



WP No.509 of 2017

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED : 02-11-2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

WP No.509 of 2017

And

WMP No.23247 of 2021

- 1.A.Manivannan
- 2.D.Gnanasekaran
- 3.T.Selvam
- 4.D.M.Asokan
- 5.M.S.Saravanan
- 6.C.Raja
- 7.S.Mathiyazhagan
- 8.M.Perumal
- 9.R.Ragu
- 10.M.Mahendran
- 11.M.Devagi
- 12.G.Jyothi
- 13.G.Krishnaveni
- 14.A.Porkodi
- 15.G.Sudhandiram
- 16.G.Kuppusamy
- 17.K.Santha
- 18.G.Saraswathi
- 19.D.Muniammal
- 20.S.Navaneethakumar
- 21.P.Chitra



WP No.509 of 2017

- 22.C.Sekar
- 23.V.Azhagarasan
- 24.S.Sankaran
- 25.M.Gunaseelan
- 26.D.Narayanan
- 27.K.Subathra
- 28.M.Sumathi
- 29.G.Jayasudha
- 30.G.Shanmugam
- 31.M.Sekar
- 32.R.Jayanthi
- 33.J.Bhuvaneswari
- 34.R.Thirupathi
- 35.M.Karthigeyan
- 36.D.Ravivarman
- 37.K.Venkatachalam
- 38.B.Narayana Prasath
- 39.G.Maheswari
- 40.R.Gandhi
- 41.R.Ezhumalai
- 42.A.Prakasam
- 43.M.Surya
- 44.S.Shanthi
- 45.R.Padmini
- 46.G.Punitha
- 47.R.Kalaiselvi
- 48.D.Manjula
- 49.M.Arun
- 50.V.Sivasankar
- 51.S.Rajarajan
- 52.C.Kavitha
- 53.J.Jayarani
- 54.M.Ezhilmaran
- 55.S.Govindharaj
- 56.T.Lakshmi

..

Petitioners



WP No.509 of 2017

WEB COPY

VS.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by its Principal Secretary to Government,
Finance Department,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai – 600 009.
2. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by its Principal Secretary to Government,
School Education Department,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai – 600 009.
3. The Director of Elementary Education,
DPI Campus,
College Road,
Chennai – 600 006.
4. The Member Secretary,
Teachers Recruitment Board,
4th Floor, EVK Sampath Maligai,
DPI Campus,
College Road,
Chennai – 600 006.

..

Respondents

Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to pass orders for revision of scale of pay for the petitioners in the post of



WP No.509 of 2017

Secondary Grade Teacher in the pre-revised scale of pay of Rs.4500-125-7000 as stated in the call letter for Certificate Verification and order of selection with corresponding revised scale of pay as Rs.8370-20,200 + 2800 GP applying 1.86 method from the date of their initial appointment with all consequential and other attendant benefits including arrears of salary.

For Petitioners : Mr.G.Sankaran

For Respondents-1 to 3 : Ms.S.Mythreye Chandru,
Special Government Pleader.

For Respondent-4 : Mr.C.Kathiravan,
Special Government Pleader

(TRB).

ORDER

The writ on hand has been instituted by the petitioners to direct the respondents to pass orders for revision of scale of pay for the petitioners in the post of Secondary Grade Teacher in the pre-revised scale of pay of Rs.4500-125-7000 as stated in the call letter for Certificate Verification and order of selection with corresponding revised scale of pay as Rs.8370-20,200 + 2800 GP applying 1.86 method from the date of their initial appointment with all consequential and other attendant benefits including arrears of salary.



WP No.509 of 2017

2. The writ petitioners were selected and appointed to the post of Secondary Grade Teachers through Teacher Recruitment Board in the year 2009. The present writ petition is filed mainly on the ground that there is an anomaly in the matter of fixation of pay between the Secondary Grade Teachers who were appointed prior to 01.06.2009 and after 01.06.2009.

3. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the writ petitioners mainly contended that the Government issued G.O.Ms.No.234, Finance (Pay Cell) Department, dated 01.06.2009, implementing the recommendations of the Official Committee for revision of scale of pay and allowances, etc., i.e, under the Tamil Nadu Revised Scale of Pay Rules, 2009. As per the said Rules, the existing scale of pay of Rs.4500~125~7000 as on 01.01.2006 was revised as Rs.5200~20200+2800 Grade Pay. As per the Recruitment Notification, through which the petitioners were appointed after 01.06.2009, they were fixed with a scale of pay of Rs.4500~125~7000. The Junior Engineers/Agricultural Officers, etc., made a representation to rectify the pay anomaly. The One Man Commission appointed by the Government made certain recommendations and in implementation of the said recommendations,



WP No.509 of 2017

the Government issued G.O.Ms.No.340, dated 26.08.2010.

WEB COPY

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners made a submission that as per the Government Order, the benefit of revised scale of pay is extended in respect of the employees appointed on or after 01.06.2009 and therefore, the petitioners, who were appointed after 01.06.2009, are eligible for the revised scale of pay. In view of the said anomaly, representations were also made and the same was not considered by the respondents.

5. At the outset, it is contended that the Secondary Grade Teachers appointed before 01.06.2009 are getting basic pay of Rs.8,370/~ and a total pay of Rs.11,920/~ and the Secondary Grade Teachers appointed after 01.06.2009 are receiving total pay of Rs.8,750/~. In view of the said anomaly, the petitioners have made a representation to rectify the same, which was not considered.

6. The learned Special Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the respondents 1 to 3 and the learned Special Government Pleader



WP No.509 of 2017

appearing on behalf of the fourth respondent objected the contentions raised on behalf of the learned counsel for the petitioners, by stating that the cut-off date for fixation of pay cannot be questioned, as the cut-off date is necessary to be fixed, for the purpose of implementation of pay scales for various categories in the Government Services. If at all the cut-off date caused certain anomalies, the said anomalies are to be considered only by the Government and in the present case, there is no such anomaly raised, as the Government Order in G.O.Ms.No.340 is not applicable to the case of the writ petitioners.

7. In this context, the learned Special Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the respondents 1 to 3 and the learned Special Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the fourth respondent have reiterated that in G.O.Ms.No.340, dated 26.08.2010, orders were issued on the recommendation of the One Man Commission to the effect that to rectify the pay anomaly caused to the Junior Assistants recruited from among the Contract Assistants and Agricultural Officers by the Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission prior to 01.06.2009 and joined in Government Service



WP No.509 of 2017

prior to 01.06.2009 or subsequently due to administrative reasons, by allowing them the fitment benefit. The Government extended such relaxation in respect of the said Junior Assistants, since they have been selected in the month of May, 2009 itself and majority of them joined prior to 01.06.2009 and few of them joined in service subsequently. It has been mentioned in the said Government Order that such fitment benefit would not be applicable to the appointments made after 01.06.2009. Therefore, the petitioners cannot compare themselves with the seniors, who joined in service prior to 01.06.2009 in the pre-revised scale of pay.

8. The learned Special Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the respondents 1 to 3 and the learned Special Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the fourth respondent further contended that in G.O.Ms.No.340, it has been specifically mentioned that fitment benefit would not be applicable to the appointments made after 01.06.2009. The Pay Grievance Redressal Cell was also of the view that further extension of the benefit would not be appropriate as the issue can be taken back to the date on which vacancies arose. The Government is within its rights to review the



WP No.509 of 2017

requirement of staff and have them join on an appropriate date. Hence, the

Committee found no justification to recommend an across the board implementation of fitment benefit in such cases. If such benefit is extended based on representations, then there would be no end to this and the very purpose of prescribing a cut-off date for availing the benefit would be defeated.

9. The Hon-ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No.1532 of 2005, **S.C.Chandra and Others vs. State of Jharkhand and Others [(2007) 8 SCC 279]**, held that the fixation of pay is a delicate mechanism, which requires various considerations including financial capacity, responsibility, educational qualification, mode of appointment, etc. and it has a cascading effect. If there is complete and wholesale identity between the two groups, even the employees in the two groups are doing identical work, then they cannot be granted higher pay, if there is no complete and wholesale identity. It is further submitted that fixing the pay scales by the Courts by applying the principle of equal pay for equal work upsets the high constitutional principle of separation of powers between the three organs of



WP No.509 of 2017

the State.

WEB COPY

10. The learned Special Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the respondents 1 to 3 and the learned Special Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the fourth respondent made a further submission that fixation of pay and determination of parity is a complex matter, which is for the executive to discharge. Granting of pay parity by this Court may result in a cascading effect and reaction which can have adverse consequences in the routine administrative exercise of the executive. On the claim for relief on par with Central Government Teachers, it is for the petitioner herein to substantiate a clear cut basis of equivalent and a resultant hostile discrimination before becoming eligible to claim right on par with the post in which the writ petitioners have compared vis-a-vis an alleged discrimination. The petitioners have failed to place before this Court as to the nature of the duties of either categories and it is not possible to hold that the writ petitioners have been discriminated by the executive.

11. Further, fixation of pay is a concept, which requires for its



WP No.509 of 2017

applicability completely and wholesale identity between a group of employees claiming identical pay scales and the other group of employees, who have already earned such pay scales. The problem about equal pay cannot always be translated into a mathematical formula. Where the mode of recruitment, qualification and promotion are totally different in the category of Teachers in the State of Tamil Nadu and Central Government, there cannot be any application of the fixation of pay on part with State Government Teachers to Central Government Teachers.

12. Further, it is submitted that there are inherent difficulties on comparing and evaluating the work of different persons in different organizations. The person doing the same work may have different degrees of responsibilities, reliabilities and confidentialities and this would be sufficient for a valid differentiation. The judgment of the Administrative Authorities concerning the responsibilities, which is attached to the post and the degree of reliability expected of an incumbent, would be a valued judgment of the Authorities concerned which, if arrived at bonafide, reasonably and rationally was not open to interference by this Court.



WP No.509 of 2017

WEB COPY

13. The petitioners appointed on or after 01.06.2009 are directly appointed in the revised scales of pay. As such, employees, who have not drawn pay in the pre-revised scales of pay, are not eligible for fitment benefit by a multiplication factor of 1.86 and the petitioners have no right to claim such benefit when they have been allowed pay fixation based on the minimum of the pay scale plus Grade pay applicable to the post and this mode of fixation is uniformly applicable to all category employees appointed as new recruits on or after 01.06.2009. The magnitude of the financial implication, in the event of conceding the prayer of the respondent would be enormous to which the State cannot afford to at this juncture, as more than 9 years have lapsed since the implementation of the revised pay scales with effect from 01.01.2016.

14. In view of the facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that the relief as such sought for in the present writ petition cannot be granted.



WP No.509 of 2017

15. Further, the learned counsel for the petitioners made a submission that the petitioners are not insisting for grant of scale of pay on par with the Central Government Teachers. However, it is left open to the petitioners to approach the respondents, if any grievance exists regarding any such discrimination or otherwise.

16. With the abovesaid observations, the writ petition stands disposed of. However, there shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

02-11-2022

Index : Yes/No.
Internet : Yes/No.
Speaking Order/Non-Speaking Order.
Svn



WP No.509 of 2017

WEB COPY

- To
- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Finance Department,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai – 600 009.
 - 2.The Principal Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
School Education Department,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai – 600 009.
 - 3.The Director of Elementary Education,
DPI Campus,
College Road,
Chennai – 600 006.
 - 4.The Member Secretary,
Teachers Recruitment Board,
4th Floor, EVK Sampath Maligai,
DPI Campus,
College Road,
Chennai – 600 006.



WEB COPY



WP No.509 of 2017

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

Svn

WP 509 of 2017

02-11-2022