

Raghavan S vs State of Kerala

Raghavan S vs State of Kerala

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1369282

Court : Kerala

Decided On : Jan-20-2023

Judge : Honourable Mr. Justice Devan Ramachandran

Appeal No. : WP(C)/12981/2018

Appellant : Raghavan S

Respondent : State of Kerala

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DEVAN
RAMACHANDRAN FRIDAY, THE 20TH DAY OF JANUARY 2023 /
30TH POUSHA, 1944 WP(C) NO. 10782 OF 2018 PETITIONERS: 1
K.S.VISWANATHAN

AGED 44 YEARS L. D. CLERK, SREE SANKARA COLLEGE, KALADY-
683574, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT. 2 T. S. SHIJU AGED 42 YEARS SON
OF T. K. SUBRAMANIAN, AGED 42 YEARS, L. D. CLERK, SREE
SANKARA COLLEGE, KALADY- 683574, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT. 3
SONI MURALI LAB ASSISTANT, SREE SANKARA COLLEGE,
KALADY- 683574, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT. 4 T. S. SATHEESAN AGED

43 YEARS SON OF SANKUNNY NAIR, AGED 43 YEARS, LAB ASSISTANT, SREE SANKARA COLLEGE, KALADY-683574, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT. 5 O. V. SREEKANTH LAB ASSISTANT, SREE SANKARA COLLEGE, KALADY-683574, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT. 6 N. SREEJITH LAB ASSISTANT, SREE SANKARA COLLEGE, KALADY-683574, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT. BY ADV SRI.P.C.SASIDHARAN

RESPONDENTS: 1 STATE OF KERALA REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, HIGHER EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695001. 2 THE DIRECTOR OF COLLEGIATE EDUCATION VIKAS BHAVAN, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695033. ..2..

3 THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF COLLEGIATE EDUCATION ERNAKULAM-682011. 4 THE MANAGER SREE SANKARA COLLEGE, KALADY-683574, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT. 5 THE PRINCIPAL SREE SANKARA COLLEGE, KALADY-683574, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT. 6 SRI. S. RAGHAVAN L. D. CLERK, SREE SANKARA COLLEGE, KALADY-683574, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT. 7 SRI. A. P. NANDAKUMAR LAB ASSISTANT, SREE SANKARA COLLEGE, KALADY-683574, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT. 8 SRI. R. RAJESH LAB ASSISTANT, SREE SANKARA COLLEGE, KALADY-683574, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT. 9 SRI. V. B. KISHOR KUMAR LAB ASSISTANT, SREE SANKARA COLLEGE, KALADY-683574, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT. BY ADVS. SAJITH KUMAR V. SMT.LATHA ANAND N.S.DAYA SINDHU SHREE HARI GOVERNMENT PLEADER

SRI.JOSHY THANNICKKAMATTAM -GP SRI.P.C.SASIDHARAN-SC THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 20.01.2023, ALONG WITH WP(C).12981/2018, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING: ..3..

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DEVAN RAMACHANDRAN FRIDAY, THE 20TH DAY OF JANUARY 2023 / 30TH POUSHA, 1944 WP(C) NO. 12981 OF 2018 PETITIONERS:

1 RAGHAVAN S AGED 42 YEARS S/O SUBRAMANIAN, AGED 42 YEARS, RESIDING AT RAGHAVA NIVAS,MATTOR, KALADY PO, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT, PIN-683574. 2 A.P NANDAKUMAR S/O A.P NAIR, AGED 48 YEARS, RESIDING AT ALADY HOUSE,IRINGOLE PO, PERUMBAVOOR, PIN-683548. 3 RAJESH R S/O RAMANATHAN K.R, AGED 37 YEARS, RESIDING ATRAM NIVAS, CHANDRATHIL ROAD, SWARAKSHA 18/A, EDAPPALLY PO,COCHIN-682024. 4 KISHORE KUMAR V.B S/O V.N BALAN NAIR, AGED 33 YEARS, RESIDING AT VAIRELILHOUSE, MATTOR, KALADY PO, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT, PIN-683574. BY ADVS. SRI.SAJITH KUMAR V. SRI.N.S.DAYA SINDHU SHREE HARI

RESPONDENTS: 1 STATE OF KERALA REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,HIGHER EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT,THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN-695001. 2 DIRECTOR OF COLLEGIATE EDUCATION DIRECTORATE OF COLLEGIATE EDUCATION,VIKAS BHAVAN, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN-695033. ..4..

3 DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF COLLEGIATE EDUCATION DIRECTORATE OF COLLEGIATE EDUCATION,VIKAS BHAVAN, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN-695033. 4 DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF COLLEGIATE EDUCATION ERNAKULAM, PIN-682011. 5 MANAGER SREE SANKARA COLLEGE, KALADY, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT, PIN-683574.. 6 VISWANATHAN K.S LOWER DIVISION CLERK, SREE SANKARA COLLEGE, KALADY, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT, PIN-683574. 7 SHIJU T.S LOWER DIVISION CLERK, SREE SANKARA COLLEGE,KALADY, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT, PIN-683574. 8 SONI MURALI LAB ASSISTANT, SREE SANKARA COLLEGE,KALADY, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT, PIN-683574. 9 SATHEESAN T.S LAB

ASSISTANT, SREE SANKARA COLLEGE,KALADY, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT, PIN-683574. 10 SREEKANTH O.V LAB ASSISTANT, SREE SANKARA COLLEGE,KALADY, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT, PIN-683574. 11 SREEJITH N LAB ASSISTANT, SREE SANKARA COLLEGE,KALADY, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT, PIN-683574. 12 THE PRINCIPAL SREE SANKARA COLLEGE,KALADY, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT, PIN-683574. BY ADVS. GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.JOSEPH SEBASTIAN PARACKAL SRI.M.N.RADHAKRISHNA MENON SRI.P.C.SASIDHARAN SRI.JOSHY THANNICKKAMATTAM-GP ..5..

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 20.01.2023, ALONG WITH WP(C).10782/2018, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING: ..6..

JUDGMENT

[WP(C) Nos.10782/2018, 12981/2018] The controversies involved in these cases are with respect to the direct appointment of the petitioners in WP(C)No.10782/2018.

2. The petitioners in WP(C)No.12981/2018 were serving

Sree Sankara College as Last Grade Servants (who will hereinafter be referred to as the Promotees), when, in the year 2010, the petitioners in WP(C)No.10782/2018 (who will hereinafter be referred to as the Direct Recruits) were appointed.

3. The Promotees were thereafter granted promotion

as Lab Assistants in the year 2012; and they stake claim to be shown as Senior to the Direct Recruits, on the ground that latter were not qualified at the time when they were initially appointed.

4. This led to the Government issuing an order dated

22.01.2011 - a copy of which is on record as Ext.P1, produced along with WP(C)No.12981/2018 - cancelling the approval ..7.. granted to the Direct Recruits. It transpires that said persons took up the matter with the Government again, which then issued its subsequent order dated 14.03.2011 (which will hereinafter be referred to as the First Government Order) - a copy of which is on record as Ext.P2 in WP(C)No.12981/2018 and as Ext.P10 in WP(C)No.10782/2018 - wherein, it was ordered that the Direct Recruits have to obtain necessary qualifications within the time frame fixed therein; and that until then, their salary and other benefits will be only as per Last Grade Servants. The Government, in the said order also directed the Director of Collegiate Education to issue appropriate orders, which led to an order dated 22.06.2011 to be issued by the said Authority (hereinafter referred to as the Order of DD) - a copy of which is on recorded as Ext.P3 in WP(C)No.12981/2018 and as Ext.P11 in WP(C)No.10782/2018 - in which, it was recorded that the Direct Recruits are to clear the mandatory qualifying test within the time frame fixed and that if they did not do so, all their benefits will be recovered from them. ..8..

5. The genesis of controversy is at this stage, because

the Promotees took the stand that, going by the 1 st order of the Government and The order of the DD, the Direct Recruits would only be construed as being Last Grade Servants and hence junior to them; but that when a seniority list was thereafter prepared, it was shown otherwise.

6. The Promotees thus approached this Court, by

filing WP(C)No.2892/2017, which culminated in a judgment

dated 17.02.2017, wherein, direction was given the Director of Collegiate Education ('Director' for short), to take up the representations of the parties and enter into a decision thereon. This led to to the Director issuing an order dated 07.07.2017 ('Director's Order') - which has been produced as Ext.P7, along with WP(C)No.12981/2019 - in which, he introduced a line saying that the conditions imposed in the First Government Order would apply to the aspect of seniority also, in the cadre of Attender.

7. The afore order was challenged by the 'Direct

Recruits'; by filing an appeal before the Government, which has now culminated in its order dated 19.02.2018 directing ..9.. recasting of seniority list placing the Direct Recruits below the Promotees.

8. The Direct Recruits, thus, impugn the order of the Government dated 19.02.2018 in W.P(C)No.10782/2018, while the Promotees seek that said order be implemented immediately in W.P(C)No.12981/2018.

9. I have heard Sri.P.C.Sasidharan - learned counsel for

the petitioners in W.P.(C)No.10782/2018; Sri.Sajith Kumar - learned counsel for the petitioners in W.P.(C)No.12981/2018 and Sri.Joshy Thannickkamattam - learned Government Pleader appearing for the official respondents.

10. The afore narrative of facts render it indubitable

that, the germane question for consideration is whether there was any condition in the First Government Order or the Order of the Deputy Director, which were issued in the year 2011, with respect to internecine seniority between the two category of petitioners.

11. Sri.P.C.Sasidharan - learned counsel for the Direct

Recruits, vehemently argued that, if one examines the afore said orders, it becomes ineluctable that his clients were ..10.. granted approval in the post of Lab Assistants, but on condition that they will draw a lower scale of pay, until such time as they clear the mandatory educational test. He fortified the submissions, relying upon the Order of the Deputy Director, wherein, it is said that the earlier cancellation of his clients approval of appointment is being withdrawn, on condition that they will clear the imperative educational tests within the time frame fixed therein. He, thus, argued that when the Deputy Director issued his subsequent order, pursuant to the directions of this Court in the judgment in W.P(C)No.2892/2017, it was wholly impermissible for him to have introduced a condition which was never imposed in the earlier orders of the Government or that

of the Deputy Director; and then to have stated that the conditions in those orders would apply in the case of seniority also. He submitted that it is, therefore, that his clients were constrained to approach the Government through an appeal against it, but which has now resulted in the impugned order, wherein, none of these aspects have been considered, much less even deliberated upon. ..11..

12. In response, Sri.Sajith Kumar - learned counsel for

the Promotees, submitted that the appointments of Direct Recruits were void ab initio, because they did not have the necessary qualifications in the year 2010. He relied upon the

judgment of this Court in Bhawana v. State of Maharashtra

and Ors. [(2019) 4 SCC 300], in substantiation, contenting that, when appointments were made from among the candidates who were not qualified, same would not inure to them any benefit, much less to be placed in a Seniority List, particularly, over-riding the rights of eligible persons. He pointed out that, even going by the First Government Order, what is stated therein was that approval of the appointments of Direct Recruits was being granted only on condition that they would clear the mandatory test; and that until they do so, they would all be construed to be Last Grade Servants. He argued that, hence, even if, by any stretch of imagination, the appointment of Direct Recruits can be found to be proper, their inclusion in the Seniority list, above the Promotees, is illegal, unlawful and untenable. He thus prayed that ..12.. W.P(C)No.10782/2018 be dismissed and W.P(C)No.12981/2018 be allowed.

13. Sri.Joshy Thannickkamattam - learned Government

Pleader, began his submissions relying upon a counter affidavit filed by the Director of Collegiate Education (herein after referred to as the Director) and pointed out that, said Authority has undeservedly averred that, until such time as the Direct Recruits clear their mandatory tests, they could not have been granted any benefit in the post of Attender and that they could only be construed to be a Last Grade Servant. He asserted that this has been clarified by the Government in

the First Government Order, which was followed by the Order of the Deputy Director; and hence, that when the Director issued his order pursuant to the directions of this Court in W.P(C)No.2897/2017, he was without error in having recorded therein that the conditions in the afore two orders applied to the question of seniority also. He concluded, saying that the Government, therefore, issued its order impugned in W.P(C)No.10782/2018, considering all these aspects and after hearing both sides and thus argued that it is irreproachable. ..13..

14. Sri.Radhakrishna Pillai - learned Standing Counsel

for Sree Sankara College, affirmed that probation of the Direct Recruits as Lab Assistants, was ordered by the Manager of his client in the year 2015; and that, he had acted so under the bona fide impression that their initial appointments as such were approved through the First Government Order and the subsequent Order of the Deputy Director, albeit, in a lower scale of pay. He added that, his client has no specific comment on the disputes between the two classes of employees and that, they will abide by any directions to be issued by this Court.

15. Before I move onto the merits of the rival

contentions with respect to the seniority of the parties, it is necessary for me to decide whether the prayer of the promotees in W.P(C)No.12981/2018, against initial appointment of the Direct Recruits can now be considered.

16. Even though, Sri.Sajith Kumar - learned counsel for

the petitioner, relies upon Nagendra Chandra and Ors. v. State of Jharkhand and Ors. [(2008) 1 SCC 798], to argue that even a belated challenge to an appointment is possible, I ..14.. cannot find favour with it, because this is not a case where his clients have merely committed delay, but also since, in the earlier round of litigation - when they approached this Court in W.P(C)No.2892/2017 - they impelled no such claim, but confined their case to the question of seniority among the two classes of persons. It is, therefore, that this Court allowed the said writ petition and directed the Director to consider the representations of the Promotees, before granting approval to the Direct Recruits. Had the appointment

of the Direct Recruits been called into question therein, I am certain that the learned Judge would have considered that also; but it having been not done, the Director was obligated to consider only the question of seniority and nothing else.

17. That apart, the Direct Recruits were appointed as

early as in the year 2010 and they were also given approval. Even though this was sought to be withdrawn by the Government through order dated 22.01.2011, the approval was reinstated through the First Government Order dated 14.03.2011, leading to the subsequent Order of the Deputy Director. Pertinently, it is without dispute or contest that the ..15.. Direct Recruits were all subsequently confirmed in service, their probation having been declared by the College, as evident from Exts.P12 to P15 in W.P.(C)No.10782/2018, which were all issued as early as in the year 2015. These orders were not challenged by the Promotees and they impelled no complaint or cause against the action of the Manager of the College. Even though they were fully aware of these facts, they approached this Court through W.P.(C)No.2892/2017, solely seeking that seniority be ordered to be recast, which was allowed in part, directing the Director to consider their claim.

18. In such a scenario, this Court certainly finds no

reason to entertain the prayer of the Promotees against the appointments of the Direct Recruits, especially, when they have chosen not to challenge either the First Government Order or the subsequent Order of the Deputy Director.

19. That being said, when I examine the validity of the

impugned Government Order dated 19.02.2018, it must be borne in mind that said order was issued on an appeal filed by the Direct Recruits against the order of the Director dated ..16.. 07.07.2017. It is their specific case that the Director, in the said order, has found that the conditions imposed by the Government in the First Government Order and the subsequent Order of the Deputy Director apply to the case of seniority also. However, he has not cited any reason for concluding in such a manner, nor has he given any reasons which persuaded him to think so.

20. Therefore, when the Direct Recruits challenged

that order in appeal before the Government, it was certainly up to them to decide this issue specifically and to answer whether the conditions imposed by them in their First Government Order, which led to the Order of the Deputy Director was intended to apply even in the case of seniority between the two class of parties. In fact, this way the only crucial and germane aspect which ought to have been decided by the Government and it is the only one which has not been touched

upon. This, not having been done and the impugned order

reflecting no such consideration, I am afraid, it cannot be ordered to be implemented. ..17..

21. Therefore, in the absence of any decision by the

Government, as to whether the Director was justified in holding in the order, dated 07.07.2017, that the conditions in the First Government Order and the Order of the Deputy Director would apply to the case of seniority also, the conclusions in the impugned order would have no legs to stand.

22. To paraphrase, it is only after the Government had considered the afore aspects, could they have entered into any final conclusion.

23. In the afore circumstances, I am sure that this Court

cannot find favour with the order of the Government dated 19.02.2018 impugned in W.P.(C)No.10782/2018; and consequently, cannot allow the plea of the Promotees to have the same implemented, as has been prayed for by them in W.P.(C)No.12891/2018. Resultantly: a) W.P.(C)No.10782/2018 is allowed and Ext.P22 is set aside. b) W.P.(C)No.12981/2018 is closed. ..18.. c) Consequently, Government is directed to reconsider the appeal of the Direct Recruits - a copy of which is produced as Ext.P8 in W.P.(C)No.12981/2018 - after hearing

both sides appositely; thus culminating in an appropriate order

and necessary action thereon, adverting to my observations above and specifically to the various orders that govern the field. I clarify that I have not entered into the

merits of the contentions of the parties with respect to seniority and that any observation of mine herein is only intended to govern the directions in this judgment and nothing more. Axiomatically, this Government will be at full liberty to decide this issue dispassionately and comprehensively, while the resultant order is issued. Sd/- DEVAN RAMACHANDRAN, JUDGE ACR ..19.. APPENDIX OF WP(C) 10782/2018 PETITIONER EXHIBITS EXHIBIT P1 TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION DATED 28.1.2009. EXHIBIT P2 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER SANCTIONING 3 POSTS DATED 17.4.2010. EXHIBIT P3 TRUE COPY OF THE MINUTES OF THE SELECTION COMMITTEE.

EXHIBIT P4 TRUE COPY OF THE APPOINTMENT ORDER

ISSUED TO THE 1ST PETITIONER DATED 21.6.2010.

EXHIBIT P5 TRUE COPY OF THE APPOINTMENT ORDER

ISSUED TO THE 2ND PETITIONER DATED 21.6.2010.

EXHIBIT P6 TRUE COPY OF THE APPOINTMENT ORDER

ISSUED TO THE 3RD PETITIONER DATED 21.6.2010. EXHIBIT P7 TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED TO THE PRINCIPAL BY THE DIRECTOR OF COLLEGIATE EDUCATION DATED 8.12.2010. EXHIBIT P8 TRUE COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION DATED 08.11.2013. EXHIBIT P9 TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER DATED 18.2.2011 IN WP(C) NO. 5281 OF 2011. EXHIBIT P10 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 14.03.2011. EXHIBIT P11 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED

22.06.2011 AND THE PETITIONER'S APPOINTMENT AS LAB ASSISTANT WAS APPROVED WITH EFFECT FROM 23.06.2010.

EXHIBIT P12 TRUE COPY OF THE DECLARATION OF PROBATION OF THE 1ST PETITIONER DATED 6.9.2011. EXHIBIT P13 TRUE COPY OF THE DECLARATION OF PROBATION OF THE 2ND PETITIONER DATED 6.9.2011. ..20.. EXHIBIT P14 TRUE COPY OF THE DECLARATION OF PROBATION OF

THE 3RD PETITIONER DATED 6.9.2011. EXHIBIT P15 TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 14.01.2011. EXHIBIT P16 TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 15.06.2011 OF THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF COLLEGIATE EDUCATION.

EXHIBIT P17 TRUE COPY OF THE APPOINTMENT ORDER

DATED 18.6.2011 ISSUED TO THE 4TH PETITIONER.

EXHIBIT P18 TRUE COPY OF THE APPOINTMENT ORDER

DATED 18.6.2011 ISSUED TO THE 5TH PETITIONER.

EXHIBIT P19 TRUE COPY OF THE APPOINTMENT ORDER

DATED 18.6.2011 ISSUED TO THE 6TH PETITIONER. EXHIBIT P20 TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS DATED 04.10.2011 OF THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF COLLEGIATE EDUCATION. EXHIBIT P21 TRUE COPY OF THE APPROVAL OF PROMOTION DATED 20.5.2015. EXHIBIT P22 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER, GO(RT) NO. EXHIBIT P23 TRUE COPY OF THE DEPARTMENTAL TEST CERTIFICATE ISSUED TO THE 2ND PETITIONER. EXHIBIT P24 TRUE COPY OF THE DEPARTMENTAL TEST CERTIFICATE ISSUED TO THE 4TH PETITIONER. Exhibit P25 THE TRUE COPY OF THE RESULT PUBLISHED BY THE KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION DATED 19-09-2017. Exhibit P26 THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO. F2/43858/2018 DATED 07-04-2018. RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT R6(a) THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER

NO.F2/34255/2010/COLL.EDN DATED 22.01.2011 OF THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF COLLEGIATE EDUCATION IN THE OFFICE OF ..21.. THE 2ND RESPONDENT. EXHIBIT R6(b) A TRUE COPY OF THAT SENIORITY LIST DATED 1/5/2014 ISSUED BY 5TH RESPONDENT. EXHIBIT R6(c) A TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 10/11/2014 SUBMITTED BY THE 8TH RESPONDENT. EXHIBIT R6(d) A TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT

DATED 17.02.2017 IN WP(C)2892/2017 OF THE HONBLE HIGH COURT.

EXHIBIT R6(e) A TRUE COPY OF ORDER

NO.F2/3525/2017/E.EDN.D DATED 07.07.2017 ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT. EXHIBIT R6(f) A TRUE COPY OF APPEAL DATED 20.07.2017 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONERS.

EXHIBIT R6(g) A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER

NO.27076/D3/15/H.EDN DATED 04.11.2015 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT TO THE 2ND RESPONDENT. ..22.. APPENDIX OF WP(C) 12981/2018 PETITIONER EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT P1 THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER

NO.F2/34255/210/COLL.EDN DATED 22.01.2011 ISSUED BY THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF COLLEGIATE EDUCATION IN THE OFFICE OF THE 2ND RESPONDENT. EXHIBIT P2 GOVERNMENT LETTER NO.4206/D3/2011/H.EDN. DATED 14.03.2011 ISSUED ON BEHALF OF THE 1ST RESPONDENT.

EXHIBIT P3 A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER

NO.F2/34255/2010/COLL. EDN. DATED 22.06.2011 OF THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF COLLEGIATE EDUCATION. EXHIBIT P4 A TRUE COPY OF THE SENIORITY LIST DATED 01.05.2014 ISSUED BY THE PRINCIPAL OF THE 5TH RESPONDENT COLLEGE. EXHIBIT P5 A TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 10.11.2014 FILED BY THE 3RD PETITIONER BEFORE THE 2ND RESPONDENT. EXHIBIT P6 A TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 17.02.2017 IN WP(C) 2892/2017 OF THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT.

EXHIBIT P7 A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER

NO.F2/3525/2017/C.EDN.D. DATED 07.07.2017 ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT. EXHIBIT P8 A TRUE COPY OF THE APPEAL DATED

20.07.2017 SUBMITTED BY THE RESPONDENT BY THE RESPONDENT 6 TO
11. EXHIBIT P9 A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO.GO(RT)
NO.303/2018/H.EDN. DATED 19.02.2018 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT.

EXHIBIT P10 A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER

NO.27076/D3/15/H.EDN DATED 04/11/2015 ISSUED BY THE 1ST
RESPONDENT TO 2ND RESPONDENT.

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com