



W.P.(MD)Nos.8717 to 8726 of 2024

**BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT**

**DATED : 05.04.2024**

**CORAM**

**THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R.N.MANJULA**

**W.P.(MD)Nos.8717 to 8726 of 2024**

**and**

**W.M.P.(MD).Nos.7955, 7957, 7958, 7959, 7960, 7961, 7962, 7963,  
7964, 7965, 7968, 7969, 7980, 7981, 7982, 7983, 7985, 7986, 7987  
and 7988 of 2024**

**Prayer in W.P(MD).No.8717 of 2024**

S.Kalamohan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,  
Represented by its Principal Secretary to Government,  
Higher Education Department,  
Secretariat,  
St.George Fort,  
Chennai.



W.P.(MD)Nos.8717 to 8726 of 2024

2.The Registrar,  
Madurai Kamaraj University,  
Madurai.

3.The Director,  
Department of Local Fund Audit,  
No.571, Officers building,  
Veterinary Hospital Campus,  
Nandanam,  
Chennai-600 035.

... Respondents

**PRAYER:** Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of Writ of Certiorari, calling for the records relating to the impugned order passed by the second respondent vide his proceedings in Ref.Emp.No.A1678/MKU/Show Cause Notice/Reply/2024 dated 26.03.2024 and quash the same as illegal.

In all Writ Petitions

For Petitioners : Mr.M.Ajmal Khan

Senior Counsel for

M/s.Ajmal Associates



W.P.(MD)Nos.8717 to 8726 of 2024

For Respondents : Mr.T.Amjad Khan – for R1 & R3

Government Advocate

Mr.Aasiq Ismail – for R2

for Mr.T.Cibi Chakraborty

### **COMMON ORDER**

Heard Mr.Ajmal Khan, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners, Mr.T.Amjad Khan, learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondent Nos.1 and 3 and Mr.Aasiq Ismail, learned counsel representing for T.Cibi Chakrboorthy, learned counsel appearing for the respondent No.2.

2. The writ petitioners, who have served as Senior Deputy Registrar and Senior Superintendent respectively at the time of retirement during the years 2013, 2014 and 2015, have filed these Writ Petitions challenging the order of the second respondent University revising their pension pursuant to the Government Order



W.P.(MD)Nos.8717 to 8726 of 2024

issued in G.O.(D).No.282, Higher Education (H2) Department, dated 13.10.2022.

3. The revision was on the premise that in the Government side, there is no equivalent posts available to that of the Senior Deputy Registrar and the Senior Superintendent, which were held by the petitioners in the second respondent University; due to paucity of funds, certain budgetary measurements were taken by revising the provisional pension given to the petitioners; this is in view of the fact that they held posts equivalent for which available in the Government with the less pay.

4. Mr.Ajmal Khan, the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the Government Order in G.O. (D).No.282, Higher Education (H2) Department, dated 13.10.2022, cannot be issued superseding the statutory provisions and further the executive instructions cannot take away the rights of the petitioners which have been granted to them in accordance with the statutory



W.P.(MD)Nos.8717 to 8726 of 2024

entitlement. It is further submitted that even for any reason, the Government Order can be enforceable only with a prospective effect and cannot be operated retrospectively by affecting the pension already accorded in favour of these petitioners. Reliance was placed on the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India held in the case of *State of Jharkhand vs. Jitendra Kumar* reported in (2013) 12 SCC 210 and *State of Madhya Pradesh and others vs. Yogendra Shrivastava* reported in (2010) 12 SCC 538.

5. However, Mr.T.Cibi Chakraborty, the learned counsel appearing for the second respondent submitted that the Government Order has been approved by the Syndicate which is the supreme body of the University and the implementation has been done only in accordance with law and according to the statutory requirement. It is further submitted that prior to revision, notice has been issued to the petitioners and they have made their submissions and after considering their submissions, the impugned order has been passed; however, no recovery has been made and the revision of



W.P.(MD)Nos.8717 to 8726 of 2024

pension has been effected. Hence, these petitioners cannot attack the same.

6. In G.O.(D).No.282, Higher Education (H2) Department, dated 13.10.2022, certain decisions have been taken pursuant to the suggestions and undertaking given by the University to the Government. One of the proposals so sent to the Government was to revise the provisional pension on the revised pay certified by the Local Fund Audit Department wherever applicable. For the sake of clarity, the above part of the Government Order is extracted hereunder:

*“5.(v) The provisional pension shall be revised based on the revised pay certified by the Local Fund Audit Department where ever applicable. The number of persons drawing provisional pension due to non settlement of audit paras should be reduced immediately starting from the earliest ones to the recent ones.”*

7. Even according to the second respondent University,



W.P.(MD)Nos.8717 to 8726 of 2024

the proposal was given only to the revised provisional pension and not the regular pension which has been granted to these petitioners. Admittedly, the petitioners were not given with any provisional pension and whatever that has been accorded to them was subsequent to their retirement and the regular pension for which they are entitled to.

8. It is trite law that the Government Order cannot be superseded by any statutory provisions which are governing the service conditions of the employees. So far as these petitioners are concerned, they had retired from service and the relation between the petitioners and the second respondent University as that of employee and employer had ceased to exist. It is not the argument of the respondent that the posts, by names, Senior Deputy Registrar and Senior Superintendent, were not in existence at the time of their employment. Only because those posts are available, the petitioners were rightly placed in those posts on their promotion and they were allowed to retire as how they have been designated. In this regard, it



W.P.(MD)Nos.8717 to 8726 of 2024

is worthwhile to refer to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of *State of Jharkhand vs. Jitendra Kumar* reported in *(2013) 12 SCC 210*, wherein, it has been held that the right to receive pension is recognised as a right in “property” and the executive instructions cannot have a statutory character and hence those executive instructions cannot be called as law. In the words of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India it is given as under:

*“16. The fact remains that there is an imprimatur to the legal principle that the right to receive pension is recognised as a right in “property”. Article 300-A of the Constitution of India reads as under:*

*“300-A. Persons not to be deprived of property save by authority of law.- No person shall be deprived of his property save by authority of law”.*

*Once we proceed on that premise, the answer to the question posed by us in the beginning of this judgment becomes too obvious. A person cannot be deprived of this pension without the authority of law, which is the constitutional mandate enshrined in Article 300-A of the Constitution. It follows that*



W.P.(MD)Nos.8717 to 8726 of 2024

*attempt of the appellant to take away a part of pension or gratuity or even leave encashment without any statutory provision and under the umbrage of administrative instruction cannot be countenanced.*

*17. It hardly needs to be emphasised that the executive instructions are not having statutory character and therefore, cannot be termed as “law” within the meaning of the aforesaid Article 300-A. On the basis of such a circular, which is not having force of law, the appellant cannot withhold even a part of pension or gratuity. As we noticed above, so far as statutory Rules are concerned, there is no provision for withholding pension or gratuity in the given situation. Had there been any such provision in these Rules, the position would have been different.*

*18. We, accordingly, find that there is no merit in the instant appeals as the impugned order of the High Court is without blemish. Accordingly, these appeals are dismissed with costs quantified at Rs.10,000/- each.”*

9. With regard to the date of implementation of any of the Statutory Rules leaving alone the executive instructions, it has been



W.P.(MD)Nos.8717 to 8726 of 2024

categorically held that such Rules can operate only with prospective effect and not retrospectively. In the said judgment, it has been held as under:

*“15. It is no doubt true that Rules made under Article 309 can be made so as to operate with retrospective effect. But it is well settled that rights and benefits which have already been earned or acquired under the existing Rules cannot be taken away by amending the Rules with retrospective effect. (See N.C.Singhal vs. Armed Forces Medical Services; K.C.Arora vs. State of Haryana and T.R.Kapur vs. State of Haryana). Therefore, it has to be held that while the amendment, even if it is to be considered as otherwise valid, cannot affect the rights and benefits which had accrued to the employees under the unamended rules. The right to NPA @ 25% of the pay having accrued to the respondents under the unamended Rules, it follows the respondent employees will be entitled to non-practising allowance @ 25% of their pay upto 20-05-2003.”*



W.P.(MD)Nos.8717 to 8726 of 2024

WEB COPY

10. The petitioners, who were working as Senior Deputy Registrar and Senior Superintendent, were not subjected to any disciplinary proceedings and while allowing them to retire no conditions were imposed in view of any pending or contemplated disciplinary action. As stated already, the pensionary benefits sanctioned to the petitioners are all regular pension in accordance with the Rules. Hence, the respondents have got no authority to call for those orders which are given already and to revise the same pursuant to the subsequent Government Order issued due to change of policy of the University.

11. The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the order which has not been issued for recovery of the pension already granted itself would amount to implementing the Government Order with prospective effect and hence, they can not be given with retrospective effect.

12. The reduction of pension has been made only because



W.P.(MD)Nos.8717 to 8726 of 2024

the posts by names Senior Deputy Registrar and Senior Superintendent are something luxurious and hence, they have to be re-designated as Superintendent and Deputy Registrar respectively, as how they available in the government departments. Such re-designation has been made with effect from the year 2008 and consequence thereof, the pension due to the petitioner has been revised through the impugned order. No re-designation can be impacted on those persons who are no more in service. In other words if any re-designation exercise is done in respect of retired individuals that is possible only by going posterior in time. Whichever way it is looked, the attempt of the second respondent University to implement the Government Order against the petitioners in a retrospective manner is glaringly visible.

13. Coming to the next point of issuing executive instruction not supported by statutes and enactments, it is held after having made elaborate discussion in the case of the ***Madras University Staff Association, represented by its President,***



W.P.(MD)Nos.8717 to 8726 of 2024

***University of Madras, Chennai-5 vs. State of Tamil Nadu, represented by the Secretary to Government, Higher Education Department, Fort St.George, Chennai-9 and another,*** it is held that it is ultravires to issue instructions contrary to the enactment of the legislature and concluded as under:-

*32. In view of my elaborate discussions in the foregoing paragraphs, I would sum up the conclusions in the following terms:*

*(i) As the law has been made by the State legislature conferring the power of regulation of service conditions of non-teaching staff of the universities on Syndicate, the executive is not empowered to pass the impugned order in regard to that matter in exercise of his executive power under Article 162 of the Constitution nor can he exercise such power with reference to that matter through the officers subordinate to him.*

*(ii) A law having occupied the field, it is not open for the State, in exercise of its executive power, to prescribe the same field, by an executive order.*

*(iii) Executive power of the State cannot be*



W.P.(MD)Nos.8717 to 8726 of 2024

*repugnant to the enactment of the legislature.*

*(iv) Executive order of the State can be issued only when the statutes or enactments are having gaps and do not cover the area by the existing Rules.*

*(v) Mere funding of the State to the Universities does not confer any privilege on the State to issue executive orders, so as to interfere with the administration of the Universities.*

*(vi) Executive order (i.e) the impugned order of the First respondent in G.O.Ms.No.402, Higher Education (H2) Department, dated 13.12.2006 is inoperative and it is, accordingly declared ultra vires to the provisions of the Acts.*

14. In the cases in hand, the entitlement of the petitioners to get pension in accordance with the provisions of pension has been reduced and modified through an administrative order which is thoroughly illegal. In reality, the petitioners' services with the respondent university had ended and thereafter the posts held by the petitioner can not be re-designated as against them. In other words



W.P.(MD)Nos.8717 to 8726 of 2024

the petitioners are no more holding the posts of Senior Deputy Registrar and Senior Superintendent in order to get it re-designated. Such an action would amount to doing something on a thing which does not exist. Hence in all possibilities and realities of rule of law, the respondents do not have authority to pass the impugned order. As the impugned notices are against the spirit and scope of the statutory protection given to the petitioners, they are illegal and liable to be set aside.

15. Insofar as the petitioner in W.P.(MD)No.8720 of 2024 is concerned, he was working in the post of Superintendent at the time of his retirement. The impugned order, dated 26.03.2024 passed by the second respondent would state that the petitioner being a Superintendent, was given with a pension higher than that of the persons worked in similar posts in the Government Department. Since audit objection has been raised, the second respondent has passed the impugned order.



W.P.(MD)Nos.8717 to 8726 of 2024

WEB COPY

16. The conditions of service of this petitioner and the Government servants were not claimed to be equal and the petitioner is governed by the Rules and Regulation of the University. Each time when the Government Orders are passed with regard to any of the service benefits or service conditions, it is the Syndicate of the University which has to take a call and pass a Resolution whether such orders or scheme is applicable to the University and whether the University is going to implement or not ?

17. At the time when this petitioner was working as a Superintendent, the University has not chosen to take any decision to equate the service conditions of the persons who are working as Superintendent in the University to the Superintendent working in the Government Departments. If the respondent University takes such a decision, that can be implemented prospectively and the petitioner cannot cast it back to the days, in which, the petitioner was working with the University and thereby, revise the pension. Though the impugned order would show that the revision of pension has been



W.P.(MD)Nos.8717 to 8726 of 2024

implemented in a retrospective manner, but the foundational right or the reason for which the pension impact has been made has got its footing retrospectively. Hence, the impugned order even as against this petitioner, is also not legal.

18. Accordingly,

(i) The Writ Petition in W.P(MD).No.8717 of 2024 is allowed and the impugned order passed by the second respondent vide proceedings in Ref.Emp.No.A1678/MKU/Show Cause Notice/Reply/2024, dated 26.03.2024, is quashed.

(ii) The Writ Petition in W.P(MD).No.8718 of 2024 is allowed and the impugned order passed by the second respondent vide proceedings in Ref.Emp.No.A1680/MKU/Show Cause Notice/Reply/2024, dated 26.03.2024, is quashed.

(iii) The Writ Petition in W.P(MD).No.8719 of 2024 is allowed and the impugned order passed by the second respondent vide proceedings in Ref.Emp.No.A1643/MKU/Show Cause Notice/Reply/2024, dated 26.03.2024, is quashed.



W.P.(MD)Nos.8717 to 8726 of 2024

WEB COPY

(iv) The Writ Petition in W.P(MD).No.8720 of 2024 is allowed and the impugned order passed by the second respondent vide proceedings in Ref.Emp.No.A1690/MKU/Show Cause Notice/Reply/2024, dated 26.03.2024, is quashed.

(v) The Writ Petition in W.P(MD).No.8721 of 2024 is allowed and the impugned order passed by the second respondent vide proceedings in Ref.Emp.No.A1651/MKU/Show Cause Notice/Reply/2024, dated 26.03.2024, is quashed.

(vi) The Writ Petition in W.P(MD).No.8722 of 2024 is allowed and the impugned order passed by the second respondent vide proceedings in Ref.Emp.No.A1637/MKU/Show Cause Notice/Reply/2024, dated 26.03.2024, is quashed.

(vii) The Writ Petition in W.P(MD).No.8723 of 2024 is allowed and the impugned order passed by the second respondent vide proceedings in Ref.Emp.No.A1679/MKU/Show Cause Notice/Reply/2024, dated 26.03.2024, is quashed.

(viii) The Writ Petition in W.P(MD).No.8724 of 2024 is allowed and the impugned order passed by the second respondent



W.P.(MD)Nos.8717 to 8726 of 2024

vide proceedings in Ref.Emp.No.A1694/MKU/Show Cause Notice/Reply/2024, dated 26.03.2024, is quashed.

(ix) The Writ Petition in W.P(MD).No.8725 of 2024 is allowed and the impugned order passed by the second respondent vide proceedings in Ref.Emp.No.A1684/MKU/Show Cause Notice/Reply/2024, dated 26.03.2024, is quashed.

(x) The Writ Petition in W.P(MD).No.8726 of 2024 is allowed and the impugned order passed by the second respondent vide proceedings in Ref.Emp.No.A1653/MKU/Show Cause Notice/Reply/2024, dated 26.03.2024, is quashed.

There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

**05.04.2024**

NCC :yes/no  
Index :yes/no  
Internet :yes/no

RM



W.P.(MD)Nos.8717 to 8726 of 2024

To  
WEB COPY

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu,  
Represented by its Principal Secretary to Government,  
Higher Education Department,  
Secretariat,  
St.George Fort,  
Chennai.
- 2.The Registrar,  
Madurai Kamaraj University,  
Madurai.
- 3.The Director,  
Department of Local Fund Audit,  
No.571, Officers building,  
Veterinary Hospital Campus,  
Nandanam,  
Chennai-600 035.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)Nos.8717 to 8726 of 2024

**R.N.MANJULA, J.**

RM

**W.P.(MD)Nos.8717 to 8726 of 2024**

**05.04.2024**