25.05.1998, an order of cancellation of appointment order of the petitioner was passed on 22.10.1998.

6. It is the further case of the petitioner that petitioner and 12 others exhalded before the 4th Respondent. The Revenue Divisional Officer of Thirukovilur and the Tahsildar, Ulundurpet, the Executive Officer, Town Panchayat met the members of their service Union. The Peace Committee was constituted consisting of R.D.O., Tahsildar, Executive Officer and representative of the N.M.R. Pursuant to which, the Committee resolved on 24.10.1998 that the 4th respondent Town Panchayat should issue an individual order on 24.10.1998 permitting the petitioner and 12 others to work as N.M.R. and they should receive their respective wages as they received prior to regular appointment.

7. Under these circumstances, G.O.Ms.No.199 MAWS Dept dated 12.08.1997 and G.O.Ms.No.84 MAWS Dept dated 21.05.1998 were issued and the petitioner approached the 4th respondent to regularize his service in terms of the aforesaid G.O. Since the 4th respondent had failed to regularise the service of the petitioner, the petitioner filed a claim petition under Section 33(C) (2) of Industrial Dispute Act,1946 before the Labour Court, Cuddalore claiming back wages as ordered by the Inspector of Labour. The said claim petition was allowed on 08.06.1997.

8. Almost after a lapse of five years, the Executive Officer of the 4th respondent Town Panchayat filed writ petitions in W.P.Nos.40494, 40495, 40956 & 40499 of 2002 and W.P.Nos.40497, 40498 & 40500 of 2002. By two separate orders dated 18.09.2007 and 24.09.2007, the writ petitions filed by the Executive Officer of the 4th respondent Town Panchayat were disposed. Relevant portion of the respective orders read as under:-

W.P.Nos.40494, 40495, 40956 & 40499 of 2002

''4. Today, the petitioner and the first respondent/workmen in all these writ petitions are present before the Court and they have filed a joint memo of compromise signed by them, under which, the petitioner has accepted the appointment of the first respondent/workmen as permanent employees of the Ulundurpet Town Panchayat, without any back wages, as the first respondents/workmen have given up their claim for back wages.



WEB COPY

5. In view of the same, the memo of compromise is recorded and the writ petitions are disposed of in terms of the memo of compromise. The petitioner is directed to complete the process of appointment of the first respondents/workmen as permanent employees of the Ulundurpet Town Panchayat, after fulfilling the statutory requirements, and pass necessary orders, as expeditiously as possible, within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Needless to state that the first respondents/workmen, on conferment of permanent status, shall be entitled to all other benefits, excepting back wages, which have been given up by the first respondents/workmen themselves in all these writ petitions. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. No costs.'

W.P.Nos.40497, 40498 & 40500 of 2002

''4. Today, the petitioner and the first respondent/workmen in all these writ petitions are present before the Court and they have filed a joint memo of compromise signed by them, under which, the petitioner has accepted the appointment of the first respondent/workmen as permanent employees of the Ulundurpet Town Panchayat, without any back wages, as the first respondents/workmen have given up their claim for back wages.

5. Earlier, in W.P.Nos.40494, 40495, 40496 & 40499 of 2002, dated 18.09.2007, recording the memo of compromise, this Court disposed of those writ petitions.

6. In view of the same, the memo of compromise is recorded and the writ petitions are disposed of in terms of the memo of compromise. The petitioner is directed to complete the process of appointment of the first respondents/workmen as permanent employees of the Ulundurpet Town Panchayat, after fulfilling the statutory requirements, and pass necessary orders, as expeditiously as possible, within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Needless to state that the first respondents/workmen, on conferment of permanent status, shall be entitled to all other benefits, excepting back wages, which have been given up by the first respondents/workmen themselves in all these writ petitions. Consequently, connected miscellaneous



petitions are closed. No costs.'

9. Pursuant to the above, the petitioner was brought on regular time scale of pay with effect from 2008.

WEB COPY

10. This petitioner was subsequently appointed on 12.09.2008, by which time, the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules 1978 stood amended in terms of G.O.Ms.No.259, Finance (Pension) Department dated 06.08.2003 vide S.R.O. B-82/2003 with effect from 1st of April, 2003. Under these circumstances, the petitioner has sent representations asking the respondents to grant Government Pension under the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules, 1978 as it stood prior to being amended vide G.O.Ms.No.259, Finance (Pension) Department dated 06.08.2003.

11. The respondents have passed the impugned order by referring to the decision of the Full Bench of this Court in W.A.No.158 of 2019 and batch vide order dated 13.12.2019, wherein, the Full Bench of this Court has answered the reference as follows:-

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

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

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

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

(iv) Those government servants who were appointed in the aforesaid four categories before the cut off date and later appointed under Rule 10 (a) (i) of Tamil Nadu State and Subordinate Service Rules before 01.04.2003 and absorbed into regular service after



01.04.2003 will not be entitled to count half of their past service for the purpose of determination of qualifying service for pension.

WEB COPY

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

12. Appearing on behalf of the petitioner, the learned counsel submits that the petitioner was entitled for a permanent status in the 4th respondent Town Panchayat in terms of the order of the Inspector of Labour dated 06.06.1997 and therefore entitled to not only to the Government Pension under the provision of the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules 1978 but also to reckon the same for determining the qualifying service under Rule 11 of the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules 1978.

13. It is further submitted that the 4th respondent represented by its Executive Officer though had filed writ petitions, those writ petitions were disposed in terms of the Memo of Compromise, wherein, the rights that were given up by the petitioner was confined to claim back wages and therefore the stand of the Department that the petitioner was not entitled to pension in terms of the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules 1978 cannot be countenanced.

14. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that at best, the petitioner is not entitled for back wages alone. It is also submitted that the petitioner is however entitled to include the service rendered by him in the temporary capacity from the date of their employment and expiry of 480 days in terms of the provision of the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status) Act, 1981.

15. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the decision of the Full Bench of this Court would not come in the way of grant of pension to the petitioner as the Court dealt with a different issue altogether in a reference to the Full Bench.

16. It is also submitted that the 4th respondent cannot take advantage of their own mistake in not complying with the order dated 06.06.1997 of the Inspector of Labour. It is further submitted that it is not open for the respondents to state that the petitioner was not to be considered as "permanent employee" of the 4th respondent at this distinct point of time especially



after having extracted the work from the petitioner from the year 1992.

17. Appearing on behalf of the respondents, the learned Government Advocate submits that the issue is squarely covered against the petitioner in terms of the decision of the Full Bench rendered in W.A.No.158 of 2019 referred to supra. The learned Government Advocate further submits that the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status) Act, 1981 does not apply to the Local Body inasmuch as they are not "industrial establishments" within the meaning of the aforesaid Act. It is further submitted that the appointments in the 4th respondent Town Panchayat has to be in accordance with the provisions of G.O.Ms.No.199, Municipal Administration & Water Supply (TP-3) Department, dated 12.08.1997 and in terms of G.O.Ms.No.205, Rural Development Department, dated 23.03.1989.

18. It is also submitted that the right to claim pension under the unamended Tamil Nadu Pension Rules, 1978 will not apply to the petitioner inasmuch as the proviso to Rule 2 of the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules, 1978 clearly states that the Rule shall not apply to the Government servants appointed on or after 1st of April, 2003 in the Government service. It is submitted that it cannot be said a service in connection with the affairs of the State which were borne on pensionable establishment, whether on temporary or permanent.

19. It is also submitted that the appointment of the petitioner is only in the year 2008 i.e., with effect from 12.09.2008 and therefore the petitioner is not entitled to the benefit of Government Pension. It is further submitted that the prior to the above said date, the petitioner only come within the exception provided in Rule 2 of the Pension Rules 1978. Therefore, on this count also, the petitioner is not entitled for the relief. It is therefore submitted that the impugned order cannot be interfered based on the submissions and averments in the affidavit of the petitioner. Finally, the learned Government Advocate for the respondents submits that a reading of Rule 11 of the Pension Rules makes it clear that the petitioner is not entitled to include the period of service rendered in temporary capacity on daily wage basis and therefore, this writ petition is liable to be dismissed.

20. The learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents has drawn my attention to G.O.Ms.No.199, Municipal Administration & Water Supply (TP-3), dated 12.08.1997, wherein, a general norms was fixed for new recruitment. He also referred to G.O.Ms.No.205. Rural Development Department, dated



23.03.1989, wherein, it was specified that the recruitment was to be made only by the following due recruitment process.

21. By way of rejoinder, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is entitled to the notional fixation of the pay with effect from the expiry of 480 days from their initial date of appointment in terms of the provision of the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status) Act, 1981.

22. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents.

23. The facts are not in dispute. In this case, the petitioner has been in continuous service of the 4th respondent as sweeper from 1992. The respondents ought to have regularized the service of the petitioner in terms of the order dated 06.06.1997 of the Inspector of Labour. The 4th respondent also took about 5 years to file Writ Petitions in W.P.Nos.40494, 40495, 40956 & 40499 of 2002 and W.P.Nos.40497, 40498 & 40500 of 2002 before this Court against said order dated 08.06.1997 of the Labour Inspector. The said Writ Petitions were disposed by orders dated 18.09.2007 & 24.09.2007 respectively based on a Compromise Memo. The relevant portion of the said orders has already been extracted in Paragraph 5 of this order.

24. Paragraph 4 of the said orders which has been extracted above clearly states that the 4th respondent had accepted the appointment of the petitioner as permanent employee, without any back wages, as the petitioner has given up his claim for back wages. The last paragraph (i.e. paragraph 5 of the order dated 18.09.2007 and paragraph 6 of the order dated 24.09.2007) of the said orders clearly also states that the petitioner was entitled to all other benefits excepting backwages.

25. It would be apt to refer the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sheo Narain Nagar Vs. State of U.P., (2018) 13 SCC 432, wherein, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has emphasized the plight of the workers from the marginalized section of the Society / Communities. Relevant portion from the said decision is re-produced below:-

"7. When we consider the prevailing scenario, it is painful to note that the decision in Umadevi (3) [State of Karnataka v. Umadevi (3), (2006) 4 SCC 1 : 2006 SCC (L&S) 753] has not been properly understood and rather wrongly applied by various State Governments. We have called for the data in the instant case to ensure as to how many employees were working on contract basis or ad



WEB COPY

hoc basis or daily-wage basis in different State departments. We can take judicial notice that widely aforesaid practice is being continued. Though this Court has emphasised that incumbents should be appointed on regular basis as per rules but new devise of making appointment on contract basis has been adopted, employment is offered on daily-wage basis, etc. in exploitative forms. This situation was not envisaged by Umadevi (3) [State of Karnataka v. Umadevi (3), (2006) 4 SCC 1 : 2006 SCC (L&S) 753] . The prime intendment of the decision was that the employment process should be by fair means and not by back door entry and in the available pay scale. That spirit of the Umadevi (3) [State of Karnataka v. Umadevi (3), (2006) 4 SCC 1 : 2006 SCC (L&S) 753] has been ignored and conveniently overlooked by various State Governments/authorities. We regretfully make the observation that Umadevi (3) [State of Karnataka v. Umadevi (3), (2006) 4 SCC 1 : 2006 SCC (L&S) 753] has not been implemented in its true spirit and has not been followed in its pith and substance. It is being used only as a tool for not regularising the services of incumbents. They are being continued in service without payment of due salary for which they are entitled on the basis of Articles 14, 16 read with Article 34(1)(d) of the Constitution of India as if they have no constitutional protection as envisaged in D.S. Nakara v. Union of India [D.S. Nakara v. Union of India, (1983) 1 SCC 305 : 1983 SCC (L&S) 145 : AIR 1983 SC 130] , from cradle to grave. In heydays of life they are serving on exploitative terms with no guarantee of livelihood to be continued and in old age they are going to be destituted, there being no provision for pension, retiral benefits, etc. There is clear contravention of constitutional provisions and aspiration of downtrodden class. They do have equal rights and to make them equals they require protection and cannot be dealt with arbitrarily. The kind of treatment meted out is not only bad but equally unconstitutional and is denial of rights. We have to strike a balance to really implement the ideology of Umadevi (3) [State of Karnataka v. Umadevi (3), (2006) 4 SCC 1 : 2006 SCC (L&S) 753] . Thus, the time has come to stop the situation where Umadevi (3) [State of Karnataka v. Umadevi (3), (2006) 4 SCC 1 : 2006 SCC (L&S) 753] can be permitted to be flouted, whereas, this Court has interdicted such employment way back in the year 2006. The employment cannot be on exploitative terms, whereas Umadevi (3) [State of Karnataka



WEB COPY

v.Umadevi (3), (2006) 4 SCC 1 : 2006 SCC (L&S) 753] laid down that there should not be back door entry and every post should be filled by regular employment, but a new device has been adopted for making appointment on payment of paltry system on contract/ad hoc basis or otherwise. This kind of action is not permissible when we consider the pith and substance of true spirit in Umadevi (3) [State of Karnataka v.Umadevi (3), (2006) 4 SCC 1 : 2006 SCC (L&S) 753].

8. Coming to the facts of the instant case, there was a direction issued way back in the year 1999, to consider the regularisation of the appellants. However, regularisation was not done. The respondents chose to give minimum of the pay scale, which was available to the regular employees, way back in the year 2000 and by passing an order, the appellants were also conferred temporary status in the year 2006, with retrospective effect on 2-10-2002. As the respondents have themselves chosen to confer a temporary status to the employees, as such there was requirement at work and posts were also available at the particular point of time when order was passed. Thus, the submission raised by the learned counsel for the respondent that posts were not available, is belied by their own action. Obviously, the order was passed considering the long period of services rendered by the appellants, which were taken on exploitative terms".

26. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the above case has also clearly observed that the earlier decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in State of Karnataka Vs. Umadevi (3), (2006) 4 SCC 1 was being wrongly incorporated to deny the benefits to the persons like petitioner. Therefore, the respondents ought to have regularized the services of the petitioner in terms of the decision of the Inspector of Labour.

27. Having forced the petitioner to enter into the compromise and thereby bind him to an order of this Court, the respondents cannot take undue advantage in the delay on their part regularizing the services of the petitioner with effect from the date specified in the order of the Inspector of Labour and that petitioner is given their back wages alone. If the services of the petitioner was regularized then and there in terms of the decision of the Inspector of Police as modified by an order dated 18.09.2007 & 24.09.2007, the appointment of the petitioner would date back to end of 480th day. It is no longer open for the respondents to state that the 4th respondent is outside the purview of the provisions of the Tamil Nadu



Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status) Act, 1981.

28. That being the case, the petitioner is entitled to the Government Pension under the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules, 1978 which makes it clear that a Government Servant appointed to the service and post in connection with the affairs of the State which are borne on pensionable establishments, whether temporary or permanent.

29. Though the petitioner's regularization was subsequent to the amendment of the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules, 1978 vide G.O.Ms.No.259, Finance (Pension) Department, dated 06.08.2003, it is to be noticed that even after the petitioner was appointed on temporary or permanent basis, there cannot be any denial of pension, merely because the respondents regularized the service of the petitioner on 12.09.2008 pursuant to the orders dated 18.09.2007 and 24.09.2007 of this Court in W.P.Nos.40494, 40495, 40956 & 40499 of 2002 and W.P.Nos.40497, 40498 & 40500 of 2002 filed by the 4th respondent.

30. Even otherwise, paragraph 45(ii) from the order dated 03.12.2019 of the Full Bench of this Court in The Government of Tamil Nadu, rep. by Secretary to Government, Public Works Department Vs. R.Kaliyamoorthy and etc. in W.A.No.158 of 2016 etc., batch, makes it clear that the case of the petitioner would be covered by the provisions of the aforesaid Rules which are reiterated for the sake of clarity:-

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

- i. Those who are freshly appointed on or after 01.04.2003 are not entitled to pension in view of proviso to Rule 2 of Tamil Nadu Pension Rules, 1978 inserted by G.O.Ms.No.259 dated 06.08.2003.
- ii. Those government servants/employees appointed prior to 01.04.2003 whether on temporary or permanent basis in terms of Rule 10 (a) (i) of Tamil Nadu State and Subordinate Service Rules will be entitled to get pension as per the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules, 1978.
- iii. In case, a government employee/servant had also rendered service in non-provincialised service, or on consolidated pay or on honorarium or daily wage basis and if such services were regularised before 01.04.2003, half of such service rendered



WEB COPY

shall be counted for the purpose of conferment of pensionary benefits.

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

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

31. In Sheo Narain Nagar case referred to supra, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has clearly underlined the malaise in exploitative tendency to appoint the citizens on daily wage basis without making them permanent employees of State Service. Following passages only need to be reminded to the State from Paragraph 7 of the above Judgment which has already been extracted above:-

i. We can take judicial notice that widely aforesaid practice is being continued. Though this Court has emphasised that incumbents should be appointed on regular basis as per rules but new device of making appointment on contract basis has been adopted, employment is offered on daily-wage basis, etc. in exploitative forms

ii. There is clear contravention of constitutional provisions and aspiration of downtrodden class. They do have equal rights and to make them equals they require protection and cannot be dealt with arbitrarily. The kind of treatment meted out is not only bad but equally unconstitutional and is denial of rights.

iii. The employment cannot be on exploitative terms, whereas Umadevi (3) [State of Karnataka v. Umadevi (3), (2006) 4 SCC 1 : 2006 SCC (L&S) 753] laid down that there should not be back door entry and every post should be filled by regular employment, but a new device has been adopted for making



WEB COPY

appointment on payment of paltry system on contract/ad hoc basis or otherwise. This kind of action is not permissible when we consider the pith and substance of true spirit in Umadevi (3) [State of Karnataka v. Umadevi (3), (2006) 4 SCC 1 : 2006 SCC (L&S) 753] .

32. It was bounden duty of the respondents State to have regularised the services of such employees as a Welfare State. Only the State can protect the interest of its citizen who have the misfortune of either not getting proper education or getting suitably employed with a decent salary. The State ought to have played a more proactive role in protecting their right by regularising their services.

33. The benefit of pension to the Sweepers who have given their youth and essence of life cannot be denied as the pension of the Government is to benefit of old, feeble and frail to support themselves in the evening of their life. To deny pension is to deny dignity and honour which are part of life and liberty given to them and recognised under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. The action of the respondents is not only arbitrary but also borders with unfair labour practice which needs judicial intervention. This is a fit case for exercising the discretion under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Therefore, the impugned order dated 09.07.2021 of the 4th stands quashed.

34. The respondents are directed to fix the pay of the petitioner with effect from 01.01.1994 notionally as per the order passed by the Inspector of Labour and in the light of the order of this Court in W.P.No.40499 of 2002 dated 18.09.2007 with all consequential service and monetary benefits including pensionary benefits under the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules, 1978.

35. Therefore, this Writ Petition stands allowed with the above observations. No cost. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS-IX)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

kkd



To:

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu
Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai 600 009.

WEB COPY

2. The Director of Town Panchayats,
Urban Administration Department Buildings,
No.75, Santhome High Road,
M.R.C.Nagar, Chennai 600 028.
3. The Assistant Director of Town Panchayats,
Cuddalore.
4. The Executive Officer,
Ulundurpet Town Panchayat,
Ulundurpet, Kallakuruchi.

W.P.No.23573 of 2021

JP-II (CO)
RLP(11/03/2022)