

[CR]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN

WEDNESDAY, 1ST DAY OF MARCH 2023 / 10TH PHALGUNA, 1944

WP(C) NO. 21821 OF 2022

PETITIONER:

GEETHAKUMARY. J

AGED 50 YEARS

HEADMISTRESS, ALL SAINTS HIGH SCHOOL, PUTHAYAM.
691324.

BY ADV S.ABDUL RAZZAK

RESPONDENTS:

- 1 THE DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL OFFICER
PUNALUR. 691 331.
- 2 THE DIRECTOR,
GENERAL EDUCATION, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.695 014.
- 3 THE MANAGER,
ALL SAINTS HIGH SCHOOL, PUTHAYAM. 691324.
- 4 GOVERNMENT OF KERALA,
REP.BY PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, GENERAL EDUCATION (B)
DEPARTMENT, GOVT. SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.695 001.

BY ADV.SMT.NISHA BOSE, SR.G.P

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
21.02.2023, THE COURT ON 1.3.2023 DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

CR**P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN, J.****-----
W.P.(C)No.21821 of 2022****-----
Dated this the 1st day of March, 2023****JUDGMENT**

The petitioner, Smt.Geethakumary.J, was promoted as Headmistress against a retirement vacancy that arose on 01.04.2017 in the 3rd respondent's school, who is The Manager of All Saints Higher Secondary School, Puthayam, which is an aided High School. Currently, she is continuing in that post. The 1st respondent, The District Educational Officer, approved the said promotion and a copy of the appointment order with the approval order is Ext.P1 in this writ petition. The petitioner was originally appointed as High School Assistant (Hindi) (for short, "HSA") with effect from 02.06.2003 as per Ext.P2 and the same was approved as evident by the endorsement in Ext.P2. According to the petitioner, Ext.P1 promotion as Headmistress was after the completion of 13 years of approved graduate service as HSA. The petitioner has B.A Degree Certificate (Hindi) and M.A Degree Certificate (Hindi), Exts.P3 and P4 are the Certificates to prove the same.

2. As per Ext.P5 Government Order, 'Acharya Course' of the Kerala Hindi Prachara Sabha from Hindi Teacher's Training College, Thiruvananthapuram was treated as equivalent training qualification as prescribed under Rule 44A of Chapter XIV(A) and Rule 2 of Chapter XXXI of the Kerala Education Rules, 1959 (hereinafter referred to as,"KER"). It is the case of the petitioner that the 4th respondent, the State of Kerala, represented by Principal Secretary, General Education Department also made requisite amendment to the relevant rules with retrospective effect in Ext.P5 Government Order as evident by Ext.P6 Government Order. It is the case of the petitioner that, at the time of appointment as HSA (Hindi), the petitioner had the requisite training qualifications. Ext.P7 is the Acharya Certificate issued to the petitioner by the Kerala Hindi Prachar Sabha dated 12.11.1992. It is the case of the petitioner that the petitioner has also obtained B.Ed Degree in December 2013 as evident by Ext.P8. The petitioner has also passed the Account Test (Lower) and the test on Kerala Education Act and Rules conducted by the Kerala Public Service Commission in the year 2012. Exts.P9 and P10 are the Certificates to prove the same.

3. The petitioner was the senior most in the combined seniority list of High School Assistants maintained as per Rule 34

(a) of Chapter XIV(A) of KER, at the time of Ext.P1 promotion as Headmistress. Ext.P1 promotion was approved with effect from 01.04.2017 by the 1st respondent. Therefore, according to the petitioner, as on the date of occurrence of vacancy of Headmistress, the petitioner possessed all the qualifications as prescribed under Chapter XIV(A), Rule 44 and Rule 44A read with the Explanations to sub-rule (1) of Rule 44A. It is also the case of the petitioner that the petitioner had more than 13 years of continuous graduate service with requisite collegiate training which was prescribed as equivalent. But the Additional Director, General Education Department, Thiruvananthapuram, as per Ext.P11 cancelled the approval granted for Ext.P1 promotion by stating that the petitioner did not possess the graduate service qualification as stipulated under Rule 44A in Chapter XIV(A) of KER. As per Ext.P12, the 2nd respondent refused to consider the appeal filed by the petitioner. Aggrieved by Ext.P11 order, the petitioner availed a statutory revision before the 4th respondent. Thereafter the petitioner filed W.P.(C)No.40318/2018 challenging Ext.P11. In that writ petition, as per Ext.P13 order, the reversion of the petitioner was stayed but the payment of headmaster's scale of pay was deferred.

4. It is the case of the petitioner that the above writ

petition was finally disposed of as per Ext.P14 judgment by directing the disposal of the statutory revision by the 4th respondent. Thereafter, all the parties were heard by the Joint Secretary of the 4th respondent. But the revision was dismissed as per Ext.P15. Aggrieved by Exts.P11 and P15, this writ petition is filed.

5. Heard Adv.S.A.Razak and the Senior Government Pleader, Smt.Nisha Bose.

6. The counsel for the petitioner submitted that Ext.P11 is an order passed without giving an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner. The counsel also submitted that in Ext.P11, the only reason for cancelling the promotion is that the petitioner did not possess the graduate service qualification as stipulated under Rule 44A in Chapter XIV(A) of KER. According to the petitioner, the petitioner possess the required graduate service qualifications. The counsel took me through the relevant provisions in KER and submitted that Ext.P7 is a certificate issued by the Kerala Hindi Prachara Sabha and the same is approved as a qualification, however, the same was not considered. The counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is qualified as per Rule 44A of Chapter XIV(A) KER read with

Explanations to Sub Rule (1) of Rule 44A of Chapter XIV(A) of KER. The counsel submitted that Ext.P7 is a collegiate training. The counsel took me through explanation-I of Rule 44A Chapter of XIV(A) of KER and submitted that the graduate service means "acquisition of collegiate training such as B.T/L.T or B.Ed". The counsel also takes me through Rule 2 of Chapter XXXI of KER and submitted that Acharya of Kerala Hindi Prachar Sabha with a pass in SSLC examination conducted by the Commissioner of Government Examinations, Kerala or its equivalent is an academic qualification for the post of HSA. The counsel submitted that Rule 2(1) of Chapter XXXI of KER is to be read along with the explanation to Rule 44A of Chapter XIV(A) of KER. It is the definite case of the petitioner that the petitioner is fully qualified for the post of HSA. The Government Pleader, on the other hand, submitted that as per Rule 2(1) of Chapter XXXI of KER, the qualification for the post of Headmaster is a degree in Arts or Science or its equivalent and B.Ed/B.T/L.T or its equivalent as conferred or recognised by the Universities in Kerala. The Government Pleader submitted that no equivalency certificate is produced by the petitioner to show that Ext.P7 certificate is equivalent to B.Ed/B.T or L.T. Hence the petitioner is not qualified. The Government Pleader also supported

Exts.P11 and P15 orders.

7. This Court considered the contentions of the petitioner and the Government pleader.

8. Ext.P11 is the first order cancelling the approval of the promotion of the petitioner as Headmistress. Prima facie, I am of the opinion that Ext.P11 will not stand because it is an order passed without giving an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner. Admittedly, the petitioner was promoted as Headmistress as per Ext.P1 order and the same was approved on 27.09.2017 with effect from 01.04.2017. This is clear from Ext.P1 order. After about 4½ months, Ext.P11 order was passed by the 2nd respondent without hearing the petitioner. Before cancelling a promotion order, it is the bounden duty of the authority concerned to give an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner. The petitioner was promoted as the Headmistress in a school. The post of a Headmistress in a school is a prestigious position in society and in students community. One fine morning the petitioner's promotion as Headmistress is cancelled by the 2nd respondent even without hearing the petitioner. At least the embarrassment to a teacher in such situation is to be taken note of by the department. Hence the action of the 2nd respondent in

issuing Ext P11 is not at all acceptable. Therefore, in my opinion, prima facie Ext.P11 will not stand.

9. The reason mentioned in Ext.P11 for cancelling the approval is that the petitioner did not possess 12 years graduate service as per Rule 44A Chapter XIV(A) of KER for promotion. It is not clear how the District Educational Officer, Punalur approved Ext.P1 order on 27.09.2017, if the petitioner does not have 12 years of graduate service as on that date. The 2nd respondent issued Ext.P11 order based on the letter No.B3/6758/2017 dated 30.11.2017 of the District Educational Officer. Copy of the same is not furnished to the petitioner. How did the District Educational Officer subsequently came to know about this lack of 12 years graduate service to the petitioner is not clear from Ext.P11. It is also not clear what steps were taken against the District Educational Officer for issuing the approval order on 29.09.2017, if the petitioner does not have 12 years graduate service as stated in Ext.P11 order.

10. Whatever that may be the case, the question to be decided is whether the petitioner has 12 years graduate service as mentioned in Rule 44A of Chapter XIV(A) of KER. Rule 44 Chapter XIV(A) of KER states that the appointment of

Headmasters shall ordinarily be according to seniority from the seniority list prepared and maintained under Clauses (a) and (b) as the case may be of Rule 34. Admittedly the petitioner was the senior most as per the seniority list. There is no rival contestant to the petitioner as far as seniority is concerned as per the seniority list. Then comes Rule 44A of Chapter XIV(A) of KER. It will be better to extract Rule 44A of Chapter XIV(A) of KER hereunder :

44A. (1) Subject to the provisions contained in sub-rule (1) of rule 44, the minimum service qualification for appointment as Headmaster in Aided Complete High Schools/Training schools shall be twelve years of continuous graduate service with a pass in the test in Kerala Education Act and the Kerala Education Rules and a pass in account Test (Lower) conducted by Kerala Public Service Commission.

Provided that Headmasters of High and Training Schools, who were actually holding the said post on the eleventh day of June, 1974 shall stand exempted from passing the Account Test (Lower).

Provident further that Teachers who have attained the age of 50 years shall stand exempted permanently from acquiring the test qualification specified in Sub rule (1).

[X X X X]

Explanation I: For the purpose of this rule, "Graduate Service" means all service of a teacher as High School Assistant, Training School Assistant, Headmaster of an incomplete High School, Headmaster of a complete Upper Primary School/Middle school or Headmaster of a Training School after acquisition of Collegiate training such as B.T,

L.T. Or B.Ed. But in the case of such teachers appointed prior to 15-10-1957 their untrained service after graduation shall also be reckoned as "Graduate Service", provided that their appointments were not in accordance with the Madras Educational Rules.

Note:- A period of 8 years from 6-11-1968 is given to Headmasters or Aided complete High and Training Schools for passing the test in the Act and Rules. All appointments to the posts of Headmasters of Aided complete High and Training Schools during the period of 8 years from 6-11-1968 shall be provisional. If such persons do not secure the test qualification within the specified period they will be reverted.

Explanation II: The High School Assistants (Languages), according to their seniority in the combined seniority list of teachers prepared under clause (a) of rule 34 shall also be appointed as Headmasters in High Schools, provided they possess the qualification prescribed under rule 44 and sub rule (1) above, and rule 2, Chapter XXXI, for promotion as Headmasters of High Schools as on the date of occurrence of vacancy."

11. As per Rule 44A, the minimum service qualification for appointment as Headmaster in an aided complete high schools/training schools shall be 12 years of continuous graduate service with a pass in the test in Kerala Education Act and Kerala Education Rules and a pass in Account Test (lower) conducted by Kerala Public Service Commission. As evident by Exts.P9 and P10, the petitioner has the test qualification in Kerala Education Act and Kerala Education Rules and has also passed in Account test (lower) conducted by Kerala Public Service Commission. The question to be decided is whether the petitioner has 12 years

continuous graduate service. It is true that the petitioner has acquired B.Ed degree as per Ext.P8. But that was only in December 2013. If B.Ed degree obtained by the petitioner as per Ext.P8 is taken into consideration as on the date of Ext.P1 promotion order, the petitioner does not have 12 years of continuous graduate service. The petitioner relied on Ext.P7 the Acharya certificate issued by the Kerala Hindi Prachar Sabha to show that the petitioner has 12 years of continuous graduate service. Whether Ext.P7 can be treated as a graduate service is the question to be decided in this case. "Graduate Service" is explained in Explanation (1) to Rule 44A of Chapter XIV(A) of KER. As per Explanation (1), the Graduate Service means all services of a teacher as High School Assistant, Training School Assistant, Headmaster of an incomplete high school, Headmaster of a complete Upper Primary School/Middle School or Headmaster of a Training School after acquisition of collegiate training such as B.T, L.T or B.Ed. Therefore, service of a teacher as High School Assistant, Training School Assistant, Headmaster should be after the acquisition of collegiate training such as B.T, L.T or B.Ed.

12. The contention of the petitioner is that Ext.P7 is a

collegiate training. A perusal of Ext.P7 will show that the petitioner has completed the course of 'Acharya' training in the Hindi Teachers' Training College, Thiruvananthapuram of the Kerala Hindi Prachar Sabha and passed the Acharya examination of the Sabha conducted in September 1991. However, what is meant by collegiate training is not defined in Kerala Education Act and Rules.

13. Therefore, we have to accept the simple meaning of 'collegiate training', which means a training in a college. Therefore there cannot be a dispute to the fact that the Acharya Examination of Kerala Hindi Prachar Sabha is a collegiate training in the light of Ext P7 certificate. Then the next question to be decided is whether Ext.P7 Acharya Certificate is equivalent to B.T, L.T or B.Ed. In explanation (I) to Rule 44A of Chapter XIV(A) of KER, it is not mentioned as "collegiate training in B.T, L.T or B.Ed". But it is stated that "collegiate training **such as** BT, LT or B.Ed." What is the meaning of "such as"? As per Chambers 20th Century Dictionary, "such" means, of that kind, the like kind, or the same kind (often followed by *as* or by a clause beginning with that). In **Good Year India Ltd v. Collector of Customs, Bombay [AIR 1999 SC 1558]**, the Apex Court observed that the words 'such as' means illustrative

of the various things. It will be better to extract paragraph 2 of the above judgment hereunder:

"2. The valves are made of copper alloy and the appellants have produced certificates of the manufacturers in support of their claim that the valves were made of corrosion-resisting material. In these circumstances, the authorities should have procured on the basis that the valves were made of corrosion resisting material and merely because they are made of copper alloy would not disentitle the appellants from claiming that they fall under Sub-Heading (2). The words "such as stainless steel, nickel monel, incoloy, hostelry" in Sub-Heading (2) are only illustrative of the various metals from which valves can be made but the said description is not exhaustive of the metals. If the material from which the valves are made is a corrosion-resisting material then the valves would fall under Sub-Heading (2) of Heading 84.61 (84.81). In these circumstances, we are unable to uphold the impugned judgments and it must be held that the valves imported by the appellants being made of corrosion resisting material, would fall under Sub-Heading (2) of Heading 84.61 (84.81) of the Customs Tariff. The appeals are accordingly allowed and the impugned judgments are set aside. No order as to costs."
(underline supplied)

14. In **Royal Hatcheries Pvt. and Others v. State of A.P. and Others [AIR 1994 SC 666]**, the Apex Court observed that so far as the word 'such as' is concerned, they are meant to be illustrative and not exhaustive. Therefore it is clear that the words 'such as' used in explanation I of Rule 44A Chapter XIV(A)

of KER is only an illustrative meaning of graduate service and it is not limited to B.T, L.T or B.Ed. Therefore the collegiate training such as B.T, L.T or B.Ed includes a collegiate training of Acharya conducted by Hindi Teachers' Training College, Thiruvananthapuram also. At this stage, it will be better to consider the academic qualification and training qualification prescribed for the post of High School Assistant (Hindi) as per Rule 2(iv) of Chapter XXXI of KER. It will be better to extract Rule 2(iv) of Chapter XXXI of KER hereunder:

"High School Assistant (Hindi):- The candidate shall possess any of the academic qualifications and training qualification as specified below:

A. ACADEMIC QUALIFICATION

A degree in Hindi conferred or recognised by the Universities in Kerala; or

A title of Oriental learning in Hindi awarded or recognised by the Universities in Kerala; or

Praveen of the Dakshina Bharat Hindi Prachar Sabha, Madras with a pass in the S.S.L.C Examination conducted by the Commissioner for Government Examinations, Kerala, or its equivalent; or

Sahithyacharya of Kerala Hindi Prachar Sabha with a pass in S. S.L.C. Examination conducted by the Commissioner for Government Examinations, Kerala or its equivalent.

B. TRAINING QUALIFICATIONS

B.Ed/B.T/L.T. conferred or recognised by the Universities in Kerala or Diploma or Certificate of Language Teachers' Training in Hindi issued by the Commissioner for Government

Examinations, Kerala; or

Diploma in Hindi Teachers Training issued by the Commissioner for Government Examinations, Kerala; or

A pass in anyone of the following examinations of the Kendriya Hindi Sikshan Mandai Agra namely:

- (i) Hindi Siksha Praveen;
- (ii) Hindi Sikshan Parangath
- (iii) Hindi Sikshan Nishnat

Explanation I:- Persons who have successfully undergone Pracharak Diploma of the Dakshina Bharat Hindi Prachar Sabha upto and including the academic Year 1969-70 shall be considered to possess the requisite training qualification.

Explanation II:- Persons who have successfully undergone the Course in Hindi Teachers Diploma course of the Regional Hindi Training College Gandhigram Madura during the academic year 1967-68 or prior to that year shall be considered to possess the requisite training qualifications.

Explanation III:- Persons who have successfully undergone the Acharya course of the Kerala Hindi Prachar Sabha upto and including the academic year 2014-15 shall be considered to possess the requisite training qualification.”

15. In Explanation III to the training qualifications for the post of HSA, it is clearly stated that persons who have successfully undergone Acharya course of the Kerala Hindi Prachar Sabha up to and including the academic year 2014-15 shall be considered to possess the requisite training qualification.

It is true that in Rule 2(1) of Chapter XXXI, the qualification for the post of Headmaster is shown as a degree in Arts or Science or its equivalent and B.Ed / B.T / L.T or its equivalent as conferred or recognised by the Universities in Kerala. Admittedly the petitioner has a degree and there is no dispute on that. But whether the petitioner's qualification based on Ext.P7 can be treated as equivalent to B.Ed / B.T / L.T as mentioned in Rule 2 of Chapter XXXI of KER is the point to be decided. For deciding the same, this Court has to read Rule (2) of Chapter XXXI of KER read with Explanation (1) to Rule 44A of Chapter XIV(A) of KER. There the graduate service is explained to the effect that the graduate service should be after acquisition of collegiate training such as B.T, L.T or B.Ed. Rule 44A Chapter of XIV(A) also states the minimum qualification for appointment as Headmaster. Since the explanation clearly says that after acquisition of collegiate training such as B.T, L.T or B.Ed, the candidate should be in graduate service as defined in that explanation. **Hence it is clear that the qualification of B.T, L.T or B.Ed alone are not included but such other qualifications are also included.** As I mentioned earlier, Ext.P7 is a collegiate training and as per Rule 2(iv) of Chapter XXXI of KER, the training qualification includes Acharya course of the Kerala Hindi Prachar Sabha.

Explanation III was inserted as per Ext.P6 amendment to KER on 17.02.2020. Since that Explanation was added on 17.02.2020, the mentioning of the term “equivalent” in Rule 2(1) of Chapter XXXI of KER can be presumed as relaxed. Therefore it is clear that the petitioner has the required qualifications.

16. The Apex Court in **Praveen Kumar v. Kerala Public Service Commission [2021 (4) KLT OnLine 1178 (SC)]** considered the definition of the term equivalence. Paragraph 26 is relevant, which is extracted hereunder:

“26. Note (v) of Clause 7 of the employment notification in the case PK and Note (vi) of Clause 7 of the employment notification in the case of AD required disclosure of the equivalency orders. A plain reading of the two GOs clearly reflect that their degrees were equivalent to the requisite qualifications contained in the eligibility criteria. In the case of *Aarya K. Babu* (supra), the disputed subject was recognized subsequently and introduced as part of the eligibility criteria. The principle of equivalency was not the main reasoning on the basis of which the said case was decided. The word “equivalence” in its plain meaning implies something which is equal to another. In the field of academics, application of the principle of equivalency in relation to degrees in two subjects would mean that they had the same standing or status all along, unless the official instrument according equivalency specifies a date from which the respective subjects would be treated as such, in express terms or by implication.”

17. The Apex Court observed that the word 'equivalence' in

its plaint meaning implies something which is equal to another. The Apex Court also observed that in the field of academics, application of the principle of equivalency in relation to degrees in two subjects would mean that they had the same standing or status all along, unless the official instrument according to equivalency specifies a date from which the respective subjects would be treated as such, in express terms or by implication. In the light of the words used 'such as' in Explanation I to Rule 44A while narrating the collegiate training, I am of the considered opinion that Ext.P7 certificate can be treated as a collegiate training such as B.T, L.T or B.Ed as mentioned in Explanation I to Rule 44A of Chapter XIV(A) of KER.

18. In ***Balakrishna Pillai v. State of Kerala and others*** [2000 (2) KLJ 789], the Division Bench of this Court observed that even though the language Hindi comes under the faculty of Oriental Studies, what is awarded is a degree in Arts and therefore, a teacher who acquired B.A. (Hindi) is qualified for promotion to the post of Headmaster. In this case, the petitioner has a B.A.Degree and M.A.Degree as evident by Exts.P3 and P4. Anyway, such a dispute is not there from the department.

19. Moreover, in ***Sambasivan v. State of Kerala*** [2002 (1) KLT 324], a Division bench of this Court considered 12 years

graduate service mentioned in the rule Rule 44A in detail. It will be better to extract paragraph 7 of the above judgment hereunder:

"7. Controverting the above contention, the counsel for the contesting respondents submitted as follows: There can be different types of training acquired by a teacher. He might be a T.T.C. holder. He might have language teachers training course which is sufficient for appointment as H.S.A. (Language). There are other training qualifications, such as B.T. / L.T. / B.Ed. These three qualifications (BT / LT / B.Ed.) are obtained after collegiate training. There might be a case where a teacher might have completed 12 years service after obtaining Degree in the concerned Subject. But, he may not have completed 12 years after obtaining B.Ed. Degree. If the qualification is prescribed as graduate service obtained after acquiring training qualification, a language teacher with L.T.T.C. Or T.T.C. and who has completed 12 years service after obtaining B.A. Degree will be eligible for appointment as Headmaster as L.T.T.C. and T.T.C. are also training qualifications, even if he has not completed 12 years after obtaining B.Ed. So, to exclude other training qualifications, it is specified that the 12 years graduate service should be after acquisition of collegiate training. What is meant by the said Explanation is that the training qualification must be a qualification at the college level and not an inferior training qualification. We find that the contention urged by the respondents is a plausible view. It is not stated in the Rule that the qualification must be B.T. / L.T. or B.Ed. obtained after studying in a college. On the contrary, the words used are "after acquisition of collegiate training, such as, B.T. / L.T. or B.Ed." It only means that the graduate service must be service after obtaining B.T. / L.T. or B.Ed. or similar qualification."

20. This also proves that after, "acquisition of college training", only means that the graduate service must be service after obtaining B.T/L.T or B.Ed or similar qualification. In the light of the above dictum also, the petitioner has succeeded.

21. The Government Pleader on the other hand relied on the judgment of the Division Bench in **Sally Mathew v. State of Kerala** [2002 (3) KLT 816]. In my opinion, that decision need not be considered, because subsequent to that, there is an amendment in KER as evident by Ext.P6 by which an explanation is added that the persons who have obtained the Acharya title of the Kerala Hindi Prachar Sabha and Siksha Snathak title of the Dakshina Bharat Hindi Prachar Sabha upto and including the academic year 2014-15 is considered to have acquired the requisite training qualification. It is mentioned that the amendment is w.e.f. 03.10.1988. Under such circumstances, the principle laid down by the Division Bench in **Sally Mathew's case** (supra) may not be relevant because of the subsequent retrospective amendment in the KER. The upshot of the above discussions is that the impugned orders are to be set aside.

Therefore, this writ petition is allowed in the following manner :

- 1) Exts.P11 and P15 are quashed and the approval of Ext.P1

order is confirmed.

- 2) The respondents are directed to disburse all service benefits admissible for service as Headmistress from 01.04.2017, in the light of Ext.P1 appointment order and approval order.
- 3) The arrears of salary and other benefits if any shall be disbursed to the petitioner within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

Sd/-

P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN
JUDGE

DM
DAS
JV
SKS

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 21821/2022

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

- Exhibit P1 PHOTOCOPY OF PROMOTION ORDER & APPROVAL
ORDER NO. B3/2030/17/ D.DIS.DTD. 27-9-2017.
- Exhibit P2 PHOTOCOPY OF HSA APPOINTMENT ORDER &
APPROVAL ORDER NO.B3/3644/ 2003/D.
DIS.DATED. 24- 01-2004.
- Exhibit P3 PHOTOCOPY OF B.A. (HINDI) DEGREE
CERTIFICATE DATED.23-8-2000.
- Exhibit P4 PHOTOCOPY OF M.A DEGREE (HINDI)
CERTIFICATE) DT.23-11-2007.
- Exhibit P5 COPY OF G.O(MS)150/88/G.EDN DATED 3.10.1988.
- Exhibit P6 PHOTOCOPY OF G.O. (P) NO.4/2020/G. EDN.
DATED 17-02-2020.
- Exhibit P7 PHOTOCOPY OF CERTIFICATE DT. 12-11-1992 FOR
REQUISITE TRAINING QUALIFICATION.
- Exhibit P8 PHOTOCOPY OF B.ED DEGREE CERTIFICATE DATED
25-02-2014.
- Exhibit P9 PHOTOCOPY OF KPSC ACCOUNT TEST (LOWER)
CERTIFICATE DTD 17-5-2017.
- Exhibit P10 PHOTOCOPY OF ORDER NO. ET1/96293/
2017/K.DIS.DATED 12-02-2018 BY 2ND
RESPONDENT.
- Exhibit P11 PHOTOCOPY OF 2ND RESPONDENT'S LETTER NO.
DATED 04-08-2018.
- Exhibit P12 PHOTOCOPY OF 2ND RESPONDENT'S LETTER NO.
DATED 04-08-2018.
- Exhibit P13 PHOTOCOPY OF INTERIM ORDER DATED 11-12 2018
IN WP (C) NO. 40318/2018.
- Exhibit P14 PHOTOCOPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 10-012022
IN WP (C) NO. 40318/2018.
- Exhibit P15 PHOTOCOPY OF G.O (MS) NO.3687/2022 /G.EDN.
DATED 20-6-2022.

RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

- Exhibit R1(a) A true copy of G.O(Rt) No.3687/2022/G.Edn
dated 20.06.2022