



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

WEB COPY

DATED : 12.06.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SURESH KUMAR

and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.ARUL MURUGAN

W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

and

C.M.P.(MD)Nos.6118 & 6973 of 2024

1.The Chief Educational Officer,
Office of the Chief Educational Office,
Thanjavur District,
Thanjavur.

2.The District Educational Officer,
Office of the District Educational Office,
Kumbakonam, Thanjavur District.

: Appellants in both W.As.

Vs.

Town Higher Secondary School,
Represented by its Secretary,
PR.P.Velappan, Kumabkonam,
Thanjavur District-612 001.

: Respondents in both W.As.

COMMON PRAYER: Writ Appeals filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent Act, to set aside the order dated 21.12.2023 in W.P.(MD)Nos. 30604 and 30603 of 2023 on the file of this Court.



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

For Appellants : Mr.D.Sadiq Raja
Additional Government Pleader
For Respondents : Mr.T.Antony Arulraj

COMMON JUDGMENT

[Judgment of the Court was delivered by **R.SURESH KUMAR, J.**]

Since these intra-Court appeals arise out of a common order passed by the Writ Court dated 21.12.2023, made in W.P.(MD)Nos.30603 and 30604 of 2023, both these Writ Appeals are heard together and disposed of by this common order.

2.The respondent School was started in the year 1864 i.e., on 14.04.1864. In the year 1978, it was upgraded as Higher Secondary School. It is one of the oldest Schools in the State, as it has been established 160 years back and had produced very many distinguished persons and Scholars in all these years. It is also informed to the Court that the great Mathematician Mr.Ramanujam is the product of this School. Like that, very many scholars and luminaires had their initial schooling at this School. With such reputation, the School has been functioning.



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

3.In the said school, in the post of PG Assistant (Mathematics) and PG Assistant (English), the incumbents, who had been working, either have retired or got promoted, therefore, the respective Posts of PG Assistant (Mathematics) and PG Assistant (English) have become vacant.

4.Insofar as the post of PG Assistant (English) is concerned, the erstwhile incumbent, one K.Swaminathan, retired from service on 28.04.2023. Therefore, in the vacancy, caused due to his retirement, the next person has to be appointed, for which, the method to be adopted as per the procedure contemplated under Act as well as Rules, is by way of promotion from the post of BT Assistant or giving appointment by transfer by way of deployment from any other aided School in the education District, provided there has been any surplus post with the Teacher already been approved, available in the concerned educational District.

5.Since there has been no such surplus Teacher available, as the School is a standalone Institution and it is not under the corporate or joint management, running any other School, the only method available for the School is to give promotion to the eligible person, if any, who is



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

already working in the School as BT Assistant. Accordingly, one Keerthivasan, who was already working as BT Assistant (English), since has been qualified to hold the post of PG Assistant, he had been given promotion to the post of PG Assistant (English) with effect from 12.06.2023. Even though the said appointment had been made on 25.05.2023, the effect of such appointment had been given with effect from 12.06.2023, as the School had reopened only on that date during the academic year 2023-24.

6.After making such appointment, a proposal had been forwarded by the School Management for approval to the appellants herein, that is to the District Educational Officer and Chief Educational Officer. The Chief Educational Officer, who is the first appellant herein, having considered the proposal submitted by the School, has rejected the same, vide his proceedings dated 05.12.2023. Challenging the said order, the School had filed Writ Petition in W.P.(MD)No.30604 of 2023.

7.Like that, in the same School, the post of PG Assistant (Mathematics) was held by a Teacher called one A.Balasubramanian. He has been promoted as Headmaster with effect from 05.05.2022.



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

WEB COPY

Therefore, that post has also become vacant, wherein also adopting the same method, the School promoted and appointed one Thiyaagasundaram with effect from 22.02.2023, as he was having the qualification to hold the post of PG Assistant (Mathematics). Pursuant to the said appointment order dated 22.02.2023, a proposal had been sent by the School to the appellants for approval. The said proposal also, having been considered, was rejected by the proceedings issued by the first appellant, that is the Chief Educational Officer, on 05.12.2023, which is the order impugned in yet another Writ Petition filed by the School in W.P.(MD)No.30603 of 2023.

8.That is how, these two Writ Petitions came to be heard by the Writ Court and decided in a common impugned order dated 21.12.2023, wherein the learned Single Judge had allowed the Writ Petitions. Therefore, aggrieved over the said order of the Writ Court, the present intra-Court appeals have been directed.

9.Heard, Mr.D.Sadiq Raja, learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the appellants and Mr.T.Antony Arulraj, learned counsel appearing for the respondent School.



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

10.The learned Additional Government Pleader would contend that the appointments of Teaching and Non-Teaching Staff in a Government Aided Private Schools, especially, Non-minority Institutions, are fully governed by the Provisions of the Tamil Nadu Private Schools (Regulation) Act, 2018 (in short, hereinafter referred to as 'the Act') as well as the Tamil Nadu Private Schools (Regulation) Rules, 2023.

11.In this context, the learned Additional Government Pleader would contend that in exercise of powers conferred under Section 57 of the Act, the Governor of Tamil Nadu makes Rules called “Tamil Nadu Private Schools (Regulation) Rules, 2023” (in short, hereinafter referred to as 'the Rules').

12.In the said Rules, Rule 28 speaks about the conditions of Service of staff in an aided private school, wherein the learned Additional Government Pleader heavily relied upon Rule 28 (2) of the Rules, which is extracted hereunder for easy reference:

“28.....

(2) *Appointment to the various categories of teaching and non*



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

WEB COPY

teaching staff shall be made as follows:-

- (a) Teaching Staff.-(i) by deployment of a teacher from any other aided private school in the same cadre drawing salary out of the grant from the funds of the Government; or*
(ii) if no candidate is available by method (i) above, by promotion from among the qualified teachers in the feeder categories in that school:

Provided that promotion shall be made on grounds of merit and ability, seniority being considered only when merit and ability are approximately equal; or

- (iii) if no candidate is available by method (ii) above, appointment from among the non-teaching staff employed in that school, provided he is fully qualified to hold the post of a teacher; or*

(iv) if no candidate is available by method (iii) above, by direct recruitment;

- (b) Non-Teaching Staff.-(i) by deployment from among the incumbents from any other aided private school in the same cadre, drawing salary out of the grant from the State funds; or*
(ii) if no candidate is available by method (i) above, by promotion from among the qualified incumbents in the feeder categories or holding the post carrying the lower scale of pay in that school:

Provided that promotion shall be made on grounds of merit and ability, seniority being considered only when merit and ability are approximately equal; or

- (iii) if no candidate is available by method*



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

WEB COPY

(ii) above, appointment from among the incumbents holding the post carrying identical scale of pay of the post which has to be filled up in that school, provided he is fully qualified to hold the post; or
(iv) if no candidate is available by method(iii) above, by direct recruitment:”

13.The learned Additional Government Pleader would also relied upon Sub Rule 5 of Rule 28, which reads thus:

“(5) Method of appointment,- The methods of appointment to the various categories of teaching and non-teaching staff in an aided private school shall be as prescribed in Annexure-V.”

14.As per Rule 28(2), the appointment to the various categories of Teaching and Non-Teaching Staff, shall be made as per the procedure, which has been followed therein, under which, Rule 28(2) Clause (a), makes it clear that by deployment of a Teacher from any other aided private School in the same cadre drawing salary out of the grant from the funds of the Government or if no candidate is available by method (i) above, by promotion from among the qualified Teaches in the feeder categories in that School can be explored.



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

15. Under the Sub-Clause (5) of Rule 28, the method of appointment also has been mentioned, which says that the method of appointment under various categories in Teaching and Non-Teaching staff in an aided private School shall be made as per the procedure prescribed in Annexure (v).

16. Therefore, the learned Additional Government Pleader relies upon Annexure (v) of the Rules, where the Annexure (v) under Rule 28(5) provides the method of appointment in an aided private School under various categories of Teaching and Non-Teaching Staff, like Headmaster, PG Teachers, Graduate Teachers, Physical Directors, Junior Lecturers etc.,.

17. In the said table of Annexure (v) in Serial No.6, the category has been mentioned as Post Graduate Assistants in Academic subjects or languages, where the method of appointment has also been mentioned, which reads thus:



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

S.No.	Categories	Method of Appointment
(6)	Post Graduate Assistants in Academic subjects or Languages	<i>1. Deployment of teaching staff in the same cadre from any other aided school; or</i> <i>2. Promotion from the holders of the post of,-</i> <i>(a) Graduate Teachers in Academic subject or languages in that school or from any other aided school; or</i> <i>(b) Vocational Instructors; or</i> <i>(c) Non-teaching Staff in that school or from any other aided school; or</i> <i>3. Direct recruitment.</i>

18. Here also, the method is deployment of Teaching Staff in the same cadre from any other aided School or promotion from the holders of the post of Graduate Teachers in academic subject or languages, Vocational Instructors, Non-Teaching staff and the third method is direct recruitment.

19. Relying upon these Rules, including Annexure (v), the learned Additional Government Pleader would vehemently contend that insofar as the filling up of the post of PG Assistant, which has become vacant in the respondent School as per the Rule, is concerned, the first



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

method to be adopted by the School is to explore the possibility of getting deployment of excess Teachers, who are available in the educational district.

20. Without exploring such method, since the School has gone into the second method of appointment through promotion from BT Assistant, it is violation of the Rules and therefore, on that ground, the Chief Educational Officer, that is the appellant herein, has rejected the approval sought for by the School through the orders, which were impugned before the Writ Court.

21. However, according to the learned Additional Government Pleader, these aspects, especially, the Rule position, have not been considered by the Writ Court and the learned Single Judge in a short order, has only come to a cryptic conclusion that considering the fact that the School is a non-minority standalone Institution, the authorities have to verify the staff fixation order for the relevant academic year and for the relevant subject and in case, if the appointments have been made within the staff fixation order, they are duty bound to approve the said appointments. By making this observation, the learned Single Judge was



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

pleased to allow the Writ Petitions by setting aside the order made by the Chief Educational Officer. Therefore, the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge is liable to be interfered with, the learned Additional Government Pleader contended.

22.On the other hand, the learned counsel for the respondent/petitioner has contended that, insofar as the two vacancies, that is PG Assistant (English) and PG Assistant (Mathematics), are concerned, the factual matrix, as to how those vacancies have arisen, has been stated in the appointment order itself, wherein it has been stated that the two posts are sanctioned posts and those have become vacant, in one case, one PG Assistant, the incumbent had retired and in another case, the incumbent got promoted as Headmaster. Therefore, the vacancy arose in respect of these two posts, which have to be immediately filled up, the reason being that one is PG Assistant (English) and another is PG Assistant (Mathematics), both are important core subjects to be taught to the students and the Institution cannot wait for any longer without plausible reasons. Therefore, the School explored the possibility of making an appointment of PG Assistant Teachers by adopting any of the method as per Rules.



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

WEB COPY

23.The learned counsel would contend that assuming that the Rules has come into effect from 13.01.2023 as per which, especially under Rule 28 (2) and (5) along with Annexure (v) of the Rules, the first method to be adopted by the School, is redeployment and if there has been no Teacher available for the purpose of redeployment, they have to explore the second method of appointment by way of promotion. Insofar as the academic year 2022-23 is concerned, the vacancy arose in question caused in the month of April, 2023 and in another case in the Month of April or May 2022. When that being the position, at that time, when the vacancy arose and at the time when the School was trying to fill up the vacant posts, absolutely, there is no clue whatsoever from the Educational Authorities with regard to the availability of surplus Staff and no such list has been published or released or intimated by the Educational Authorities, namely, the Chief Educational Officer and the District Educational Officer.

24.Therefore, the second available method accorded by the Rule is by giving promotion from the post of BT Assistant to PG Assistant, which was adopted by the School, whereby, the eligible



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

Teachers, who hold the said post, were given promotion and therefore, there has been no violation on the part of the School in making such appointment of PG Assistants. Hence, the learned counsel seeks indulgence of this Court to sustain the order passed by the Writ Court and dismiss the Writ Appeals.

25.We have considered the said rival submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on both sides and also perused the materials placed on record.

26.It is an admitted case that two posts, namely, PG Assistant (English) and PG Assistant (Mathematics) at the respondent School, are the sanctioned posts, wherein since the incumbents either have been promoted or retired, both the posts have become vacant. To fill up the said posts, immediate action has to be taken by the School. Assuming that the Rules had come into effect from 13.01.2023, under Rule 28(2) as well as 28(5) r/w Annexure (v) of the Rules, the method to be adopted by the School for filling up the post of PG Assistant is first to explore the possibility of appointment through deployment and if there is no candidate available in the education district, then only, the promotional



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

avenue has to be explored and appointment shall be made by way of promotion. Insofar as this legal position by quoting the Rules is concerned, as stated by the learned Additional Government Pleader, there could be no quarrel.

27.However, when we turn into factual matrix, when the cases came up for earlier hearing, after hearing the arguments of both sides, at one point of time, this Court directed the learned Additional Government Pleader to produce necessary documents, stating that there has been a list of excess Teachers in both subjects, namely, PG Assistant (English) and PG Assistant (Mathematics), available in the education district for the purpose of redeployment to the respondent School.

28.With regard to the said query raised by this Court, the learned Additional Government Pleader has produced a list of surplus Teachers, that has been issued on 27.05.2024, that is only last month, where, according to the appellants, there have been 15 excess Teachers, out of which, there was one excess Teacher in PG Assistant (English) and one excess Teacher in PG Assistant (Mathematics). The remaining Teachers are for other subjects, like Tamil, Science, Physical Education.



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

For all those Teachers, counselling was also conducted on 30.05.2024.

Pursuant to the said counselling, approval has been given to one PG Assistant (Mathematics) and one PG Assistant (English) and they are chosen to go for some other School.

29.It is to be noted that this list has been issued by the District Educational Office only on 27.05.2024, whereas the issue now before us pertains to the academic year 2023-24. Therefore, insofar as the appointment, that has to be made in respect of these two posts, which have become vacant in the respondent School, is concerned, one post had become vacant some time in the month of February, 2023 and another in the month of April or May, 2022 and in respect of these two posts, the order of appointment was given on 22.02.2023 to the post of PG Assistant (Mathematics) and order of appointment has been given on 25.05.2023 with effect from 12.06.2023 to the post of PG Assistant (English).

30.Therefore, at the time, when the posts had become vacant or at the time of appointments, which have been made in respect of these two Teachers by the respondent School, there has been no list of excess



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

WEB COPY

Teachers ever been made available, either through Website or through any private communication issued by the Chief Educational Officer and the District Educational Officer.

31. When that being the position, the reasons, that have been stated in the order passed by the Chief Educational Officer in rejecting the proposal submitted by the School for approval of such appointment, are to be gone into. If we go through the order dated 05.12.2023 passed in both the cases, which were impugned before the Writ Court, the Chief Educational Officer has only stated that there have been two Mathematics Teachers in PG and two English Teachers in PG, available as excess Teachers and those Teachers can be utilised for the purpose of appointment in the respondent School. Without making such appointment, if any appointment is made by giving promotion to the existing BT Assistant in the School concerned, that cannot be approved. In this context, Rule 28(5) and Annexure (v) of the Rules have also been quoted in the order.

32. However, the fact remains that there has been no excess Teachers list produced by the Chief Educational Officer and District



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

WEB COPY Educational Officer. Despite time has been given, the only list, that has been produced by the appellants, is the list dated 27.05.2024, that too in respect of one Teacher in Maths and one Teacher in English, which have become surplus only for the academic year 2024-25 and not for the academic year 2023-24.

33.In this context, even though arguments were advanced by the learned Additional Government Pleader that as per the Rules, whenever vacancy arose, the School concerned has to explore the possibility of verifying as to whether there has been any excess Teacher available in the particular subject and category in the education district, that proposition as projected by the learned Additional Government Pleader, is to be outrightly rejected, the reason being that insofar as the particular School is concerned, if there has been a vacancy, which arises, it has to be filled up as per the Rule.

34.If the School wants to fill up the post by way of first method of redeployment, readily, the list of excess Teachers in a particular subject in particular cadre must be available for all the Schools, which are running in the District. Unless such lists are available to all the



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

Schools released by the Chief Educational Officer and the District Educational Officer, there could be no access of any information with regard to the surplus Teachers in any other Schools in the District. Therefore, that kind of exploration has to be undertaken only by the Educational Authorities and based on such enumeration, they have to prepare the list in every academic year, that too, well prior to the commencement of the academic year and such list has to be released.

35. Here in the case on hand, a very short list of 15 persons has been released on 27.05.2024, where one PG Assistant (Mathematics) and one PG Assistant (English) have been shown as surplus. Whereas, such list has only been released for the academic year 2024-25 and therefore, the said argument advanced by the learned Additional Government Pleader, that the School has to explore the possibility to go to all the Schools in the District to draw a list of surplus Teachers, is thoroughly impossible and it is not the job left with any School, as the job is left with the Educational Authorities. That must be the interpretation to be given to Rule 28 of the Rules.



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

WEB COPY

36. Moreover, yet another peculiar aspect also has to be seen in this case, where the appointment, that has been given insofar as PG Teacher of the respondent School, dated 22.02.2023, is for Maths subject. The said appointment has been rejected, by order dated 05.12.2023, by the Chief Educational Officer, Thanjavur District. Whereas, in the very same Thanjavur District at Kumbakonam education district, there has been another School called 'Srinivasa Rao Government Aided Higher Secondary School', where the post of PG Assistant had become vacant with effect from 31.05.2023, as the existing incumbent retired from service. In order to fill up the said post, the School Management had given promotion to an existing BT Assistant, namely, N.Rajeswari, and appointment had been given on 12.06.2023. The said appointment given by the said School on 12.06.2023 in the very same education district for the very same post of PG Assistant (Mathematics) has been approved by the Chief Educational Officer, who is none other than the first appellant herein, by proceedings dated 10.11.2023.

37. Though this proposal has been approved on 10.11.2023, within a period of one month, on 05.12.2023, with regard to case of the respondent School, the very same Chief Educational Officer has taken a



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

different stand and stating all these reasons, by quoting Rule 28(5), Annexure (v) of the Rules and availability of two PG Teachers in Maths subject etc., rejected the proposal seeking approval. But, the very same Chief Educational Officer has been very silent about any of these issues insofar as his order, dated 10.11.2023 is concerned, giving approval to the said appointment of Rajeswari in the Srinivasa Rao Aided School.

38. When specifically, it was posed to the learned Additional Government Pleader to give explanation with regard to the order dated 10.11.2023, the very same learned Additional Government Pleader would submit that the order dated 10.11.2023 may be an illegal order, but that cannot be cited for comparison and there could be no equality in illegality. Therefore, the respondent School cannot take any shelter in seeking similar direction as that of the Srinivasa Rao Aided School by quoting the order, dated 10.11.2023.

39. Absolutely, there could be no equality in illegality. But a rampant illegality is committed by the Chief Educational Officer of the Thanjavur District, who is the first appellant herein and when explanation is called for, the Chief Education Officer is silent and if he



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

has not come forward to give any explanation, the Court can presume that for extraneous consideration, the order dated 10.11.2023 has been passed, whereas for the very same reason of non-fulfilling of extraneous consideration, the order dated 05.12.2023 has been passed.

40.Except this conclusion, no other conclusion can be arrived at by this Court, after having a perusal of both the orders dated 10.11.2023 and 05.12.2023, the reason being that the post in both Schools, which became vacant, is PG Assistant (Mathematics) and the appointment given in the respondent School is on 22.02.2023, that has been rejected on 05.12.2023, whereas for the very same PG Assistant (Mathematics) post, in respect of Srinivasa Rao Aided Shool, appointment has been given on 12.06.2023 and approved on 10.11.2023. In the approval order dated 10.11.2023, no reason whatsoever, including quoting of Rule 28 (5) of the Rules, has been made by the Chief Educational Officer, whereas the very same Chief Educational Officer, within 25 days, had passed a rejection order on 05.12.2023 in respect of the respondent School, where he has quoted Rule 28(5), Annexure (v) of the Rules and other reasons.



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

41. Even though those reasons cited by the Chief Educational Officer, in the order dated 05.12.2023, would not be sustained, because of the reasons, which we have discussed herein above, the attitude of the very same Officer or the very same Authority, namely, the Chief Educational Officer, Thanjavur, in respect of these two Schools, clearly exposes the way in which this District Level Educational Officers are functioning in the State. Merely, this one Officer since has committed this mistake, the Court cannot put a blame on all similar officers, but this Court of-late had come across many such cases in the School Education Department, where these kind of discriminate orders have been passed at the whims and fancies of the District Educational Officer and the Chief Educational Officer. In the result, there has been pouring of litigations before the High Court both at the Principal Seat as well as the Madurai Bench of Madras High Court and repeatedly, this Court has held in innumerable cases that the way in which these Officers are functioning is not well to the Rule of law. Despite those orders, the attitude of the Officers and their functioning in such a way have become unstoppable.



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

42.This observation has become necessitated, in view of the facts, under which, these two orders have been placed before us for the immediate comparison.

43.It is yet another agony to be mentioned herein that the very same Teacher Rajeswari, whose appointment has been approved by order of the Chief Educational Officer dated 10.11.2023, has been shown as an excess Teacher in the excess Teachers list of 15 Teachers, that has been released by the Chief Educational Officer on 27.05.2024. Knowing well that the Teacher, if at all approved, certainly, will become a excess Teacher, it could not be understood that on what basis, the Chief Educational Officer has given such approval in respect of said Srinivasa Rao Aided School, by order dated 10.11.2023. If the post became vacant on 23.06.2023, the post would have been vacant for the academic year 2023-24. If the Teacher becomes excess for the academic year 2023-24, knowing well that the Teacher would be an excess Teacher in the particular School, such approval has been given on 10.11.2023. This scheme designed by the Chief Educational Officer has got exposed by the subsequent list of excess Teachers published by the very Chief Educational Officer for the year 2024-25, on 27.05.2024.



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

WEB COPY

44.These documents are the clear testimony to establish a strong case against the appellants, not only by the respondent School but also by the various educational Institutions as well as the Teachers. These kind of attitude adopted by the Chief Educational Officer and District Educational Officer concerned, are nothing but a capricious exercise of power at whims and fancies of the Chief Educational Officer and District Educational Officer concerned,

45.We feel that this is one of the case, where the concerned Chief Educational Officer and the District Educational Officer, especially, the Chief Educational Officer shall be subjected to some enquiry to be conducted departmentally, therefore, at the end of this order, we are going to make recommendation to the Director of School Education to conduct an enquiry in this regard, insofar as the aforesaid episode is concerned.

46.Therefore, for all these reasons, that have been stated at the discussion herein above made, we do not have any hesitation to hold that the appointments, that have been made by the respondent School insofar



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

as the posts of PG Assistant (Mathematics) and PG Assistant (English) for the academic year 2023-24 are concerned, are proper as that have been made strictly in accordance with Rules. Therefore, those appointments are to be approved.

47.Though this much of detailed reasons have not been given by the learned Single Judge, it cannot be found fault with, because, the learned Single Judge has also come to the conclusion that if it is a standalone Institution and not by the Corporate Management, the staff strength alone will be the criteria to be followed, which is one of the added reasons apart from the reasons, that we discussed in allowing the Writ Petitions. Therefore, the order passed by the learned Single Judge through the common order dated 21.12.2023 has to be sustained, accordingly, it is sustained.

48.In view of the discussion herein above made, the appellants herein, especially, the first appellant, is hereby directed to give approval to the two appointments made by the respondent School, namely, PG Assistant (Mathematics) and PG Assistant (English) with effect from the date of such appointment, that is from 22.02.2023 in respect of PG



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

Assistant (Mathematics) and from 12.06.2023 in respect of PG Assistant (English) without any further delay within a maximum period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

49.It is made clear that once such approval order is given, the Teachers are entitled to get salary and other service benefits with effect from the said date of appointment.

50.Apart from the above directions, for the disturbing reasons, which we have discussed hereinabove, we are inclined to issue the following directions:

“(i)The Director of School Education, Higher Secondary, is hereby directed to conduct enquiry with regard to the aforesaid episode with the Chief Educational Officer and the District Educational Officer of Thanjaur District and Kumbakonam education district and if any malpractice is found out at the end of the enquiry, disciplinary proceedings can be initiated against the erring officials.



WEB COPY



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

(ii) Insofar as the implementation of the Rules, especially, Rule 28 of the said Rules, is concerned, the Director of School Education shall issue circular to all the Chief Educational Officers and the District Educational Officers to publish a list of surplus Teachers in the concerned education district well in advance, that is well prior to the commencement of the academic year, so that, the School, where the post become vacant in a particular academic year, can easily access with the list of surplus Teachers and accordingly, they may explore the possibility of making appointment by taking Teachers from the list of surplus Teachers. This should be immediately implemented even for the current academic year, that is 2024-25, as the same has just begun.

51. In view of all these reasons, these Writ Appeals are dismissed with a cost of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) in each of the Writ Appeals, which shall be borne by the first appellant, namely, the Chief Educational Officer, Thanjavur, from whom the amount can be



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

collected by the Government to be paid to the respondent School.

WEB COPY

Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

[R.S.K.,J.] [G.A.M.,J.]

12.06.2024

Neutral Citation : Yes/No

Index : Yes/No

Internet : Yes/No

ta



WEB COPY



W.A.(MD)Nos.828 and 967 of 2024

R.SURESH KUMAR, J.
and
G.ARUL MURUGAN, J.

ta

W.A.(MD)Nos. 828 and 967 of 2024

12.06.2024