



W.P.(MD).Nos.1928 to 1939, 1968 & 2053 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 11.03.2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE L.VICTORIA GOWRI

W.P.(MD).Nos.1928 to 1939, 1968 & 2053 of 2024

W.P(MD)No.1928 of 2024:

Govindaraj

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Secretary,
Higher Education (K2) Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George,
Chennai.

2.The Madurai Kamaraj University,
Rep.by its Registrar,
University Campus,
Madurai-625 021.

... Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the 2nd respondent herein to consider the petitioner's representation, dated 20.01.2024 and pass appropriate orders to regularize the service as in the post of Watchman in one of the 204 available permanent vacancy in 2nd Respondent University in Class



W.P.(MD).Nos.1928 to 1939, 1968 & 2053 of 2024

IV Category, with effect from completion of his 10 years service without break i.e., from 29.10.2018 with all consequential monetary and service benefits, within a stipulated time as fixed by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Meenakshi Sundaram

For R1 : Mr.P.T.Thiraviam
Government Advocate

For R2 : Mr.T.Sakthi Kumaran
Standing Counsel

COMMON ORDER

The present writ petitions have been seeking direction against the 2nd respondent herein to consider the petitioners' representations respectively and pass appropriate orders to regularize their service in the respective post in 2nd Respondent University in Class IV Category on completion of 10 years service without break with all consequential monetary and service benefits.

2. Heard the learned counsels on either side and perused the materials available on record.



W.P.(MD).Nos.1928 to 1939, 1968 & 2053 of 2024

WEB COPY

3. The petitioners were appointed as casual labours on various dates. Later, the Appointment Committee of the University appointed the respective petitioner as Causal Labour on Consolidated Pay (CPCLR). The petitioners were assigned duty in the services of the University. The petitioners have been working for more than 10 years on consolidated pay with the fond hope that the University would place them in a regular scale of pay. The petitioners were initially appointed as Casual Labour and they are eligible for regularization under time scale of pay in anyone of the existing clerical vacancy in the University. For the sake of convenience, the details of the service rendered by the writ petitioners is tabulated as follows:

S.No.	Writ Number	Petition	Name of the writ petitioner	Date of entry into service	Date on completion of 10 years	Service period as on today
1.	W.P(MD)No.1928 of 2024		Govindaraj	29.10.2008	29.10.2018	15.3
2.	W.P(MD)No.1929 of 2024		P.N.Ramanathan	01.04.2008	01.04.2018	15.8
3.	W.P(MD)No.1930 of 2024		M.S.S.Godson	01.11.2007	01.11.2017	16.3
4.	W.P(MD)No.1931 of 2024		M.Sangeetha	02.08.2008	02.08.2018	15.5
5.	W.P(MD)No.1932 of 2024		Muthupandi	01.04.2013	01.04.2023	10.8
6.	W.P(MD)No.1933 of 2024		Shanmugavel	01.04.2013	01.04.2023	10.8



W.P.(MD).Nos.1928 to 1939, 1968 & 2053 of 2024

7.	W.P(MD)No.1934 of 2024	S.Kumar	13.12.2001	13.12.2011	22
8.	W.P(MD)No.1935 of 2024	S.Saravanan	18.03.2013	18.03.2023	10.9
9.	W.P(MD)No.1936 of 2024	M.Mohan	30.12.2009	30.12.2019	14
10.	W.P(MD)No.1937 of 2024	A.Deivendran	05.01.2009	05.01.2019	15
11.	W.P(MD)No.1938 of 2024	S.Mahendran	06.02.2008	06.02.2018	15.10
12.	W.P(MD)No.1939 of 2024	M.Krishnan	01.02.2006	01.02.2016	17.10
13.	W.P(MD)No.2053 of 2024	M.Pravinkumar	16.07.2009	16.07.2019	14
14.	W.P(MD)No.1968 of 2024	S.Senthil Pandian	09.02.2009	09.02.2019	14

4. A similar matter came to be dealt with by this Court in W.P(MD)No. 12554 of 2022, dated 01.12.2022 and that was allowed and the order was confirmed by the Division Bench in W.A.(MD)No.981 of 2023 and thereafter, SLP was preferred by the University before the Hon'ble Apex Court and the same was dismissed.

5. For better appreciation of the facts, the order passed in W.P(MD)No. 12554 of 2022, dated 01.12.2022 is extracted hereunder:



WEB COPY

“5. I carefully considered the rival contentions and went through the materials on record. Though the petitioner was appointed only as Casual Labourer in the year 2005, it was not a back door entry. The University had published notification calling for applications from eligible candidates seeking appointment as Casual Labourer on consolidated basis. The University issued call letter dated 13.10.2005 calling upon the petitioner to attend interview on 26.10.2005. The petitioner was subjected to selection process. Proper resolution was passed by the appointment committee and that is how the petitioner came to be appointed on 14.11.2005. The petitioner has been serving the University without any break for the last 17 years.

6. My attention is drawn to the resolution passed by the syndicate of the respondent University on 12.08.2005. The resolution reads that the consolidated pay Casual Labourers and Casual Labourers on daily wages be allowed regular time scale of pay if they completed 10 years of service. This resolution has not been rescinded till date. I can understand the objection of the University if it is claimed that the cadre strength will be exceeded. Admittedly, it is stated that regular vacancies were available when he completed 10 years and even as on date. It is well settled that relief of regularisation can be given only in favour of the person who is still in service. That apart, he has to bring his case within the extant norms. The petitioner is able to fulfil both the conditions.

7. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner relies on order dated 29.04.2014 passed by the Hon'ble Division Bench in W.A(MD)Nos.351 of 2012 etc. The Hon'ble Division Bench had held as follows:



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD).Nos.1928 to 1939, 1968 & 2053 of 2024

“18. If the posts sanctioned by the Finance Committee are to be filled up by the University on a regular basis, the University would have to go in for a fresh direct recruitment. As per the statutes of the University, such regular process of selection will be through a written examination followed by viva voce. The respondents in these cases, were actually sponsored through employment exchange. They were made to appear for written examination. Those who were short listed in the written examination were interviewed and the respondents were selected. Therefore, despite the fact that they were appointed temporarily on daily wages basis, the respondents herein have fulfilled the qualifications prescribed for the posts and they were selected by the very same method of recruitment prescribed for regular selection.

19. The reliance placed by the learned Senior Counsel for the University upon the decision of the Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court in Uma Devi, cannot be applied stricto sensu, to cases of this nature. It is for the simple reason that Courts will have to distinguish between the appointments made through back door methods and appointments made by following the rigorous process of selection. The principles that would apply to back door appointments cannot be simply transported to the cases where a process of selection is strictly followed.”

This order was followed by another Hon’ble Division Bench to which I was a party (order dated 10.08.2017 in W.A(MD)Nos.919 and 920 of 2016).

8.The University which is the employer is receiving funds from the Government. The Government is not a necessary party to the present proceedings. I hold that the writ petitioners cannot be non-suited merely because the Government has not been impleaded. All the



W.P.(MD).Nos.1928 to 1939, 1968 & 2053 of 2024

WEB COPY

relevant norms are fulfilled. I direct the respondent University to regularise the services of the petitioner on completion of 10 years of service as casual labour. However, taking note of the contention advanced by the learned Standing Counsel for the respondent that the University is facing financial crunch, the petitioner will be eligible for monetary benefits only from the date of the impugned order. The order impugned in this writ petition is set aside.

9.This writ petition is allowed. No costs.”

6. The case on hand is absolutely similar and there is no place for taking a different footing. In view of the same, by adopting the order passed by this Court in W.P(MD)No.12554 of 2022, I hold that the writ petitioners cannot be non-suited and the respondents are directed to regularise the service of the petitioners in terms of the order passed in the aforesaid writ petition, within a period of eight (8) weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

7. Accordingly, this writ petitions stand disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

11.03.2024

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes
gbg



W.P.(MD).Nos.1928 to 1939, 1968 & 2053 of 2024

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Secretary,
Higher Education (K2) Department,
Secretariat, Fort St.George,
Chennai.
- 2.The Registrar,
The Madurai Kamaraj University,
University Campus,
Madurai-625 021.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD).Nos.1928 to 1939, 1968 & 2053 of 2024

L.VICTORIA GOWRI, J.

gbg

W.P.(MD).Nos.1928 to 1939, 1968 & 2053 of 2024

11.03.2024