2025:KER:28873

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM**

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE VIJU ABRAHAM**

**WEDNESDAY, THE 2ND DAY OF APRIL 2025 / 12TH CHAITHRA, 1947**

**WP(C) NO. 42054 OF 2022**

**PETITIONER:**

**CORPORATE MANAGER
CORPORATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY, DIOCESE OF THAMARASSERY, KOZHIKODE DISTRICT, PIN - 673 573.**

**BY ADV PAULSON THOMAS**

**RESPONDENTS:**

1 **STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, GENERAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695 001.**

2 **THE DIRECTOR OF GENERAL EDUCATION,
GENERAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT OF KERALA, JAGATHY, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695 005.**

3 **REGIONAL DEPUTY DIRECTOR,
HIGHER SECONDARY EDUCATION, KOZHIKODE, PIN - 673 001.**

**OTHER PRESENT:**

**GP- RIYAL DEVASSY**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 02.04.2025, ALONG WITH WP(C).42620/2022, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**

2025:KER:28873

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM**

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE VIJU ABRAHAM**

**WEDNESDAY, THE 2ND DAY OF APRIL 2025 / 12TH CHAITHRA, 1947**

**WP(C) NO. 42620 OF 2022**

**PETITIONER:**

**CORPORATE MANAGER**
**CORPORATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY, DIOCESE OF KOTHAMANGALAM, PIN - 686 691.**

**BY ADV PAULSON THOMAS**

**RESPONDENTS:**

1 **STATE OF KERALA**
**REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, GENERAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695 001.**

2 **THE DIRECTOR OF GENERAL EDUCATION,**
**GENERAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT OF KERALA, JAGATHY, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695 005.**

3 **REGIONAL DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION,**
**KOTTAYAM, PIN- 686 001.**

**BY ADV ADVOCATE GENERAL OFFICE KERALA**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 02.04.2025, ALONG WITH WP(C).42054/2022, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**

2025:KER:28873

**VIJU ABRAHAM,J**

**WP(C).Nos.42054 & 42620 of 2022**

**Dated this the 2nd day of April, 2025**

**JUDGMENT**

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

WP(C) No.42054 of 2022

2. The petitioner is the Corporate Manager of Schools coming under Corporate Educational Agency Diocese of Thamarassery, Kozhikode and St.Joseph's Higher Secondary School, Pullurampara, Kozhikode District comes under the management of the said educational agency.

3. It is averred that the Government of Kerala has sanctioned new Higher Secondary Schools in the State and one Science batch and one Humanities batch were sanctioned at St.Joseph's Higher Secondary School, Pullurampara and

2025:KER:28873

thereafter by Ext.P1 further batches were sanctioned. One of the stipulation in Ext.P1 Government order was that the initial appointment of teachers will be on daily wage basis and that for the academic year 2014-2015 there must be 40 students in a batch and from 2015-2016 onwards the required number of students is 50. Later Government created posts by two separate Government orders which are produced as Exts.P3 and P4. By Ext.P4 order only one post of HSST(Jr.) Malayalam was sanctioned at St.Joseph's Higher Secondary School, Pullurampara and the rest of the teaching post were not sanctioned despite the availability of posts is admitted in Exts.P5 and P6 staff fixation order. As the posts were not sanctioned Ext.P7 request was submitted by the Corporate Manager.

4. Petitioner relying on Ext.P8 Government Order which deals with norms for sanctioning of additional batches in the year 2015-2016 submits

2025:KER:28873

that as per the said norms the school must satisfy 50 students in the batch for the last three years. Petitioner would contend that even going by Ext.P8 the school has got more than 50 students in the additional Science batch during the years 2019-2020, 2020-2021 and 2021-2022. Petitioner would further submit that even though the school sanctioned as per Exts.P1 and P2 were not having 50 students the Government issued Ext.P9 order, modifying the conditions and relaxing the stipulation of having 50 students and permitted continuance of the Higher Secondary courses and batches sanctioned as per Exts.P1 and P2. It was prescribed in the said order that even if a batch is short of 50 students, the course can be continued, with a rider that for appointment of teachers on regular basis in such schools there must be at least 40 students. For the year 2018-2019, Ext.P10 order was issued wherein the said arrangement was continued. Petitioner also relies

2025:KER:28873

on Ext.P11 circular wherein the minimum students required for maintaining a batch was fixed as 25 with a maximum of 50. By Ext.P14 interim order this Court has directed the Government to take a decision in the matter and pursuant to the same Ext.P15 order was issued rejecting the request of the petitioner for creation of post. It is aggrieved by the same, the petitioner has approached this Court.

WP(C) No.42620 of 2022

5. The above writ petition is filed by the Manager of Corporate Educational Agency, Diocese of Kothamangalam and St.George Higher Secondary School, Kallanickal is a school under the management of the said Corporate educational agency. By Ext.P1 the Government sanctioned new Higher Secondary Schools and thereupon one Commerce batch was sanctioned in St.George High School Kallanickal. Petitioner relying on Ext.P3 chart submits that during 2014-2015 there were 50

2025:KER:28873

students and in 2018-2019, 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 all the available batches are working with student strength of 50 and above. Thereupon, petitioner made Ext.P5 request for sanctioning of the post. By Ext.P6 order posts were created, but petitioner would contend that there is serious anomaly in the sanctioning of the post and submitted that the post of Lab Assistant was also sanctioned despite the fact that there is no Science Batch sanctioned in the school. It is contended that since the post of HSST Computer Application is sanctioned, the other posts in respect of the sanctioned Commerce batch are also to be sanctioned as the Commerce batch sanctioned in the school are with the subject combinations Accountancy with Computer Accounting, Business Studies, Economics and Computer Application and that the Computer Application is only one among the optional subject in the sanctioned Commerce batch. It is further contended that though an additional

2025:KER:28873

Humanities batch was sanctioned in the school in the year 2015-2016 no posts were sanctioned and the norms being adopted in Ext.P7 Government Order is that the school must satisfy 50 students in the batch for the last 3 years and submits that as per Ext.P3 the data of the students revealed that during 2018-2019,2019-2020,2020-2021, 2021-2022 the school has got more than 50 students in the Humanities batch. Ext.P8 request was submitted by the Manager in this regard and the same was rejected as per Ext.P9. Petitioner also relies on Ext.P10 Government Order which was issued on finding that even in respect of schools sanctioned as per Exts.P1 and P2 were not having 50 students and ordered that even if a batch is short of 50 student, the course can be continued, but with a rider that for appointment of teachers on regular basis in such schools there must at least 40 students. This was followed by Ext.P11 with same condition for the years 2018-2019. It is the

2025:KER:28873

contention of the petitioner that admittedly, the petitioner's school has got strength of more than 50 students in all batches in the last 4 years. Ext.P12 is the staff fixation order for the year 2017-2018 to 2019-2020 and posts were sanctioned as per Ext.P13, but on daily wage basis. Pursuant to Ext.P14 direction issued by this Court the issue was considered by the Government and rejected as per Ext.P15 which is the same order, challenged in WP(C) No.42054 of 2022. Petitioner also relies on Ext.P16 circular issued by the Director of Higher Secondary Education prescribing a minimum of 25 and maximum of 50 students for maintaining a batch. Later Government have also issued Ext.P17 order to the effect that only 25 students are required for maintaining a batch. On the basis of the same it is contended that the student strength of 25 is the minimum required for sanctioning and maintaining a higher secondary batch and the prescription of 50 as the maximum and minimum is perverse and

2025:KER:28873

absolutely without any basis. It is in the said circumstance, the above writ petition has been filed seeking to quash Ext.P9 and Ext.P15 orders.

6. A detailed counter affidavit has been filed in WP(C) No.42054 of 2022 by the 1st respondent wherein it is contended that the petitioner does not satisfy the condition of GO. (MS) No.143/2014,ie., Ext.P1 and submits that in the academic year 2023-2024 there were only 48 students in Commerce Batch and as per the ICT Cell report there is no required students during last three years in the school and therefore, the school does not satisfy the criteria for sanctioning the post and hence the posts cannot be sanctioned.

7. An additional counter affidavit was also filed by the 1st respondent explaining the circular dated 30.5.2000 and submitted the above circular was issued only in respect of the appointment of Higher Secondary School teachers on hourly basis and that the said criteria in Ext.P11 circular

2025:KER:28873

cannot be made applicable for creation of posts in the School and that the insistence of minimum strength of students in a batch as 25 as per Ext.P17 Government Order is applicable only to the batches in which posts had already been created.

8. A reply affidavit was also filed by the petitioner in WP(C) No.42054/22 to the counter affidavit filed by the 1st respondent and submitted that Exts.P16 and P17 Government Orders made it clear that it is the duty of the Government to create necessary teaching posts in the batches sanctioned as per Exts.P1 and P2 and that Government have decide in principle to create the posts in respect of such schools sanctioned. It is further submits that the Government is statutorily bound as per Section 9 of the Kerala Education Act to pay the salary due to the teachers appointed on account of sanctioning of batches. Ext.P18 Government order was also relied on by the petitioner in support of the contentions. It is the

2025:KER:28873

contention of the petitioner in WP(C) No.42054/22 that even going by Ext.P15 impugned order the Director has reported to the Government that the school is having sufficient students strength and all other facilities and recommended for creation of posts and after such a report is submitted by the Director it was incumbent upon the Government to sanction posts in existing aided schools and the stand of the Government that creation of posts is a policy matter of the Government is untenable. It is contended that creation of posts and payment of salary to teachers in already sanctioned courses is not a policy matter but a statutory obligation. Number of students admitted as shown in staff fixation order from 2015 onwards in the additional batch is extracted in the table which reads as follows:

| Year | Standard | No.of students |
|---|---|---|
| 2014-2015 | XIB | 40 (as on closing of admission in single window-2 students left thereafter) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2015-2016 | XIB | 50 |
| 2016-2017 | XIB | 52 |
| 2017-2018 | XIB | 51 |
| 2018-2019 | XIB | 45 (due to Flood) |
| 2019-2020 | XIB | 57 |
| 2020-2021 | XIB | 59 |
| 2021-2022 | XIB | 55 |
| 2022-2023 | XIB | 54 |
| 2023-2024 | XIB | 52 |
| 2024-2025 | XIB | 57 |

On the basis of the same it is contended that the Government is duty bound to sanction necessary posts after having sanctioned the batches.

9. In the counter affidavit and additional counter affidavit filed in WP(C) No.42620 of 2022 similar contentions were raised.

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

11. The claim of the petitioners in both the cases for sanctioning of additional posts in the Higher Secondary Division was directed to be considered by this Court by a common order dated 20.11.2023 and pursuant to the same Ext.P15 order

2025:KER:28873

has been issued. A perusal of Ext.P15 would reveal that the Director has categorically found that there is sufficient students strength for sanctioning of the post in the Higher Secondary School teachers for the additional batches. It was also found by the Director that from the year 2020-2021, 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 ie, for continuous 3 years there are more than 50 students undergoing studies in these batches and on that basis posts could be created. But while issuing Ext.P15 order the said recommendation of the Director was not take into consideration at all. The Government has taken a stand that as per the conditions in Ext.P1 original sanction of batches whereby additional batches were sanctioned, for the first year there should be 40 students and from the second year there should be 50 students and that the said condition has not been satisfied by the petitioners. The specific contention of the petitioners is that Ext.P13 staff fixation order in

2025:KER:28873

respect of the St.George Higher Secondary School Kallanickal revealed that the school satisfies the minimum number of 50 in a batch. By Exts.P10 and P11 orders produced in WP(C) No.42620 of 2022 the Government itself have reduced the students strength of 50 to 40 in respect of 63 schools sanctioned as per Exts.P1 and P2 and created the post. Even after issuance of Exts.P10 and P11 the insistence of the Government that there should be 50 students in a batch to sanctioned the post is without any basis. As regard St.Joseph's Higher Secondary School, Pullurampara whereby the declining of the sanction of the post is challenged in WP(C) No.42054 of 2022, petitioner would contend that the table produced along with reply affidavit which was extracted in this judgment revealed that there is sufficient strength of 50 students. Petitioner also relies on Exts.P5 and P6 staff fixation order which would reveal that the school satisfies all the norms for sanctioning the posts

2025:KER:28873

and the competent authority, which is the Regional Deputy Director of Higher Secondary Education has sanctioned the necessary teaching posts. I also find considerable force in the argument of the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in WP(C)No.42054 of 2022 that after having sanctioned one HSST(Jr.) Malayalam post there is no reason for non sanctioning of the other posts.

12. Section 9 of the Kerala Education Rules makes it obligatory that the Government shall pay the salary of all teachers in aided schools direct or through the Headmaster of the school. In Ext.P12 judgment in WP(C) No.42054 of 2022 this Court have considered the issue, and held that once the school has been sanctioned, the students have to be taught, for which there should be teachers and after the educational authority has already fixed the staff strength, there is no justification for the Government in delaying the sanctioning of the posts and the Court found that sanctioning of posts

2025:KER:28873

should also accompany sanctioning of the school itself as without teachers school cannot function. The Division Bench of this Court in Ext.P13 judgment in W.A No.672 of 2010 also held that it is the obligation of the Government to meet salary and additional cost for additional staff, provided, the teachers are appointed consistent with the norms for appointment based on the student strength in the school and that the Government cannot expect the school to be run without the required staff strength.

13. Yet another aspect to be noted is that in Ext.P15 order though the Director of Higher Secondary has recommended for creation of posts for both the schools, one of the reason stated by the Government for not creating the post is that the same will cause serious financial liability on the Government. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner relying on the judgment in **Amina v. State of Kerala 2004 KHC 108** submits that though

2025:KER:28873

the said judgment was rendered in the context of aided colleges, the principle laid down therein will squarely apply in the facts of the present case and submitted that the Government cannot avoid statutory liability for payment of teachers on the ground of financial strain. Paragraph 14 of the judgment reads as follows:

> "14. The plea of the Government arising rather out of financial strain, and the stand of the University, of course can be appreciated only if we stand in their shoes. Additional posts impose financial burden to the State exchequer, but the question is, could this be pointed out as a reason for avoiding statutory liability. The direct payment system had been introduced, and accepted by the parties concerned, and if that be so, the Government could not have resorted to a stand that they still have unilateral right to repudiate the terms. The argument is thoroughly unacceptable. The obligation arises from a statutory contract. The import of a principle of policy, as suggested by the Government Pleader, has no place or relevance. If the Government finds such burden unbearable, appropriate measures

2025:KER:28873

> could be resorted to as admissible under law. The Government have no case that the fee collected are not remitted to them, as is envisaged in the direct payment system."

The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner also relies on the Apex Court judgment in **Chandigarh Administration and Others v. Rajni Vali and Other 2000 KHC 942** which held that the administration cannot shirk its responsibility of ensuring proper education in schools and colleges on the plea of lack of resources. Relevant portion of the said judgment reads as follows:

> "6. The position has to be accepted as well settled that imparting primary and secondary education to students is the bounden duty of the state Administration. It is a Constitutional mandate that the State shall ensure proper education to the students on whom the future of the society depends. In line with this principle, the State has enacted Statutes and framed Rules and Regulations to control/regulate establishment and running of private schools at different levels. The State Government provides grant-in-aid to private schools with a view to ensure smooth running of the

2025:KER:28873

institution and to ensure that the standard of teaching does not suffer on account of paucity of funds. It needs no emphasis that appointment of qualified and efficient teachers is a sine qua non for maintaining high standard of teaching in any educational institution.

10. Coming to the contention of the appellants that the Chandigarh Administration will find it difficult to bear the additional financial burden if the claim of the respondents 1 to 12 is accepted, we need only say that such a contention raised in different cases of similar nature has been rejected by this Court. The State Administration cannot shirk its responsibility of ensuring proper education in schools and colleges on the plea of lack of resources. It is for the Authorities running the Administration to find out the ways and means of securing funds for the purpose. We do not deem it necessary to consider this question in further detail. The contention raised by the appellants in this regard is rejected. It is, however, clarified that the proportion in which the additional burden will be shared by the Chandigarh Administration and the Management of the school will be in accordance with the Grant-in-aid Scheme applicable to the school from

2025:KER:28873

> time to time. The judgment of the High Court that the sharing of the financial burden will be in the ratio of 95% to 5% is modified accordingly."

14. In the light of the judgments cited supra, I am of the view that financial liability to be incurred by the Government in creation of the post cannot be a reason for denying the creation of post which has been duly recommended by the Director of Higher Secondary Education as evident from Ext.P15 itself. The only reason stated in Ext.P15 is that there is a condition imposed in Ext.P1 original sanctioning of the batches that there should be 40 students in the 1st year and from 2nd year there should be 50 students and the said condition has not been satisfied. It is to be seen that taking note of the fact that the schools sanctioned as per Exts.P1 and P2 were not having 50 students insisted in Ext.P1 order whereby batches were originally sanctioned, Government by Exts.P10 and P11 has relaxed the said stipulation of 50

2025:KER:28873

students to that of 40 students in a batch and held that the appointment of teachers can be made on a regular basis. On the basis of Exts.P10 and P11 in respect of school sanction as per Exts.P1 & P2 relaxation was applied and posts were created, there is absolutely no reason for not denying the said benefit to the petitioners herein. Further more, the specific contention of the petitioners is that the Government itself have modified as per Ext.P7 order produced in WP(C) No.42620 of 2022 that on the basis of the request made by the Management for sanctioning of the post which has been denied for the reason that there is no sufficient students strength, the Government has reduced the said criteria and held that if there are minimum 50 students in a batch for the last 3 academic years a proposal could be sent by the Director of General Education by the Director for sanctioning of the post. It is specifically take into consideration the said aspect that in Ext.P15

2025:KER:28873

the Director has recommended for creation of the post stating that there are 50 students in the batch for the year 2021-2022 to 2022-2023.

15. In the light of the above, I find that none of the reasons stated in Ext.P15 could be accepted for rejecting the request of the petitioner for creation of an additional post in the St.Joseph's Higher Secondary School Pullurampara and St.George Higher Secondary School, Kallanickal. Accordingly, Exts.P9 and P15 orders in WP(C) No.42620 of 2022 and Ext.P15 order in WP(C) No.42054 of 2022 are set aside with a consequential direction to the 1st respondent Government to reconsider the matter afresh in the light of the observation made above and taking into consideration the recommendation of the Director of the Higher Secondary, Education reflected in Ext.P15 that posts could be sanctioned in the subject schools. Petitioners will be free to submit notes of argument bringing to the notice of the

2025:KER:28873

Government, all the relevant Government Orders and the decisions of the courts cited above, and a fresh decision regarding the same shall be taken by the 1st respondent after affording an opportunity of being heard to the petitioners, within an outer limit of 3 months from the date of receipt of a copy of the judgment.

With the above said observation and direction the above writ petitions are disposed of.

sd/-
**VIJU ABRAHAM**
**JUDGE**

pm

2025:KER:28873

**APPENDIX OF WP(C) 42620/2022**

**PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Exhibit P1** | **TRUE COPY OF THE G.O.(MS)NO. 143/2014/G.EDN. DATED 31-07-2014 ALONG WITH THE RELEVANT PART OF THE LIST OF SCHOOLS.** |
| **Exhibit P2** | **TRUE COPY OF G.O.(MS)NO. 247/2014/ G.EDN. DATED 24-11-2014 ALONG WITH THE RELEVANT PART OF THE LIST OF SCHOOLS.** |
| **Exhibit P3** | **TRUE COPY OF THE STUDENT STRENGTH AVAILABLE IN THE SCHOOL IN THE FORM OF A CHART PREPARED BY THE PRINCIPAL OF THE SCHOOL.** |
| **Exhibit P4** | **TRUE COPY OF THE FITNESS CERTIFICATE OF THE SCHOOL BUILDING DATED 27-05-2020.** |
| **Exhibit P5** | **TRUE COPY OF THE REQUEST FOR SANCTIONING OF POST MADE BY THE CORPORATE MANAGER DATED 07-08-2019.** |
| **Exhibit P6** | **TRUE COPY OF G.O.(MS)NO. 41/2021/ G.EDN. DATED 25-01-2021.** |
| **Exhibit P7** | **TRUE COPY OF G.O.(MS)NO. 105/2021/ G.EDN. DATED 19-02-2021.** |
| **Exhibit P8** | **TRUE COPY OF THE REQUEST OF THE MANAGER DATED 23-02-2021 FOR SANCTIONING POSTS.** |
| **Exhibit P9** | **TRUE COPY OF G.O.(RT.) NO. 8387/2022/G.EDN. DATED 04-11-2022.** |
| **Exhibit P10** | **TRUE COPY OF G.O.(MS)NO. 76/2017/ G.EDN. DATED 10-07-2017.** |
| **Exhibit P11** | **TRUE COPY OF G.O.(MS)NO. 65/2018/ G.EDN. DATED 19-05-2018.** |

2025:KER:28873

| | |
|---|---|
| **Exhibit P12** | **TRUE COPY OF THE STAFF FIXATION ORDER WITH NO. B1/921/2021/RDD/HSE/KTM DATED 29-06-2021 FOR THE YEARS 2017-2018 TO 2019-2020 IN RESPECT OF THE COMMERCE BATCH SANCTIONED AS PER EXHIBIT-P1.** |
| **Exhibit P13** | **TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO. B1/1012/2022/RDD/HSE/KTM DATED 07-03-2022 SANCTIONING THE POST FOR THE YEARS 2017-2018 TO 2019-2020.** |
| **Exhibit-P14** | **TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER DATED 20-11-2023 IN W.P.(C)NO. 42620/2022.** |
| **Exhibit-P15** | **TRUE COPY OF G.O.(RT.)NO. 2197/2024/G.EDN. DATED 16-03-2024.** |
| **Exhibit-P16** | **TRUE COPY OF THE CIRCULAR OF THE DIRECTOR NO. AD-B1-7225/2000/HSE DATED 30-05-2000.** |
| **Exhibit-P17** | **TRUE COPY OF G.O.(MS)NO. 35/2024/G.EDN. DATED 16-03-2024 .** |

2025:KER:28873

**APPENDIX OF WP(C) 42054/2022**

**PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Exhibit P1** | **TRUE COPY OF THE G.O.(MS)NO. 143/2014/G.EDN. DATED 31-07-2014 ALONG WITH THE RELEVANT PART OF THE LIST OF SCHOOLS.** |
| **Exhibit P2** | **TRUE COPY OF G.O.(MS)NO. 247/2014/ G.EDN. DATED 24-11-2014 ALONG WITH THE RELEVANT PART OF THE LIST OF SCHOOLS.** |
| **Exhibit P3** | **TRUE COPY OF G.O.(MS)NO. 106/2017/ G.EDN. DATED 21-08-2017.** |
| **Exhibit P4** | **TRUE COPY OF G.O.(MS)NO. 41/2021/ G.EDN. DATED 25-01-2021.** |
| **Exhibit P5** | **TRUE COPY OF THE STAFF FIXATION ORDER FOR THE YEARS 2014-2015, 2015-2016, 2016-2017, 2017-2018, 2018-2019 AND 2019-2020, BY A COMPOSITE ORDER WITH NO. A5/9750/2019/DDIS DATED 29-01-2020.** |
| **Exhibit P6** | **TRUE COPY OF STAFF FIXATION ORDER NO. A5/2352/2021/DDIS DATED 14-07-2021.** |
| **Exhibit P7** | **TRUE COPY OF THE REQUEST FOR SANCTIONING OF POST MADE BY THE CORPORATE MANAGER DATED 24-01-2022.** |
| **Exhibit P8** | **TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGE OF THE SAID GOVERNMENT ORDER G.O.(MS)NO. 105/2021/ G.EDN. DATED 19-02-2021.** |
| **Exhibit P9** | **TRUE COPY OF G.O.(MS)NO. 76/2017/ G.EDN. DATED 10-07-2017.** |
| **Exhibit P10** | **TRUE COPY OF ORDER G.O.(MS)NO. 65/2018/G.EDN. DATED 19-05-2018.** |
| **Exhibit P11** | **TRUE COPY OF THE CIRCULAR OF THE** |

| | |
|---|---|
| | **DIRECTOR NO. AD-B1-7225/2000/HSE DATED 30-05-2000 PRESCRIBING THE MINIMUM BATCH STRENGTH AS 25 AND MAXIMUM AS 50.** |
| **Exhibit-P12** | **TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 11-02-2010 IN W.P.(C)NO. 37392/2009.** |
| **Exhibit-P13** | **TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN W.A. NO. 672/2010 DATED 21-05-2010.** |
| **Exhibit-P14** | **TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER IN W.P. (C)NO. 42054/2022 DATED 20-11-2023.** |
| **Exhibit-P15** | **TRUE COPY OF G.O.(RT.)NO. 2197/2024/G.EDN. DATED 16-03-2024.** |
| **Exhibit-P16** | **True copy of GO (MS) No. 76/2016 dated 11/04/2016.** |
| **Exhibit-P17** | **True copy of GO (MS) No.77/2016 dated 11/04/2016.** |
| **Exhibit-P18** | **True copy of G.O.(MS)No. 35/2024/G.Edn. dated 16-03-2024.** |
| **Exhibit-P19** | **True copy of the Staff Fixation order for the year 2021-2022 with No. RDDHSC/KKD/3036/2023(A5) dated 14/09/2023.** |
| **Exhibit-P20** | **True copy of the Staff Fixation order for the year 2023-2024 with No. RDDHSC/KKD/2190/2024 dated 27/07/2024.** |