



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL K.NARENDRAN

&

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE MURALEE KRISHNA S.

THURSDAY, THE 29<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JANUARY 2026 / 9TH MAGHA, 1947

OP (KAT) NO. 379 OF 2025

AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 01.07.2025 IN OA NO.1877 OF 2024 OF KERALA  
ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

PETITIONERS/RESPONDENTS 2 AND 3:

- 1 THE KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, PATOM.P.O,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA., PIN - 682016
- 2 THE DISTRICT OFFICER,KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION,  
DISTRICT OFFICE, EASTERN ENTRY TOWER, ERNAKULAM SOUTH  
RAILWAY STATION, KOCHI, KERALA., PIN - 682016

BY ADV SHRI.P.C.SASIDHARAN

RESPONDENTS/APPLICANT AND 1<sup>ST</sup> RESPONDENT:

- 1 NITHYA.V.L,D/O VINODKUMAR.N.R, RESIDING AT V.L NIVAS,  
CHAMAVILA, KAKKAMoola, KALLIYOOR, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,  
KERALA., PIN - 695042
- 2 STATE OF KERALA REPRESENTED BY THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO  
GOVERNMENT, EDUCATION HIGHER, GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM , KERALA., PIN - 695001

BY ADVS.  
SHRI.KALAM PASHA B.  
SMT.HASNA ASHRAF T.A  
SHRI.ANANDU U.R.  
SMT.PRINCY XAVIER, SR.G.P

THIS OP KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL WAS FINALLY HEARD ON  
05.01.2026 ALONG WITH OP (KAT) NO.400 OF 2025 AND CONNECTED CASES, THE  
COURT ON 29.01.2026 PASSED THE FOLLOWING:



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL K.NARENDRAN

&

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE MURALEE KRISHNA S.

THURSDAY, THE 29<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JANUARY 2026 / 9TH MAGHA, 1947

OP (KAT) NO. 400 OF 2025

AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 01.07.2025 IN OA NO.591 OF 2024 OF KERALA  
ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

PETITIONER/2<sup>ND</sup> RESPONDENT:

KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, PATTOM PO,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM , KERALA, PIN - 695004

BY ADV SHRI.P.C.SASIDHARAN

RESPONDENTS/APPLICANT & 1<sup>ST</sup> RESPONDENT:

- 1 ASWATHI M.VIJAYAN,W/O ANISH C, MANNAKUNNEL,  
KUDAYATHOOR.P.O, THODUPPUZHA, IDUKKI, KERALA, PIN -  
685590
- 2 STATE OF KERALA REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY  
LOCAL SELF GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT,  
THIRUVANANATHAPURAM, PIN - 695001

BY ADVS.  
SHRI.KALAM PASHA B.,SMT.VISHAKHA J.  
SMT.HASNA ASHRAF T.A,SHRI.ANANDU U.R.  
SMT.PRINCY XAVIER, SR.G.P

THIS OP KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL WAS FINALLY HEARD ON  
05.01.2026 ALONG WITH OP (KAT) NO.379 OF 2025 AND CONNECTED CASES, THE  
COURT ON 29.01.2026 PASSED THE FOLLOWING:



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL K.NARENDRAN

&

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE MURALEE KRISHNA S.

THURSDAY, THE 29<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JANUARY 2026 / 9TH MAGHA, 1947

OP (KAT) NO. 429 OF 2025

AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 01.07.2025 IN OA NO.1001 OF 2024 OF KERALA  
ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

PETITIONER/1<sup>ST</sup> RESPONDENT:

KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, PATTOM PO,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM , KERALA, PIN - 695004

BY ADV SHRI.P.C.SASIDHARAN

RESPONDENTS/APPLICANTS AND 2<sup>ND</sup> RESPONDENT:

- 1      LEKSHMY PRIYA M  
D/O NARAYANAN POTTI...RESIDING AT CHENGILLAM. T  
C/2839-55(C-19) , TM NAGAR, THALIYIL, KARAMANA,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA. , PIN - 695002
- 2      GREESHMA S  
D/O SASIDHARAN NAIR, THADATHARIKATHU VEEDU,  
PERINGAMALA PO, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA, PIN -  
695563
- 3      VAISAKH C L  
S/O CHANDRASEKHARAN PILLAI, VAISAKHOM, MADANTHCODE,  
NELLIMUKKU P O, KOLLAM,KERALA, PIN - 691509
- 4      SALIJA S  
W/O MIDHUN S, SAJITH BHAVAN, AKKOLICHERI, MAYYANADU P  
O, KOLLAM, KERALA, PIN - 691020



- 5 PRATHIBHA V T  
W/O SHIBU, PUNNAMOODU, KALLIYOOR PO, VELLAYANI,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA, PIN - 695042
- 6 ATHIRA M S  
W/O JAYASANKAR, SANKARAMANGALAM, CHELLAMCODE,  
POOVATHOOR P O, NEDUMANGADU,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA, PIN - 695561
- 7 AMAL G H  
S/O HARIKUMAR, HARITHAM, VAMANAPURAM,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA, PIN - 695606
- 8 GOKUL G S  
S/O GOPAKUMARAN NAIR, KRISHNASREE, NETTA, NEDUMANGADU  
P O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA, PIN - 695541
- 9 STATE OF KERALA  
REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, HIGHER  
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695001

BY ADVS.  
SHRI.KALAM PASHA B.  
SMT.VISHAKHA J.  
SMT.HASNA ASHRAF T.A  
SHRI.ANANDU U.R.  
SMT.PRINCNY XAVIER, SR.G.P

THIS OP KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL WAS FINALLY HEARD ON  
05.01.2026 ALONG WITH OP (KAT) NO.379 OF 2025 AND CONNECTED CASES, THE  
COURT ON 29.01.2026 PASSED THE FOLLOWING:



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL K.NARENDRAN

&

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE MURALEE KRISHNA S.

THURSDAY, THE 29<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JANUARY 2026 / 9TH MAGHA, 1947

OP (KAT) NO. 434 OF 2025

AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 01.07.2025 IN OA NO.1530 OF 2024 OF KERALA  
ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

PETITIONERS/RESPONDENTS 2 AND 3:

- 1 KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY. PATTOM P.O,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA, PIN - 695004
- 2 THE DISTRICT OFFICER, KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION,  
THRISSUR DISTRICT OFFICE, SC/ST/BUILDING, TOWN HALL  
ROAD, THRISSUR. KERALA, PIN - 680020

BY ADV SHRI.P.C.SASIDHARAN

RESPONDENTS/APPLICANT & 1ST RESPONDENT:

- 1 REMYA S.N, W/O SANTHOSH, RESIDING AT RAKESH NIVAS  
CHERUTHURUTHY PANJAL, THALAPPILLY, THRISSUR, KERALA.,  
PIN - 679531
- 2 STATE OF KERALA REPRESENTED BY THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY  
TO GOVERNMENT, EDUCATION HIGHER, GOVERNMENT  
SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA, PIN - 695001

BY ADVS.

SHRI.KALAM PASHA B., SMT.VISHAKHA J., SMT.HASNA ASHRAF  
T.A, SHRI.ANANDU U.R., SMT.PRINCY XAVIER, SR.G.P

THIS OP KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL WAS FINALLY HEARD ON  
05.01.2026 ALONG WITH OP (KAT) NO.379 OF 2025 AND CONNECTED CASES, THE  
COURT ON 29.01.2026 PASSED THE FOLLOWING:



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL K.NARENDRAN

&

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE MURALEE KRISHNA S.

THURSDAY, THE 29<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JANUARY 2026 / 9TH MAGHA, 1947

OP (KAT) NO. 436 OF 2025

AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 01.07.2025 IN OA NO.1842 OF 2024 OF KERALA  
ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

PETITIONERS/RESPONDENTS 2 AND 3:

- 1 THE KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, PATTOM.P.O,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA., PIN - 685001
- 2 THE DISTRICT OFFICER,KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION,  
DISTRICT OFFICE, EASTERN ENTRY TOWER, ERNAKULAM SOUTH  
RAILWAY STATION, KOCHI, KERALA., PIN - 682016

BY ADV SHRI.P.C.SASIDHARAN

RESPONDENTS/APPLICANT/1<sup>ST</sup> RESPONDENT:

- 1 VAISAKH.C.L,S/O CHANDRASEKARAN PILLAI, RESIDING AT  
VAISAKHAM, MADANTHACODE, KUZHIMATHICADU, NELLIMUKKU,  
KOLLAM, KERALA, PIN - 691509
- 2 STATE OF KERALA,REPRESENTED BY THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY  
TO GOVERNMENT, EDUCATION HIGHER, GOVERNMENT  
SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM ,KERALA., PIN - 695001

BY ADVS.

SHRI.KALAM PASHA B.,SMT.VISHAKHA J.,SMT.HASNA ASHRAF  
T.A,SHRI.ANANDU U.R., SMT.PRINCY XAVIER, SR.G.P

THIS OP KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL WAS FINALLY HEARD ON  
05.01.2026 ALONG WITH OP (KAT) NO.379 OF 2025 AND CONNECTED CASES, THE  
COURT ON 29.01.2026 PASSED THE FOLLOWING:



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL K.NARENDRA

&

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE MURALEE KRISHNA S.

THURSDAY, THE 29<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JANUARY 2026 / 9TH MAGHA, 1947

OP(KAT) NO. 439 OF 2025

AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 01.07.2025 IN OA NO.1536 OF 2024 OF  
KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

PETITIONERS/RESPONDENTS 2 & 3:

- 1 KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY. PATTOM P.O,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM. KERALA, PIN - 695004
- 2 THE DISTRICT OFFICER, KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DISTRICT OFFICE,  
PATTOOM P.O. THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA,  
PIN - 695004

BY ADV SHRI.P.C.SASIDHARAN

RESPONDENTS/APPLICANT & 1<sup>ST</sup> RESPONDENT:

- 1 LEKSHMY PRIYA M,D/O NARAYANAN POTTI... RESIDING AT  
CHENGILLAM TC/2839-55 C-19 TM NAGAR THALIYIL,  
KARAMANA, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA., PIN - 695002
- 2 SALIJA.S,W/O MIDHUN.S., SAJITH BHAVAN,  
AKKOLICHERI. MAYYANADU.P.O., KOLLAM DIST,KERALA,  
PIN - 691020
- 3 REJITHA R,D/O RAVEENDRANACHARY, RENJITH BHAVAN,  
ULANADU P O, KULANADA, PATHANAMTHITTA, KERALA,  
PIN - 689503
- 4 STATE OF KERALA ,REPRESENTED BY THE PRINCIPAL  
SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, EDUCATION HIGHER,



GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA.,  
PIN - 695001

BY ADVS.  
SHRI.KALAM PASHA B. ,SMT.VISHAKHA J.  
SMT.HASNA ASHRAF T.A,SHRI.ANANDU U.R. ,  
SMT.PRINCY XAVIER, SR.G.P

THIS OP KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL WAS FINALLY HEARD ON  
05.01.2026 ALONG WITH OP (KAT) NO.379 OF 2025 AND CONNECTED CASES, THE  
COURT ON 29.01.2026 PASSED THE FOLLOWING:





IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL K.NARENDRAN

&

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE MURALEE KRISHNA S.

THURSDAY, THE 29<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JANUARY 2026 / 9TH MAGHA, 1947

OP (KAT) NO. 441 OF 2025

AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 01.07.2025 IN OA NO.1062 OF 2024 OF  
KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

PETITIONER/1<sup>ST</sup> RESPONDENT:

KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, PATTOM P.O.,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695004

BY ADV SHRI.P.C.SASIDHARAN

RESPONDENTS/APPLICANTS/2<sup>ND</sup> RESPONDENT:

- 1 LEKSHMI VENUGOPAL,D/O. VENUGOPAL, RESIDING AT  
SREELEKSHMY, 25 NCC NAGAR, PEROORKADA PO,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695005
- 2 STATE OF KERALA REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL  
SECRETARY. HIGHER EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT  
SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695001

BY ADVS.  
SHRI.KALAM PASHA B.,SMT.VISHAKHA J.  
SMT.HASNA ASHRAF T.A,SHRI.ANANDU U.R.  
SMT.PRINCY XAVIER, SR.G.P

THIS OP KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL WAS FINALLY HEARD ON  
05.01.2026 ALONG WITH OP (KAT) NO.379 OF 2025 AND CONNECTED CASES, THE  
COURT ON 29.01.2026 PASSED THE FOLLOWING:



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL K.NARENDRAN

&

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE MURALEE KRISHNA S.

THURSDAY, THE 29<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JANUARY 2026 / 9TH MAGHA, 1947

OP (KAT) NO. 456 OF 2025

AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 01.07.2025 IN OA NO.1316 OF 2024 OF  
KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

PETITIONER/1<sup>ST</sup> RESPONDENT:

KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, PATTOM PO,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA, PIN - 695004

BY ADV SHRI.P.C.SASIDHARAN

RESPONDENTS/APPLICANTS AND 2<sup>ND</sup> RESPONDENT:

- 1 MASHEEKA SALAM,W/O NASEEF MOHAMMED, RESIDING AT  
NARIKUTHU HOUSE, PULIKKAL, MALAPPURAM, KERALA,, PIN -  
673637
- 2 BABY NUBLA V.M,W/O AJMAL.M.A, AGED 29 YEARS, BABY  
VILLA, VALIYAPARAMBU KOTAYI PO, PALAKKAD, PIN - 678572
- 3 STATE OF KERALA REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL  
SECRETARY. HIGHER EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT  
SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695001

BY ADVS.

SHRI.KALAM PASHA B. ,SMT.VISHAKHA J.  
SMT.HASNA ASHRAF T.A,SHRI.ANANDU U.R.  
SMT.PRINCY XAVIER SR.G.P

THIS OP KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL WAS FINALLY HEARD ON  
05.01.2026 ALONG WITH OP (KAT) NO.379 OF 2025 AND CONNECTED CASES, THE  
COURT ON 29.01.2026 PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

**COMMON JUDGMENT**

Muralee Krishna, J.

These original petitions are filed by the Kerala Public Service Commission ('KPSC', for short), invoking the supervisory jurisdiction of this Court under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, challenging the common order dated 01.07.2025 passed by the Kerala Administrative Tribunal at Thiruvananthapuram (the 'Tribunal', for short) in the respective original applications. The District Officer of KPSC is also one of the petitioners in some of the original petitions, wherever he was a party in the respective original applications. Since the point to be decided in these original petitions is the same, they are heard together and are being disposed of by this common judgment. For convenience of reference, the parties to these original petitions are referred to in this judgment as they were referred by the Tribunal, unless otherwise stated.

2. The point to be decided in these original petitions depends upon the interpretation of the stipulation in the note appended to Clause (7) of the respective notifications dated 31.12.2020 and 30.11.2022 issued by the KPSC inviting



applications for the post of Librarian Grade-IV in the Department of Kerala Common Pool Library and in the Department of Kerala Municipal Common Service and also the qualifications prescribed for the said post in the Kerala Common Pool Library Subordinate Service Rules as it stood amended in the year 2009, through the gazette notification dated 09.06.2009.

3. While coming to the facts of these original petitions, the applicants before the Tribunal are candidates possessing a Bachelor's Degree in Library and Information Science (BLISc) obtained through Distance Education Mode from various Universities, like the Institute of Distance Education of the University of Kerala, the Indira Gandhi National Open University (IGNOU), etc. By the notification dated 31.12.2020, the KPSC has invited applications for the selection of Librarian Grade-IV in the Department of Kerala Municipal Common Services. Similarly, by the notification dated 30.11.2022, the KPSC has invited applications for the post of Librarian Grade-IV in the Department of Kerala Common Pool Library. As per the notifications, the stipulated qualifications for direct recruitment are: (i) Bachelor's Degree in any subject and Bachelor's Degree in Library and



Information Science, or (ii) SSLC and Diploma in Library Science, or (iii) SSLC and Certificate in Library Science recognised by the Government. As per note (ii) appended to Clause (7) of the notification dated 31.12.2020 and note (1) appended to Clause (7) of notification dated 30.11.2022, it is stipulated that the qualification proposed for direct recruitment shall be one acquired after undergoing a regular course of study from any of the Universities in Kerala or recognised as equivalent thereto by any of the Universities in Kerala.

3.1. The applicants were included in the short list published by the KPSC, drawn on the basis of the written examination conducted. But subsequently, their candidature was rejected through endorsements made in their profile to the effect that they have acquired the required qualification only through distance education. According to the applicants, they have produced equivalency certificates obtained from various Universities in Kerala, certifying that the degree of BLISc obtained through distance education mode is recognised as equivalent to the degree of BLISc offered through regular course in the respective Universities. The applicants further contended that, vide order



dated 02.05.2017 bearing G.O.(Ms)No.119/2017/H.Edn, the Government of Kerala has declared that one year BLISc course offered through the school of distance education of the University of Kerala and one year BLISc degree course (regular) offered by the Department of Library and Information Science of the University of Kerala are equivalent. Therefore, according to the applicants, they are fully qualified for the post of Librarian Grade-IV as notified above. Being aggrieved by the rejection of their candidature, the applicants filed the respective original applications seeking their inclusion in the ranked lists published by the KPSC and the District Officers of the KPSC to publish the revised ranked list incorporating the applicants therein.

3.2. The applicants in all the cases were permitted to participate in the selection process, provisionally, based on interim orders issued by the Tribunal. However, their names were not included in the ranked list published by the KPSC, mentioning that the results of those candidates are withheld subject to final orders in the original applications.

3.3. In some of the original applications, the KPSC filed reply statements, inter alia, contending that the stipulation in the



notification that the degree has to be acquired after undergoing a regular course of study. The equivalent degree also has to satisfy the said condition of regular study. The KPSC issued the notifications based on the Special Rules in existence, which are statutory rules in terms of the provisions of the Constitution of India and the Kerala Public Services Act, 1968, which laid down the qualification to be acquired through a regular mode of study. The qualification mentioned in the notification is entirely based on the Special Rules for the post. Since the degree obtained by the applicants was through distance education scheme, their applications for the post were rejected as they had not possessed the required qualification through regular study as insisted in the notification.

3.4. In the reply statement filed by the State of Kerala, it is stated that the University of Kerala has recognised BLISc degree course through distance education as equivalent to the regular course offered by the Departments of the said University. It is pursuant to that the Government issued the notification dated 02.05.2017 declaring that the one-year BLISc degree course offered through the school of distance education of the University



of Kerala and the one-year BLISc degree course (regular) offered by the Department of Library and Information Science of the University of Kerala are equivalent. According to the Government, it is up to the University concerned to decide whether the BLISc degree course obtained through distance education mode offered by any other University is equivalent to the regular course of that University, within the State. The State Government had issued orders regarding the equivalency on the basis of reports of the University/Higher Education Council.

3.5. After hearing both sides and on appreciation of materials on record, the Tribunal allowed the original applications, holding that the equivalency certificates produced by the applicants, obtained from the Universities in Kerala, as well as the equivalency ordered by the Government would indicate that the applicants are satisfying the qualifications stipulated under the Special Rules and the notification, making them eligible to contest in the selection to the post in question. The Tribunal declared that the applicants are fulfilling the qualifications stipulated to the post of Librarian Grade IV under the notifications published by the KPSC, based on the equivalency certificates produced from the





Universities in Kerala. Consequently, the rejection of their candidature made by the KPSC was set aside, and KPSC was directed to publish an addendum notification by including the applicants at the appropriate ranking position and to issue advice based on their turn. The steps were directed to be completed within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of the said order.

3.6. Being aggrieved by the aforesaid order of the Tribunal, KPSC and its District Officers are now before this Court with these original petitions.

4. Heard Sri.P.C. Sasidharan, the learned Standing Counsel for the KPSC, Sri.Kalam Pasha, the learned counsel for the party respondents - applicants and Smt.Princy Xavier, the learned Senior Government Pleader.

5. The learned Standing Counsel for KPSC would submit that going by the qualifications prescribed in the note appended to Clause (7) of the notifications, a candidate in order to qualify for the selection to the post of Librarian Grade IV in the Department of Kerala Common Pool Library as well as in the Department of Kerala Municipal Common Services should have acquired the



Bachelors Degree in Library and Information Science after undergoing a regular course of study from any of the Universities in Kerala or recognised as equivalent thereto by any of the Universities in Kerala, which means that the equivalency should be only to the candidates who acquired the said qualification by a regular course of study from any of the Universities outside Kerala. The equivalency certificates produced by the applicants should satisfy not only equivalency but regular course of study also. The Tribunal failed to consider these aspects while passing the impugned order. The learned Standing Counsel further submitted that the necessity of acquiring the qualification by undergoing a regular course of study stipulated in the notifications as well as in the Special Rules, is not challenged in the original applications. The learned counsel relied on the judgment of this Court in **Shine Bose. B v. Kerala Public Service Commission [2015 (1) KHC 354]**, the judgment dated 21.12.2016 passed by a Division Bench of this Court in O.P.(KAT)No.131 of 2016 **Asha. K v. State of Kerala [2016 :KER: 55340]**, and that of the Apex Court in **Nagaland Public Service Commission v. State of Nagaland [(2017) 13 SCC 498]** in support of his arguments.



6. On the other hand, Sri.Kalam Pasha, the learned counsel for the party respondents, would submit that the equivalency certificates granted by the Universities to the applicants are applicable as if it is equal to one acquired by undergoing a regular course of study from the respective Universities. In those certificates, it is specifically stated that the equivalency granted is by recognising the degree of BLISc (distance education) awarded to the applicants as equivalent to BLISc (regular) degree. Moreover, the Government of Kerala has also taken a stand that the equivalency certificates issued to the applicants are sufficient to qualify for the posts notified. Apart from that, the Government has issued an order declaring that the one-year BLISc degree course offered through the school of distance education of the University of Kerala and one year BLISc degree course (regular) offered by the Department of Library and Information Science of the University of Kerala are equivalent. In support of his arguments the learned counsel relied on the judgments of the Apex Court in **Jaiveer Singh v. State of Uttarakhand [2023 KHC Online 1005]**, **State of Punjab v. Manjit Singh [(2003) 11 SCC 559]** and **Guru Nanak Dev**



**University v. Sanjay Kumar Katwal [(2009) 1 SCC 610]**. The learned counsel further submitted that the judgment in **Shine Bose. B [2015 (1) KHC 354]** is not applicable to the facts of the instant cases.

7. The learned Senior Government Pleader would submit that even if a Government order is there, it is the Special Rules that would prevail and therefore the equivalent qualification obtained by the applicants should be after undergoing a regular course of study.

8. Article 227 of the Constitution of India deals with the power of superintendence over all courts by the High Court. Under clause (1) of Article 227 of the Constitution, every High Court shall have superintendence over all courts and tribunals throughout the territories in relation to which it exercises jurisdiction.

9. In **Shalini Shyam Shetty v. Rajendra Shankar Patil [(2010) 8 SCC 329]** the Apex Court, while analysing the scope and ambit of the power of superintendence under Article 227 of the Constitution, held that the object of superintendence, both administrative and judicial, is to maintain efficiency, smooth and orderly functioning of the entire machinery of justice in such a way



as it does not bring it into any disrepute. The power of interference under Article 227 is to be kept to the minimum to ensure that the wheel of justice does not come to a halt and the fountain of justice remains pure and unpolluted in order to maintain public confidence in the functioning of the tribunals and courts subordinate to the High Court.

10. In **Jai Singh v. Municipal Corporation of Delhi [(2010) 9 SCC 385]**, while considering the nature and scope of the powers under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, the Apex Court held that, undoubtedly the High Court, under Article 227 of the Constitution, has the jurisdiction to ensure that all subordinate courts, as well as statutory or quasi-judicial tribunals exercise the powers vested in them, within the bounds of their authority. The High Court has the power and the jurisdiction to ensure that they act in accordance with the well established principles of law. The exercise of jurisdiction must be within the well recognised constraints. It cannot be exercised like a 'bull in a china shop', to correct all errors of the judgment of a court or tribunal, acting within the limits of its jurisdiction. This correctional jurisdiction can be exercised in cases where orders have been passed in grave



dereliction of duty or in flagrant abuse of fundamental principles of law or justice.

11. In **K.V.S. Ram v. Bangalore Metropolitan Transport Corporation [(2015) 12 SCC 39]** the Apex Court held that, in exercise of the power of superintendence under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, the High Court can interfere with the order of the court or tribunal only when there has been a patent perversity in the orders of the tribunal and courts subordinate to it or where there has been gross and manifest failure of justice or the basic principles of natural justice have been flouted.

12. In **Sobhana Nair K.N. v. Shaji S.G. Nair [2016 (1) KHC 1]** a Division Bench of this Court held that, the law is well settled by a catena of decisions of the Apex Court that in proceedings under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, this Court cannot sit in appeal over the findings recorded by the lower court or tribunal and the jurisdiction of this Court is only supervisory in nature and not that of an appellate court. Therefore, no interference under Article 227 of the Constitution is called for, unless this Court finds that the lower court or tribunal has committed manifest error, or the reasoning is palpably



perverse or patently unreasonable, or the decision of the lower court or tribunal is in direct conflict with settled principles of law.

13. In view of the law laid down in the decisions referred to supra, the High Court in exercise of its supervisory jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, cannot sit in appeal over the findings recorded by a lower court or tribunal. The supervisory jurisdiction cannot be exercised to correct all errors of the order or judgment of a lower court or tribunal, acting within the limits of its jurisdiction. The correctional jurisdiction under Article 227 can be exercised only in a case where the order or judgment of a lower court or tribunal has been passed in grave dereliction of duty or in flagrant abuse of fundamental principles of law or justice. Therefore, no interference under Article 227 is called for, unless the High Court finds that the lower court or tribunal has committed manifest error, or the reasoning is palpably perverse or patently unreasonable, or the decision of the lower court or tribunal is in direct conflict with settled principles of law or where there has been gross and manifest failure of justice or the basic principles of natural justice have been flouted.

14. In **Shine Bose.B [2015 (1) KHC 354]** while



considering the issue whether the M.Com degree obtained under a correspondence course from Annamalai University by the petitioners therein is sufficient for being considered for recruitment to the post of Vocational Teacher in Office Secretaryship in terms of the notification dated 30.11.2009 issued by the KPSC in view of note (1) under Rule 4 of the Kerala Vocational Higher Secondary Education Subordinate Service Rules 2004, which provides that all the educational qualifications for teaching posts should be acquired after a regular course of study from a recognized University in Kerala or recognised as equivalent thereto by any one of the Universities in Kerala, a Division Bench of this Court held thus:

"3. The learned counsel for the petitioners argued that once the equivalence of the qualification is certified by the University of Kerala, the M. Com. Degree of the Annamalai University ought to have been treated as equivalent to the M. Com. Degree of the University of Kerala. But, the fact of the matter remains that the aforequoted Note under R.4 of the Special Rules provides that the qualification should be one acquired after a regular course of study. Remember, we are dealing with recruitment to a teaching post. If we are to dissect the aforequoted rule and hold that a correspondence course from any other University will be





equivalent to a degree obtained after a regular course of study from a University in Kerala, the situation will be contradictory. We say so because, if we adopt such a view, while a candidate qualifying from a University in Kerala should be one who had undergone a regular course of study, a candidate who obtains a degree from any University outside Kerala would be eligible without undergoing a regular course of study. It would be fallacious if we were to hold so. The very purpose of having the prescription that one should have acquired the educational qualification after a regular course of study is consciously made by the Government in the Special Rules, having regard to the objects sought to be achieved; that is to say, to pick up competent hands to man the teaching posts”.

(Underline supplied)

15. In the judgment dated 21.12.2016 in O.P.(KAT)No.131 of 2016 **Asha. K v. State of Kerala [2016 :KER: 55340]**, a Division Bench of this Court held thus:

“5. The PSC issued Annexure A1 notification dated 30.04.2010, inviting application for selection and appointment as HSST-Senior [English]. Subsequently, Annexure A2 addendum notification was issued, inviting applications also for selection and appointment as HSSTJunior [English]. This was followed by yet another notification as Annexure A3, whereby the PSC invited applications from qualified candidates for selection and appointment as NVT-Senior/Junior [English]. The



qualifications stipulated for both the streams [HSST/NVT] were almost the same and the only difference in Annexure A3 notification was that the qualification should be one acquired after 'regular study'. Pursuant to the applications preferred by the petitioners, they participated in a common examination conducted by the PSC [common to all the four different posts notified as per Annexure A1, A2 & A3].

XXX

XXX

XXX

XXXX

14. The contention of the petitioners appears to be that, once a course is recognised as equivalent by anyone of the Universities in Kerala, 'regular course of study' should not have been insisted any further. The prayers raised in the O.A. in the above context are in the following terms:

"i) issue a writ of mandamus or other appropriate writ, direction or order to the respondents to include the name of the applicant in the rank list for appointment to the post of Non-Vocational Teacher English (Senior) and further to advice and appoint her to the service.

ii) issue a writ order or direction to declare that Note:1 to Rule 6(1) of the Rules 2004 [if made applicable to Rule 6(1) (English) is illegal and unsustainable.

iii) issue a writ of certiorari or other appropriate writ order or direction to call for the records leading to Annexures A11 to the extent of not including the name of the applicant and quash the same.

iv) grant such other orders which this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the circumstance of the



case.

and

v) award the cost of this application to the applicant”.

15. With regard to the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners with reference to the 'correspondences with the UGC', as to the importance of 'distance education', dealt with as Annexures A12 to A14 [pages 93, 94 & 96], it is to be noted that Annexure A12 dated 28.07.1993 is in respect of the Distance Educational Course offered by Open University established in the country by an Act of Parliament in accordance with the provisions contained in Section 2(f) of the University Grant commission Act, 1956. It was accordingly clarified that these Universities were therefore empowered to award Degrees in terms of Section 22(1) of the UGC Act, 1956. Annexure A14 issued by the AICTE on 13.05.2005 refers to recognition of MBA/MCA awarded by 'IGNOU' established by sub-section (2) of Section 1 of the IGNOU Act, 1985. Similarly, Annexure A15 dated 14.10.2013 is a communication issued by the UGC in respect of equivalence of Degree awarded by Open and Distance Learning Institutions established under an Act of Parliament.

16. The issue where the Degree obtained under a correspondence course from Annamalai University can be treated as equivalent to the Degree awarded by the University of Kerala came to be considered by Division Bench of this Court in Shine Bose v. Kerala Public Service Commission [2015 (1) KLT 591]. The question considered by the Bench was with reference to 'Note I' under the Rules



for Kerala Vocational Higher Secondary Education Subordinate Service Rules, 2004, which specifically provided that, all the educational qualifications for teaching course should be those acquired after 'regular course' of study from the recognised University in Kerala or recognised as equivalent thereto by anyone of the Universities in Kerala. The verdict passed by the Kerala Administrative Tribunal holding that, in so far as 'teaching posts' were concerned, the candidate should have obtained the Degree, after undergoing a 'regular course' of study, was upheld and the O.P.s were dismissed. However, there is a contention for the petitioners that the law declared by the Division Bench of this Court in 2015 (1) KLT 591 [supra] is distinguishable. Despite the said attempted made by the learned counsel, we find it difficult to persuade ourselves to hold that the dictum in 2015 (1) KLT 591 [supra] is distinguishable. As clearly pointed out, the issue involved in the said case [2015 (1) KLT 591] [supra] was whether the basic qualification of M.Com. for appointment to the post of Vocational Teacher obtained under a correspondence course from the Annamalai University was equivalent to be regarded as M.Com. Degree of the University of Kerala. The Bench referred to 'Note I' under the Rules, 2004 [which are statutory Rules in terms of the provisions of the Constitution of India and the Kerala Public Service Act, 1968], which specifically provided that all the educational qualifications for teaching course should be acquired after a regular course of study from a recognised University in Kerala or recognised as equivalent thereto by anyone of the



Universities in Kerala. The main contention put forth by the petitioner before the Court was that the 'Note' was amended based on the undertaking given before this Court as per the Counter Affidavit filed in WP(C) No.12209 of 2006 that, the Rule was proposed to be amended and that there would be no hurdle in approving promotion of the writ petitioner. But according to the PSC, the amendment was necessitated to give effect to the judgment already rendered by this Court on the point that the Rule could not stipulate that Degree issued from any University in Kerala alone will be considered, thus necessitating the equivalency to be pointed out, which in fact was done by adding the 'Note'. The submission made before the Court was that, the 'bracketed portion' in the 'Note' giving equivalency to the Degree obtained from a University outside the State was quite categoric, in so far as nothing else was to be looked into, ie., whether it was under the regular study or the correspondence stream. The Bench observed that, if such an interpretation was to be given, candidates qualifying from the University in Kerala, should be those, who had undergone a 'regular course' of study; wheareas a candidate obtaining Degree from any 'University outside the Kerala' without undergoing a regular course of study would become eligible; which was held as fallacious. Observing that the stipulation was in respect of recruitment to a 'Teaching post' and in so far as specific stipulation was there in the Rule to have obtained a Degree after pursuing a 'regular course', if the Court was to dissect the aforesaid Rule and hold that a 'correspondence course' from any University was enough as



equivalent to a Degree obtained after the 'regular course' of study from the University of Kerala, the result would be disastrous. It was also observed that the prescription that one should have acquired the educational qualification after 'regular course' of study, was a conscious decision of the Government, as borne by the Special Rules and as such, no interference was possible. This Court does not find any reason to deviate from the view taken by the Bench in 2015 (1) KLT 591.” (underline supplied)

16. In **Nagaland Public Service Commission [(2017) 13 SCC 498]**, the Apex Court held thus:

“2. The short dispute that arises for consideration in these two appeals is on the essential qualification for the post of Lecturer, Chemistry in the Higher Education Department in the State of Nagaland.

3. The prescribed qualification is M.Sc. in the subject concerned. The appellant, in the connected matter, is only M.Sc. in Biochemistry. It is the contention of the appellants that Biochemistry is Chemistry for all purposes.

4. We find it difficult to accept the submission. It may be seen from the advertisement itself for Item No.10, that for the post of Lecturer in Chemistry, what is prescribed is only M.Sc. without any further description. It is a post in the Department of Information Technology and Technical Education. But for the post of Lecturer in Chemistry in Higher Education, the prescribed qualification, being M.Sc. in the subject concerned, namely, Chemistry itself, the appellant - Nagaland Public Service Commission is not right



in completing selection based on the opinion sought from the expert that Biochemistry is Chemistry for all purposes. 5. Qualification is something to be prescribed by the State Government, the appointing authority. The Commission is only to go by the qualification and it cannot improve upon that. Since the State does not have a case that the appellant possesses the required qualification and rightly so, we find no merit in the appeals, which are, accordingly, dismissed”.

(underline supplied)

17. In **Guru Nanak Dev University [(2009) 1 SCC 610]**

the Apex Court held thus:

“9. The prescription of eligibility criteria is very clear. It requires a Bachelor's degree with not less than 45% marks or a Master's degree. The university's contention that the candidate must have a Bachelor's degree and only if his marks are less than 45% in the Bachelor's Degree Course, the Master's degree was to be considered, would mean that the word 'or' should be substituted by the words 'in the event of the candidate not having 45% marks in Bachelor's degree'. Reading such words into the provision is impermissible. The word 'or' is disjunctive. No doubt, in some exceptional circumstances, the word 'or' has been read as conjunctive as meaning 'and', where the context warranted it. But the word 'or' cannot obviously be read as referring to a conditional alternative, when such condition is not specified. In view of the provision relating to eligibility being unambiguous and using the word 'or', it is clear that a Master's degree without a Bachelor's degree will satisfy



the eligibility requirement.

XXXX

XXXX

XXXXX

15. The first respondent has passed his M.A. (OUS) from Annamalai University through distance education. Equivalence is a technical academic matter. It cannot be implied or assumed. Any decision of the academic body of the university relating to equivalence should be by a specific order or resolution, duly published. The first respondent has not been able to produce any document to show that appellant university has recognized the M.A. English (OUS) of Annamalai University through distance education as equivalent to M.A. of appellant university. Thus it has to be held that first respondent does not fulfil the eligibility criterion of the appellant university for admission to three year law course.

16. The first respondent made a faint attempt to contend that the distance education system includes 'correspondence courses' and therefore recognition of M.A. (correspondence course) as equivalent to M.A. Course of appellant University, would amount to recognition of M.A. - OUS (distance education) course, as an equivalent. For this purpose, he relied upon the definition of 'distance education system' in Section 2(e) of Indira Gandhi National Open University Act, 1985. But there is nothing to show that Annamalai University has treated correspondence course and OUS (distance education) course as the same. What is more important is that the appellant university does not wish to treat correspondence course and Distance Education Course as being the same. That is a matter of





policy. Courts will not interfere with the said policy relating to an academic matter”.

18. In **Manjit Singh [(2003) 11 SCC 559]**, the Apex Court held thus:

“9. In the present case, the stand of the appellant Commission is that for medical services where the members of service have to deal with the health and life of the people, they must have some minimum standard of efficiency and it is the bounden duty of the Commission to ensure the same. It is perhaps with this view in mind that the Commission fixed 45% minimum qualifying cut off marks for general category candidates and 40% cut - off marks for Scheduled Caste candidates. We feel, here lies the fallacy in the whole reasoning of the Commission. It is no doubt true that the Commission is an independent and autonomous body and has to work without influence of any authority or the government. It is rather under duty to act independently. But at the same time the fact cannot be lost sight of that the State Government is competent to lay down the qualifications for different posts, and frame rules for the purpose or take policy decisions which may of course not be against the law.

XXXX

XXXX

XXXX

XXXX

11. In the case in hand, it was not for the Commission to have fixed any cut - off marks in respect of reserved category candidates. The result has evidently been that candidates otherwise qualified for interview stand rejected on the basis of merit say, they do not have the upto the



mark merit, as prescribed by the Commission. The selection was by interview of the eligible candidates. It is certainly the responsibility of the Commission to make the selection of efficient people amongst those who are eligible for consideration. The unsuitable candidates could well be rejected in the selection by interview. It is not the question of subservience but there are certain matters of policies, on which the decision is to be taken by the Government. The Commission derives its powers under Art.320 of the Constitution as well as its limits too. Independent and fair working of the Commission is of utmost importance. It is also not supposed to function under any pressure of the government, as submitted on behalf of the appellant Commission. But at the same time it has to conform to the provisions of the law and has also to abide by the rules and regulations on the subject and to take into account the policy decisions which are within the domain of the State Government. It cannot impose its own policy decision in a matter beyond its purview". (underline supplied)

19. In **Jaiveer Singh [2023 KHC Online 1005]** the Apex Court held thus:

"40. It will be relevant to refer to the observations of this Court in the case of *Devender Bhaskar and Others v. State of Haryana and Others [(2021) SCC Online SC 1116/ 2021 INSC 783)*, which read thus:

"21. In *Mohammad Shujat Ali v. Union of India*[1975 (3) SCC 76] it was held that the question regarding equivalence of educational qualifications is a technical



question based on proper assessment and evaluation of the relevant academic standards and practical attainments of such qualifications. It was further held that where the decision of the Government is based on the recommendation of an expert body, then the Court, uninformed of relevant data and unaided by technical insights necessary for the purpose of determining equivalence, would not lightly disturb the decision of the Government unless it is based on extraneous or irrelevant considerations or actuated *mala fides* or is irrational and perverse or manifestly wrong.

22. In *J. Ranga Swamy v. Government of Andhra Pradesh* [1990 (1) SCC 288] this Court held that it is not for the court to consider the relevance of qualification prescribed for various posts.

23. In *State of Rajasthan v. Lata Arun* [2002 (6) SCC 252] this Court held that the prescribed eligibility qualification for admission to a course or for recruitment to or promotion in service are matters to be considered by the appropriate authority. It was held thus:

"13. From the ratio of the decisions noted above, it is clear that the prescribed eligibility qualification for admission to a course or for recruitment to or promotion in service are matters to be considered by the appropriate authority. It is not for courts to decide whether a particular educational qualification should or should not be accepted as equivalent to the qualification prescribed by the authority."



24. In *Guru Nanak Dev University v. Sanjay Kumar Katwal* [2009 (1) SCC 610] this Court has reiterated that equivalence is a technical academic matter. It cannot be implied or assumed. Any decision of the academic body of the university relating to equivalence should be by a specific order or resolution, duly published. Dealing specifically with whether a distance education course was equivalent to the degree of MA (English) of the appellant university therein, the Court held that no material had been produced before it to show that the distance education course had been recognized as such.

25. In *Zahoor Ahmad Rather v. Sheikh Imtiyaz Ahmad* [2019 (2) SCC 404], it was held that the State, as an employer, is entitled to prescribe qualifications as a condition of eligibility, after taking into consideration the nature of the job, the aptitude required for efficient discharge of duties, functionality of various qualifications, course content leading up to the acquisition of various qualifications, etc. Judicial review can neither expand the ambit of the prescribed qualifications nor decide the equivalence of the prescribed qualifications with any other given qualification. Equivalence of qualification is a matter for the State, as recruiting authority, to determine.

26. Having regard to the above, in our view, the High Court has erred in holding that the diploma/degree in Art and Craft given by the Kurukshetra University is equivalent to two - year Diploma in Art and Craft



examination conducted by the Haryana Industrial Training Department or diploma in Art and Craft conducted by Director, Industrial Training and Vocational Education, Haryana." (underline supplied)

20. As stated hereinabove, the question of qualification of the applicants for the post of Librarian Grade IV centres around the interpretation of the Note appended to clause 7 of the notification. From the judgments referred to supra it is clear that the State, as an employer, is entitled to prescribe qualifications as a condition of eligibility, after taking into consideration the nature of the job, the aptitude required for efficient discharge of duties, functionality of various qualifications, course content leading up to the acquisition of various qualifications, etc. The Commission is only to go by the qualification, and it cannot improve upon that. It is also trite that when the special rules prescribe a particular qualification, the government cannot dilute it by issuing a subsequent executive order. In the instant cases, admittedly, the qualification stated in the note appended to clause 7 of the notification is the very same qualification prescribed in the Special Rules. Then the question is how these qualifications have to be interpreted.



21. When we dissect the Note appended to clause 7 of the notification, it can be summarised as under:

- 1) Qualification acquired after undergoing a regular course of study - That means the qualification required must have been acquired by completing the course in the regular mode of study and not by correspondence, distance learning or part-time.
- (2) From any of the Universities in Kerala - the qualification can be from any of the Universities in Kerala by undergoing a regular course of study , or
- (3) Recognised as equivalent thereto by any university in Kerala - If the qualification is from any university outside Kerala, it must be by undergoing a regular course of study equivalent to the one declared by the University in Kerala.

22. In short, the qualification must be obtained through regular course of study either from a university in Kerala or from a university outside Kerala, but through a regular course of study officially recognised as equivalent by a university in Kerala. In no strength of imagination, the qualification obtained through distance learning can be said as equivalent to a degree obtained through a regular course. If the contention of the applicants is accepted, it will create a situation that a candidate qualifying from a University in Kerala should be by undergoing a regular course of study, and whereas a candidate who obtains the qualification from



any University outside Kerala would be eligible without undergoing a regular course of study. It would be fallacious if we were to hold so as held in **Shine Bose B [2015 (1) KHC 354]**.

23. Having considered the pleadings and materials on record and the submissions made at the Bar, we find that the applicants did not satisfy the qualifications stipulated in the Note appended to clause 7 of the notifications. The Tribunal grossly erred in arriving at the right finding in this regard, which led to the passing of the impugned order in favour of the applicants. Therefore, these original petitions are liable to be allowed by setting aside the impugned order of the Tribunal.

In the result, the original petitions are allowed by setting aside the impugned order dated 01.07.2025 passed by the Tribunal in the original applications, and the original applications stand dismissed. The pending interlocutory applications, if any, stand closed.

Sd/-  
**ANIL K.NARENDRA, JUDGE**

Sd/-

sks

**MURALEE KRISHNA S., JUDGE**

APPENDIX OF OP (KAT) NO. 379 OF 2025**PETITIONER ANNEXURES**

Annexure A1	TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION-CATEGORY NO.494/2020-497/2020 DATE 31-12-2020 ISSUED BY KPSC
Annexure A2	TRUE COPY OF B.SC (ZOOLOGY) DEGREE CERTIFICATE OF APPLICANT NO.0574269 DATE 14-5-2019 ISSUED BY THE KERALA UNIVERSITY
Annexure A2 (a)	TRUE COPY OF THE BLISC. DEGREE CERTIFICATE NO.0646138 DATE 28-6-2021 OF APPLICANT ISSUED BY THE KERALA UNIVERSITY
Annexure A3	TRUE COPY OF SHORT LIST WITH SL NO 33/2023/DOE CAT NO 494/2020 DATED 16/10/2023 ISSUED BY THE KPSC DISTRICT OFFICE ERNAKULAM
Annexure A4	TRUE COPY OF CALL LETTER NO. E5-1/13/2019-KPSC DOEKM DATE 25-9-2024 OF SECRETARY KPSC PATTON TVPM TO APPLICANT
Annexure A5	TRUE COPY OF THE RANKED LIST NO 1172/2024/SSV-CAT NO 494/2020. WEF. 25-11-2024 ISSUED BY THE KPSC ERNAKULAM
Annexure A6	TRUE COPY OF THE PETITION DATED 29/11/2024 APPLICANT BEFORE THE 3RD RESPONDENT
Annexure A7	TRUE COPY OF THE GO (MS) NO 119/2017/H.EDN DATED 2-5-2017 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT
Exhibit P1	TRUE COPY OF THE O.A. NO.1877/2024 FILED BY THE APPLICANTS BEFORE THE KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
Exhibit P2	THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER IN O.A. NO.1877/2024 DATED 01/07/2025

**RESPONDENT EXHIBITS**

Exhibit R1(b)	The true copy of the G.O.(P) No. 14/2020/G.Edn dated 30.09.2020
Exhibit R1(a)	The true copy of the G.O.(Ms) No. 4340/2018/G.Edn dated 24.10.2018



APPENDIX OF OP(KAT) NO. 400 OF 2025**PETITIONER ANNEXURES**

Annexure A1	TRUE COPY OF NOTIFICATION DATED 31.12.2020 ISSUED BY 2ND RESPONDENT CAT NO.494/2020
Annexure A2	TRUE COPY OF THE INTIMATION BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT UNDATED.
Annexure A3	TRUE COPY OF MESSAGE DATED 18.03.2024 SENT BY 2ND RESPONDENT THROUGH THE CANDIDATE'S PORTAL
Annexure A4	TRUE COPY OF THE DEGREE CERTIFICATE ISSUED BY IGNOU DATED 30.09.2020 REG NO. 195411645.
Annexure A5	TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION NO.UGCIDEB/2013 DATED 14.10.2013 ISSUED BY UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION (UGC)
Annexure A6	TRUE COPY OF THE EQUIVALENCY CERTIFICATE DATED 5.02.2024 NO. 104972 ISSUED BY M.G UNIVERSITY, KOTTAYAM
Annexure A7	TRUE COPY OF WP(C) NO.11295 OF 2024 (WITHOUT EXHIBITS) FILED ON 19.03.2024 BEFORE THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF KERALA.
Annexure A8	TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER DATED 19.03.2024 IN WP(C) NO.11295 OF 2024.
Annexure A9	TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGEMENT DATED 25.03.2024 IN WP(C)NO.11295 OF 2024
Exhibit P1	TRUE COPY OF THE O.A. NO.591/2024 FILED BY THE APPLICANT BEFORE THE KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
Exhibit P2	THE TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY STATEMENT DATED 1/11/2024 FILED BY THE COMMISSION
Exhibit P3	THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER IN O.A. NO.591/2024 DATED 01/07/2025
Exhibit P4	A TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER ON OP(KAT)379 OF 2025 DATED 12/09/2025

**RESPONDENT EXHIBITS**

Exhibit R1(b)	The true copy of the G.O.(Ms) No. 4340/2018/G.Edn dated 24.10.2018
Exhibit R1(c)	The true copy of the G.O.(P) No. 14/2020/G.Edn dated 30.09.2020
Exhibit R1(a)	The true copy of G.O.(Ms) No. 119/2017/H.Edn dated 02.05.2017

APPENDIX OF OP(KAT) NO. 429 OF 2025**PETITIONER ANNEXURES**

Annexure A1	TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION-CATEGORY NO 490/2022 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT IN GAZETTE DATED 30-11-2022.
Annexure A2	TRUE COPY OF THE GO (P) NO 53/2009 H.EDN DATED 9TH JUNE, 2009 ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT.
Annexure A3	TRUE COPY OF THE SHORT LIST WITH SL NO 85/2024/ERXVI, CAT. NO.490/2022 DATED 13/3/2024 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT.
Annexure A4	TRUE COPY OF THE PRINT OUT OF THE REJECTION MESSAGE DATED 11-6-2024 TO THE 1ST APPLICANT.
Annexure A4 (a)	TRUE COPY OF THE PRINT OUT OF THE REJECTION MESSAGE DATED 11-6-2024 TO THE 2ND APPLICANT.
Annexure A4 (b)	TRUE COPY OF THE PRINT OUT OF THE REJECTION MESSAGE DATED 11-6-2024 TO THE 3RD APPLICANT.
Annexure A4 (c)	TRUE COPY OF THE PRINT OUT OF THE REJECTION MESSAGE DATED 11-6-2024 TO THE 4TH APPLICANT.
Annexure A4 (d)	TRUE COPY OF THE PRINT OUT OF THE REJECTION MESSAGE DATED 11-6-2024 TO THE 5TH APPLICANT.
Annexure A4 (e)	TRUE COPY OF THE PRINT OUT OF THE REJECTION MESSAGE DATED 11-6-2024 TO THE 6TH APPLICANT.
Annexure A4 (f)	RUE COPY OF THE PRINT OUT OF THE REJECTION MESSAGE DATED 6-2024 TO THE 7TH APPLICANT.
Annexure A4 (g)	TRUE COPY OF THE PRINT OUT OF THE REJECTION MESSAGE DATED 11-6-2024 TO THE 8TH APPLICANT.
Annexure A5	TRUE COPY OF THE PETITION DATED 19/6/2024 BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT BY THE 1ST APPLICANT.
Annexure A5 (a)	TRUE COPY OF THE PETITION DATED 18/6/2024 BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT BY THE 2ND APPLICANT.
Annexure A5 (b)	TRUE COPY OF THE PETITION DATED 18/6/2024 BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT BY THE 3RD APPLICANT.
Annexure A5 (c)	TRUE COPY OF THE PETITION DATED 18/6/2024 BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT BY THE 4TH APPLICANT.
Annexure A5 (d)	TRUE COPY OF THE PETITION DATED 6/5/2024 BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT BY THE 5TH APPLICANT.
Annexure A5 (e)	TRUE COPY OF THE PETITION DATED 19/6/2024 BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT BY THE 6TH



	APPLICANT.
Annexure A5 (f)	TRUE COPY OF THE PETITION DATED 19/6/2024 BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT BY THE 7TH APPLICANT
Annexure A5 (g)	TRUE COPY OF THE PETITION DATED NIL AND BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT BY THE 8TH APPLICANT.
Annexure A6	TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO.AC.A.II/2/59/2013 DATED 13/2/2013 ISSUED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF KERALA.
Annexure A7	TRUE COPY OF THE PUBLIC NOTICE NO. F.NO 3-5/2022(DEB-III) DATED 2/9/2022 ISSUED BY THE UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION.
Annexure A8	TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 11/4/2024 IN OA(EKM) 601/2024
Annexure A9	TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 10/12/2024 IN OA 1842/2024 OF THIS HON'BLE TRIBUNAL.
Annexure R2 (a)	TRUE COPY OF GO(MS) NO.119/2017/HEDN DATED 02.05.2017.
Annexure A10	TRUE COPY OF THE RANKED LIST BEARING NO. 1210/2024/SSVI ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT CATEGORY NO. 490/2022 W.E.F 05/12/2024.
ANNEXURE A10	TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY NO.84/251/2024-HEDN DATED 16.10.2024 ISSUED BY THE 2 <sup>ND</sup> RESPONDENT AS PER THE RTI ACT IN R/1
Annexure A11	TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT AS PER THE RTI ACT NO. IDSI(4)/1157198/2025/GW DATED 07/05/2025.
Annexure A12	TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT AS PER THE RTI ACT NO. IDS-1(3)-1143482/2025/GW DATED 15/04/2025.
Exhibit P1	TRUE COPY OF THE O.A. NO.1001/2024 FILED BY THE APPLICANTS BEFORE THE KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
Exhibit P2	TRUE COPY OF THE M.A. IN O.A. NO.1001/2024 DATED 16/12/2024 FILED BY THE APPLICANTS
Exhibit P3	TRUE COPY OF REPLY STATEMENT
Exhibit P4	TRUE COPY OF THE REJOINDER DATED 23/01/2025 FILED BY THE APPLICANTS
Exhibit P5	TRUE COPY OF THE M.A. IN O.A. NO.1001/2024 DATED 26/05/2025
Exhibit P6	THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER IN O.A. NO.1001/2024 DATED 01/07/2025



**RESPONDENT EXHIBITS**

<b>Exhibit R1(a)</b>	<b>The true copy of the G.O. (Ms)</b>	<b>No.</b>
	<b>4340/2018/G.Edn dated 24.10.2018</b>	
<b>Exhibit R1(b)</b>	<b>The true copy of the G.O. (P)</b>	<b>No.</b>
	<b>14/2020/G.Edn dated 30.09.2020</b>	

APPENDIX OF OP(KAT) NO. 434 OF 2025

## PETITIONER ANNEXURES

Annexure A1	TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION - CATEGORY NO. 494/2020 ISSUED BY KPSC DATED NIL.
Annexure A2	TRUE COPY OF THE SHORT LIST WITH SL NO 35/2023/DOR CAT NO.494/2020 DATED 01.11.2023 ISSUED BY THE KPSC THRISSUR
Annexure A3	TRUE COPY OF THE PRINT OUT OF THE STATUS PAGE OF REMYA S.N..
Annexure A4	TRUE COPY OF THE APPEAL DATED 27.09.2024 APPLICANT FILED TO THE CHAIRMAN PSC.
Annexure A5	TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE NO. 103095 DATED 25.10.2023 ISSUED BY THE MAHATHMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY
Annexure A6	TRUE COPY OF THE PUBLIC NOTICE F. NO. 3-5/2022 (DEB-III) DATED 02.08.2022 ISSUED BY THE UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION.
Annexure A7	TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 11.04.2024 IN OA(EKM) 601/2024 ISSUED BY THE KAT ADDITIONAL BENCH EKM.
Annexure A8	TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT PAGES GIVEN UNDER RTI ACT NO. IDSII(4)/1066062/2024/GW DATED 19.12.2024 ISSUED TO LAKSHMI PRIYA BY UNDER SECRETARY & STATE PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER, KPSC.
Annexure A9	TRUE COPY OF THE RANKED LIST BEARING NO.1228/2024/SSV ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT CATEGORY NO.494/2020 W.E.F. 07.12.2024.
Annexure A10	TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 10.12.2024 IN OA 1842/2024 OF THIS HON'BLE TRIBUNAL.
Exhibit P1	TRUE COPY OF APPLICATION THE O.A. NO.1530/2024 FILED BY THE APPLICANT BEFORE THE KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
Exhibit P2	THE TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY STATEMENT FILED BY THE COMMISSION IN JANUARY, 2025
Exhibit P3	TRUE COPY OF THE REJOINDER
Exhibit P4	TRUE COPY OF THE M.A FILED BY THE APPLICANT ON OA 1530 OF 2024
Exhibit P5	THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER IN O.A. NO.1530/2024 DATED 01/07/2025

## RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

Exhibit R1(a)	The true copy of the G.O.(Ms) No. 4340/2018/G.Edn dated 24.10.2018
Exhibit R1(b)	The true copy of the G.O.(P) No. 14/2020/G.Edn dated 30.09.2020

**APPENDIX OF OP(KAT) NO. 436 OF 2025****PETITIONER ANNEXURES**

<b>Annexure A1</b>	TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION-CATEGORY NO. 494/2020 ISSUED BY KPSC, DATE 3-2-2021 ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT.
<b>Annexure A2</b>	TRUE COPY OF B.TECH CERTIFICATE (COMPUTER SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING) NO.42513802/42513305/14400030 DATE 13/7/2022 ISSUED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF KERALA (FACULTY OF ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY) .
<b>Annexure A2 (a)</b>	TRUE COPY OF THE BLIS. DEGREE CERTIFICATE NO.00855181017 ISSUED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF KERALA (FACULTY OF ARTS) .
<b>Annexure A3</b>	TRUE COPY OF SHORT LIST WITH SL NO 33/2023/DOE CAT NO 494/2020 DATED 16/10/2023 ISSUED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT.
<b>Annexure A4</b>	TRUE COPY CALL LETTER NO. E5-1/13/2019-KPSC DO EKM DATE 25-9-2024 ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT.
<b>Annexure A5</b>	TRUE COPY OF THE RANKED LIST NO 1172/2024/SSVCAT NO 494/2020. WEF 25-11-2024 ISSUED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT.
<b>Annexure A6</b>	TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 26/11/2024 SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT BEFORE THE 3RD RESPONDENT.
<b>Annexure A7</b>	TRUE COPY OF THE GO (MS)NO 119/2017/HEDN DATED 2-5-2017.
<b>Exhibit P1</b>	TRUE COPY OF THE O.A. NO.1842/2024 FILED BY THE APPLICANT BEFORE THE KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
<b>Exhibit P2</b>	THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER IN O.A. NO.1842/2024 DATED 01/07/2025
<b>Exhibit P3</b>	THE TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER DATED 12/09/2025 IN O.P(KAT) NO.379/2025

**RESPONDENT EXHIBITS**

<b>Exhibit R1(a)</b>	The true copy of the G.O.(Ms) No. 4340/2018/G.Edn dated 24.10.2018
<b>Exhibit R1(b)</b>	The true copy of the G.O.(P) No. 14/2020/G.Edn dated 30.09.2020

APPENDIX OF OP(KAT) NO. 439 OF 2025**PETITIONER ANNEXURES**

Annexure A1	TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION-CATEGORY NO.494/2020-497/2020 ISSUED BY KPSC.
Annexure A2	TRUE COPY OF THE SHORT LIST WITH SL NO 41/23/DOT CAT NO 494/2020 DATED 13/10/2023 ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT.
Annexure A3	TRUE COPY OF PRINT OUT OF THE STATUS PAGE OF LEKSHMY PRIYA.
Annexure A3 (a)	TRUE COPY OF PRINT OUT OF THE STATUS PAGE OF SALIJA.S..
Annexure A3 (b)	TRUE COPY OF PRINT OUT OF THE STATUS PAGES OF REJITHA.R..
Annexure A4	TRUE COPY OF THE PETITION DATED 19/6/2024 FILED BY LEKSHMY PRIYA.M TO THE CHAIRMAN PSC AGAINST THE ANNEXURE A3 STATUS.
Annexure A4 (a)	TRUE COPY OF THE PETITION DATED 28/9/2024 FILED BY SALIJA. S TO THE CHAIRMAN PSC AGAINST THE ANNEXURE A3A STATUS.
Annexure A4 (b)	TRUE COPY OF THE PETITION DATED 26/9/2024 FILED BY REJITHA R. TO THE CHAIRMAN PSC AGAINST THE ANNEXURE A3B STATUS.
Annexure A5	TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE OF LEKSHMIPRIYA NO.64103/ AC ALL/2023 UOK DATED 20/3/2024 ISSUED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF KERALA.
Annexure A5 (a)	TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE OF SALIJA NO.64103/ AC.ALL/ 2023 UOK DATED 12/2/2024 ISSUED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF KERALA
Annexure A5 (b)	TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE OF REJITHA NO.64103/ AC. ALL/ 2023 UOK DATED 11/3/2024 ISSUED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF KERALA.
Annexure A6	TRUE COPY OF THE PUBLIC NOTICE, F.NO 3-5/2022(DEB-III) DATED 2-9-2022 ISSUED BY THE UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION..
Annexure A7	TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 11/4/2024 IN OA(EKM) 601/2024
Annexure A10	TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 10.12.2024 IN OA 1842/2024 OF THIS HON'BLE TRIBUNAL
Annexure A8	TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGES GIVEN UNDER RTI ACT NO.ID SII(4)/1066062/2024/GW DATED 19.12.2024 ISSUED TO LAKSHMIPRIYA BY UNDER SECRETARY AND STATE PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER.
Annexure A9	TRUE COPY OF THE RANKED LIST BEARING



NO.1143/2024/SSII ISSUED BY THE 2ND  
RESPONDENT CATEGORY NO.494/2020, W.E.F.  
18.11.2024.

Exhibit P1 TRUE COPY OF THE O.A. NO.1536/2024 FILED BY  
THE APPLICANTS BEFORE THE KERALA  
ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ERNAKULAM BENCH

Exhibit P2 THE TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY STATEMENT FILED  
BY THE COMMISSION IN JANUARY 2025

Exhibit P3 TRUE COPY OF THE M.A

Exhibit P4 TRUE COPY OF THE REJOINDER

Exhibit P5 THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER IN O.A.  
NO.1536/2024 DATED 01/07/2025

**RESPONDENT EXHIBITS**

Exhibit R1(a) The true copy of the G.O.(Ms) No.  
4340/2018/G.Edn dated 24.10.2018

Exhibit R1(b) The true copy of the G.O.(P) No.  
14/2020/G.Edn dated 30.09.2020



APPENDIX OF OP(KAT) NO. 441 OF 2025**PETITIONER ANNEXURES**

Annexure A1	TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION-CATEGORY NO. 490/2022 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT IN GAZETTE DATED 30-11-2022
Annexure A2	TRUE COPY OF THE GO(P) NO. 53/2009 H.EDN DATED 9TH JUNE, 2009 ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT.
Annexure A3	TRUE COPY OF THE SHORT LIST WITH SL NO.85/2024/ERXVI, CAT. NO. 490/2022 DATED 13/03/2024 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT.
Annexure A4	TRUE COPY OF THE PRINT OUT OF THE REJECTION MESSAGE DATED 11.06.2024 TO THE APPLICANT
Annexure A5	TRUE COPY OF THE PETITION DATED 12/06/2024 BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT BY THE APPLICANT.
Annexure A6	TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO.AC.A.II/2/59/2013 DATED 13/2/2013 ISSUED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF KERALA
Annexure A7	TRUE COPY OF THE PUBLIC NOTICE NO.F.NO. 3-5/2022(DEB-III) DATED 02/09/2022 ISSUED BY THE UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION
Annexure A8	TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 28/06/2024 IN OA 1001/2024 OF THIS HON'BLE TRIBUNAL.
Annexure A9	TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 10/12/2024 IN OA 1842/2024 OF THIS HONOURABLE TRIBUNAL
Exhibit P1	TRUE COPY OF THE O.A. NO.1062/2024 FILED BY THE APPLICANTS BEFORE THE KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
Exhibit P2	THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER IN O.A. NO.1062/2024 DATED 01/07/2025

**RESPONDENT EXHIBITS**

Exhibit R1(a)	The true copy of the G.O.(Ms) No. 4340/2018/G.Edn. dated 24.10.2018
Exhibit R1(b)	The true copy of the G.O.(P) No. 14/2020/G.Edn dated 30.09.2020

APPENDIX OF OP(KAT) NO. 456 OF 2025**PETITIONER ANNEXURES**

Annexure A1	TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION-CATEGORY NO 490/2022 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT IN GAZETTE DATED 30-11-2022
Annexure A2	TRUE COPY OF THE GO (P) NO 53/2009 H.EDN DATED 9TH JUNE, 2009 ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT
Annexure A3	TRUE COPY OF THE SHORT LIST WITH SL NO 85/2024/ERXVI, CAT. NO. 490/2022 DATED 13/3/2024 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT.
Annexure A4	TRUE COPY OF THE PRINT OUT OF THE REJECTION MESSAGE DATED 11 6-2024 TO THE 1ST APPLICANT.
Annexure A4 (a)	TRUE COPY OF THE PRINT OUT OF THE REJECTION MESSAGE DATED 11 6-2024 TO THE 2ND APPLICANT.
Annexure A5	TRUE COPY OF THE PETITION DATED 09/08/2024 BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT BY THE 1ST APPLICANT.
Annexure A5 (a)	TRUE COPY OF THE PETITION DATED 05/08/2024 BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT BY THE 2ND APPLICANT
Annexure A6	TRUE COPY OF THE EQUIVALENCY CERTIFICATE NO. FILE NO EQ2024/31204 DATED 31/1/2024 ISSUED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT
Annexure A7	TRUE COPY OF THE PUBLIC NOTICE, F. NO 3-5/2022(DEB-III) DATED 2.9-2022.
Annexure A8	TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 28/6/2024 IN OA 1001/2024 OF THIS HONORABLE TRIBUNAL
Annexure A9	TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 10/12/2024 IN OA 1842/2024 OF THIS HON'BLE TRIBUNAL
Exhibit P1	TRUE COPY OF THE O.A. NO.1316/2024 FILED BY THE APPLICANTS BEFORE THE KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
Exhibit P2	TRUE COPY OF REPLY STATEMENT
Exhibit P3	THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER IN O.A. NO.1316/2024 DATED 01/07/2025



**RESPONDENT EXHIBITS**

**Exhibit R1(a)**                      The true copy of the G.O.(Ms) No.  
4340/2018/G.Edn dated 24.10.2018

**Exhibit R1(c)**                      The true copy of Circular No.KRB/893/2025-  
GSO6 dated 20-5-2025 issued by the Chancellor

**Exhibit R1(b)**                      The true copy of the G.O.(P) No.  
14/2020/G.Edn dated 30.09.2020