

Supreme Court of India

Smt. Ram Sakhi Devi Uttar Pradesh ... vs U.P. Secondary Education Service ... on 20 March, 1997

Bench: K. Ramaswamy, S. Saghir Ahmad

PETITIONER:

SMT. RAM SAKHI DEVI UTTAR PRADESH PRADHAN ADHYAPAK PARISHAD&

Vs.

RESPONDENT:

U.P. SECONDARY EDUCATION SERVICE COMMISSION ,STATE OF U.P. &

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 20/03/1997

BENCH:

K. RAMASWAMY, S. SAGHIR AHMAD

ACT:

HEADNOTE :

JUDGMENT :

WITH CIVIL APPEAL NO.1825 OF 1986 O R D E R CA NO.472/86:

This appeal by special leave arises from the judgment of the Division Bench of the Allahabad High Court, made on November 6, 1985 in Civil Miscellaneous Writ Petition No.10982/85.

The admitted facts are that the appellant was appointed as Headmistress of Junior High School, Kamla Nehru Kanya Vidyalaya, Shiv Shankari Dham Pachewara Chunal Mirzapur which was upgraded in July, 1982 as High School. The Managing Committee advertised through newspaper under the U.P. Intermediate Education Act, 1921 for selection of the candidates, obviously, under Section 16-E. The committee had selected the appellant on December 17, 1983 and the appellant was sought to be ratified. Since the ratification was not accorded by the District Inspector, the appellant had approached by the High Court. The High Court relying upon its earlier decision in Jai Prakesh Sharma vs. State of U.P. & Ors. [WP No.174/85] dismissed the writ petition. Thus, this appeal by special leave.

Though the High Court may not be correct in following its judgment in dismissing the writ petition, on facts we find that there is no substantial difference in the result. The admitted position is that the U.P. Secondary Education (Services Commission) Act, 1982, had come into force with effect from July 14, 1981. Section 10 of the Act specifies the purpose of making appointment to the posts of

teachers specified in the Schedule. It postulates thus:

"(1) For the purpose of making appointment of a teacher specified in the Schedule, the management shall notify the vacancy to the Commission in such manner and through such officer or authority as may be prescribed.

(2) The procedure of selection of candidates for appointment to the posts of such teachers shall be such as may be prescribed: Provided that the Commission shall, with a view to inviting talented persons, give wide publicity in the State to the vacancies notified under sub-section (1)."

It is, thus, clear that Section 10 envisages two steps, namely, every institution is enjoined to notify to the Commission the vacancies through such officer or authority as may be prescribed. The Service Commission, before selection, will give wide publicity by inviting applications from all qualified candidates so that talented candidates would apply for get selected to the post. Though this Section has been amended by Amendment Act 12 of 1985, the same is not relevant and has no application to this case. It reads as under:

"Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the Intermediate Education Act, 1921 or the Regulations made thereunder but subject to the provisions of Sections 18, 21-B, 21-C, 21-D, 33 and 33-A on or after July 10, 1981, be made by the management only on the recommendation of the Commission;

(b) every appointment of a teacher specified in the Scheduled, shall, on or after July 1, 1981, be made by the management only on the recommendation of the Board."

Thus, it could be seen that after coming into force of the said Amendment Act, the power of the Management to constitute a Selection Committee under Section 16-E of the U.P. Intermediate Act has been taken away. Instead the selection has to be made only through the Commission under the Act and the selected candidate shall be appointed on its recommendation and in no other manner. The selection by the School under Intermediate Education Act, 1921 is illegal.

Learned counsel for the appellant has sought to place reliance on Section 33-A of the Regulation made under Section 16-E of the U.P. Intermediate Act to regularise such ad hoc appointments. Undoubtedly, every teacher directly appointed before the commencement of the Act, in other words, on ad hoc basis, against the substantive vacancy may be regularised under Section 33-A; but it cannot be used as a routine. It is mandatory for the management to notify to the Commission and in case the Commission is unable to recommend the selected candidates within a reasonable time, any candidate appointed on ad hoc basis will be deemed to have been appointed in substantive capacity. The resource to Section 33-A should be made sparingly and not as a routine. If Section 33-A route is adopted as a routine, the entire process of Selection contemplated under the Act would be given a decent burial and illegal appointment would gain legitimacy. Under these circumstances, we do not think that the counsel is right in contending that the appellant could be regularised under Section 33-A of the Regulation.

The appeal is accordingly dismissed. No. costs. CA NO.1825/86:

The appeal having become infructuous, is dismissed. No Costs.