



W.P.No.14775 of 2021

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 14.02.2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R.N.MANJULA

W.P.No.14775 of 2021

E.Jayaraj

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu rep by its
Secretary to Government,
School Education Department,
Secretariat, Chennai 9.

2.The Director of Government Examinations,
O/o the Directorate of Government Examinations,
College Road, Chennai 6.

3.The Deputy Director (Administration)
of Government Examinations,
O/o the Directorate of Government Examinations,
College Road, Chennai 6.

... Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records connected in R.C.No.100352/E2-1/2019, dated 11.12.2020 of the third respondent and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to extend the benefits of G.O.(ID).No.286, School Education (GE1) Department, dated 19.07.2016, G.O.(ID).NO.238, School Education



W.P.No.14775 of 2021

(Nee.Va.4(2)) Department, dated 07.04.2017, and G.O.(Pa).No.72, School Education (GE) Department, dated 28.02.2019 and grant pension to the petitioner from the date of retirement.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.R.Suresh for
Mr.K.Arumugam

For Respondents : Mr.P.Gurunathan, AGP

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records connected in R.C.No.100352/E2-1/2019, dated 11.12.2020 of the third respondent and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to extend the benefits of G.O.(ID).No.286, School Education (GE1) Department, dated 19.07.2016, G.O.(ID).NO.238, School Education (Nee.Va.4(2)) Department, dated 07.04.2017, and G.O.(Pa).No.72, School Education (GE) Department, dated 28.02.2019 and grant pension to the petitioner from the date of retirement.

2. Heard Mr.A.R.Suresh for Mr.K.Arumugam, learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr.P.Gurunathan, learned Additional Government Pleader



W.P.No.14775 of 2021

for the respondents.

WEB COPY

3. The case of these petitioner is similar to the dispute which arose in Writ Petitions in W.P.Nos.13517 & 13520 of 2021 (Tajunisa Begam and another Vs. The State of Tamil Nadu and others). In the said Writ Petitions, this Court has passed the following order:

"4. When a similarly placed person has filed Writ Petition before this Court in W.P.No.18248 of 2020 via order dated 19.12.2023, this Court has held as under:-

"10. It is not denied that similarly persons like the petitioners have been regularised every now and then by G.O.(Ms.)No.524, Personnel & Administrative Reforms Department, dated 06.06.1983. Even though the G.O. contemplates only 5 years of completion of their services as a qualification of regularisation, the regularisation could be made as and when the vacancy was arising in the posts of Sweepers or sanitary workers.

11. Despite the petitioners had completed 10 years of service from the year 1989-2000, a proposal to regularise them has been sent in the year 2001. The petitioners fall under the remaining 16 Mazdoors and for whom the proposal had been sent for 8 conservancy Mazdoors. Though it is aggrieved by the Staff Committee constituted by the Government that their services can be regularised on the condition that no Mazdoor shall be appointed in future and their services could be regularised only from the date of issuance of the Government Order, they were not



W.P.No.14775 of 2021

regularised in view of the subsequent G.O.(Ms.)No.212, Personnel & Administrative Reforms (P) Department, dated 29.11.2001. The said G.O. has been issued to ban all Government recruitments except the working posts like Teachers, Doctors and Police Constables.

12. The regularisation is being done only by virtue of G.O.(Ms.)No.524, Personnel & Administrative Reforms Department, dated 06.06.1983, which was issued by considering the long services of the persons working as daily wages for several years. When a welfare measure is implemented against certain number of similarly placed persons, it should also be extended to rest of the persons of the same category. Even though there is no ill intention on the part of the Government, the hurdles were realised in view of G.O.(Ms.)No.212, Personnel & Administrative Reforms (P) Department, dated 29.11.2001. The above G.O. ought not to have been understood in a way it bars even the regularisation exercise that has to be taken as per the policy decision already taken in that regard.

13. If the purpose of G.O.(Ms.)No.212, Personnel & Administrative Reforms (P) Department, dated 29.11.2001 has not been understood wrongly, the petitioners would have got their regularisation much earlier. There cannot be any second thought that the date of regularisation can be taken effect from the date of issuance of the order. In the case of the petitioners or specifically as against the remaining 16 Mazdoors the date of regularisation subsequent to 31.03.2003 will play a major difference. Because



W.P.No.14775 of 2021

the persons who have got regularisation before 31.03.2003 will be covered under the old pension scheme and all those persons whose services have been regularised later than 31.03.2003 will not get the benefit of old pension scheme.

14. In fact, the very regularisation itself is needed only to accommodate the Mazdoors to come under regular scheme in which they are entitled to get the retiral benefits including pension. If such benefits are not extended to the remaining 16 Mazdoors, the very purpose of regularisation itself will be lost. In fact, the Government was conscious of what is being done and what is being to given to its employees by putting a conscious condition that no Mazdoors shall be appointed in future similar to the petitioners.

15. Under such circumstances and also taking into consideration of the various earlier judgments which have confirmed the entitlement of similarly placed persons like petitioners about their regularisation w.e.f. the completion of 10 years of service, I feel the same benefit can be extended to the case of the petitioners as well.

16. Though it is correct to state that the regularisation can be taken effect only from the date of issuance of G.O. in view of the reasons already stated in case of these petitioners the date of the G.O. cannot be interpreted from the date of issuance of the Government Orders dated 29.09.2006 ad 29.11.2007 respectively.

17. Had there not been a wrong presumption about the



W.P.No.14775 of 2021

ban, the petitioners- services could have been regularised by issuing the G.O. any time subsequent to the proposal that was sent as early as in the year 2001.

18. So in order to mitigate the above difficulty and also to bring the petitioners under the old pension scheme as it was applicable to the similarly placed persons whose services have been regularised before 31.03.2003, I feel the regularisation of the petitioners should be given with effect from the date of completion of their 10 years of service.

In view of the same, this Writ Petition is allowed and the order passed by the 1st respondent in Lr.No.49090/Maintenance/2020-2, dated 22.05.2020 is set aside and the 1st respondent is directed to consider the petitioners case as a special case in view of the hurdles placed in the form of wrong presumption of the ban order and issue orders for regularisation of the petitioners services w.e.f. the date of completion of 10 years of their respective service and attendant benefits, within a period of eight (8) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.”

5. Since the above observation is applicable to the facts and relief sought in the present case also, this Writ Petition can also be disposed on the similar lines.

*6. In view of the above, these Writ Petitions are **allowed** and the rejection orders passed by the second*



W.P.No.14775 of 2021

respondent in R.C.No.029352/E2-1/2020, dated 30.11.2020 and R.C.No.101539/E2-1/2017, dated 21.12.2020 are set aside. The first respondent is directed to issue orders for regularisation of the petitioners services w.e.f. the date of completion of 10 years of their respective service and attendant benefits, in the light of the order dated 19.12.2023 passed in W.P.No.18248 of 2020, within a period of eight (8) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs. "

4. The matter in issue is also similar to the earlier Writ Petitions filed in W.P.Nos.13517 & 13520 of 2021, where the above orders have been passed. Since the petitioner is also similarly placed, his case would also have the similar line of appreciation as how it was considered in the above Writ Petitions. Hence this petitioner is also entitled to the same relief as already granted to the other similarly placed persons in the earlier judicial orders.

5. In view of the above, this Writ Petition is allowed and the order passed by the third respondent in R.C.No.100352/E2-1/2019, dated



W.P.No.14775 of 2021

11.12.2020 is set aside. The first respondent is directed to issue orders for regularisation of the petitioner's services with effect from the date of completion of 10 years of service with attendant benefits, in the light of the above judicial pronouncements, within a period of eight (8) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs.

14.02.2024

Index : Yes /No
Internet : Yes/No
Speaking / Non-speaking
gsk



W.P.No.14775 of 2021

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
School Education Department,
Secretariat, Chennai 9.
- 2.The Director of Government Examinations,
O/o the Directorate of Government Examinations,
College Road, Chennai 6.
- 3.The Deputy Director (Administration)
of Government Examinations,
O/o the Directorate of Government Examinations,
College Road, Chennai 6.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.14775 of 2021

R.N.MANJULA, J.

gsk

W.P.No.14775 of 2021

14.02.2024