

இராமநாதபுரம் மாவட்டக் கல்வி அலுவலரின்(தொடக்கக் கல்வி) செயல்முறைகள்

நக.எண்.5194/ஆ.4/2022 நாள் 02.11.2024

\*\*\*\*\*

பொருள்- வழக்கு-தொடக்கக் கல்வி இராமநாதபுரம் கல்வி மாவட்டம் - நயினார்கோவில் ஒன்றியம் - அ. காச்சான் - ஊராட்சி ஒன்றிய தொடக்கப்பள்ளி- இடைநிலை ஆசிரியர் - திருமதி. எம். சரஸ்பானு - உதயகுடி - ஊராட்சி ஒன்றிய நடுநிலைப் பள்ளி-இடைநிலை ஆசிரியர் - திரு.பி.முகில் - தாளையடிக்கோட்டை - ஊராட்சி ஒன்றிய நடுநிலைப் பள்ளி - இடைநிலை ஆசிரியர் - திருமதி.பி.பொன்னி ஆகியோர்கள் - ஊக்க ஊதிய உயர்வு வேண்டி - சென்னை உயர்நீதிமன்ற மதுரைக்கிளையில் வழக்கு தொடரப்பட்டது ( W.P(MD)No: 21038/2022 to 21040/2022 ) - வழக்கின் மீது 22.10.2024 அன்று தீர்ப்பாணை பெறப்பட்டது - தீர்ப்பாணையினை எதிர்த்து மேல்முறையீடு செய்யக் கோருதல் - சார்பு.

பார்வை- சென்னை உயர்நீதிமன்ற மதுரைக் கிளை வழக்கு (W.P(MD)No: 21038/2022 to 21040/2022 )தீர்ப்பாணை நாள், 22.10.2024

\*\*\*\*\*

இராமநாதபுரம் கல்வி மாவட்டம், நயினார்கோவில் ஒன்றியம், அ. காச்சான், ஊராட்சி ஒன்றிய தொடக்கப் பள்ளியில் இடைநிலை ஆசிரியராகப் பணிபுரிந்துவரும் திருமதி. எம். சரஸ்பானு, உதயகுடி, ஊராட்சி ஒன்றிய நடுநிலைப் பள்ளியில் இடைநிலை ஆசிரியராகப் பணிபுரிந்துவரும் திரு. பி. முகில் மற்றும் தாளையடிக்கோட்டை, ஊராட்சி ஒன்றிய நடுநிலைப் பள்ளியில் இடைநிலை ஆசிரியராகப் பணிபுரிந்துவரும் திருமதி. பி. பொன்னி ஆகியோர்கள் ஊக்க ஊதிய உயர்வு வேண்டி சென்னை உயர்நீதிமன்ற மதுரைக்கிளையில் வழக்கு தொடரப்பட்டு ( W.P(MD)No: 21038/2022 to 21040/2022 ) வழக்கின் மீது 22.10.2024 அன்று சார்ந்த ஆசிரியர்களுக்கு சாதகமாக தீர்ப்பாணை பெறப்பட்டுள்ளது.

வ. எண்	ஆசிரியர் பெயர் மற்றும் பதவி	பணிபுரியும் பள்ளி	வழக்கு எண்	தீர்ப்பாணை பெறப்பட்ட நாள்	தீர்ப்பாணை விவரம்
1	திருமதி. எம். சரஸ்பானு இடைநிலை ஆசிரியர்	ஊராட்சி ஒன்றிய தொடக்கப் பள்ளி, அ. காச்சான், நயினார்கோவில் ஒன்றியம்	W.P(MD)No. 21038/2022	22.10.2024	The writ petition stands allowed
2	திரு. பி. முகில் இடைநிலை ஆசிரியர்	ஊராட்சி ஒன்றிய நடுநிலைப் பள்ளி, உதயகுடி நயினார்கோவில் ஒன்றியம்	W.P(MD)No. 21039/2022	22.10.2024	The writ petition stands allowed
3	திருமதி. பி. பொன்னி இடைநிலை ஆசிரியர்	ஊராட்சி ஒன்றிய நடுநிலைப் பள்ளி, தாளையடிக்கோட்டை நயினார்கோவில் ஒன்றியம்	W.P(MD)No: 21040/2022	22.10.2024	The writ petition stands allowed

எனவே மேற்கண்ட மூன்று வழக்குகளின் தீர்ப்பாணைகளை எதிர்த்து, ஒருவார காலத்திற்குள் மேல்முறையீடு தாக்கல் செய்து, W.A.(M.D) S.R.No. பெற்று இவ்வலுவலகத்திற்கு அனுப்பி வைக்குமாறு நயினார்கோவில் வட்டாரக் கல்வி அலுவலர் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளப்படுகிறார்.

இணைப்பு - மேற்கண்ட வழக்குகளின்  
தீர்ப்பாணை நகல்.

  
மாண்புமிகு கல்வி அலுவலர்  
(தொடக்கக் கல்வி)  
இராமநாதபுரம்  
9/11/24

பெறுநர்- வட்டாரக் கல்வி அலுவலர்,  
நயினார்கோவில்



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.21038 of 2022**

M.Saras Banu

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The District Educational Officer,  
Ramanathapuram.

2.The Block Education Officer,  
Nainarkovil,  
Ramanathapuram.

3.The Headmaster,  
Panchayat Union Primary School,  
A.Kachan, Nainarkovil Union,  
Ramanathapuram.

... Respondents

**Prayer** : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the second respondent to consider for 1st incentive increment by accepting the proposal, dated 19.11.2019, which has been rectified subsequent to the return of proposal for some clarification, within the time fixed by this Court and pass such other and further orders as this Court.



For Petitioner : Mr.S.Satheesh Kumar  
For R-1 & R-2 : Mr.N.Ramesh Arumugam  
Government Advocate

**ORDER**

This writ petition has been filed seeking for a Mandamus to the second respondent to consider for first incentive increment by accepting the proposal, dated 19.11.2019, which has been rectified subsequent to the return of proposal for some clarification.

2. The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner has completed her diploma in Teacher Training Education in 2007 and after getting selected into Government Service joined as Secondary Grade Teacher in Panchayat Union Primary School, Vandal Village, Nainarkovil Block on 26.06.2014 and at present, she is working as Secondary Grade Teacher in Panchayat Union Primary School, A.Kachan Village, Paramakudi Taluk from 26.06.2014. After getting prior permission from the Assistant Elementary Educational Officer, Nainarkovil, the present second respondent the petitioner has completed her B.Sc., Maths through Annamalai University from 2013 to 2016 and she has completed her B.Ed., through Alagappa University in the year 2017 and 2018



W.P(MD)No.21038 of 2022

WEB COPY

after getting prior permission from the second respondent. After completing B.Ed., the petitioner has applied for the first incentive increment through the third respondent with all relevant documents on 19.11.2019. Subsequently, the second respondent has returned the proposal on 13.12.2019 by seeking clarification and the same has been answered through the third respondent and the same has neither been rejected by a speaking order by receiving the proposal nor been granted incentive. Hence, the present writ petition.

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 official 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 on 22.08.2019 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



WEB COPY

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 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*



WEB COPY

*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 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*



WEB COPY



*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.”*

*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*





WEB COPY



*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 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 she is entitled for the same since she has studied the B.Ed., degree course only after approving



WEB COPY

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.

7. The counter affidavit was filed by the first respondent on 30.09.2022. As per the counter affidavit filed by the first respondent, the relevant portion is reads as follows:

*"6. It is submitted that as per G.O(Ms)No.37 that the previous orders were not issued, then the employee is not eligible for sanction of any advance increments for passing higher qualification irrespective of the post held / degree acquired. In the present case there is no previous orders sanctioning incentive increment for higher qualification was passed to the petitioner. Hence, as per G.O(Ms)No.37 under Sub Clause 6(vi) the petitioner is not entitled to the incentive increment for higher studies.*

*7. It is submitted that the Government has taken a policy decision to stop giving incentive increments. The G.O(Ms)No.37, Personnel and Administrative Reforms (FR-IV) Department, dated 10.03.2020 wherein, the decision to*



WEB COPY

*grant incentive increment has been done away. The G.O(Ms)No.116, Personnel and Administrative Reforms (FR-IV) Department, dated 15.10.2020 wherein, it has been clarified the date from which the Government Order in G.O(Ms)No.37, Personnel and Administrative Reforms (FR-IV) Department, dated 10.03.2020 came into force. These Government Orders have come into force for the period after G.O(Ms)No.37, Personnel and Administrative Reforms (FR-IV) Department, dated 10.03.2020 was issued."*

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

**9.** The learned Government Advocate appearing for the official 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.



WEB COPY

**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.

**12.** The learned Government Advocate appearing for the official 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 second respondent is directed to grant first incentive increment to the petitioner based on the judgments of the Hon'ble



WEB COPY

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

To

- 1.The District Educational Officer,  
Ramanathapuram.
- 2.The Block Education Officer,  
Nainarkovil,  
Ramanathapuram.
- 3.The Headmaster,  
Panchayat Union Primary School,  
A.Kachan, Nainarkovil Union,  
Ramanathapuram.



WEB COPY

[www.Padasalai.Net](http://www.Padasalai.Net)



W.P(MD)No.21038 of 2022

J.SATHYA NARAYANA PRASAD, J.

BTR

W.P(MD)No.21038 of 2022

22.10.2024



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.21039 of 2022**

B.Mugil

... Petitioner

Vs.


1.The District Educational Officer,  
Ramanathapuram.

2.The Block Education Officer,  
Nainarkovil,  
Ramanathapuram.

3.The Headmaster,  
Panchayat Union Middle School,  
Udhayakudi,  
Nainarkovil Union,  
Ramanathapuram.

... Respondents

**Prayer** : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records relating to the impugned order passed by the second respondent in O.Mu.No.610/A1/2020, dated 22.06.2020 and consequently direct the second respondent to grant the second incentive increment to the petitioner within the time fixed by this Court and pass such other and further orders as this Court.



WEB COPY

[www.Padasalai.Net](http://www.Padasalai.Net)



W.P(MD)No.21039 of 2022

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Satheesh Kumar

For R-1 & R-2 : Mr.N.Ramesh Arumugam  
Government Advocate

### **ORDER**

This writ petition has been filed to quash the order, dated 22.06.2020 passed by the second respondent and consequently, direct the second respondent to grant the second incentive increment to the petitioner within the time fixed by this Court.

2. The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner has completed her diploma in Teacher Training Education in 2010 and after getting selected into Government service, she joined as Secondary Grade Teacher in Mugilthagam Village, Thiruvadanai Union on 17.12.2012 and at present, she is working as Secondary Grade Teacher in Udhayakudi Village, Nainarkovil Union from 01.07.2013. The petitioner has completed her M.A., in the year 2019 and after completing M.A., she has applied for second incentive increment through the third respondent with all relevant documents on 06.11.2019. Subsequently, the second respondent has returned the proposal by seeking clarification and the





WEB COPY

same has been answered through the third respondent on 23.03.2020 and the same has been rejected through the impugned order in O.Mu.No.610/A1/2020, dated 22.06.2020 by citing G.O(Ms)No.37, dated 10.03.2020. Hence, the present writ petition.

3. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has completed M.A., English degree after obtaining permission from the competent authority and the learned Government Advocate appearing for the official 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 M.A., English 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:



WEB COPY



"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 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



WEB COPY

*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 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*



WEB COPY



*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.”*

*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*



WEB COPY

*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 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 second incentive increment and she is entitled for the same since she has studied the M.A., English 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 second 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.

7. The counter affidavit was filed by the first respondent on 30.09.2022.

As per the counter affidavit filed by the first respondent, the relevant portion is reads as follows:

*"6. It is submitted that as per G.O(Ms)No.37 that the previous orders were not issued, then the employee is not eligible for sanction of any advance increments for passing higher qualification irrespective of the post held / degree acquired. In the present case there is no previous orders sanctioning incentive increment for higher qualification was passed to the petitioner. Hence, as per G.O(Ms)No.37 under Sub Clause 6(vi) the petitioner is not entitled to the incentive increment for higher studies.*

*7. It is submitted that the Government has taken a policy decision to stop giving incentive increments. The G.O(Ms)No.37, Personnel and Administrative Reforms (FR-IV) Department, dated 10.03.2020 wherein, the decision to grant incentive increment has been done away. The G.O(Ms)No.116, Personnel and Administrative Reforms (FR-IV) Department, dated 15.10.2020 wherein, it has been clarified the date from which the Government Order in*



WEB COPY

*G.O(Ms)No.37, Personnel and Administrative Reforms (FR-IV) Department, dated 10.03.2020 came into force. These Government Orders have come into force for the period after G.O(Ms)No.37, Personnel and Administrative Reforms (FR-IV) Department, dated 10.03.2020 was issued."*

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

**9.** The learned Government Advocate appearing for the official 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.



WEB COPY

**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.

**12.** The learned Government Advocate appearing for the official 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 second incentive increment to the petitioner herein.

**13.** In view of the above facts and circumstances of the case, the order passed by the second respondent in O.Mu.No.610/A1/2020, dated 22.06.2020 is liable to be set aside. Accordingly, the same is quashed. The second respondent is directed to grant second 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.





WEB COPY

14. In the result, the writ petition stands allowed with the above observations and directions. There shall be no order as to costs.

22.10.2024

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

To

- 1.The District Educational Officer,  
Ramanathapuram.
- 2.The Block Education Officer,  
Nainarkovil,  
Ramanathapuram.
- 3.The Headmaster,  
Panchayat Union Middle School,  
Udhayakudi,  
Nainarkovil Union,  
Ramanathapuram.



WEB COPY

[www.Padasalai.Net](http://www.Padasalai.Net)



W.P(MD)No.21039 of 2022

J.SATHYA NARAYANA PRASAD, J.

BTR

W.P(MD)No.21039 of 2022

22.10.2024



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.21040 of 2022**

B.Ponni

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The District Educational Officer,  
Ramanathapuram.

2.The Block Education Officer,  
Nainarkovil,  
Ramanathapuram.

3.The Headmaster,  
Panchayat Union Primary School,  
Thalayadikottai,  
Nainarkovil Union,  
Ramanathapuram.

... Respondents

**Prayer** : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records relating to the impugned order passed by the second respondent in O.Mu.No.609/A1/2020, dated 22.06.2020 and consequently direct the second respondent to grant the second incentive increment to the petitioner within the time fixed by this Court and pass such other and further orders as this Court.



WEB COPY

[www.Padasalai.Net](http://www.Padasalai.Net)



W.P(MD)No.21040 of 2022

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Satheesh Kumar

For R-1 & R-2 : Mr.N.Ramesh Arumugam  
Government Advocate

### **ORDER**

This writ petition has been filed to quash the order, dated 22.06.2020 passed by the second respondent and consequently, direct the second respondent to grant the second incentive increment to the petitioner within the time fixed by this Court.

2. The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner has completed her diploma in Teacher Training Education in 2004 and after getting selected into Government service, she joined as Secondary Grade Teacher in Vallam Village, Nainarkovil Union on 17.12.2012 and at present, she is working as Secondary Grade Teacher in Thalayadikottai from 18.08.2015. After completing her B.Ed., in Tamil, the second respondent through his proceedings in Na.Ka.No. 43/A1/2018, dated -04-2018 has passed order for first incentive. The petitioner has completed her M.A., Tamil from Tamil Nadu Open University from 2017 to 2019 after getting prior permission from the second respondent through his



WEB COPY

proceedings in O.Mu.No.1359/A1/2017, dated -12-2017. The petitioner has completed her M.A., Tamil in the year 2019 and after completing M.A., Tamil she has applied for second incentive increment through the third respondent with all relevant documents on 13.01.2020. Subsequently, the second respondent has returned the proposal by seeking clarification and the same has been answered through the third respondent on 23.03.2020 and the same has been rejected through the impugned order in O.Mu.No.609/A1/2020, dated 22.06.2020 by citing G.O(Ms)No.37, dated 10.03.2020. Hence, the present writ petition.

3. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has completed M.A., Tamil degree after obtaining permission from the competent authority and the learned Government Advocate appearing for the official 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 M.A., Tamil degree in September 2019 much prior to the issuance of the above said Government Order.



WEB COPY

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 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*



WEB COPY

*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 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:*



WEB COPY



“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.”*

*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*





WEB COPY

*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 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.*



WEB COPY

6. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner further submitted that the writ petitioner seeking only second incentive increment and she is entitled for the same since she has studied the M.A., Tamil 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 second 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.

7. The counter affidavit was filed by the first respondent on 30.09.2022. As per the counter affidavit filed by the first respondent, the relevant portion is reads as follows:

*"6. It is submitted that as per G.O(Ms)No.37 that the previous orders were not issued, then the employee is not eligible for sanction of any advance increments for passing higher qualification irrespective of the post held / degree acquired. In the present case there is no previous orders sanctioning incentive increment for higher qualification was passed to the petitioner. Hence, as per G.O(Ms)No.37 under Sub Clause 6(vi) the petitioner is not entitled to the incentive increment for higher studies.*



WEB COPY

7. *It is submitted that the Government has taken a policy decision to stop giving incentive increments. The G.O(Ms)No.37, Personnel and Administrative Reforms (FR-IV) Department, dated 10.03.2020 wherein, the decision to grant incentive increment has been done away. The G.O(Ms)No.116, Personnel and Administrative Reforms (FR-IV) Department, dated 15.10.2020 wherein, it has been clarified the date from which the Government Order in G.O(Ms)No.37, Personnel and Administrative Reforms (FR-IV) Department, dated 10.03.2020 came into force. These Government Orders have come into force for the period after G.O(Ms)No.37, Personnel and Administrative Reforms (FR-IV) Department, dated 10.03.2020 was issued."*

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

9. The learned Government Advocate appearing for the official 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.



WEB COPY

**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.

**12.** The learned Government Advocate appearing for the official 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 second incentive increment to the petitioner herein.

**13.** In view of the above facts and circumstances of the case, the order passed by the second respondent in O.Mu.No.609/A1/2020, dated 22.06.2020



WEB COPY

is liable to be set aside. Accordingly, the same is quashed. The second respondent is directed to grant second 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.

14. In the result, the writ petition stands allowed with the above observations and directions. There shall be no order as to costs.

22.10.2024

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

- To
- 1.The District Educational Officer,  
Ramanathapuram.
  - 2.The Block Education Officer,  
Nainarkovil,  
Ramanathapuram.
  - 3.The Headmaster,  
Panchayat Union Primary School,  
Thalayadikottai,  
Nainarkovil Union,  
Ramanathapuram.



WEB COPY

[www.Padasalai.Net](http://www.Padasalai.Net)



W.P(MD)No.21040 of 2022

J.SATHYA NARAYANA PRASAD, J.

BTR

W.P(MD)No.21040 of 2022

22.10.2024