

CWP-14160-2016 and connected petitions

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

Date of decision:08.02.2023

1. CWP-14160-2016

Kuldeep Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

AND

2. CWP-15327-2016

Baljeet Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. S.K.Nehra, Advocate for
the petitioners in both the petitions.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Both these writ petitions can be conveniently disposed of by a common judgment since they raise the same issue as to the promotions of the petitioners on the post of Elementary School Head Masters (ESHMs) w.e.f. 19.01.2013 i.e. the day juniors to the petitioners were promoted on the aforesaid post.

CWP-14160-2016 and connected petitions

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioners were appointed on the post of Drawing Teachers; that at the time of their joining, services of the petitioners were governed by the rules known as 'Haryana State Education School Cadre (Group-C) Service Rules, 1998 and that in pursuance of the aforesaid rules, the appointing authority to the posts in case of Sanskrit Teacher, Hindi Teacher, Punjabi Teacher, Physical Training Instructions, Art and Craft Teacher (Drawing Teacher), Tailoring Teacher and Tabla Player, was the District Education Officer of the concerned district.

Learned counsel for the petitioners further contends that thereafter, the Government notified the rules called as 'The Haryana School Education (Group-C) State Cadre, Service Rules, 2012 (hereinafter referred to as 'Service Rules, 2012); that under Rule 9(5) of the Service Rules, 2012, the Classical and Vernacular (C & V) Cadre consisting of the posts of Sanskrit Teachers, Hindi Teachers, Punjabi Teachers, Physical Training Instructors, Art and Craft Teacher (Drawing Teacher), Tailoring Teachers and Tabla Players, had been converted to Trained Graduate Teachers (TGTs) in the relevant subjects and no further recruitment shall be made to these categories when the present incumbent on the notification of these rules vacate the post on his promotion, retirement or any other purpose.

Learned counsel for the petitioners further contends that as per the Service Rules, 2012, the promotion avenue for a TGT is on the post of ESHM and 85% posts of ESHM are to be filled amongst the TGTs, but the claim of the petitioners for promotion on the post of ESHM was not considered by the authorities whereas such C & V Hindi Teachers, who

CWP-14160-2016 and connected petitions

were appointed on regular basis upto 25.11.2004, had been promoted, vide order dated 09.04.2013.

Learned counsel for the petitioners further contends that some employees, namely, Sandeep Singh, Tarun Yadav and Rakesh Kumar, who are juniors to the petitioners, approached this Court by way of CWP-10325-2013 with a prayer that they be promoted to the posts of ESHMs from the day their juniors had been promoted, and that the said writ petition, vide order dated 20.05.2014 passed by a Coordinate Bench, had been allowed. Learned counsel prays that since the above named juniors to the petitioners have already been promoted in view of the aforesaid judgment dated 20.05.2014 passed in CWP-10325-2013, the petitioners may also be promoted to the posts of ESHM.

On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that the judgment passed by a Division Bench in State of Haryana Vs. Sandeep Singh and others, LPA No.1992 of 2014, decided on 03.12.2014, affirming the judgment dated 20.05.2014 passed in CWP-10325-2013 relied by the petitioners, has already been set aside by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in 'State of Haryana and another Vs. Sandeep Singh and others', 2019(6) SCC 453. Learned State counsel, hence, submits that the petitioners' case is now squared covered against them, by the aforesaid judgment.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

A perusal of the record would show that some employees had filed CWP-10325-2013. The Coordinate Bench had interpreted the provisions of Rules to hold that once Classical and Vernacular (C & V) Teachers have been designated as TGT, then the Classical and Vernacular

CWP-14160-2016 and connected petitions

(C & V) Teachers are Masters for all intents and purposes and hence, entitled to be considered for the promotion as ESHMs. The judgment passed by the learned Single Judge was upheld by the Division Bench. However, the State of Haryana filed an appeal before the Hon'ble Supreme Court which as noticed above, was accepted resulting in reversal of the judgments passed by the learned Single Judge as well as the Division Bench.

Truly speaking, the contentions urged before this Court are no longer *res integra*, having been decided by the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in State of Haryana and another (supra).

The Hon'ble Supreme Court while discussing the Scheme of the Rules, held as under:

“15. We find that the High Court has taken a simplistic view on the bare reading of Rule 9 (5) of 2012 Rules to hold that with the commencement of 2012 Rules, the C&V Teachers become part of TGT Cadre and as part of the TGT Cadre, they become entitled for promotion to the post of Elementary School Headmaster from the day their juniors were promoted to such post.

16. The appointment of the writ petitioners as C&V Teacher is prior to the commencement of 2012 Rules. The 1998 Rules contemplate direct recruitment to the post of Master and to various other disciplines, commonly called as C&V Teachers. In fact, the post of Master is a promotion post for C&V Teachers in terms of Rule 9 of the 1998 Rules. The qualification for the post of Art Master by way of direct recruitment and promotion is Graduate or Matric/10+2 with 5 years Degree/Diploma. However, for promotion the additional qualification is 3 years' experience on the post of JBT and C&V Teachers.

CWP-14160-2016 and connected petitions

17. *The post of TGT is contemplated to be filled up by direct recruitment and by promotion from amongst primary teachers/C&V Teachers. Column 3 of the Appendix B of 2012 Rules prescribes the academic qualifications and experience for direct recruitment on contract basis whereas, Column 4 prescribes academic qualifications and experience for appointment other than by direct recruitment on contract basis. The qualifications for filling up the post of TGT by way of promotion are B.F.A/B.A and 2-year Diploma in Elementary Education; or B.F.A/B.A with at least 50% marks and 1-year Bachelor in Education (B.Ed.); or B.F.A/B.A with at least 45% marks and 1-year Bachelor in Education (B.Ed.); in accordance with the NCTE (Recognition Norms and Procedure) Regulations issued from time to time in this regard; or Senior Secondary (or its equivalent) with at least 50% marks and 4 year B.A. Ed. Etc. and 3 years' experience as Primary Teacher (PRT)/ Classical & Vernacular (C&V) Teacher. Thus, the post of TGT is a promotion post for C&V Teachers as well.*

18. *Therefore, the reading of the entire 2012 Rules shows that the Masters appointed under 1998 Rules alone were holding equivalent post to that of the members of the cadre of TGT. It is such category alone who are entitled to be promoted to the post of Elementary School Headmaster in terms of the qualifications prescribed in Appendix B particularly in view of Rule 2(h) and Rule 7 of the 2012 Rules. TGT means a Trained Graduate Teacher in the relevant subject appointed after notification of the 2012 Rules and include the Masters appointed before the notification of these Rules. Therefore, the Masters appointed in terms of 1998 Rules are only the Trained Graduate Teachers in terms of 2012 Rules. The post of Master under the 1998 Rules or the Post of TGT under the 2012 Rules is in fact promotion post for the C&V Teachers.*

CWP-14160-2016 and connected petitions

19. *The entire argument of the appellants is based upon the expression used that C&V Teachers governed by 1998 Rules shall be “converted to TGT in relevant subject”. The question is whether such C&V Teachers stand upgraded to the post of TGT though, their promotion channel under 1998 Rules was to the post of Master which alone has been treated as TGT as defined in Rule 2(h) of the 2012 Rules and in view of express language of Rule 7 which mandates that the appointment shall be made to the post of TGT only in accordance with the qualifications prescribed in 2012 Rules.*

20. *The reading of the Rules would show that C&V Teachers are treated to be TGT so as to avoid anomalous situation where the C&V Teachers after the commencement of 2012 Rules would not be governed by any set of Rules. Therefore, the expression that such C&V 14 Teachers stand converted to TGT is only to facilitate their service conditions to be governed by the 2012 Rules rather than to upgrade the C&V Teachers as members of TGT Cadre. The feeder and the promotional cadre cannot be treated at par by virtue of the expression used in Rule 9 (5) of 2012 Rules that the C&V Teachers shall be converted to TGT. Such conversion is only for a limited purpose of 2012 Rules being extended to them and that such C&V Teachers do not become member of the “cadre” eligible for promotion as Elementary School Headmaster. Rule 9(5) of 2012 Rules does not use the word “cadre”. Therefore, such teachers cannot be treated to be part of TGT cadre. Such interpretation is further supported by the fact that C&V Teacher is a dying cadre and no further recruitment is to be made in these categories.*

21. *Such C&V Teachers, if eligible, can seek appointment by way of a direct recruitment or other than by direct recruitment in terms of the academic qualifications*

CWP-14160-2016 and connected petitions

and experience contained in Appendix B of 2012 Rules but they cannot be treated en masse as members of TGT Cadre. The State may consider to provide opportunity to such teachers for appointment as TGTs.”

This Court is of the view that the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme court covers all the aspects of the arguments of the learned counsel for the petitioners.

As per Service Rules, 2012, the Classical and Vernacular (C & V) teachers are treated to be TGT so as to avoid anomalous situation. The said conversion is only for a limited purpose of Rules, 2012. The Classical and Vernacular (C & V) teacher is a dying cadre and no further recruitment is to be made in the said categories.

In view of the above, this Court does not find any merit in both the petitions.

Dismissed.

08.02.2023

parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No