



2026:KER:28916

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE VIJU ABRAHAM

TUESDAY, THE 31<sup>ST</sup> DAY OF MARCH 2026 / 10TH CHAITHRA, 1948

WP(C) NO. 5942 OF 2026

PETITIONER:

A.K. BABY,AGED 64 YEARS  
HIGH SCHOOL ASSISTANT (RETIRED),  
SRI VIVEKANANDA VOCATIONAL HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL,  
PALEMAD, NILAMBUR,MALAPPURAM DISTRICT.  
RESIDING AT AYYAMPALLI HOUSE, POOKKOTHUMANA P.O.,  
CHUNGATHARA, NILAMBUR, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT,  
PIN - 679334

BY ADVS.  
DR.GEORGE ABRAHAM  
SMT.MARY CATHERINE PRIYANKA P.S.  
SHRI.ALEX TOM JOSEPH

RESPONDENTS:

- 1 STATE OF KERALA  
REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,  
GENERAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695001
- 2 THE DIRECTOR OF GENERAL EDUCATION,  
JAGATHY, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695014
- 3 THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION,  
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION,  
MALAPPURAM DISTRICT, PIN - 676505
- 4 THE DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL OFFICER,  
OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL OFFICER  
WANDoor, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT, PIN - 676328
- 5 MANAGER,  
SRI VIVEKANANDA VOCATIONAL HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL



2026:KER:28916

**PALEMAD, NILAMBUR, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT,  
PIN - 679331**

**BY ADVS.  
SRI.JESTIN MATHEW  
SHRI.JOSHY RAJ R.R.  
SHRI.SACHIN ZACHARIAH  
SHRI.ABHAY R. UNNITHAN**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON  
31.03.2026, ALONG WITH WP(C).6532/2026, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY  
DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**



2026:KER:28916

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE VIJU ABRAHAM

TUESDAY, THE 31<sup>ST</sup> DAY OF MARCH 2026 / 10TH CHAITHRA, 1948

WP(C) NO. 6532 OF 2026

PETITIONER:

MANAGER, SREE VIVEKANANDA HIGH SCHOOL  
PALEMAD P.O., EDAKKARA, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT.,  
PIN - 679331

BY ADVS.  
SRI.JESTIN MATHEW  
SHRI.JOSHY RAJ R.R.  
SHRI.SACHIN ZACHARIAH  
SHRI.ABHAY R. UNNITHAN

RESPONDENTS:

- 1 STATE OF KERALA  
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT,  
GENERAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT,  
GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.,  
PIN - 695001
- 2 DIRECTOR OF GENERAL EDUCATION (DGE)  
JAGATHY, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM., PIN - 695014
- 3 DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION  
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION,  
MALAPPURAM DISTRICT., PIN - 676505
- 4 DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL OFFICER,WANDOOD,  
OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL OFFICER,  
MALAPPURAM., PIN - 679328
- 5 ASSISTANT EDUCATIONAL OFFICER  
NILAMBUR, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT, PIN - 679329



2026:KER:28916

6        A.K. BABY  
          S/O PAILI KORA, AYYAMPALLIL HOUSE,  
          POOKOTTUMANNA P.O., CHUNGATHARA, NILAMBUR,  
          MALAPPURAM DISTRICT, PIN - 679334

BY ADV DR.GEORGE ABRAHAM

OTHER PRESENT:

GP VENUGOPAL V

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON  
31.03.2026, ALONG WITH WP(C).5942/2026, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY  
DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



2026:KER:28916

**'CR'****VIJU ABRAHAM, J.****.....  
W.P.(C) Nos.5942 of 2026 and 6532 of 2026  
.....****Dated this the 31<sup>st</sup> day of March, 2026****JUDGMENT**

Since a common issue is involved in these writ petitions, they are heard and disposed of by a common judgment.

2. W.P.(C) No.5942 of 2026 is filed by an aided school teacher seeking implementation of Ext.P20 order issued by the Government. Whereas, W.P.(C) No.6532 of 2026 is filed by the Manager of the said school challenging the said order, a copy of which is produced as Ext.P18.

3. Petitioner in W.P.(C) No.5942 of 2026 was put in charge as headmaster of the school during the period in which the regular headmistress of the school was placed under suspension by the manager. After the reinstatement of the headmistress, charge was handed over and all documents, including an amount of Rs.26,945.80, as the cash balance relating to the noon meal programme were also handed over. But, the stand taken by the headmistress is that the said amount has not been handed over to her. Based on a complaint, Ext.P1 communication was



2026:KER:28916

issued on 02.03.2010, directing the petitioner to hand over the amount within seven days. Ext.P2 memo of charges was issued to the petitioner, to which Ext.P3 reply was filed, wherein the petitioner took a stand that the amount has already been handed over to the headmistress, but to put a quietus to the whole issue, he is prepared to remit the said amount, if he is granted an opportunity to remit the same in instalments. But the manager did not accept the same. Disciplinary proceedings were initiated for imposition of a major penalty as contemplated under Rule 75 of Chapter XIV A, KER. Enquiry report was submitted by the District Educational Officer, finding that the petitioner is guilty of the charges levelled against him. The Manager, without serving a copy of the enquiry report to the petitioner, issued Ext.P5 show cause notice, to which Ext.P6 objection was filed by the petitioner. Without considering the same, by Ext.P7 order, a punishment of compulsory retirement was imposed on the petitioner. The appeal filed against the same was dismissed and later, by Ext.P11, the Government also rejected the revision filed by the petitioner. Challenging Ext.P11, the petitioner filed W.P.(C) No.19577 of 2015, and this Court, by Ext.P12 judgment, set aside Ext.P11 order and directed the Government to reconsider the matter. In the meanwhile, the petitioner superannuated from service on 31.03.2016. After the remand by this Court as per Ext.P12 judgment, the Government reconsidered the matter and issued



2026:KER:28916

Ext.P13 order, finding that the entire procedure adopted by the Manager was wrong and directed to conduct a fresh enquiry. On the basis of the same, enquiry was conducted by the District Educational Officer and submitted Ext.P16 enquiry report, finding that the allegation levelled against the petitioner could not be proved beyond doubt, and a copy of the enquiry report was forwarded to the manager for taking appropriate action. Since no action was taken, petitioner was constrained to approach this Court by filing W.P.(C) No.31093 of 2024, which was disposed of as per Ext.P17 judgment directing the manager to issue consequential orders based on Ext.P16 enquiry report. Without considering Ext.P16 enquiry report, wherein it was held that the charges could not be proved, by Ext.P18 order, the manager imposed a major penalty of compulsory retirement. Challenging Ext.P18, Ext.P19 revision was filed by the petitioner before the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent Government and pursuant to the direction issued by this Court in W.P.(C) No.43961 of 2024, Government issued Ext.P20 order wherein it was found that the petitioner is entitled to get all the benefits including the salary for the period from 04.07.2011 to 31.03.2016 and also to count the said period for all service benefits. Petitioner has approached this Court by filing W.P.(C) No.5942 of 2026, seeking to implement Ext.P20 order.

4. W.P.(C) No.6532 of 2026 is filed by the manager



2026:KER:28916

mainly contending that the manager being aggrieved by the findings in Ext.P16 enquiry report, finding that the charge against the teacher, the petitioner in W.P.(C) No.5942 of 2026, could not be proved, has preferred Ext.P17 revision petition before the Government and while Ext.P18 order (Ext.P20 order sought to be implemented in W.P.(C) No. 5942 of 2026) was passed by the Government, Ext.P17 revision petition was very much pending before the Government and it is without considering the said revision that Ext.P18 order was passed. It is submitted that the issuance of Ext.P18 order without considering Ext.P17 revision petition preferred by the petitioner is absolutely arbitrary and unjust and further that the enquiry report exonerating the petitioner in W.P.(C) No.5942 of 2026 is without following the procedures and without considering the seriousness of the allegation levelled against the petitioner in W.P.(C) No.5942 of 2026. Therefore, the petitioner prayed for an expeditious consideration of Ext.P17 revision petition and also sought the quashing of Ext.P18 order.

5. A detailed counter affidavit is filed by the 6<sup>th</sup> respondent in W.P.(C) No.6532 of 2026, who is the petitioner in W.P.(C) No.5942 of 2026, wherein it is contended that the manager has accepted the enquiry report and thereafter issued Ext.R6(a) order imposing a punishment of compulsory retirement and after accepting the enquiry report, Ext.P17 revision petition stated to have been filed by the Manager



is not maintainable.

6. I have heard the rival contentions on both sides.

7. The question to be considered is as to whether the Manager of the school is entitled to reject an enquiry report wherein it is held that the allegation against the teacher could not be proved beyond doubt and impose a punishment of compulsory retirement on the delinquent teacher, discarding the enquiry report.

8. Section 12 of the Kerala Education Act, 1958 deals with conditions of service of aided school teachers. Section 12(2) provides that no teacher of an aided school shall be dismissed, removed or reduced in rank by the manager without the previous sanction of the officer authorised by the Government in this behalf, or placed under suspension by the manager for a continuous period exceeding fifteen days without such previous sanction. Going by Section 12(2), a major punishment could be imposed by the manager only with the previous sanction of the authorised officer of the Government. Rule 75 of Chapter XIV A, KER provides for the procedure to be followed for imposing major penalty, which mandates that it is for the manager on a prima facie satisfaction that the delinquent has committed alleged charge, to frame a charge and call for an explanation from the delinquent teacher and after receiving the reply, the manager if satisfied that a formal inquiry should be conducted,



2026:KER:28916

shall order that a formal inquiry being conducted and thereafter the manager shall forward the records of the case with a request to the Deputy Director (Education) in case of headmasters of High Schools and Training Schools or to the educational officers in other cases, that a formal inquiry may be conducted by that officer or any other officer not below the rank of an Assistant Educational Officer authorised by that officer or an officer of the department appointed by the Director or Government. The said rule further mandates that at the conclusion of the inquiry, the inquiring authority shall prepare a report of the inquiry, recording its findings on each of the charges and if the manager is of the opinion that any of the major penalty should be imposed, he shall furnish the teacher a copy of the report of the inquiring authority, give him notice regarding the action proposed and thereafter the manager can pass final orders imposing the penalty with the previous sanction of the competent authority. So, going by the said provision, a major punishment could be imposed on the delinquent employee only with the sanction of the competent authority. Further, if the manager finds that a formal inquiry is to be conducted, the matter has to be placed before the competent authority, and it is for the authority in the Education Department to conduct a formal inquiry, based on which the manager could impose punishment, that too after obtaining previous sanction of the competent authority. Here is a case where the



2026:KER:28916

disciplinary authority, as per Ext.P16 inquiry report, entered a finding that the charges levelled against the teacher, the petitioner in W.P.(C) No.5942 of 2026, could not be proved beyond doubt. But the Manager did not accept the said report and passed Ext.P18 proceedings imposing a punishment of compulsory retirement from service. It is a settled position in service law that a disciplinary authority could disagree with the findings in the enquiry report and impose punishment but after following the procedures contemplated therein. But whether such power is granted to the Manager of an aided school as per the provisions of the Kerala Education Act and Rules is the question to be decided in these writ petitions. The said issue was considered by a Division Bench of this Court in **Cherian v. Anna S.Varghese, 1987 KHC 103**, as to the jurisdiction of the manager to discard the finding of the enquiry officer and take an independent decision for imposing a penalty. After considering the relevant provision of the Kerala Education Act, 1958 and the Kerala Education Rules, 1959, the Division Bench of this Court held that the manager is bound by the finding of the enquiry officer regarding the innocence of the delinquent staff, and he has no power to proceed further to impose any punishment. Paragraphs 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 23 of the said decision read as follows:

*“15. The disciplinary jurisdiction of the Manager, very extensive as they were, has necessarily to be defined and confined within certain*



2026:KER:28916

*prescribed limits in public interest, especially when the institutions are receiving substantial financial aid from the State. The restrictions imposed by the Act and the rules thus stem from the natural distrust in a biased Manager acting arbitrarily and the legitimate anxiety, to safeguard the interests of the large number of the teaching and non teaching staff of these schools, and to create an impartial atmosphere for the conduct of the enquiry. A neutral authority, an educational officer, is thus specified by the Act itself for the conduct of the enquiry with no choice left to the Manager. The Act thus controls his discretion and commands the appointment of the educational officer as the enquiry authority. (When this officer conducts the enquiry as enjoined by the Act, can the Manager still be given the discretion to discard his finding to enable him to proceed further against the delinquent staff, for, then, the purpose for which the statute itself designated the enquiry officer is defeated. Moreover, under the Rules, the enquiry officer is an authority higher in status than the Manager. This higher status is recognised in R.81A itself. It is difficult to visualise a situation where the findings of a higher authority as an enquiry officer can be straightaway rejected by the subordinate authority functioning as the Manager. The legislative intention thus seems to be clear that the Act and the Rules do not intend to give any power to discard the finding of innocence entered by the enquiry officer. To this extent, in the peculiar circumstances prevailing in this State, when almost all the educational institutions controlled by Managers or Corporate management are brought under the statutory grip of the Act and the Rules, the Act has made a clear departure from the general principles applicable to ordinary disciplinary enquiry.*

*16. This view is strengthened by the further fact that the punishment can eventually be imposed only if the educational officer grants sanction. It is too much to expect that when the educational officer finds a teacher not guilty after an enquiry, the Manager can expect to*



2026:KER:28916

*get sanction to impose punishment from the educational officer himself. To permit the Manager to proceed with the enquiry even after the teacher has been found to be not guilty, is thus only an exercise in futility.*

*17. It is significant to note that clauses, 10 and 11 of R.75 only provide that after the inquiry, the inquiry authority shall forward the record of the enquiry to the Manager and if the Manager is of opinion that any of the major penalties should be imposed, he has to take the next step of giving the delinquent staff an opportunity to make a representation. This provision is in marked contrast to the provision contained in the Kerala Civil Services (Classification, Control & Appeal) Rules, where R.15(11) reads thus:-*

*"The Disciplinary Authority, where it is not the Government, shall if it is not the Inquiring Authority, consider the record of the inquiry and record its findings on each charge. Where the Disciplinary Authority is Government, it shall consider the records of the inquiry and where it is considered necessary to depart from the findings of the Inquiring Authority, record its provisional findings on each charge with reasons thereof."*

*Same is the rule. 15(2) of the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, which runs as follows:-*

*'The disciplinary authority shall, if it disagrees with the findings of the inquiring authority on any article of charge, record its reasons for such disagreement and record its own*



2026:KER:28916

*findings on such charge if the evidence on record is sufficient for the purpose."*

*18. It, therefore, seems to be clear that when the Manager proposes to take action under Clause.11 of R.75, when he proposes to issue notice proposing the penalty to be imposed, he is bound by the finding of the independent impartial statutory authority, the educational officer. A fortiori, it follows that the Manager has no jurisdiction to discard the finding of "not guilty" entered by the educational officer and proceed to issue notice proposing a provisional punishment. The jurisdiction under clause.2 of R.75 cannot thus arise where the educational officer, after an enquiry as contemplated under the Act and the Rules, finds that the member of the staff is innocent.*

*19. The Act provided a complete disciplinary Code for the aided educational institutions. Thus, the legislative intention to assure a reasonable impartial and effective enquiry, the prescription of a designated authority higher than the Manager as an enquiry officer, with no choice of selection left to the Manager, the adoption, not by accident but by design, of a terminology different from similar provisions applicable to civil servants, lead to the irresistible conclusion that the Manager is bound by the finding of the enquiry officer regarding the innocence of the delinquent staff and he has no power to proceed further to impose any punishment. The scheme and intent of the Act and the Rules, the content and context of Clause.11 of R.75 indicate that the statutory scheme of disciplinary proceedings for imposing major punishment excluded the ordinary jurisdiction of the Manager to convert a finding of not guilty by the enquiry officer into a finding of guilt.*

XXXXX      XXXXX      XXXXX      XXXXX

*23. We, therefore, hold that the Manager did not have jurisdiction to issue the notices Exts. P6 and P10 proposing to impose a major*



2026:KER:28916

*punishment of dismissal after the enquiry officer entered a finding that the charges against the Clerk and the Menial Staff were not proved The notices are thus quashed and the Original Petitions stand allowed to that extent.”*

The Division Bench of this Court in **Cherian**'s case cited supra has categorically held that the manager has no jurisdiction to impose any punishment after the enquiry officer has entered a finding that the charges levelled against the delinquent are not proved and that the general principle applicable to ordinary disciplinary enquiry is not applicable to an enquiry conducted as per the provisions of the Kerala Education Act and Rules. In the light of the judgment of the Division Bench of this Court in **Cherian**'s case cited supra and taking into consideration the above and facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the view that Ext.P18 punishment imposed by the manager discarding Ext.P16 enquiry report, wherein the charges against petitioner were found to be not proved, was rightly interfered as per Ext.P20 order by the Government. Therefore, I am of the view that Ext.P20 order produced in W.P.(C) No.5942 of 2026, which is impugned in W.P.(C) No.6532 of 2026, is not liable to be interfered with. Since the manager has accepted the enquiry report and passed an order based on the same, which has been interfered by the Government as per Ext.P20 order produced in W.P.(C) No.5942 of 2026, I am not inclined to issue an order directing consideration of Ext.P17 revision petition filed by the manager, the petitioner in W.P.(C) No.6532 of



2026:KER:28916

2026.

Accordingly, W.P.(C) No.6532 of 2026 is dismissed. W.P.(C) No.5942 of 2026 is disposed of, directing the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent to implement Ext.P20 order issued by the Government and grant all benefits as ordered by the Government in Ext.P20 order.

Sd/-

**VIJU ABRAHAM  
JUDGE**

cks



2026:KER:28916

APPENDIX OF WP(C) NO. 5942 OF 2026

## PETITIONER EXHIBITS

- Exhibit P1 A COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION NO.C5/26926/09 DATED 2/3/2010 ISSUED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT
- Exhibit P2 A COPY OF THE MEMO OF CHARGES NO.SVV-M 01/2010 DATED 14/5/2010
- Exhibit P3 A COPY OF THE REPLY SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER DATED 13/6/2010
- Exhibit P4 A COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION NO. A3/3184/10 DATED 16/2/2011 ISSUED BY THE DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL OFFICER
- Exhibit P5 A COPY OF THE SHOW CAUSE NOTICE NO. S.V.V.M.01/2010 DATED 11/4/2011 ISSUED BY THE MANAGER TO THE PETITIONER
- Exhibit P6 A COPY OF THE REPLY SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER DATED 30/4/2011
- Exhibit P7 A COPY OF THE ORDER OF PROCEEDINGS BY THE MANAGER NO.SVVM/01/2010 DATED 4/7/2011
- Exhibit P8 A COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN W.P.(C) NO. 18985/2011 DATED 13/7/2011
- Exhibit P9 A COPY OF THE ORDER NO.B5/10205/2010 DATED 29/10/2011 OF THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION
- Exhibit P10 A COPY OF THE ORDER NO. V1/44613/11/DPI DATED 15/3/2012
- Exhibit P11 A COPY OF THE GOVERNMENT ORDER, G.O(RT) NO. 2336/2015/G.EDN DATED 15/6/2015
- Exhibit P12 A COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN W.P.(C) NO. 19577/2015 DATED 19/2/2021
- Exhibit P13 A COPY OF THE G.O(MS) NO. 8303/2022/GEDN DATED 22/12/2022
- Exhibit P14 A COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION NO.DEOTRD/ 1259/2023-B1 DATED 1/6/2023 ISSUED BY THE DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL OFFICER
- Exhibit P15 A COPY OF THE HEARING NOTICE NO.DEOTIR/ 1357/2023-B1 DATED 17/2/2024 ISSUED BY THE DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL OFFICER, TIRUR
- Exhibit P16 A COPY OF THE ENQUIRY REPORT NO.DEOTIR/



2026:KER:28916

1357/2023-B1 DATED 1/4/2024 PREPARED BY  
THE DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL OFFICER, TIRUR

Exhibit P17 A COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN W.P.(C) NO.  
31093/2024 DATED 18/10/2024

Exhibit P18 A COPY OF THE PUNISHMENT ORDER NO.  
SVVM/11/2024 DATED 29/11/2024 IMPOSED BY  
THE MANAGER

Exhibit P19 A COPY OF THE REVISION SUBMITTED BY THE  
PETITIONER DATED 6/12/2024

Exhibit P20 A COPY OF THE GOVERNMENT ORDER, G.O(RT)  
NO. 10346/2025/G.EDN DATED 18/12/2025



2026:KER:28916

APPENDIX OF WP(C) NO. 6532 OF 2026

## PETITIONER EXHIBITS

- Exhibit P1 A TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER NO. C.5/26926/09 DATED 02/03/2010 ISSUED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT TO THE 6TH RESPONDENT IS PRODUCED HEREWITH AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT P1.
- Exhibit P2 A TRUE COPY OF THE MEMO OF CHARGES NO. SVV-M 01/2010, DATED 14/05/2010, ISSUED BY THE PETITIONER TO THE 6TH RESPONDENT, IS PRODUCED HEREWITH AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT P2.
- Exhibit P3 A TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY DATED 13/06/2010 SUBMITTED BY THE 6TH RESPONDENT TO THE MANAGER IS PRODUCED HEREWITH AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT P3.
- Exhibit P4 A TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE NO. A3/3184/10 DATED 16/02/2011 ISSUED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT TO THE 6TH RESPONDENT IS PRODUCED HEREWITH AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT P4.
- Exhibit P5 A TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE NO. S.V.V.M. 01/2010 DATED 11/04/2011 ISSUED BY THE MANAGER TO THE 6TH RESPONDENT IS PRODUCED HEREWITH AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT P5.
- Exhibit P6 A TRUE COPY OF THE WRITTEN STATEMENT DATED 30/04/2011 SUBMITTED BY THE 6TH RESPONDENT TO THE MANAGER IS PRODUCED HEREWITH AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT P6.
- Exhibit P7 A TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS NO. SVVM/01/2010 DATED 04/07/2011 ISSUED BY THE MANAGER TO THE 6TH RESPONDENT IS PRODUCED HEREWITH AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT P7.
- Exhibit P8 A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO. B5/10205/2010 DATED 29/10/2011 ISSUED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT IS PRODUCED HEREWITH AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT P8.
- Exhibit P9 A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO. V1/44613/11/DPI DATED 15/03/2012 ISSUED BY THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTIONS, IS PRODUCED HEREWITH AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT P9.
- Exhibit P10 A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO. G.O(RT) NO. 2336/2015/G.EDN. DATED 15/06/2015, ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT, IS PRODUCED HEREWITH AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT P10.
- Exhibit P11 A TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 19/02/2021 ISSUED BY THIS HONOURABLE COURT IS PRODUCED HEREWITH AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT



2026:KER:28916

P11.

Exhibit P12 A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO. G.O.(M.S.) NO. 8303/2022/GEDN DATED 22/12/2022 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT IS PRODUCED HERewith AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT P12.

Exhibit P13 A TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE NO. DEOTRD/1259/2023-B1 DATED 01/06/2023 ISSUED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT TO THE PETITIONER IS PRODUCED HERewith AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT P13.

Exhibit P14 A TRUE COPY OF THE HEARING NOTICE NO. DEOTIR/1357/2023-B1 DATED 17/02/2024 ISSUED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT TO THE PETITIONER IS PRODUCED HERewith AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT P14.

Exhibit P15 A TRUE COPY OF THE ENQUIRY REPORT NO. DEOTIR/1357/2023-B1 DATED 01/04/2024 ISSUED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT IS PRODUCED HERewith AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT P15.

Exhibit P16 A TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 18/10/2024 ISSUED BY THIS HONOURABLE COURT IS PRODUCED HERewith AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT P16.

Exhibit P17 A TRUE COPY OF THE REVISION PETITION DATED 04/11/2024 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT IS PRODUCED HERewith AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT P17.

Exhibit P18 A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO. G.O.(M.S.) NO. 10346/2025/GEDN DATED 18/12/2025 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT IS PRODUCED HERewith AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT P18.

**RESPONDENT EXHIBITS**

Exhibit R6(a) A copy of the order No. SVVM/11/2024 dated 29/11/2024 issued by the Manager