



W.P(MD)No.22353 of 2022

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 22.10.2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE J.SATHYA NARAYANA PRASAD

W.P(MD)No.22353 of 2022

S.Muthaiah

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Chief Educational Officer,
Pudukottai District.

2.The District Educational Officer,
Illuppur,
Pudukottai District.

3.The Block Educational Officer,
Viralimalai,
Pudukottai District.

... Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to sanction the incentive increment for B.Ed., qualification from 02.06.2019 and confer all consequential benefits and pass such further or other orders.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Panneer Selvam
For Respondents : Mr.N.Ramesh Arumugam
Government Advocate



W.P(MD)No.22353 of 2022

WEB COPY

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed seeking for a Mandamus to the respondents to sanction the incentive increment for B.Ed., qualification from 02.06.2019 and confer all consequential benefits.

2. The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner was appointed as a Secondary Grade Teacher on 19.02.1999. The petitioner obtained permission to study B.Sc., on 02.12.2011 and passed B.Sc., in the year 2015. He obtained permission to study B.Ed., on 07.04.2017 and passed B.Ed., in the year 2019. As per the Scheme, he is entitled for one set of incentive increment for the higher qualification of B.Ed. Therefore, he made request to the respondents to sanction the incentive increment for B.Ed. The petitioner has also approached the respondents in person on several occasions to sanction the incentive increment. The petitioner is requesting the respondents to sanction the first set of incentive increment. Therefore, there is no impediment to sanction the same. Since his request not was not considered, the petitioner has come forward with the present writ petition.



W.P(MD)No.22353 of 2022

WEB COPY

3. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has completed B.Ed., degree after obtaining permission from the competent authority and the learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents mainly contend that as per G.O(Ms)No.37, Personnel and Administration Reforms (FR-IV) Department, dated 10.03.2020, the decision to grant incentive increment has been done away. In the instant case, the petitioner has completed B.Ed., degree in June 2019 much prior to the issuance of the above said Government Order.

4. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner also relied on the judgment of the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in a similar case in W.A(MD)No.975 of 2024, dated 12.06.2024 and the relevant paragraph of the same is extracted and reads as follows:

"9.G.O(Ms)No.37 does not operate retrospectively and the purposive interpretation of Clause 6(vi) in the Government Order can only be that the Teachers, who had all acquired the higher qualification prior to the issuance of the Government Order and if otherwise qualified are eligible for sanction of the incentive increment. If the interpretation made by the learned Additional Government Pleader is to be



W.P(MD)No.22353 of 2022

accepted, then the very object of the inclusion of clause 6(vi) in the Government Order becomes redundant. As such, we have no hesitation to hold that the Teachers, who, after obtaining necessary permission from the authorities, had acquired higher qualification, ie., wherever the degrees had been awarded prior to issuance of G.O.(Ms)No.37, dated 10.03.2020, are entitled for advance increment for the higher qualification, if it is within the limit of two incentive increments in their career.

10.In the instant case, admittedly, the first respondent after obtaining necessary permission had acquired M.A. (Tamil) degree as early as on 18.05.2019, which is well before the issuance of G.O.(Ms)No.37, dated 10.03.2020 and the first respondent had been awarded only one incentive increment for the B.Ed., course. Hence, the first respondent is entitled for the sanctioning of second advance increment for the M.A.(Tamil) degree obtained by her, as covered under Clause-6(vi) of G.O(Ms)No.37. In such view of the matter, we find no reason to interfere with the order passed by the learned Judge and the order of the Writ Court is accordingly, sustained."

5. He has also relied on another judgment of the same Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court following the order passed in W.A(MD)No.975 of 2024



W.P(MD)No.22353 of 2022

and the writ appeal is W.A(MD)No.1052 of 2024, dated 21.06.2024 and the relevant paragraph of the same is extracted and reads as follows:

7.Be that as it may, in the meantime, the Government issued G.O.(Ms)No.37, Personnel and Administrative Reforms (FR-IV) Department, dated 10.03.2020, withdrawing and cancelling the incentive increment scheme. However, Clause-6(vi) of G.O.(Ms)No.37, protects the Teachers, who had already acquired the qualification prior to the issuance of the Government Order by the cancellation of the scheme and they are entitled for the award of incentive increment. Clause 6(vi) is extracted hereunder for easy reference:

“6.....

I....

VI.The case of Government servants who have acquired higher qualification prior to issue of this general order, and not sanctioned with advance increments be examined separately as per the previous orders issued, if any, by the administrative department concerned and with reference to the posts specified in that order and if he is otherwise qualified, then the advance increment may be sanctioned by the administrative department concerned after obtaining concurrence of Finance department. If no previous orders were issued by any of the department concerned, they are not eligible for sanction of any advance increments for passing higher qualification irrespective of the post held/degrees acquired.”



WEB COPY

11. Therefore, already we have held that all the persons, who had been acquired additional qualification prior to issuance of G.O.(Ms)No.37, if it is within two incentive increment, they are entitled for grant of incentive increment. Further, the clarification issued in G.O.(Ms)No.95, had been dealt with by the learned Judge and having found that G.O.(Ms)No.37 cannot operate retrospectively, the benefits granted under the incentive scheme prior to the Government Order, cannot be taken back and therefore, the similarly placed persons cannot be discriminated and treated unequally. As, already it has been decided that G.O.(Ms)No.37, does not have a retrospective effect and the employees, who had acquired additional qualification prior to issuance of G.O.(Ms)No.37, are entitled for the grant of incentive increment, the clarificatory order issued in G.O.(Ms)No.95, can in no way affect the rights of the concerned persons, who had acquired additional qualification and the right accrued on them cannot be tinkered with or taken away and the benefits cannot be denied through this clarificatory order.

12. In the instant case, the Writ Petitioner has, admittedly, acquired additional qualification by getting proper permission prior to issuance of G.O.(Ms)No.37 and it is his second incentive increment and in fact, the same also had



W.P(MD)No.22353 of 2022

been considered and granted by the appellants by proceedings, dated 19.12.2019 with effect from 01.07.2017. Hence, the argument of the appellants that in view of the clarificatory order, the Writ Petitioner is not entitled for the incentive increment, cannot be sustained and accordingly, rejected. The learned Judge, had rightly, arrived at a conclusion that the Writ Petitioner is entitled for the grant of second incentive increment and the same cannot be denied in view of G.O.(Ms)No. 37 and G.O.(Ms)No.95, which needs no interference and accordingly, sustained.

6. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner further submitted that the writ petitioner seeking only first incentive increment and he is entitled for the same since he has studied the B.Ed., degree course only after approving the prior permission of the authorities and as per the judgments of the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court, once the permission is obtained, the first incentive increment cannot be denied by the respondents in view of the G.O(Ms)No.37, dated 10.03.2022 since the petitioner has completed the course much prior to that (i.e.,) in the year 2019.



W.P(MD)No.22353 of 2022

WEB COPY

7. The counter affidavit was filed by the second respondent on 29.09.2022. As per the counter affidavit filed by the second respondent, the relevant portion is reads as follows:

"4. It is submitted that in the meantime, the Government issued G.O(Ms)No.37 Personnel and Administrative Reforms (FR-IV) Department dated 10.03.2020 cancelling the scheme of award of incentive increments. It is pertinent to submit that although the petitioner passed the B.Ed., degree in the year 2019, he made request for granting incentive increments only on 07.10.2020 for the reasons best known for him. The Clause 6(vi) of G.O(Ms)No.37 Personnel and Administrative Reforms (FR-IV) Department dated 10.03.2020 specifies that the cases of government servants who have acquired higher qualifications prior to the issue of this general order, and not sanctioned with advance increments be examined separately as per the previous orders issued, if any by the administrative department concerned and with reference to the posts specified in that order and if he is otherwise qualified, then the advance increment may be sanctioned by the administrative department concerned after obtaining concurrence of Finance Department. If no previous order were issued by any of the department concerned, then they are not eligible for sanction of any advance increments for



WEB COPY

passing higher qualification irrespective of the post held / degree obtained. In the sub clause (vii) it has been held that No fresh / further proposals will be entertained by Personnel and Administrative Reforms Department on this issued in future. In the instant case, the petitioner made his request only on 07.10.2020 and hence the question of granting any incentive increment does not arise. Accordingly the request of the petitioner is not sustainable in law.

5. It is submitted that as per the Clarification issued in G.O(Ms)No.116 Personnel and Administrative Department (FR-IV) dated 16.10.2020, it has been stated in para 4(7) that instructions in para 6 (vi) and (vii) of G.O(Ms)No.37 Personnel and Administrative Reforms (FR-IV) Department dated 10.03.2020 has to be followed in which it has been held that if no previous order were issued by any of the department concerned, then they are not eligible for sanction of any advance increments for passing higher qualification irrespective of the post held / degree obtained. In the sub clause (vii) it has been held that No fresh / further proposals will be entertained by the Personnel and Administrative Reforms Department on this issue in future. It is pertinent to submit that the petitioner has made his request only on 07.10.2020 very belatedly. Accordingly the prayer of the petitioner is not sustainable in law and the writ petition is not maintainable in law and is liable to dismissed."



W.P(MD)No.22353 of 2022

WEB COPY

8. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

9. The learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents submitted that the review application has been filed against the order passed by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in W.A(MD)No.975 of 2024, dated 12.06.2024. The review application has been filed to review the order passed in the writ appeal on 23.08.2024 in C.M.P(MD)No.11590 of 2024 and the same is pending before the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court.

10. The review has been filed with the C.M.P(MD)No.11590 of 2024 to condone the delay. Only after the delay is condoned, the main review application would be numbered by the Registry.

11. The review application is only in SR stage and the same is not even numbered. Hence, the judgment of the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court still holds good and the respondents are bound by the above judgment.



W.P(MD)No.22353 of 2022

WEB COPY

12. The learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents further drew the attention of this Court to the judgment of the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in W.A(MD)No.1202 of 2023, dated 15.11.2023, wherein, in that case, it is pertaining to the grant of third incentive increment. Hence, the same is not applicable to the case on hand, since it is pertaining to the grant of first incentive increment to the petitioner herein.

13. In view of the above facts and circumstances of the case, the writ petition stands allowed and the third respondent is directed to grant first incentive increment to the petitioner based on the judgments of the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court stated *supra*, within a period of eight (8) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. There shall be no order as to costs.

22.10.2024

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes
BTR



W.P(MD)No.22353 of 2022

WEB COPY

- To
- 1.The Chief Educational Officer,
Pudukottai District.
 - 2.The District Educational Officer,
Illuppur,
Pudukottai District.
 - 3.The Block Educational Officer,
Viralimalai,
Pudukottai District.



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.22353 of 2022

J.SATHYA NARAYANA PRASAD, J.

BTR

W.P(MD)No.22353 of 2022

22.10.2024