

Madras High Court
Madras High Court
Lakshmi Matriculation School vs State Of Tamil Nadu on 3 May, 2012
DATED: 03.05.2012

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE R.BANUMATHI

AND

THE HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE S.VIMALA

W.P.Nos.8489, 14143, 15212 to 15214, 15374 to 15376, 16023, 16025, 16116, 16234, 16246, 16373, 16488 to 16490, 16498, 16583, 16853, 16913, 16920, 16921, 16930, 16931, 16937, 16972 to 16974, 17011, 17046, 17062, 17063, 17098, 17124 to 17126, 17196, 17219, 17403, 17452, 17533, 17680, 17724, 17754, 17879, 17907, 18004, 18014, 18031, 18116, 18191, 18193, 18260, 18347, 18453, 18454, 18461, 18464, 18540, 18541, 18847, 18853 to 18859, 19060, 19308, 19377, 19379, 19404 to 19411, 19476 to 19478, 19548, 19549, 19604, 19607, 19635 to 19637, 19647, 19648, 19667, 19683, 19684, 19694, 19699, 19738, 19761, 20098 to 20100, 20282 to 20285, 20311, 20550, 20551, 20596, 20597, 20605, 20606, 20858, 20859, 20869, 20870, 21025 to 21028, 21049, 21096, 21097, 21111 to 21115, 21177, 21183, 21288, 21305, 21328, 21330, 21361, 21362, 21383, 21384, 21451, 21528, 21561, 21598, 21630, 21644, 21646, 21679, 22050, 22051, 22052, 22054, 22093, 22124, 22140, 22141, 22223, 22224, 22235, 22263, 22395, 22419 to 22421, 22513, 22697, 22706 to 22708, 22717, 22842, 22843, 23007, 23210, 23213, 23238 to 23240, 23281 to 23283, 23318, 23321, 23423, 23498, 23597 to 23599, 23634, 23636, 23651, 23733, 23734, 23771, 23789, 23795, 23876, 23879, , 24142, 24161, 24168, 24169, 24285, 24303, 24348, 24443, 24446, 24456 to 24459, 24759, 24771, 24774, 24775, 24782 to 24784, 24794, 24855, 24856, 24977, 25102 to 25104, 25283, 25707, 25799, 25989, 26049, 26050, 26167 to 26169, 26218, 26270, 26297, 26298, 26381, 26382, 26384 to 26386, 26431, 26454, 26593, 26594, 26619, 26644, 26645, 26893, 27214, 27293, 27573, 27574, 27601, 27925, 28084, 28216, 28217, 28228 to 28230, 28287, 28297, 28304 to 28306, 28553 to 28555, 29003, 29825 to 29827 and 30218 of 2011 and 255, 257, 388, 462 to 465, 694, 862, 1450, 1978, 2806, 2967, 3547, 3548, 3756, 4129, 4321, 4607 to 4610, 4628, 4629, 5037, 5050 to 5052, 5288, 5562, 5689, 5781, 6007, 6086, 6317, 6318, 6415, 6416, 6644, 6650, 6856, 6861 to 6865, 6919, 6920, 6955 to 6958, 6989, 7002, 7003, 7111 7112, 7154, 7159, 7160, 7287, 7439, 7484, 7499, 8214, 8385 to 8387 and 8573 of 2012. and

Writ Petitions relating to minority institutions:

W.P.Nos.18037, 18092, 18093, 18419, 18420, 18718, 18744, 19126, 19127, 19144, 19145, 19165, 19166, 19171, 19172, 19183, 19192, 19193, 19491, 19492, 19521, 19522, 19537, 19545, 19557, 19558, 19596, 20304, 20322, 20326, 20338 to 20340, 20351, 20371, 20372, 20387, 20410, 20416, 20425, 20819, 20843, 20845, 21030, 21054, 21099, 21127, 21131, 21136, 21266, 21268, 21430, 22769, 22993, 23364, 23963, 24048, 24170, 24497 to 24501, 24857 to 24858, 24859, 25024, 25841, 25874, 25916 and 28507 of 2011 and 243, 2606 and 3619 of 2012 W.P.NO.8489 OF 2011

LAKSHMI MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] (FORMERLY KNOWN AS TVS NURSERY & PRIMARY

SCHOOL) OTHAPATTI KARUPPAYURANI POST

MADURAI-625020 REP. BY THE SECRETARY

LAKSHMI VIDYA SANGHAM.

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENT] REP. BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE
CHENNAI.

2 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER
MADURAI.

3 THE SPECIAL OFFICER
THE COMMITTEE FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE
DETERMINATION HEADED BY JUSTICE K.
GOVINDARAJAN (RETIRED) CHENNAI-6.

Petition filed under Article 226 of the constitution of India be pleased to issue a writ of certiorari mandamus directing that the 1st Respondent its subordinates or officers are not entitled to enforce impose or otherwise issue directions to the Petitioner School in the matter of collection of fees from its students excepting with respect to the fee as may be determined by the Honourable Fee Determination Committee constituted under Section 5 of the Tamil Nadu Private Schools (Regulation of Collection of Fee) Act pursuant to the Objections dt. 31.5.10 submitted by the Petitioner and also documents submitted by the Petitioner and consequentially forbearing the 1st Respondent its men or agents from enforcing imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the Petitioner School in the matter of collection of fees.

W.P.NO.14143 OF 2011

1 M. SHEIK MOHAMMED ALI [PETITIONER] ADVOCATE NO. 25 FATHIMA ILLAM INDIRA
NAGAR
4TH ST ALWAR TIRUNAGAR CHENNAI 87

Vs

1 CHIEF SECRETARY TO [RESPONDENTS] GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT CHENNAI 9
2 THE CHAIRMAN OF THE SCHOOL
FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE COLLEGE ROAD
D.P.I. CAMPUS NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI 6
3 THE SECRETARY
MINISTER FOR SCHOOL EDUCATION SECRETARIAT
CHENNAI 9

direction to the all the respondent to dispose of the representation dt 7.6.2011.

W.P.NO.15212 OF 2011

ERODE HINDU KALVI NILAYAM [PETITIONER] NURSERY AND PRIMARY SCHOOL REP.BY ITS
PRESIDENT AND CORRESPONDENT K.K.BALUSAMY

SURAMPATTY ERODE-9

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENT] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION
COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6

Prayer

to call for the records on the file of the respondent in proceedings nil dated 27.5.2011 and quash the same as
illegal incompetent and without jurisdiction.

W.P.NO.15213 OF 2011

ERODE HINDU KALVI NILAYAM [PETITIONER] NURSERY AND PRIMARY SCHOOL REP.BY ITS
PRESIDENT AND CORRESPONDENT K.K.BALUSAMY

E.K.VALASU ERODE -11

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENT] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION
COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6

Prayer

to call for the records on the file of the respondent in proceedings nil dated 27.5.2011 and quash the same as
illegal incompetent and without jurisdiction.

W.P.NO.15214 OF 2011

ERODE HINDU KALVI NILAYAM [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION HIGHER SECONDARY
SCHOOL

REP. BY ITS PRESIDENT AND CORRESPONDENT K.K.

BALUSAMY MAMARATHUPALAYAM ERODE

Vs

THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENT] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6

to call for the records on the file of the respondent in proceedings nil dated 27.5.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent and without jurisdiction

W.P.NO.15374 OF 2011

1 WISDOM MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SEC. SCHOOL CHEYYATRAIVENDRAN
604 401

ANAKKAVOOR POST CHEYYAR TALUK

THIRUVANNAMALAI DIST. REP.BY ITS PRINCIPAL

G.MATHIALAGAN

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP.BY ITS
SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6

Prayer

calling for the records from the 1st respondent relating to the impugned order dt.27.5.2011 passed under Sec.6 (4) of Act 22 of 2009 relating to the petitioner namely Wisdom Matriculation Higher Secondary School (27002) Chyatraivendran Anakkavoor Post Cheyyar T.K. Tiruvannamalai Dist. 604 401 quash the same and further direct the 1st respondent to consider the objections raised by the petitioner dated 31.3.2011 regarding fixation of fee.

W.P.NO.15375 OF 2011

WISDOM VIDYASHRAM [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION SCHOOL ARCOT ROAD OPP.

ADHIPARAKTHI TEMPLE PAINGINAR VILLAGE

CHEYYAR 604 407 REP.BY ITS PRINCIPAL

S.BALADHANDAYUDHAPANI

Vs

THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP.BY ITS
SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6

calling for the records from the 1st respondent relating to the impugned order dt.27.5.2011 passed under Sec.6 (4) of Act 22 of 2009 relating to the petitioner namely Wisdom Vidyashram Matriculation School (27073) Arcot Road Opp. to Adiparasakthi Temple Painginar Village Cheyyar 604 407 quash the same and further direct the 1st respondent to consider the objections raised by the petitioner dated 31.3.2011 regarding fixation of fee W.P.NO.15376 OF 2011

MOORTHY MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] NO.76 PRIYAR STREET VETTAVALAM

THIRUVANNAMALAI DIST. 606 754 REP.BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT G.MANICKAM

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP.BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6

calling for the records from the 1st respondent relating to the impugned order dt.27.5.2011 passed under Sec.6 (4) of Act 22 of 2009 relating to the petitioner namely Moorthy Matriculation School (27100) 76 Periyar Street Vettavalam 606 754 Tiruvannamalai Dist. quash the same and further direct the 1st respondent to consider the objections raised by the petitioner dated 31.3.2011 regarding fixation of fee

W.P.NO.16023 OF 2011

KSHATRIYA VIDHAYSALA MAT. HR. [PETITIONER] SEC. SCHOOL REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

MR.N. ANADAVEL COLLECTORATE POST VIRUDHUNAGAR

626 002

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

2 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT

ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

3 THE IN CHARGE OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS VIRUDHUNAGAR

to call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in proceedings NIL dt 27.5.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent and without jurisdiction

W.P.NO.16025 OF 2011

T.S.T.RAJAH GIRLS MAT. HR.SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP BY ITS PRESIDENT
K.NAGARAJA

NO. 20 AL & 43 KUMBALAMMAN KOIL ST TONDIARPET

CHENNAI 81

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENT] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION
COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

2 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT

ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

3 THE INSPECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DR. AMBEDKAR GOVT. SCHOOL BUILDING

GANDHI IRWIN ROAD EGMORE CHENNAI

to call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in proceedings NIL dt 3.6.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent and without jurisdiction

W.P.NO.16116 OF 2011

MARY ANN MATRIC HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL (08407) 20 DRO COLONY

K. PUDHUR MADURAI DIST.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION
COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

To call for the records on the file of the respondent in proceedings Nil dated 03.06.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent and without jurisdiction.

W.P.NO.16234 OF 2011

1 SRI SANKARA VIDYASHRAMAM [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL

REP.BY ITS MANAGING TRUSTEE V.S.DHANDAPANI 1

SOUTH AVENUE KAMARAJAR NAGAR THIRUVANMIYUR

CHENNAI-41.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENT S] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP.BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

4 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the first Respondent Committee and the order passed by the first Respondent Committee vide CC No.31564 dt. 3rd June 2011 and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the Respondents to permit the petitioner School to collect the fees fixed by them for the Academic years 2011-12 to 2013-14.

W.P.NO.16246 OF 2011

SRI VANI VIDHYALAYA [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION SCHOOL REP.BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT 45 OLD MAMMALLAPURAM ROAD

THIRUPPORUR-603 110 KANCHEEPURAM DIST.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

CHENNAI-6.

2 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

KANCHEEPURAM.

Prayer

To call for the records of the Private Schools Fee Determination Committee Order dated 27.05.2011 1st Respondent and quash the same.

W.P.NO.16373 OF 2011

KEINS MATRICULATION HR. SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL 135 ASIR NAGAR DHALAPATHISAMUTIRAM

VIA TIRUNELVELI DT 627 101 REPBY ITS

CORRESPONDENT VASANTHA SELVANAYAGAM

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records from the 1st respondent relating to the impugned order dt 3.6.2011 passed under Sec.6 (4) of Act 22 of 2009 relating to the petitioner namely Keins Matriculation Higher Secondary School (2327) 135 Asir Nagar Dhalapathi Samudram Via Tirunelveli District 627 101 quash the same and further direct the 1st respondent to consider the objections raised by the petitioner dt 31.3.2011 regarding fixation of fee.

W.P.NO.16488 OF 2011

VIDYA VIKAS MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL (14218)

TIRUCHENGODE-637214 NAMAKKAL DISTRICT

REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING TRUSTEE DR.S.

GUNASEKARAN.

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.

GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL EDUCATION

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 3.6.2011 made in Order No.Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents and permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee.

W.P.NO.16489 OF 2011

VIDYA VIKAS BOYS HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL (14219) TIRUCHENGODE-

637214 NAMAKKAL DISTRICT REPRESENTED BY

ITS MANAGING TRUSTEE DR.S.GUNASEKARAN.

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL EDUCATION

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 3.6.2011 made in Order No.Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents and permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee

W.P.NO.16490 OF 2011

1 VIDYA VIKAS GIRLS HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL (14220) TIRUCHENGODE-637214 NAMAKKAL DISTRICT REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING TRUSTEE DR.S.GUNASEKARAN.

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL EDUCATION

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 3.6.2011 made in Order No.Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents and permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee

W.P.NO.16498 OF 2011

1 MR. S.RAMESH [PETITIONER] S/O. LATE SOUNDARARAJAN 47/62 SYFUL MULK

STREET PUDUPET CHENNAI-2.

2 MR. C.SRINIVASAN

S/O.S.V.CHELLIAH 17/5 SOLLAIAMMAN KOVIL

STREET AYANAVARAM CHENNAI-23.

3 MR. R.SRIDHAR

S/O.RANGANATHAN 21 POONVELPURAM 4TH STREET

AYANAVARAM CHENNAI-23.

4 MR. S.SURESH

S/O.A.SURYANARAYANAN NO.7 SOLLAIAMMAN

KOVIL LANE PURASAWAKKAM CHENNAI-7.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT SCHOOL

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI OFFICE COMPLEX CHENNAI-8.

3 THE INSPECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS EGMORE CHENNAI-8.

4 THE MANAGEMENT

ALAGAPPA MATRICULATION HIGHER SECONDARY

SCHOOL PURASAWAKKAM CHENNAI-7.

directing the respondents 1 to 3 to initiate action against the 4th respondent School Management in accordance with law against the levy of excess fee over and above the fee fixed by the Private Schools Fee Determination Committee by its order dt3.6.2011 and to forbear the 4th respondent School Management from in any manner collecting any excess fee from the students of the 4th respondent School other than the fee prescribed by the Committee for the academic year 2010-2011

W.P.NO.16583 OF 2011

1 HOLY CROSS MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL NO.23 FIRST MAIN ROAD MURUGESA

NAGAR THIRUNINRAVUR-602024 REP.BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MR.K.VINODH RAJA

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

COLLEGE ROAD P.T.A.BUILDING DPI CAMPUS

CHENNAI-6.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

To call for the records relating to the impugned order of the first respondent dated 27.05.2011 and to quash the same as illegal and consequently to direct the respondents herein to consider the objections raised by the petitioner regarding the fixation of fee for the Standards from LKG to VIII Standards as well as for the IX and X Standards within the time as stipulated by this Honble Court

W.P.NO.16853 OF 2011

1 ST.PETERS MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL REP.BY ITS MANAGER MR.J.

DENSINGH NO.18 G.S.T.ROAD CHENNAI-16.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP.BY JUSTICE

RAVIRAJA PANDIAN DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD

CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

REVENUE DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE

CHENNAI- 9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 1st Respondent pertaining to the order dated 27.05.2011 with respect to the Petitioner School and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st Respondent to fix the fee for the Petitioner School afresh and in accordance with law and consider the Petitioners objections dated 27.05.2011 on merits

W.P.NO.16913 OF 2011

A.U.P.E.T.CHINMAYA VIDYALAYA [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION HR.SEC.SCHOOL REP.BY ITS

SECRETARY MR.S.ANNAMALAI 18 HIGH GROUND

ROAD PALAYAMKOTTAI TIRUNELVELI-627 002.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP.BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

TIRUNELVELI-9.

Prayer

To call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in proceedings NIL dt.03.06.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent and without jurisdiction

W.P.NO.16920 OF 2011

1 ST.THOMAS HIGHER SECONDARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL (10157) P.O.BOX NO.18 GUDALUR
BAZAAR PO THE NILGIRIS-643 212.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

To call for the records on the file of the respondent in proceedings NIL dated 27.5.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent and without jurisdiction

W.P.NO.16921 OF 2011

1 MARTHOMA MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL 1/2
SRIAYYAPPA NAGAR 1ST

MAIN ROAD VIRUGAMBAKKAM (PO) CHENNAI-600

092 REP.BY THE ITS CORRESPONDENT FR.JOSE K.

JOHN

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP.BY THE ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL EDUCATION

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

3 THE SPECIAL OFFICER PRIVATE

SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI

CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 03.06.2011 made in order No.Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee

W.P.NO.16930 OF 2011

THE PRESIDENT [PETITIONER] KRISHNAMAL RAMASUBBAIYER MATRIC HIGHER

SECONDARY SCHOOL TVR NAGAR ARUPPUKOTTAI

ROAD MADURAI-625022.

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY ITS SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

3 THE CHAIRMAN

PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPLEX COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for records relating to the impugned determination of fee by the 3rd respondent Committee for the petitioner school vide proceedings dated 27.05.2011 Quash the same and further Direct the respondents to permit the petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the statement of fees as submitted by the petitioner to the 3rd respondent Committee dated 21.03.2011.

W.P.NO.16931 OF 2011

1 THE SECRETARY [PETITIONER] SRI JAYENDRA SWAMIGAL SILVER JUBILEE
MATRICULATION HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL 2ND
MAIN ROAD MAHARAJA NAGAR TIRUNELVELI- 627011.

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY ITS SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF
SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

3 THE CHAIRMAN

PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPLEX COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for records relating to the impugned determination of fee by the 3rd respondent Committee for the petitioner school vide proceedings dated 27.05.2011 Quash the same and further Direct the respondents to permit the petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the statement of fees as submitted by the petitioner to the 3rd respondent Committee dated 03.03.2011.

W.P.NO.16937 OF 2011

JAYCEE EDUCATIONAL TRUST [PETITIONER] REP BY ITS TRUSTEE CUM SECRETARY

S.F. NO. 658/3A DOOR NO.2/327 HARINI ARCADE

VADAVALLI ROAD EDAYARPALAYAM COIMBATORE

641 041

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

EDUCATION DEPT. SECETARIAT FORT ST.GEORGE

CHENNAI 9

2 PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REPBY ITS CHAIRMAN

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the 2nd respondent Committee comprised in its proceedings dt 27.5.2011 in respect of the petitioners School Jaycee Higher Secondary School Vadavalli Coimbatore and quash the same as being arbitrary unreasonable contrary to facts and records and is violative of the principles of nature justice and violative of the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Private Schools (Regulation of Collection of Fee) Act 2009.

W.P.NO.16972 OF 2011

VETRI VIKAS BOYS HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL (14122) KEERANOOR
NAMAKKAL

DISTRICT REP.BY ITS FOUNDER

DR.S.GUNASEKARAN

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP.BY THE ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.

GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD

CHENNAI- 6.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 03.06.2011 made in order No.Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents to permit the Writ Petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee

W.P.NO.16973 OF 2011

VETRI VIKAS GIRLS HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL (14126) KEERANOOR
NAMAKKAL

DISTRICT REP.BY ITS FOUNDER

DR.S.GUNASEKARAN

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP.BY THE ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.

GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 03.06.2011 made in order No.Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents to permit the Writ Petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee.

W.P.NO.16974 OF 2011

VETRI VIKAS MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL (14164)
RASIPURAM

NAMAKKAL DISTRICT REP.BY ITS FOUNDER

DR.S. GUNASEKARAN

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP.BY THE ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.

GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD

CHENNAI- 6.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 03.06.2011 made in order No.Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents to permit the Writ Petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee

W.P.NO.17011 OF 2011

THE CORRESPONDENT [PETITIONER] E.B.G. MATRIC HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL

MOONDRUMAVADI K.PUDUR MADURAI-625007.

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY ITS SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

3 THE CHAIRMAN

PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPLEX COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Calling for records relating to the impugned determination of fee by the 3rd respondent Committee for the petitioner school vide proceedings dated 03.06.2011 Quash the same and further Direct the respondents to permit the petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the statement of fees as submitted by the petitioner to the 3rd respondent Committee dated 21.03.2011.

W.P.NO.17046 OF 2011

THE CORRESPONDENT [PETITIONER] ST. JOSEPH MATRIC. HR. SEC. SCHOOL OLD

KUYAVAR PALAYAM ROAD MADURAI-625009.

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY ITS SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

3 THE CHAIRMAN

PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPLEX COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for records relating to the impugned determination of fee by the 3rd respondent Committee for the petitioner school vide proceedings dated 27.05.2011 Quash the same and further Direct the respondents to permit the petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the statement of fees as submitted by the petitioner to the 3rd respondent Committee dated 21.03.2011.

W.P.NO.17062 OF 2011

SHREE G.K. JAIN HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL REP BY ITS SECRETARY V.

SRIPAL 180 M.S. KOIL STREET ROYAPURAM

CHENNAI 13

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE

CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI

Prayer

Calling for the records on the file of the 2nd respondent relating to the impugned order of the 2nd respondent dt 3.6.2011 and quash the same and consequently direct the 2nd respondent Committee to consider the

objections raised by the petitioner and to permit the petitioner School to collect the fees as requested in its letter dt 22.4.2011

W.P.NO.16063 OF 2011

SHREE JAIN SHIKSHAN SANGH [PETITIONER] NURSERY AND PRIMARY SCHOOL REP BY ITS
SECRETARY VIJAYLAL KOTHARI 178 M.S. KOIL ST
ROYAPURAM CHENNAI 13

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE
CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE
DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL
OFFICER DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL
EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI

Prayer

Calling for the records on the file of the 2nd respondent relating to the impugned order of the 2nd respondent dt 27.5.2011 and quash the same and consequently direct the 2nd respondent Committee to consider the objections raised by the petitioner and to permit the petitioner School to collect the fees as requested in its letter dt 24.2.2011.

W.P.NO.17098 OF 2011

K.G.MATRICULATION AND HR. SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP BY ITS SECRETARY N.
BAAGYALAKSHMI W/O. P. NANDHA KUMAR
COIMBATORE MAIN ROAD ANNUR COIMBATORE DT

641 653

Vs

1 THE CHAIRMAN [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE
DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

2 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REPBY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

4 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

COIMBATORE

5 THE INSPECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOL COIMBATORE

Prayer

calling for the records of the 1st respondent Committee and the order passed by the 1st respondent Committee vide C.C. 11209 dt 27.5.2011 and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to collect the fees fixed by them for the forthcoming academic year

W.P.NO.17124 OF 2011

RAMAMKRISHNANANDA NURSERY & [PETITIONER] PRIMARY SCHOOL REP. BY ITS SECRETARY NO.9

RANGANATHAN ROAD POONTHOTTAM VILLUPURAM-

605 602 VILLUPURAM DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT [RESPONDENTS] EDUCATION DEPARTMENT GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL

NADU FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the Second Respondent in order dated 27.5.2011 issued by the Second Respondent in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the request made to the Committee To dispense with

the production of the original impugned order dated 27.5.2011 passed by the Second Respondent To stay the operation of the order dated 27.5.2011 issued by the Second Respondent in respect of the writ petitioner school pending disposal of the above writ petition

W.P.NO.17125 OF 2011

RAJSHREE SUGARS RAMAKRISHNA [PETITIONER] VIDYALAYA MATRICULATION HIGHER SEC. SCHOOL

REP. BY ITS SECRETARY NO.3/464 G.S.T. ROAD

VILLUPURAM TK MUNDIAMBAKKAM-605 601

VILLUPURAM DT.

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT [RESPONDENTS] EDUCATION DEPARTMENT GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL

NADU FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the Second Respondent in order dated 27.5.2011 issued by the Second Respondent in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the request made to the Committee

W.P.NO.17126 OF 2011

SRI RAMAKRISHNA VIDYALAYA [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION SCHOOL REP. BY ITS SECRETARY

VIVEKANANDAPURAM SALAMEDU VILLUPURAM-605

401 VILLUPURAM DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT [RESPONDENTS] EDUCATION DEPARTMENT GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL

NADU FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the Second Respondent in order dated 27.5.2011 issued by the Second Respondent in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the request made to the Committee.

W.P.NO.17196 OF 2011

1 SRI RAMAKRISHNA MATH [PETITIONER] VIVEKANANDA CENTENARY GIRLS HIGHER SECONDARY

SCHOOL REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY NO.2

SARAVANA STREET MINT CHENNAI-79.

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT [RESPONDENTs] EDUCATION DEPARTMENT GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL

NADU FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REPRESENTED BY ITS

SPECIAL OFFICER DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD

CHENNAI-6.

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the second respondent in order dated 3.6.2011 issued by the second respondent in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the request made to the Committee.

W.P.NO.17219 OF 2011

AYYANAR MATRIC. HR.SEC. SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT SCHOOL NO.26115

VEPPUR CROSS ROAD VEPPUR VIRUDHACHALAM

TALUK CUDDALORE DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTs] REP. BY THE SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINING COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records pertaining to the records of impugned proceedings dt. 27.05.2011 passed by the 2nd respondent in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and direct the respondents 1 and 2 to fix the fee structure as proposed by the petitioner school based on the statement filed on 28.03.2011 before the 2nd respondent

W.P.NO.17403 OF 2011

THE CORRESPONDENT [PETITIONER] MARY MATHA MATRIC HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL

MADURAI ROAD THENI 625 531

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTs] REP BY ITS SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

3 THE CHAIRMAN

PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPLEX COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for records relating to the impugned determination of fee by the 3rd respondent Committee for the petitioner school vide proceedings dt 7.5.2010 quash the same and further direct the respondents to permit the petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the statement of fees as submitted by the petitioner to the 3rd respondent Committee dt 27.4.2011

W.P.NO.17452 OF 2011

BHARATHI MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL REP. BY ITS SECRETARY &

CORRESPONDENT MR.C.ANAND 307 THADAGAM

ROAD GCT POST COIMBATORE-641013.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTs] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-9.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REP. BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the First Respondent dated 27.05.2011 quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner school and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the fees fixed by the petitioner for the academic years 2011-2012 and 2012-2013

W.P.NO.17533 OF 2011

DR.G.S. KALYANASUNDARAM MAT. [PETITIONER] HR. SEC. SCHOOL REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT S.

VIJAYARAGHAVAN PAZHAYA GUDALUR 609 801

KUTTALAM TK NAGAI DT

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

2 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPT.

FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the 1st respondent Committee dt 3.6.2011 and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the tuition fees fixed by the petitioner school for the academic year 2010-2011

W.P.NO.17680 OF 2011

KALLAKURICHI CO-OPERATIVE [PETITIONER] SUGAR MILLS MATRIC. HR. SEC. SCHOOL
REP. BY

ITS SPECIAL OFFICER / DISTRICT REVENUE

OFFICER THE PRESIDENT MOONGILTHURAI PATTU

VILLUPURAM DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION
COMMITTEE

D.P.I. CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REP. BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRIC. SCHOOL

D.P.I. CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 1st Respondent dated 27.05.2011 in respect of the Petitioner and quash the same and consequently direct the Respondents to fix the fees structure taking into account the details furnished by the Petitioner in the Appeal dated 28.03.2011

W.P.NO.17724 OF 2011

1 TAGORE HIGHER SECONDARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEVIYAKURICHI-

636112 ATTUR (TK) SALEM DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order dated 27.05.2011 passed by the 1st Respondent under Section 6(4) of Act 22 of 2009 against the Petitioner School viz. Tagore Higher Secondary School Deviyakurichi-636112 Attur (Tk.) Salem District and quash the same and further direct the 1st Respondent to consider the objections raised by the Petitioner School vide their letter dated 21.05.2010 regarding fixation of revised fee structure

W.P.NO.17754 OF 2011

1 M.C.T.M. CHIDAMBARAM CHETTIYAR [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL

REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL 179 LUZ CHURCH ROAD

MYLAPORE CHENNAI-4.

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY ITS SECRETARY (EDUCATION)

FORT ST. GEORGE SECRETARIAT CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order dated 03.06.2011 of the 2nd Respondent herein and quash the same

W.P.NO.17879 OF 2011

1 KAMBAN VIDYALAYA HIGH SCHOOL [PETITIONER] SELIKKARAI GUZILIAMPARAI DINDIGUL DISTRICT

REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MR.K.ASOKAN.

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY [RESPONDENTS PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE
DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

ANNA SALAI CHENNAI-2.

Prayer Calling for the records relating to the order dated 27.5.2011 Ref.C.C.No.09259 passed by the first respondent and quash the same

W.P.NO.17907 OF 2011

VIDYAPARTHI HIGHER SECONDARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL SEELAPADI DINDIGUL-5 REP.
BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MR.K.KRISHNAMURTHI.

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE
DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

ANNA SALAI CHENNAI-2.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order dated 27.5.2011 Ref.C.C.No.09254 passed by the first respondent and quash the same

W.P.NO.18004 OF 2011

SRI RAMAKRISHNA VIDYALAYA [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION HIGHER SECONDARY
SCHOOL REP.

BY SECRETARY NO.29 NARAYANA NAGAR MAIN

ROAD RAMAKRISHNAPURAM POONTHOTTAM

VILLUPURAM VILLUPURAM DT.

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT [RESPONDENTS] EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL

NADU FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REPRESENTED BY ITS

SPECIAL OFFICER DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD

CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the Second Respondent in order dated 03.06.2011 issued by the Second Respondent in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the request made to the Committee. W.P.NO.18014/2011:

VIVEKANANDA VIDYALAYA HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL VEDASANDUR ROAD

KALANGIPATTY ODDACHANTIRAM TALUK DINDIGUL

DISTRICT.

Vs

1.THE SECRETARY [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

2.THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

CHENNAI-9.

Calling for the records relating to the order dt. 27.5.2011 Ref.C.C.No.09257 passed by the first respondent and quash the same

W.P.No.18031 OF 2011

PARIMALAM MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL REP. BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT P.RATHINASABAPATHY NEAR

DHINNUR VILLAGE HOSUR-DENKANAIKOTA ROAD

HOSUR-635109.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEES [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI COMPLEX

CHENNAI-6.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in order dated 27.5.2011 passed under Section 6(4) of Act 22 of 2009 and quash the same and further direct the 1st respondent to consider the objections raised by the petitioner dated 15.03. 2011 regarding fixing the fees

W.P.No.18116 OF 2011

GURUKULAM MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REPRESENTED BY ITS CORRESPONDENT N.

ARJUNAN SWARNA BHOOMI ALAGAR THUNERI POST

THE NILGIRIS-643002.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

4 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order passed by the 1st Respondent dated 27.5.2011 made in CC No.10077 and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the fees determined by them for the Academic Year 2011-12 to 2013-14

W.P.No.18191 OF 2011

SRI KANCHI KAMAKOTI [PETITIONER] PEETATHIPATHI JAYENDRA SARASWATHI SANKARA
NURSERY & PRIMARY SCHOOL 6/338 THOPPU
STREET PULIVALAM TIRUVARUR DISTRICT-610109.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENT] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION
COMMITTEE

D.P.I. CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records on the file of the Respondent in Proceedings No.Nil dated 27.5.2011 quash the said order and direct the Respondent to consider and accept the fees structure proposed by the Petitioner

W.P.No.18193 OF 2011

THE CHAIRMAN [PETITIONER] ST. XAVIERS MATRIC HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL
VANNARPETTAI TIRUNELVELI-627 003.

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENT] REP. BY ITS SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF
SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

3 THE CHAIRMAN

PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPLEX COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned determination of fee by the 3rd respondent Committee for the petitioner school vide proceedings dated 27.5.2011 quash the same and further direct the respondents to permit the petitioner to collect fees in terms of the statement of fees as submitted by the petitioner to the 3rd respondent Committee dated 21.3.2011

W.P.No.18260 OF2011

SRI NEHRU VIDYALAYA [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL REP.

BY SECRETARY DR.ASHOK G BAFNA TIBREWAL

NAGAR ROBERTSON ROAD R.S.PURAM

COIMBATORE- 2.

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT

OF SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD

CHENNAI- 6.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

4 EX OFFICIO MEMBER SECRETARY

(P) SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

ADDL. SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL EDUCATION

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD

CHENNAI-6.

5 THE SPECIAL OFFICER

PROCEEDINGS OF THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE PTA BUILDING DPI

CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Calling for the records comprised in the order of the 5th respondent dated 27.5.2011 and quash the same as being in violation of Articles 14 and 19(1)(g) of the Constitution and the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Schools (Regulation of Collection of fee) Act 2009 and rules thereof and direct the respondents to pass fresh orders after considering the oral and written submissions of the petitioner in accordance with the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Schools (Regulation of Collection of Fee) Act 2009 and rules thereof

W.P.NO.18347 OF 2011

KAMBHAN NURSERY AND PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL GUZHILIAMPARAI DINDIGUL DISTRICT

REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MR.L.ASOKAN

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY [RESPONDENT] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

ANNA SALAI CHENNAI-2.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order dated 27.5.2011 Ref.C.C.No.910 passed by the first respondent and quash the same

W.P.No.18453 OF 2011

VEDAVALLI HR.SEC.SCHOOL REP [PETITIONER] BY ITS TRUSTEE AND CORRESPONDENT MRS.BHOOMA

PARTHASARATHY CHENNAI-MUMBAI TRUNK ROAD

BAGAVELLI T.K.THANGAL POST WALAJAPET 632

513 VELLORE DT

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY ITS SECRETARY (EDUCATION) FORT ST.

GOERGE SECRETARIAT CHENNAI 1

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

calling for the records relating to the order dt 27.5.2011 of the 2nd respondent herein and quash the same

W.P.No.18454 OF 2011

VEDAVALLI VIDYALAYA SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REP BY ITS TRUSTEE AND
CORRESPONDENT MRS.

BHOOMA PARTHASARATHY THIRUMALAI NAGAR

VANAPADI ROAD RANIPET 632 404

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY ITS SECETARY (EDUCATION) FORT
ST.

GOERGE SECRETARIAT CHENNAI 1

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records relating to the order dt 27.5.2011 of the 2nd respondent herein and quash the same

W.P.No.18461 OF 2011

SRI GAYATHRI HIGHER SECONDARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT
PARAKKADU

ARIYAGOUNDANPATTI THALAVAIPATTI POST

SALEM DISTRICT-636302.

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT [RESPONDENTS] SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

3 THE SPECIAL OFFICER

PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for records relating to orders passed by the third respondent in his proceedings Nil dated 27.05.2011 and quash the same and direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the fees as projected before the third respondent committee for the academic years 2011 to 2013

W.P.No.18464 OF 2011

PUSHPALATHA MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL REP. BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT SMT. PUSHPALATHA POORANAN

SIVANTHIPATTI ROAD THIYAGARAJA NAGAR

TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT.

Vs

1. THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

To call for the records pertaining to the order passed by the respondent dated 27.5.2011 pertaining to the petitioner school and quash the same as illegal incompetent and without jurisdiction

W.P.No.18540 OF 2011

VIDIVELLI NURSERY AND PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL 37-A SELVA SARANGAPANI STREET

KUMBAKONAM THANJAVUR REP. BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MR.SRINIVASAN.

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE
DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT
FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order dated 27.5.2011 passed by the first respondent in C.C.No.23198 and quash the same.

W.P.No.18541 OF 2011

ANDAVAR NURSERY & PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL 467 KATTUKKULA MAIN ROAD
THIRUMANGALAKUDI THIRUVIDAIMARATHUR TK
THANJAVUR DT. REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT K.
SUSILA.

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE
DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.
2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT
FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order dated 27.5.2011 passed by the first respondent in C.C.No.23080 and quash the same

W.P.No.18847 OF 2011

SPB MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL REP. BY ITS PRESIDENT
SRI.
K.S.KASI VISWANATHAN SPB COLONY ERODE-

638010 NAMAKKAL DISTRICT.

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT

OF SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD

CHENNAI-6.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

4 EX-OFFICIO MEMBER SECRETARY

PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

ADDITIONAL SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

5 THE SPECIAL OFFICER

PROCEEDINGS OF THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE PTA BUILDING DPI

CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records comprised in the order of the 5th respondent dated 27.5.2011 and quash the same as being in violation of Articles 14 and 19(1)(g) of the Constitution and the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Schools (Regulation of collection of fee) Act 2009 and rules thereof and direct the respondents to pass fresh orders after considering the oral and written submissions of the petitioner in accordance with the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Schools (Regulation of collection of Fee) Act 2009 and rules thereof

W.P.No.18853 OF 2011

MOTHERS MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] KALINGARAYANPALAYAM PALAIYUR
BHAVANI 638

301 ERODE DIST. REP.BY ITS CORRESPONDENT P.

MUTHUSAMY.

Vs

1. THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP.BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2. THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records from the 1st respondent relating to the impugned order dt 27.05.2011 passed under Sec.6 (4) of Act 22 of 2009 relating to the petitioner namely Mothers Matriculation School (12107) Palaiyur Kalingarayanpalayam Bhavani-638 301 Erode Dist quash the same and further direct the 1st respondent to consider the objections raised by the petitioner dt 20.05.2011 regarding fixation of fee

W.P.No.18854 OF 2011

SHRI MAHA HIGHER SECONDARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL INGUR PERUNDURAI T.K. ERODE DIST.

REP.BY ITS SECRETARY & CORRESPONDENT S.

ESWARAMOORTHY

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP.BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records from the 1st respondent relating to the impugned order dt 27.05.2011 passed under Sec.6 (4) of Act 22 of 2009 relating to the petitioner namely Shri Maha Higher Secondary School (12004) Ingur Perundurai T.K. Erode Dist quash the same and further direct the 1st respondent to consider the objections raised by the petitioner dt 01.06.2010 regarding fixation of fee

W.P.No.18855 OF 2011

KUMUTHA MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL 8 GANDHIPURAM NORTH

NAMBIYUR 638 458 GOBI T.K. ERODE DIST REP.

BY ITS CORRESPONDENT K.A.JANAGARATHINAM

Vs

1. THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP.BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2. THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records from the 1st respondent relating to the impugned order dt 27.05.2011 passed under Sec.6 (4) of Act 22 of 2009 relating to the petitioner namely Kumutha Matriculation Higher Secondary School (12294) 8 Gandhipuram (North) Nambiyur 638 458 Gobi T.k. Erode Dist quash the same and further direct the 1st respondent to consider the objections raised by the petitioner dt 07.06.2010 regarding fixation of fee

W.P.No.18856 OF 2011

KUMUTHA HIGH SCHOOL [PETITIONER] 8 GANDHIPURAM NORTH NAMBIYUR 638 458 GOBI

T.K. ERODE DT. REPBY ITS SECRETARYK.A.

JANAGARATHINAM

Vs

1. THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP.BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2. THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Calling for the records from the 1st respondent relating to the impugned order dt 27.05.2011 passed under Sec.6 (4) of Act 22 of 2009 relating to the petitioner namely Kumutha High School (12007) 8 Gandhipuram (North) Nambiyur 638 458 Gobi T.K. Erode Dist quash the same and further direct the 1st respondent to consider the objections raised by the petitioner dt 19.05.2010 regarding fixation of fee

W.P.No.18857 OF 2011

KONGU MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] 158-A KARUPPAGOUNDAMPALAYAM
SOLANGAPALAYAM

PASUR P.O. ERODE DT REP BY ITS SECRETARY P.

KOTRAVEL

Vs

1. THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP.BY ITS
SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2. THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records from the 1st respondent relating to the impugned order dt 27.05.2011 passed under Sec.6 (4) of Act 22 of 2009 relating to the petitioner namely Kongu Matriculation School (12211) 158-A Kaurppagoundampalayam Solangapalayam Pasur P.O. Erode District quash the same and further direct the 1st respondent to consider the objections raised by the petitioner dt 24.05.2010 regarding fixation of fee

W.P.No.18858 OF 2011

KUMUTHA NURSERY AND PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL SAVAKKATTUPALAYAM
THATHANUR VILLAGE

AVINASHI T.K. TIRUPUR DT 638 460 REP BY

ITS CORRESPONDENT K.A. JANAGARATHINAM

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP.BY ITS
SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records from the 1st respondent relating to the impugned order dt 27.05.2011 passed under Sec.6 (4) of Act 22 of 2009 relating to the petitioner namely Kumutha Nursery and Primary School (33003) Savakkattupalayam 638 460 Thathanur Village Avinashi T.K. Tirupur District quash the same and further direct the 1st respondent to consider the objections raised by the petitioner dt 19.05.2010 regarding fixation of fee

W.P.No.18859 OF 2011

THAMARAI MATRIC HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL SIVAGIRI MAIN ROAD
KUMARAPPAPURAM THAMARAIPALAYAM UNJALUR
VIA ERODE DT 638 152 REP BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT S. RAJA

Vs

1. THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP.BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2. THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records from the 1st respondent relating to the impugned order dt 27.05.2011 passed under Sec.6 (4) of Act 22 of 2009 relating to the petitioner namely Thamarai Maric Higher Secondary School (12306) Sivagiri MainRoad Kumarappapuram Thamaraipalayam Unjalur Via Erode District 638 152 quash the same and further direct the 1st respondent to consider the objections raised by the petitioner dt 23.3.2011 regarding fixation of fee

W.P.No.19060 OF 2011

AMERICAN NURSERY AND PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL S.K. NAGAR BPL TOWER
MELACHATIRAM

DARASURAM POST KUMBAKONAM THANJAVUR DT REP

BY ITS CORRESPONDENT M.R. MURTHY

Vs

1. THE SECRETARY [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

2. THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPT. SECRETARIAT FORT ST.

GEORGE CHENNAI 9

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order dt 27.5.2011 passed by the 1st respondent in CC No. 23131 and quash the same

W.P.No.19308 OF 2011

RAMYA NURSERY AND PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MR.G.

ANGAMUTHU NO.109 VELACHERY MAIN ROAD

PALLIKARANAI CHENNAI 100

Vs

1. THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER D.P.I. CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD

NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI 6

2. THE DIRECTOR OF ELEMENTARY

EDUCATION GOVT. OF TAMILNADU D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI 6

3. THE DISTRICT ELEMENTARY

EDUCATION OFFICER KANCHIPURAM DISTRICT

KANCHIPURAM

Prayer

calling for the records in respect of the impugned order passed by the 1st respondent vide its order dt 27.5.2011 in respect of the petitioner School andquash the same and direct the 1st respondent Committee to reconsider the objections dt 24.5.2010 filed by the petitioner school for determination of fee and to pass orders thereon within a time frame as may be fixed by this Honourable court

W.P.No.19377 OF 2011

KOMARASAMY GOUNDER [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION SCHOOL VETTAYAMPALAYAM E.

CHETTIPALAYAM & POST NAMBIYUR (VIA) GOBI T.

K. ERODE DT. REP BY ITS SECRETARY V.C.

SIVAKUMAR

Vs

1. THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMUS CHENNAI 6

2. THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records from the 1st respondent relating to the imugned order dt 27.5.2011 passed under sec.6 (4) of Act 22 of 2009 relating to the petitioner namely Komarasamy Gounder Matriculation School (12273) Vettayampalayam E.Chettipalayam (P.O) Nambiyur (Via) Gobi T.K. Erode District quash the same and further direct the 1st respondent to consider the objections raised by the petitioner dt 21.5.2010 regarding fixation of fee

W.P.No.19379 OF 2011

KOMARASAMY GOUNDER HR. SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL VETTAYAMPALAYAM E. CHETTIPALAYAM &

POST NAMBIYUR (VIA) GOBI T.K. ERODE DT.

REP BY ITS SECRETARY V.C. SIVAKUMAR

Vs

1. THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENT] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMUS CHENNAI 6

2. THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records from the 1st respondent relating to the imugned order dt 27.5.2011 passed under sec.6 (4) of Act 22 of 2009 relating to the petitioner namely Komarasamy Gounder Higher Secondary School (12002) Vettayampalayam E.Chettipalayam (P.O) Nambiyur (Via) Gobi T.K. Erode District quash the same and further direct the 1st respondent to consider the objections raised by the petitioner dt 21.5.2010 regarding fixation of fee

W.P.No.19404 OF 2011

SARU MATRICULATION HR. SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL (12257) REP BY ITS SECRETARY DR.A.

SAMIAPPAN SARU GARDEN BANNARI ROAD

SATHYAMANGALAM 638 401 ERODE DT

Vs

1. THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

to call for the records of the respondent in order dt 27.5.2011 passed by the respondent and quash the same after taking into consideration all the factors as mentioned in the above paragraphs

W.P.No.19405 OF 2011

M/S.MAMAHARISHI EASWARAYA [PETITIONER] GURUKULAM MATRIC HR.SEC.SCHOOL REP BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT V. VEERAMMAL THABOVANAM

ERANKATTUPALAYAM P.PULIAMPATTI 638 459

ERODE DT

Vs

1. THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

to call for the records of the respondent in order dt 27.5.2011 passed by the respondent and quash the same after taking into consideration all the factors as mentioned in the above paragraphs

W.P.No.19406 OF 2011

BANNARI AMMAN VIDYA NIKETAN [PETITIONER] MATRIC HR.SEC.SCHOOL (12183) REP BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT E.MANIVEL ALATHUKOMBAI

SATHYAMANGALAM 638 401 ERODE DT

Vs

1. THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

to call for the records of the respondent in order dt 27.5.2011 passed by the respondent and quash the same after taking into consideration all the factors as mentioned in the above paragraphs

W.P.No.19407 OF 2011

SRI SOWDESWARI VIDYALAYA [PETITIONER] MATRIC HR.SEC.SCHOOL (11305) REP BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT R. SUBRAMANIAM 15-A A.K.S.

NAGAR THADAGAM ROAD COIMBATORE 641001

Vs

1. THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

to call for the records of the respondent in order dt 27.5.2011 passed by the respondent and quash the same after taking into consideration all the factors as mentioned in the above paragraphs

W.P.No.19408 OF 2011

1. S.R.C. MEMORIAL MATRIC HR.SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT R.

PALANISAMY P. PULIAMPATTI 638 459 ERODE DT

Vs

1. THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

to call for the records of the respondent in order dt 27.5.2011 passed by the respondent and quash the same after taking into consideration all the factors as mentioned in the above paragraphs

W.P.No.19409 OF 2011

SRI NARAYANASAMY NAIDU MATRIC [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT B.

SELVARAJAN PUDUVADAVALLI SATHYAMANGALAM

638 401 ERODE DT

Vs

1. THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

to call for the records of the respondent in order dt 27.5.2011 passed by the respondent and quash the same after taking into consideration all the factors as mentioned in the above paragraphs

W.P.No.19410 OF 2011

M/S.AMMA MATRIC. SCHOOL [PETITIONER] (12108) REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT SAMPOORNAM

SWAMINATHAN 12/3 MARAIMALAI ADIGALST

PUNJAI PULIAMPATTI SATHYAMANGALAM 638 459

ERODE DT

Vs

THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

to call for the records of the respondent in order dt 27.5.2011 passed by the respondent and quash the same after taking into consideration all the factors as mentioned in the above paragraphs

W.P.No.19411 OF 2011

LITTLE FLOWER MATRIC. HR.SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP BY ITS DIRECTOR W.BASCO

ERAIYANBU 13 PERIYAKULAM ROAD

VARADHAMPALAYAM SATHYAMANGALAM 638 401

ERODE DT

Vs

1. THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer to call for the records of the respondent in order dt 27.5.2011 passed by the respondent and quash the same after taking into consideration all the factors as mentioned in the above paragraphs

W.P.No.19476 OF 2011

DAV HR. SEC. SCHOOL (RUN AND [PETITIONER] MANAGED BY TAMILNADU ARYA SAMAJ EDUCATIONAL

SOCIETY (TNASES)) REP BY ITS SECRETARY MR.S.

JAIDEV 25 CONRAN SMITH ROAD GOPALAPURAM

CHENNAI 86

Vs

1. PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS MEMBER

SECRETARY PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS

CHENNAI 8

2. THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT

ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

3. THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

4. THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

5. THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

PANAGAL BUILDING SAIDAPET CHENNAI 15

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 1st respondent Committee and the Order passed by the 1st respondent Committee dt 3.6.2011 and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the fees as proposed by them for the academic years 2010-2011 2011-2012 and 2012-2013

W.P.No.19477 OF 2011

DAV MAT. HR. SEC. SCHOOL (RUN [PETITIONER] AND MANAGED BY TAMILNADU ARYA SAMAJ

EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY (TNASES)) REP BY ITS

SECRETARY MR.S. JAIDEV 162 SIVANANDA SALAI

CHOOOLAIMEDU CHENNAI 94

Vs

1. PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES [RESPONDENT S] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS MEMBER

SECRETARY PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS

CHENNAI 8

2. THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT

ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

3. THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

4. THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

5. THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

PANAGAL BUILDING SAIDAPET CHENNAI 15

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 1st respondent Committee and the Order passed by the 1st respondent Committee dt 3.6.2011 and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the fees as proposed by them for the academic years 2010-2011 2011-2012 and 2012-2013

W.P.No.19478 OF 2011

DAV MAT. HR. SEC. SCHOOL (RUN [PETITIONER] AND MANAGED BY TAMILNADU ARYA SAMAJ EDUL.

SOCIETY (TNASES)) REP BY ITS SECRETARY MR.S.

JAIDEV BLOCK NO.12 DR.J.J.NAGAR MOGAPPAIR

EAST CHENNAI 37

Vs

1. PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS MEMBER

SECRETARY PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS

CHENNAI 8

2. THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT

ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

3. THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

4. THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

5. THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

THIRUVALLORE 602 001 THIRUVALLORE DT

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 1st respondent Committee and the Order passed by the 1st respondent Committee dt 3.6.2011 and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the fees as proposed by them for the academic years 2010-2011 2011-2012 and 2012-2013

W.P.No.19548 OF 2011

P.K.D.PRE SCHOOL [PETITIONER] RUN BY P.K.D.TRUST REP.BY ITS CHAIRMAN DR.

D.MUTHUKUMARASAMY 39 DHARMALINGAM STREET

VENKATASA COLONY POLLACHI-642 001

COIMBATORE DIST.

Vs

1. THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

2. THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP.BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-600 009.

3. THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

4. THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order passed by the 1st Respondent dated 27.05.2011 made in CC No.11088 and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the fees determined by them for the Academic Year 2011-12 to 2013-14.

W.P.No.19549 OF 2011

P.K.D.MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL REP.BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

DR.D.MUTHUKUMARASAMY A.SANGAMPALAYAM

ACHIPATTI PANCHAYAT POLLACHI-642 002

COIMBATORE DIST.

Vs

1. THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

2. THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP.BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-600 009.

3. THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

4. THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order passed by the 1st Respondent dated 27.05.2011 made in CC No.11249 and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the fees determined by them for the Academic Year 2011-12 to 2013-14

W.P.No.19604 OF 2011

SOWDAMBIKAA MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HR. SEC. SCHOOL (20450) NO.2C PARK ST

THURAIYUR 621 010 REP BY ITS PRINCIPAL

Vs

1. PRIVATE SCHOOL FEES [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI COMPOUND

COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6 REP BY ITS SECRETARY

2. THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPT. SECRETARIAT

CHENNAI 9

Prayer

calling for the records relating to the 1st respondent dt 3.6.11 vide Ref. C.C. No. 20450 and to quash the same
W.P.No.19607 OF 2011

CHINNI SRIRAMULU CHETTY [PETITIONER] VIVEKANADA VIDYALAYA MAT. SCHOOL REP
BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MR.B. GOVINDARAJ NO.1 MARUTHI

NEW TOWN THIRUVALLUR 602 001

Vs

1. STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVT. DEPT. OF
SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.GEROGE CHENNAI 9

2. THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL OF
EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD
CHENNAI 6

3. THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION
SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

4. THE SPECIAL OFFICER
PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE
PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD
CHENNAI 9

Calling for the records of the 4th respondent in relation to the impugned order dt 3.6.11 and quash the same in
so far as it relates to the petitioner school concern and consequently direct the respondents to permit the
petitioner school to collect the fee determined by them

W.P.No.19635 OF 2011

P.S.G.R.KRISHNAMMAL NURSERY [PETITIONER] AND PRIMARY SCHOOL (11156)
PEELAMEDU

COIMBATORE-641 004 REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

Vs

1. THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI

2. THE DISTRICT ELEMENTARY

EDUCATIONAL OFFICER COIMBATORE-1.

3. THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

COIMBATORE-1.

4. THE SPECIAL OFFICER

THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION

COMMITTEE COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 4th respondent relating to the impugned order dated 27.05.2011 passed by the 4th respondent and the fee determined in respect of the petitioner School and quash the same and consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the petitioner school in the matter of collection of fees from its students

W.P.No.19636 OF 2011

CHANDRA MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL (11323) CIVIL AERODROME

POST COIMBATORE-641 004 REP. BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT

Vs

1. THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENT] THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI

2. THE DISTRICT ELEMENTARY

EDUCATIONAL OFFICER COIMBATORE-1.

3. THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

COIMBATORE-1.

4. THE SPECIAL OFFICER

THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION

COMMITTEE COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 4th respondent relating to the impugned order dated 27.05.2011 passed by the 4th respondent and the fee determined in respect of the petitioner School and quash the same and consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the petitioner school in the matter of collection of fees from its students

W.P.No.19637 OF 2011

P.S.G.R.KRISHNAMMAL HR. SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL FOR GIRLS (11432) PEELAMEDU

COIMBATORE-641 004 REP. BY ITS SECRETARY

Vs

1. THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI

2. THE DISTRICT ELEMENTARY

EDUCATIONAL OFFICER COIMBATORE-1.

3. THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

COIMBATORE-1.

4. THE SPECIAL OFFICER

THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION

COMMITTEE COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 4th respondent relating to the impugned order dated 27.05.2011 passed by the 4th respondent and the fee determined in respect of the petitioner School and quash the same and consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the petitioner school in the matter of collection of fees from its students.

W.P.No.19647 OF 2011

1. KURINJI HR. SEC. SCHOOL [PETITIONER] KURINJI NAGAR KAVETTIPATTI VALLIPURAM POST

NAMAKKAL 637 003 REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

K. SUNDARRAJAN

Vs

1. THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

2. THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT

ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

3. THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the 1st respondent Committee and the order passed by the 1st respondent Committee dt 27.5.2011 and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to collect the tuition fees fixed by the petitioner School for the academic year 2010-11

W.P.No.19648 OF 2011

KURINJI MAT. HR. SEC. SCHOOL [PETITIONER] KURINJI NAGAR KAVETTIPATTI VALLIPURAM POST

NAMAKKAL 637 003 REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

K. SUNDARRAJAN

Vs

1. THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

2. THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT

ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

3. THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the 1st respondent Committee and the orders passed by the 1st respondent Committee dt 27.5.2011 and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to collect the tuition fees fixed by the petitioner School for the academic year 2010-11

W.P.No.19667 OF 2011

SRI.LAKSHMI VIDYALAYA [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION SCHOOL THADIKOMBU
DINDIGUL

DISTRICT REP.BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MR. V.

CHANDRASEKARAN

Vs

1. THE SECRETARY [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

2. THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

ANNA SALAI CHENNAI-600 002.

Calling for the records relating to the order dated 27.05.2011 Ref.C.C.No.9176 passed by the first respondent and quash the same.

W.P.No.19683 OF 2011

LBEAAR MAT. HR. SEC. SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REP BY ITS CHAIRMAN & amp;
CORRESPONDENT R.

MADHANAGOPAL NO.1/5 POONAMALLEE HIGH ROAD

NERKUNDRAM CHENNAI 107

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION
COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

2 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT

ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

3 THE INSPECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS MANAVALA NAGAR THIRUVALLUR DT

Prayer

to call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in proceedings NIL dt 3.6.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent and without jurisdiction

W.P.No.19684 OF 2011

LEO MAT. HR. SEC. SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REP BY ITS CHAIRMAN & CORRESPONDENT S.

CHITTI BABU NO. 1513-E ANNA NAGAR WESTERN

EXTENSION CHENNAI 101

Vs

1. THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

2. THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT

ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

3. THE INSPECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS MANAVALA NAGAR THIRUVALLUR DT

Prayer

to call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in proceedings NIL dt 3.6.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent and without jurisdiction

W.P.No.19694 OF 2011

1. S.S.M.LAKSHMIAMMAL NURSERY & [PETITIONER] PRIMARY SCHOOL (14175) OLD PALLIPALAYAM

ROAD KATTUVALAVU KOMARAPALAYAM-638 183.

Vs

1. THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENT] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

2. THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

ANNA SALAI CHENNAI-2.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the Order dated 27.5.2011 Ref.C.C.No.14175 passed by the first respondent and quash the same

W.P.No.19699 OF 2011

S.S.M.LAKSHMIAMMAL [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL

(14180) OLD PALLIPALAYAM ROAD KATTUVALAVU

KOMARAPALAYAM-638 183.

Vs

1. THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

2. THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

ANNA SALAI CHENNAI-2.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the Order dated 27.5.2011 Ref.C.C.No.14180 passed by the first respondent and quash the same

W.P.No.19738 OF 2011

S.R.KALYANARAMAN MEMORIAL [PETITIONER] P.S.NURSERY & PRIMARY SCHOOL (N31838)NO.91

MUNDAKA KANNI AMMAN KOIL STREET MYLAPORE

CHENNAI-4.

Vs

1. THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI

2. THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

CEO CAMPUS CHENNAI.

3. THE SPECIAL OFFICER

THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION

COMMITTEE COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 3rd respondent relating to the impugned order dated 3.6.2011 passed by the 3rd respondent and the fee determined in respect of the petitioner School and quash the same and consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the petitioner school in the matter of collection of fees from its students

W.P.No.19761 OF 2011

LAKSHMI MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] (TVS NURSERY AND PRIMARY SCHOOL)
OTHAPATTI

KARUPPAYURANI POST MADURAI-20 REP. BY THE

SECRETARY AND TREASURER

Vs

1. STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI

2. CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

CEO CAMPUS MADURAI

3. THE SPECIAL OFFICER

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD PRIVATE SCHOOLS

FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE CHENNAI-6

Prayer

calling for the records of the 3rd respondent relating to the impugned order dated 3.6.2011 passed by the 3rd respondent relating to the impugned order dated 3.6.2011 passed by the 3rd respondent and the fee determined in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the petitioners school in the matter of collection fees from its students and render justice.

W.P.No.20098 OF 2011

M/S.S.R.V.BOYS HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL MUTHUKALIPATTI POST

RASIPURAM NAMAKKAL DISTRICT REP.BY ITS

SECRETARY MR.S.SELVARAGHAVAN

Vs

1. THE STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENT] REP.BY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2. THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

CEO CAMPUS NAMAKKAL.

3. THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records comprised in the order made in No.14120 dated 03.06.2011 on the file of the 3rd respondent imposing directions for collection of fees by the petitioner school and quash the same and consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the Petitioners School in the matter of collection of fees from its students

W.P.No.20099 OF 2011

M/S.S.R.V.HI-TECH MATRIC [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL MASAKALIPATTI

RASIPURAM TALUK NAMAKKAL DISTRICT REP.BY

ITS SECRETARY MR.J.RAMASAMY

Vs

1. THE STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENT] REP.BY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2. THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

CEO CAMPUS NAMAKKAL.

3. THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records comprised in the order made in No.N14125 dated 03.06.2011 on the file of the 3rd respondent imposing directions for collection of fees by the petitioner school and quash the same and consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the Petitioners School in the matter of collection of fees from its students.

W.P.No.20100 OF 2011

M/S.S.R.V.MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL SAMAYAPURAM

MANNACHANALLUR TALUK TRICHY DISTRICT REP.

BY ITS SECRETARY MR.P.SWAMINADAN

Vs

1. THE STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENT] REP.BY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2. THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

CEO CAMPUS TRICHY.

3. THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records comprised in the order made in No.20142 dated 03.06.2011 on the file of the 3rd respondent imposing directions for collection of fees by the petitioner school and quash the same and consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the Petitioners School in the matter of collection of fees from its students.

W.P.No.20282 OF 2011

M/S ADARSH VIDHYALAYA HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL ADARSH NAGAR PARUVACHI

POST BHAVANI TALUK ERODE DISTRICT REP.BY

ITS SECRETARY/CORRESPONDENT MRS.S.SELVAMANI.

Vs

1. THE STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2. THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

CEO CAMPUS ERODE.

3. THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records comprised in the order made in No.12035 dated 27.05.2011 on the file of the 3rd respondent imposing directions for collection of fees by the petitioner School and quash the same consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the Petitioners School in the matter of collection of fees from its students

W.P.No.20283 OF 2011

M/S.ADARSH VIDHYALAYA [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION SCHOOL ADARSH NAGAR

PARUVACHI POST BHAVANI TALUK ERODE

DISTRICT REP.BY ITS SECRETARY/CORRESPONDENT

MRS.S.SELVAMANI.

Vs

1. THE STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2. THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

CEO CAMPUS ERODE.

3. THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records comprised in the order made in No.12272 dated 27.05.2011 on the file of the 3rd respondent imposing directions for collection of fees by the petitioner School and quash the same consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the Petitioners School in the matter of collection of fees from its students

W.P.No.20284 OF 2011

M/S.IDEAL MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] IDEAL NAGAR
A.SEMBULICHAMPALAYAM POST

ANDHIYUR TALUK ERODE DISTRICT REP.BY ITS

SECRETARY/CORRESPONDENT MR.K.SIVALINGAM

Vs

1. THE STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENT] REP BY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2. THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

CEO CAMPUS ERODE.

3. THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records comprised in the order made in No.12109 dated 27.05.2011 on the file of the 3rd respondent imposing directions for collection of fees by the petitioner School and quash the same and consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise

issuing directions to the Petitioners School in the matter of collection of fees from its students.

W.P.No.20285 OF 2011

M/S.IDEAL HIGHER SECONDARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL IDEAL NAGAR
A.SEMBULICHAMPALAYAM

POST ANDHIYUR TALUK ERODE DISTRICT REP.BY

ITS SECRETARY/CORRESPONDENT MR.K.SIVALINGAM

Vs

1. THE STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2. THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

CEO CAMPUS ERODE.

3. THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records comprised in the order made in No.12038 dated 27.05.2011 on the file of the 3rd respondent imposing directions for collection of fees by the petitioner School and quash the same and consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the Petitioners School in the matter of collection of fees from its students.

WP.No.20311/2011

1 AYANPURAM KALIGI RANGANATHAN [PETITIONER] MONTFORD MATRICULATION
HR.SECY. SCHOOL

STUDENT-PARENT WELFARE ASSOCIATION REP.BY

ITS GENERAL SECRETARY R.ARUL NO.124 P.A.

KOIL ST AYANAVARAM CH-23

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP.BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO
GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE

CHENNAI-600 009.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-

600 006.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP.BY ITS MEMBER

SECRETARY PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

4 KALIGI RANGANATHAN MONTFORD

MATRICULATION HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL REP.

BY ITS PRINCIPAL NO.8A PARTHASARATHY STREET

AYANAVARAM CHENNAI-600 023.

Prayer

Directing the 2nd and 3rd respondent in the light of the roceedings of the 1st respondent in Letters Nos.17986/x.2/2011-4 dated 04.07.2011 and 18229/x.2/2011-1 dated 11.07.2011 and to enquire into and dispose of the representations of the petitioner dated 02.06.2011 and 28.06.2011 within a time to be fixed by this Honourable Court

WP.No.20550/2011

1 JAI SRINIVASA VIDHYALA NURSERY [PETITIONER] AND PRIMARY SCHOOL REP.BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

K.DHANASEKARAN SOOLAI P.P.GARDENS

VEERAPPAN CHATRAM (PO) ERODE-638 004. ERODE DIST.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REP.BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-600 009.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order passed by the 1st Respondent dated 27.05.2011 made in CC No.12011 and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the fees determined by them for the Academic Year 2011-12 to 2013-14

WP.20551/2011

1 M.C.S.VIDHIYALAYA NURSERY AND [PETITIONER] PRIMARY SCHOOL REP.BY ITS CORRESPONDENT M.C.

SUBRAMANIAM 1ST STREET M.C.S.TOWER NO.143

RAJAKADU 1ST STREET ERODE-638 001 ERODE DIST.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REP.BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-600 009.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order passed by the 1st Respondent dated 27.05.2011 made in CC No.12115 and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the fees determined by them for the Academic Year 2011-12 to 2013-14

WP.No.20596/2011.

1 SRI SARADHA MEMORIAL MATRIC [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL REP. BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MR.K.K.RAJAGOPALAN

NARASINGAPURAM-PALANIAPURI ROAD

NARASINGAPURAM PO ATHUR TK SALEM DT-636 108.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS MEMBER

SECRETARY P.T.A.BUILDING D.P.I.CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS GOVT. OF TAMIL NADU D.P.I.CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records in respect of the impugned order passed by the 1st respondent vide its order dated 27.5.2011 in respect of the petitioner school (13323) and quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to reconsider and refix a revised fee structure taking into consideration of the relevant factors and in commensuration with the actual per capita expenditure incurred by the petitioner school for three consecutive Academic Years from 2010-2011 after affording a reasonable opportunity of being heard within the time frame as may be fixed by this Honourable Court

WP.No.20597/2011

1 CATHY MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL(08462) REP. BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MRS.RA.PONNYDHEVI KURINJI

NAGAR NARAYANAPURAM RESERVE LINE MADURAI

& DISTRICT-625 014.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS MEMBER

SECRETARY P.T.A.BUILDING D.P.I.CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS GOVT. OF TAMIL NADU D.P.I.CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records in respect of the impugned order passed by the 1st respondent vide its order dated 3.6.2011 in respect of the petitioner school (08462) and quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to reconsider and refix a revised fee structure taking into consideration of the relevant factors and in commensuration with the actual per capita expenditure incurred by the petitioner school for three consecutive Academic Years from 2010-2011 after affording a reasonable opportunity of being heard within the time frame as may be fixed by this Honourable Court

WP.No.20605/11.

1 KALAIMAGAL MATRIC HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL KALKURICHI BELUKURICHI

NAMAKKAL DISTRICT 637 402 REP BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MR.P. DURAI MURUGAN

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION

DEPT. FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

CEO CAMPUS NAMAKKAL

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records comprised in the order made in C.C. No. 14080 dt 3.6.2011 on the file of the 3rd respondent imposing directions for collection of fees by the petitioner School and quash the same and consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the petitioners School in the matter of collection of fees from its students

WP.No.20606/11

1 KALAIMAGAL NURSERY AND [PETITIONER] PRIMARY SCHOOL PALLIPATTY
BELUKURICHI

NAMAKKAL DISTRICT 637 402 REP BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MR.P. DURAI MURUGAN

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
EDUCATION

DEPT. FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

CEO CAMPUS NAMAKKAL

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records comprised in the order made in C.C. No. 14015 dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 3rd respondent imposing directions for collection of fees by the petitioner School and quash the same and consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the petitioners School in the matter of collection of fees from its students

WP.20858/2011

1 GREEN PARK MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL POSTAL
NAGAR

BODHUPATTY POST NALLIPALAYAM VIA NAMAKKAL

DISTRICT-637 003 REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

MR.S.P.N.SHARAVANAN

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENT] REP. BY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

CEO CAMPUS NAMAKKAL.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records comprised in the order made in No.14072 dated 3.6.2011 on the file of the 3rd respondent imposing directions for collection of fees by the petitioner school and quash the same and consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the petitioner school in the matter of collection of fees from its students

WP.20859/2011

1 A.E.T. HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL [PETITIONER] APPAMASAMUTHIRAM NARASINGAPURAM POST ATTUR

TALUK SALEM DISTRICT-636 108 REP. BY ITS

SECRETARY MR.M.ARIVALAGAN

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

CEO CAMPUS NAMAKKAL.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records comprised in the order made in No.13284 dated 27.5.2011 on the file of the 3rd respondent imposing directions for collection of fees by the petitioner school and quash the same and consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the petitioner school in the matter of collection of fees from its students

WP.No.20869/11

1 MEPCO SCHLENK MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HR. SEC. SCHOOL REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MR.

D. SINGARAVEL MARAVANKULAM THIRUMANGALAM

625 706 MADURAI

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

2 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT

ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

3 THE INSPECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS MADURAI

Prayer

to call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in proceedings NIL dt 3.6.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent and without jurisdiction

WP.No.20870/2011

1 MEPCO SCHLENK NURSERY AND [PETITIONER] PRIMARY SCHOOL REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MR.

D. SINGARAVEL 333/1 MADURAI ROAD

THIRUMANGALAM 625 706

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

2 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT

ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

3 THE INSPECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS MADURAI

Prayer

to call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in proceedings NIL dt 27.5.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent and without jurisdiction

WP.No.21025/2011

1 KONGU NATIONAL MATRIC. HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL NANJANAPURAM

KATHIRAMPATTI (POST) ERODE-638107 ERODE

DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

4 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order dated 27/05/2011 Ref.C.C.No.12105 passed by the 1st respondent and quash the same

WP.No.21026/2011

1 JAYCEES MATRIC. HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL MOOLAPALAYAM
ERODE-638004

ERODE DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION
COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order dated 27/05/2011 Ref.C.C.No.12128 passed by the 1st respondent and quash the same

WP.No.21027/2011

1 VIDYA NIKETAN NURSERY AND [PETITIONER] PRIMARY SCHOOL 32 KOTHUKARAR
STREET

PERIYAVALASU ERODE-638004 ERODE DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order passed by the 1st Respondent dated 27/05/2011 made in C.C.No.12290 and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the fees determined by them for the Academic Year 2011-12 to 2013-14

WP.No.21028/2011

1 BRINDAVAN NURSERY AND PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT K.

EASWARAMURTHY NO.374 SURAMPATTI VALASU

ROAD PALAYAPALAYAM ERODE-638009 ERODE DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order passed by the 1st Respondent dated 27/05/2011 made in C.C.No.12092 and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the fees determined by them for the Academic Year 2011-12 to 2013-14

WP.No.21049/2011

1 MOUNT CHRISTIAN MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL REP.
BY ITS

PRINCIPAL MRS. MARY VASANTHA KUMARI

ABRAMHAM STREET ADAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-88.

Vs

1 PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REPRESENTED BY
ITS

SPECIAL OFFICER DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD

CHENNAI-6.

2 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

CHENGAZHUNEERODAI ST. KANCHEEPURAM-631501.

Prayer

To call for the records connected with the issue of the impugned order dated 27.05.2011 issued by the 1st respondent quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to determine afresh the fees for the petitioner school in accordance with law

WP.No.21096/2011

1 NATIONAL MATRICULATION HIGH [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP.BY ITS TREASURER
V.M.SUKUMAR

VARATTAMPATTI KADIRIPURAM POST

KAVERIPATTINAM-635 112 KRISHNAGIRI DIST.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEES [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP.BY ITS
SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI COMPLEX CHENNAI-

600 006.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in order dated 27.05.2011 passed under section 6(4) of Act 22 of 2009 and quash the same and further directed the 1st respondent to consider the objections raised by the petitioner dated 15.03.2011 regarding fixing the fees and any other order as this Honble Court

WP.No.21097/2011

1 VIVEKALAYA MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL (FUNDED & MANAGED BY THE
AISHWARYAPRAHALAD (REGD) TRUST) REP. BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MRS. PREMA RAO 1602 TRICHY

ROAD COIMBATORE-641018.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENT] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION
COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-9.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REP. BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the First Respondent dated 27.05.2011 quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner school and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the fees fixed by the petitioner for the academic years 2011-2012 and 2012-2013

WP.No.21111/2011

1 SRI RAGAVENDRA HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL REP.BY ITS
CORRESPONDENT C.

SELVAN 18 KARATTUR ROAD SATHYAMANGALAM

ERODE (DT)-638402.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTs] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION
COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

To call for the records of the Respondent in order dated 27.05. 2011 passed by the Respondent and quash the
same after taking into consideration all the factors as mentioned in the affidavit

WP.No.21112/2011

1 SARATHA HIGHER SECONDARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP.BY ITS CORRESPONDENT G.P.

PERUMALSAMY 3 PUGALENTHI STREET

GOBICHETTIPALAYAM ERODE DISTRICT-638 452.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION
COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

To call for the records of the Respondent in order dated 27.05. 2011 passed by the Respondent and quash the
same after taking into consideration all the factors as mentioned in the affidavit

WP.No.21113/2011

1 SARATHA MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL REP.BY ITS
CORRESPONDENT G.

P.PERUMALSAMY 3 PUGALENTHI STREET

GOBICHETTIPALAYAM ERODE DISTRICT-638 452.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

To call for the records of the Respondent in order dated 27.05.2011 passed by the Respondent and quash the same after taking into consideration all the factors as mentioned in the affidavit

WP.No.21114/2011

1 SRI RAGAVENDRA MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP.BY ITS CORRESPONDENT C.SELVAN

KARATTUR ROAD SATHYAMANGALAM ERODE (DT)-

638 402.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

To call for the records of the Respondent in order dated 27.05.2011 passed by the Respondent and quash the same after taking into consideration all the factors as mentioned in the affidavit

WP.No.21115/2011

1 SHREE GURUKULAM HIGHER [PETITIONERS] SECONDARY SCHOOL REP.BY ITS PRINCIPAL DR.K.

R.RANGARAJ 33 KONDAMUTHANUR

ARIYAPPAMPALAYAM (POST) SATHYAMANGALAM-638

401 ERODE DIST.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENT] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

To call for the records of the Respondent in order dated 27.05.2011 passed by the Respondent and quash the same after taking into consideration all the factors as mentioned in the affidavit

WP.No.21177/2011

1 KONGU VIDHYALAYA MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL SCHOOL NO.12245 420-A
VAKKIL

THOTTAM MANICKAM PALAYAM ERODE DT

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION
COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

2 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP BY ITS SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

4 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

Prayer

to call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in proceedings Nil dt 27.5.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent and without jurisdiction

WP.No.21183/2011

1 SHRI GANGA MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL (12130) REP.BY ITS AUTHORISED

SIGNATORY A.NATARAJAN THE PRESIDENT THE

GANGA EDUCATIONAL AND WELFARE TRUST

NALLIGOUNDANPALAYAM ERODE DIST.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

To call for the records on the file of the respondent in proceedings nil dated 27.05.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent and without jurisdiction

WP.No.21288/2011

1 AVALPOONDURAI LIONS MATRIC [PETITIONER] HR. SEC. SCHOOL REP BY CORRESPONDENT

PALANIGOUNDAN VALASU AVALPOONDURAI ERODE DT

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

2 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP BY ITS SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

4 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

Prayer

to call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in proceedings Nil dt 27.5.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent and without jurisdiction

WP.No.21305/2011

1 HOLY TRINITY MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL NO.127/58
RAMASAMY STREET

NO.25/13 NAINIAPPAN STREET MANNADY

CHENNAI-1 REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION
COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGEROAD

CHENNAI-6.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

To call for the records relating to the impugned order of the first respondent passed in No.31158 dated 27.5.2011 and to quash the same as illegal and consequently to direct the respondents herein to consider the objections raised by the petitioner regarding the fixation of fee for the Standards I to XII within the time as stipulated by this Honourable High Court

WP.No.21328/2011

1 BHARATHIYA VIDYA MANDIR MAT. [PETITIONERS] HR.SEC.SCHOOL REP BY ITS
CORRESPONDENT MRS.

SHANTHA S. KALINGARAYAR NALLAPPA NAGAR

POLLACHI 642002 COIMBATORE DISTRICT

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENT] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION
COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

2 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

4 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records relating to the order passed by the 1st respondent dt 27.5.2011 made in CC No. 11276 and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the fees determined by them for the Academic Year 2011-12 to 2013-14

WP.No.21330/2011

1 UNION CHRISTIAN MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL REP.BY ITS

PRINCIPAL MRS.ANNA EAPEN P.B.2591 NO.33

NOWROJI ROAD CHETPET CHENNAI-600 031.

Vs

1 PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP.BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-

600 006.

2 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

PANAGAL BUILDING ANNA SALAI SAIDAPET

CHENNAI-600 015.

3 STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP.BY ITS SECRETARY EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-600 009.

Prayer

To call for the records connected with the issue of the impugned order dated 03.06.2011 issued by the 1st respondent quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to determine afresh the fees for the petitioner school in accordance with law

WP.No.21361/2011

1 SARASWATHI MAT. HR. SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL KOLLIDAM SIRKALI TK REP BY ITS
CORRESPONDENT MR.K.SEKAR D.NO.213
KODAKKARAMOOLAI POST SIRKALI TK
NAGAPATTINAM DT

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS
SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records from the 1st respondent dt 27.5.2011 relating to the petitioner namely Saraswathi Matriculation Higher Secondary School Kollidam Sirkali Taluk and to quash the same and further direct the 1st respondent to consider the objections raised by the petitioner dt 31.5.2010 regarding fixation of fee

WP.No.21362/2011

1 SRINIVASA MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] 407 MAIN ROAD KOLLIDAM SIRKALI
TK REP BY

ITS SECRETARY MR.G. MURUGESAN NO.85

MANGARAMPATTU SIRKALI TK NAGAPATTINAM DT

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS
SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records from the 1st respondent dt 27.5.2011 relating to the petitioner namely Srinivasa Matriculation School No. 407 Main Road Kollidam Sirkali Taluk and to quash the same and further direct the 1st respondent to consider the objections raised by the petitioner dt 21.5.2010 regarding fixation of fee

WP.No.21383/2011

1 JOTHI MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL REP.BY ITS

PRINCIPAL V.SAKTHIMANI 3/44 V.O.C.NAGAR

KAMARAJ NAGAR COLONY POST AMMAPET SALEM-

636 014.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

To call for the records of the Respondent in order dated 27.05.2011 passed by the 1st Respondent and quash the same after taking into consideration all the factors as mentioned in the above paragraphs

WP.NO.21384/2011

1 WISDOM GATES MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL REP.BY ITS

PRINCIPAL R.KOKILAVANI 3/44 V.O.C.NAGAR

KAMARAJ NAGAR COLONY POST AMMAPET SALEM-

636 014.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

To call for the records of the Respondent in order dated 27.05.2011 passed by the 1st Respondent and quash the same after taking into consideration all the factors as mentioned in the above paragraphs

WP.No.21451/2011

1 NATIONAL HIGHER SECONDARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY ITS SECRETARY-CUM-CORRESPONDENT MRS. AMUDHA ELANGOVAN

VARATTAMPATTI KADIRIPURAM POST

KAVERIPATTINAM-635112 KRISHNAGIRI DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEES [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI COMPLEX CHENNAI-6.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in order dated 27.5.2011 passed under section 6(4) of Act 22 of 2009 and quash the same and further directed the 1st respondent to consider the objections raised by the petitioner dated 15.3.2011 regarding fixing the fees

WP.No.21528/2011

1 HUSSAIN MEMORIAL MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL NO.6 NAINIYAMMAL

STREET KRISHNAPURAM AMBATTUR CHENNAI-53

REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT BRIGADIER (RETD) M.

I.HUSSAIN

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order dated 3.6.2011 Ref. 30536 passed by the first respondent and quash the same and all consequential proceedings

WP.No.21561/2011

1 YENNARKAY R.RAVINDRAN [PETITIONER] THILAGAVATHY VIDHYASALA
MATRICULATION HR.

SEC. SCHOOL REP. BY CORSPNT N.R.K.R.

RAVINDRAN CHAIRMAN A.R.ARUNACHALAM RD

POOTHAAYAMMAL NAGAR SIVAKASI.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION
COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

VIRUDHUNAGAR.

Prayer

To call for the records on the file of the 1st Respondent in proceedings NIL dt. 27.05.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent and without jurisdiction

WP.No.21598/2011

1 VIVEKANANDA MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL (21217)
REP. BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MR.K.V.RADHAKRISHNAN

THENPATHI SIRKALI NAGAPATTINAM DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS MEMBER

SECRETARY P.T.A.BUILDING D.P.I CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS GOVT. OF TAMIL NADU D.P.I CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records in respect of the impugned order passed by the 1st respondent vide its order dated 27.5.2011 in respect of the petitioner School (21217) and quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised Fee Structure taking into consideration of the relevant factors and in commensuration with the actual per capita expenditure incurred by the petitioner school for three consecutive academic years from 2010-2011 after affording a reasonable opportunity of being heard within the time frame as may be fixed by this Honourable Court

WP.No.21630/2011

1 SRT UNIVERSAL MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL (12189) REP. BY ITS SECRETARY &

CORRESPONDENT MRS.J.RAJALAKSHMI SRT GARDEN

METTUPALAYAM ROAD KONAMOOLOI POST ERODE

DISTRICT-638402.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-9.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REP. BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the First Respondent dated 27.05.2011 quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner school and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the fees fixed by the petitioner for the academic years 2011-2012 and 2012-2013

WP.No.21644/11

1 SIR SIVASWAMI KALALAYA HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL NO.30 WEST CIRCULAR ROAD

MANDAVELI CHENNAI-28 REP. BY ITS SECRETARY

DR. (SMT.) VATHSALA NARAYANASWAMI.

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE SPECIAL OFFICER

PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 2nd Respondent relating to the impugned order dated 03.06.2011 passed by the 2nd respondent and the fee determined in respect of the Petitioner School and quash the said order and consequentially direct the Respondents to forbear from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the Petitioner School in the matter of collection of fees from its students

WP.No.21646/2011

1 KATHIRAVAN MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL K.V.R.NAGAR

MANGALAM ROAD TIRUPPUR-641 604 REP. BY ITS

SECRETARY N.NARAYANAMOORTHY

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOL COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCSTION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records from the 1st respondent relating to the impugned order dated 27.5.2011 passed under Sec.6(4) of the Act 22 of 2009 relating to the petitioner namely Kathiravan Matriculation Higher Secondary School (33310) K.V.R.Nagar Mangalam Road Tiruppur-641 604 quash the same and further direct the 1st respondent to consider the Written Submissions made by the petitioner dated 24.3.2011 regarding fixation of fee

WP.No.21679/2011

1 KATHIRAVAN MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL POOMALUR PALLADAM ROAD MANGALAM

TIRUPUR 641 663 REP BY ITS SECRETARY N.

NARAYANAMOORTHY

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

2 THE DIRECTOR OF ELEMENTARY

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOL COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records from the 1st respondent relating to the impugned order dt 27.5.2011 passed under sec. 6 (4) of Act 22 of 2009 relating to the petitioner namely Kathiravan Matriculation School (33213) Poomalur Palladam Road Mangalam Tirupur 641 663 quash the same and further direct the 1st respondent to consider the written submissions made by the petitioner dt 24.3.2011 regarding fixation of fee

WP.No.22050/2011

1 ZION MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

DR.N.VIJAYAN GANAPATHY NAGAR MADAMBAKKAM

CHENNAI-126 KANCHEEPURAM DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL

EDUCATION DEPT. FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the first respondent Committee and the order passed by the first respondent Committee dated 27.05.2011 and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner school and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the Tuition Fees fixed by the petitioner school for the academic year 2010-2011

WP.No.22051/2011

1 ZION MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT DR.N.VIJAYAN 1ST

MAIN ROAD THIRUMALAI NAGAR CHENNAI-126

KANCHEEPURAM DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL

EDUCATION DEPT. FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the first respondent Committee and the order passed by the first respondent Committee dated 27.05.2011 and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner school and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the Tuition Fees fixed by the petitioner school for the academic year 2010-2011

WP.No.22052/2011

1 MODEL MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL REPRESENTED BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MRS.MARY MATHEW NO.15

THANDAVARAYA STREET TONDIARPET CHENNAI-21.

Vs

1 PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REPRESENTED BY ITS

SPECIAL OFFICER DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD

CHENNAI-6.

2 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

PANAGAL BUILDING ANNA SALAI SAIDAPET

CHENNAI-15.

3 STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

Prayer

To call for the records connected with the issue of the impugned order dated 03.06.2011 issued by the 1st respondent quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to determine afresh the fees for the petitioner school in accordance with law

WP.No.22054/2011

1 NATIONAL MODEL MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL
KALLOORI NAGAR

PEELAMEDU COIMBATORE-641004 REP. BY ITS

SECRETARY P.MOHAN CHANDAR.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTs] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS
SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOL COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6. Prayer

Calling for the records from the 1st Respondent relating to the impugned order dt. 27/05/2011 passed under Sec.6(4) of Act 22 of 2009 relating to the petitioner namely National Model Matriculation Higher Secondary School (11329) Kalloori Nagar Peelamedu Coimbatore-641004 quash the same and further direct the 1st Respondent to consider the written submissions made by the petitioner dt. 17/03/2011 regarding fixation of fee

WP.No.22093/2011

1 KAMALA SUBRAMANIAM [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL
(23355) PUDUKOTTAI ROAD MATHAKOTTAI

PILLAYARPATTI PANCHAYAT THANJAVUR DISTRICT

REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTs] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS
SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 1st respondent relating to the impugned order dated 03.06.2011 and made under Sec.6(4) of Act 22 of 2009 concerning the petitioner institution and to quash the same and consequently direct the 1st respondent to fix the fees by considering the objections raised by the petitioner on 22.3.2011 after giving adequate opportunity to the petitioner

WP.No.22124/2011

1 SHREE VIDYALAYA MATRIC HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL REPRESENTED BY ITS

SECRETARY MRS.KOTHAI SREEDHAR 123 VAIKKAL

ROAD GOBICHETTIPALAYAM ERODE DISTRICT-638452.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENT] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

To call for the records of the Respondent in order dated 03.06.2011 passed by the Respondent and quash the same after taking into consideration all the factors as mentioned in the above paragraphs

WP.No.22140/2011

1 ST. XAVIER NURSERY AND PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT Y.RAVI

DANIEL RAJ D.NO.40 KALTHOZHILALAR STREET

BHAVANI (POST)-638301 ERODE DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENT] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order passed by the 1st Respondent dated 27/05/2011 made in C.C.No.12076 and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the fees determined by them for the Academic Year 2011-12 to 2013-14

W.P.No.22141 of 2011

1 SRI PARIYUR AMMAN NURSERY AND [PETITIONER] PRIMARY SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT P.

SIVAKUMAR MAIN ROAD THUKANAICKENPALAYAM

GOBICHETTIPALAYAM-638506 ERODE DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTs] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

Calling for the records relating to the order passed by the 1st Respondent dated 27/05/2011 made in C.C.No.12144 and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the fees determined by them for the Academic Year 2011-12 to 2013-14

W.P.22223 of 2011

1 NALANDA MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] (N23332) THIRUMANGALAKKOTTAI
KEEZHAIYUR

ORATHANAD (TALUK)-614905 THANJAVUR

(DISTRICT) REP.BY ITS MRS.K.BABY SAROJA

CORRESPONDENT

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENT s] REP.BY THE ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.

GEORGE CHENNAI-600 009.

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL OF

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-
600 006.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE
ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 27.05.2011 made in order No.Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents and permit the Writ Petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee

W.P.No.22224 OF 2011

1 SRI KRISHNA MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL (23334) URANIPURAM
ORATHANADU

TALUK THANJAVUR DISTRICT-614 631 REP.BY

ITS CORRESPONDENT M.KAMARAJ

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTs] REP.BY THE ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.

GEORGE CHENNAI-600 009.

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL OF

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-

600 006.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 27.05.2011 made in order No.Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents and permit the Writ Petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee

W.P.No.22235 OF 2011

1 NAV BHARATH MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL (23289) T.M.C. ROAD THANJAVUR-
613004 REPRESENTED BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MR.

D.J.JOHNSON.

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENT s] REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY TO
GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.

GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-

6.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 03.06.2011 in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents to permit the Writ Petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee

W.P.No.22263 OF 2011

1 LITTLE ROSE MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL (23344) 55/G THIRUVONAM ROAD

ORTHANADU THANJAVUR-614625 REPRESENTED BY

ITS CORRESPONDENT MR.K.VEERAMANI.

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.

GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-

6.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 27.05.2011 made in order No.Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents to permit the Writ Petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee

W.P.No.22395 OF 2011

1 SRI PARIYUR AMMAN HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL MAIN ROAD

THUCKANAICKENPALAYAM GOBICHETTIPALAYAM 638

506 ERODE DIST.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6

2 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP.BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6

4 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6

Prayer

calling for the records relating to the order dated 27.5.2011 Ref.C.C.No.12023 passed by the first respondent and quash the same and all consequential proceedings

W.P.No.22419 OF 2011

1 LITTLE BIRD MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL (23351) 335 BHARATHI SALAI

KARRIKKADU PATTUKOTTAI POST AND TALUK REP.

BY ITS MR.P.MYVANNAN CORRESPONDENT

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP.BY THE ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.

GEORGE CHENNAI-9

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL OF

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6

Prayer

calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 27.5.2011 made in order No.Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents and permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school ad submitted to the Committee

W.P.No.22420 OF 2011

1 MORNING STAR MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL (23253) NO.2667
RAJAGOPALASAMY

KOIL STREET THANJAVUR 613 009 REP.BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT K.P.ARIVANANTHAM

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP.BY THE ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.

GEORGE CHENNAI-9

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL OF

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6

Prayer

calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 27.5.2011 made in order No.Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents and permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school ad submitted to the Committee

W.P.No.22421 OF 2011

1 GNANAM MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SEC. SCHOOL (2333661) 20/1271
KANARAJAR ST

EAST GATE THANJAVUR 613001 REP.BY ITS K.

PANNEERSELVAM CORRESPONDENT

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP.BY THE ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.

GEORGE CHENNAI-9

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL OF

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6

Prayer

calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 03.06.2011 made in order No.Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents and permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school ad submitted to the Committee

W.P.No.22513 OF 2011

1 CHENGALRAYAN CO-OPERATIVE [PETITIONER] SUGAR MILLS MATRIC SCHOOL REP. BY ITS

ADMINISTRATOR/ DISTRICT REVENUE OFFICER THE

PRESIDENT PERIYASEVALAI VILLUPURAM

DISTRICT-607 209.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

D.P.I.CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REP. BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRIC

SCHOOLS D.P.I.CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 1st respondent dated 27.5.2011 in respect of the petitioner School and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st respondent to fix the fee structure taking into account the details furnished by the petitioner in the Appeal dated 17.03.2011

W.P.No.22697 OF 2011

1 THE CORRESPONDENT [PETITIONER] SREE RAMA KRISHNA BALA VIDHYA
MATRICULATION

HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL PADANILAM

KULASEKHARAM 629 161 KANYAKUMARI DT

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS REP BY ITS SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL
EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

3 THE CHAIRMAN

PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPLEX COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for records relating to the impugned determination of fee by the 3rd respondent Committee for the petitioner school vide proceeding dt 27.5.2011 quash the same and further direct the respondents to permit the petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the statement of fees as submitted by the petitioner to the 3rd respondent Committee dt 25.5.2010

W.P.No.22706 OF 2011

1 MOUNT CARMEL MATRIC HR.SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL ADIRAMPATTINAM ROAD
PATTUKOTTAI 614

602 THANJAVUR DT REP BY ITS MRS.SWAMI DOSS

CHELLIAH CORRESPONDENT

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT DEPT.
OF

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL OF

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD REP BY ITS SPECIAL OFFICER CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the 3rd respondent dt 3.6.2011 made in order No. Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents to permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school submitted to the Committee

W.P.No.22707 OF 2011

1 C.P.VIDYA MANDIR HR.SEC.SCHOOL [PETITIONER] (N23370) 170-172 A.R.R.ROAD
KUMBAKONAM 612

001 REP BY ITS MR.P. CHIDAMBARANATHAN

CORRESPONDENT

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENT S] REP BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT DEPT.
OF

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL OF

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD REP BY ITS SPECIAL OFFICER CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the 3rd respondent dt 27.5.2011 in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents to permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school submitted to the Committee

W.P.No.22708 OF 2011

1 KASILINGAM MAT. SCHOOL [PETITIONER] (N23331) SIVAPARVATHI GARDEN PAPPANAD(P.O)

ORATHANAD (TK) THANJAVUR (DT) 614626 REP

BY ITS MR.S. PARAMASIVAM CORRESPONDENT

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT DEPT. OF

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL OF

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD REP BY ITS SPECIAL OFFICER CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the 3rd respondent dt 27.5.2011 made in order No. Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents to permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school submitted to the Committee

W.P.No.22717 OF 2011

1 SARASWATHI MATRIC HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL NO.

20 THIRU VI.KA STREET VILLUPURAM-605 602

VILLUPURAM DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT [RESPONDENTS] EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL

NADU FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the second respondent in order dated NIL issued by the second respondent in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the request made to the Committee

W.P.No.22842 OF 2011

1 S.K.V. HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL [PETITIONER] MANIYANOOR POST
CHITTHALANATHUR (VIA)

NAMAKKAL DISTRICT-637201 REPRESENTED BY ITS

SECRETARY MR.PONNIMANI @ K.SUBRAMANIAM.

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY TO
GOVERNMENT

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI-9.

2 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

CEO CAMPUS NAMAKKAL.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records comprised in the order made in No.14129 dated 3.6.2011 on the file of the 3rd respondent imposing directions for collection of fees by the petitioner School and quash the same and consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the Petitioner School in the matter of collection of fees from its students

W.P.No.22843 OF 2011

1 S.K.V. MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] MANIYANOR KANDAMPALAYAM
MANIYANOR POST

CHITTHALANATHUR (VIA) NAMAKKAL DISTRICT-

637201 REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY MR.

PONNIMANI @ K.SUBRAMANIAM.

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY TO
GOVERNMENT

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI-9.

2 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

CEO CAMPUS NAMAKKAL.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records comprised in the order made in No.14133 dated 27.5.2011 on the file of the 3rd respondent imposing directions for collection of fees by the petitioner School and quash the same and consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the Petitioner School in the matter of collection of fees from its students

W.P.No.23007 OF 2011

1 VIDYASREE BRINTHAVAN NURSERY & [PETITIONER] PRIMARY SCHOOL REP BY ITS
PRINCIPAL TMT.K.S.

BHANUMATHI D.NO.9 11 13 SADHASIVAM ST

BACKSIDE TO COOPTEX GOBI GOBICHETTIPALAYAM

638 452 ERODE DT

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

2 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order passed by the 1st respondent dt 27.5.2011 made in CC No. 12046 and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the fees determined by them for the Academic Year 2011-12 to 2013-14

W.P.No.23210 OF 2011

1 ANJUMAN MAT. HR. SEC. SCHOOL [PETITIONER] (23281) NO.30-E STATION ROAD AYYAMPET

614201 THANJAVUR DT REP BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MR.A. MOHAMED IBRAHIM B.E

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT DEPT. OF

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL OF

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI6

Prayer

calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the 3rd respondent dt 3.6.2011 made in order No.Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents and permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee

W.P.No.23213 OF 2011

1 IMAM SHAFI MATRIC HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL (23362) PATTUKOTTAI ROAD

ADIRAMPATTINAM 614 701 THANJAVUR DT

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

to call for the records relating to the impugned order of the 1st respondent herein dt 3.6.2011 under sec. 6 (4) of Act 22 of 2009 and to quash the same as illegal and consequently permit the petitioner to enhance the existing fee by a minimum of 75% over and above the already existing fee structure charged for the year 2009-10

W.P.No.23238 of 2011

1 SHRI VINAYAGA NURSERY AND [PETITIONER] PRIMARY SCHOOL (14211) REP. BY CORRES S.

BALASUBRAMANIAM PILLANATHAM PO

KUMARAMANGALAM VIA TIRUCHENGODE NAMAKKAL

DISTRICT-637 205

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

CHENNAI-2.

Prayer

To call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in proceedings NIL dated 27.05.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent

W.P.No.23239 OF 2011

1 SHRI VINAYAGA HIGHER SECONDARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL (14188) REP. BY CORRES S.

BALASUBRAMANIAM PILLANATHAM PO

KUMARAMANGALAM VIA TIRUCHENGODE NAMAKKAL

DISTRICT-637 205

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

CHENNAI-2.

Prayer

To call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in proceedings NIL dated 27.05.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent

W.P.No.23240 OF 2011

1 SHRI VIDYA MANDI MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL (14081) REP. BY

CORRES MR.A.S.SATHIYANATHAN GURUSAMIPALAYAM

RASIPURAM TALUK NAMAKKAL DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

CHENNAI-2.

Prayer

To call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in proceedings NIL dated 27.05.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent

W.P.No.23281 OF 2011

1 KARTHIGEYAN MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL NO.55/16A ARUNACHALAM ROAD

SALIGRAMAM CHENNAI 93 REP BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MRS. A. GOMATHI BAI

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOL COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for records on the file of the 1st respondent dt 27.5.2011 passed under sec. 6(4) of Act 22/2009 relating to the petitioner School namely Karthikeyan Matriculation School (31598) No.55/16A Arunachalam Road Saligramam Chennai 93 and quash the same and direct the respondents to approve the fee structure in terms of the statement of fee as submitted by the petitioner school to the Committee dt 28.2.2011 with proportionate increase for ensuring three academic years

W.P.No.23282 OF 2011

1 KARTHIGEYAN MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HR. SEC. SCHOOL NO.12/84 ARCOT ROAD
VADAPALANI CHENNAI 26 REP BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MRS. A. GOMATHI BAI

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS
SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOL COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for records on the file of the 1st respondent dt 3.6.2011 passed under sec. 6(4) of Act 22/2009 relating to the petitioner School namely Karthikeyan Matriculation Higher Secondary School (31376) No.12/84 Arcot Road Vadapalani Chennai 26 and quash the same and direct the respondents to approve the fee structure in terms of the statement of fee as submitted by the petitioner school to the Committee dt 24.4.2011 with proportionate increase for ensuring three academic years

W.P.No.23283 OF 2011

1 VADAPALANI MAT. HR.SEC.SCHOOL [PETITIONER] NO.25 VENGEESWARAR NAGAR 1 ST
MAIN ROAD

VADAPALANI CHENNAI 26 REP BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MRS. A. GOMATHI BAI

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS
SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOL COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for records on the file of the 1st respondent dt 3.6.2011 passed under sec. 6(4) of Act 22/2009 relating to the petitioner School namely Vadapalani Matriculation Higher Secondary School (31315) No.25 Vengeeswarar Nagar Vadapalani Chennai 26 and quash the same and direct the respondents to approve the fee structure in terms of the statement of fee as submitted by the petitioner school to the Committee dt 26.4.2011 with proportionate increase for ensuring three academic years

W.P.No.23318 OF 2011

1 SENGUNTHAR MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL REP. BY ITS

SECRETARY-CUM-CORRESPONDENT S.P.KANDASAMY

MUDALIAR THARAMANGALAM-636 502 OMALUR TK.

SALEM DIST.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER P.T.A. BUILDING DPI CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

2 THE DIRECTOR OFF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS GOVT. OF TAMILNADU DPI CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records in respect of the impugned order passed by the 1st Respondent vide its order dated 27.05.2011 in respect of the Petitioner School (13341) and quash the same and direct the 1st Respondent to reconsider and refix a revised fee structure taking into consideration of the relevant factors and in commensurate with the actual per capita expenditure incurred by the Petitioner School for three consecutive academic years from 2010-2011 after affording a reasonable opportunity of being heard within the time frame as may be fixed by this Honble Court.

W.P.No.23321 OF 2011

1 SRI SANKARA VIDAYALAYA [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL SRI

SANKARA NAGAR PAMMAL CHENNAI-600 075

KANCHEEPURAM DIST. REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

S.VISVANANTHAN.

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

ANNA SALAI CHENNAI-600 002.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order dated 03.06.2011 passed by the First Respondent in CC.No.29527 and quash the same.

W.P.No.23423 OF 2011

1 ST.ANTONY MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL
NEEDAMANDALAM MAIN

ROAD SAKKOTTAI PO. KUMBAKONAM TK. REP. BY

ITS MS.I.MARIA SELVAM CORRESPONDENT.

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY ITS SECRETSARY TO GOVT.
DEPARTMENT

OF SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI-600 009.

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL OF

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-

600 006.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the Third Respondent dated 03.06.2011 made in order No. Nil in respect of the Petitioner School and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd Respondents and permit the Writ Petition to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee.

W.P.No.23498 OF 2011

1 SRI SAKTHI VIDHYA NIKETHAN [PETITIONER] MATRIC.HR.SEC.SCHOOL (12099)
CHENNIMALAI

ROAD RANGAM PALAYAM ERODE DIST.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION
COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

2 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP.BY ITS SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-

600 009.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

4 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

To call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in proceedings nil dated 27.05.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent and without jurisdiction

W.P.No.23597 OF 2011

1 GREEN FIELD CONVENT MAT. HR. [PETITIONER] SEC. SCHOOL PUDHUPAKKAM CHENNAI
67 REP BY

ITS CORRESPONDENT K.N. RANGANATHAN NO.12-D

PRASANTH APARTMENTS RAMA RAO ROAD MYLAPORE

CHENNAI 4

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION DEPT.

FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI

2 THE INSPECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS THIRUVALLUR AND DT

3 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL

OFFICER THIRUVALLUR AND DT

4 THE SPECIAL OFFICER

THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION

COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the 4th respondent relating to the impugned order dt 3.6.2011 determining the fee in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and further consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the petitioners school in the matter of collection of fees from its students

W.P.No.23598 OF 2011

1 VIVEKANANDA MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL NO.1/1899 SOLAI AMMAN KOIL MAIN ST

ARIGNAR NAGAR REDHILLS CHENNAI 52 REP BY

CORRESPONDENT N. MANIVANNAN REDHILLS

CHENNAI 52

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION DEPT.

FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI

2 THE INSPECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS THIRUVALLUR AND DT

3 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL

OFFICER THIRUVALLUR AND DT

4 THE SPECIAL OFFICER

THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION

COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI

6

Prayer

calling for the records of the 4th respondent relating to the impugned order dt 27.5.2011 determining the fee in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and further consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the petitioners school in the matter of collection of fees from its students

W.P.No.23599 OF 2011

1 BHARATH MAT. HR. SEC. SCHOOL [PETITIONER] T.H.ROAD KOKUMEDU VILLAGE PONNERI
REP BY

ITS CORRESPONDENT M.MANIVANNAN NO.1 AKBAR

ST NGO NAGAR PONNERI 601 204

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION
DEPT.

FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI

2 THE INSPECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS THIRUVALLUR AND DT

3 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL

OFFICER THIRUVALLUR AND DT

4 THE SPECIAL OFFICER

THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION

COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI

6

Prayer

calling for the records of the 4th respondent relating to the impugned order dt 3.6.2011 determining the fee in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and further consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the petitioners school in the matter of collection of fees from its students

W.P.No.23634 OF 2011

1 ELITE MAT. HR. SEC.SCHOOL [PETITIONER] 2/220 THILAGAR ST M.A. NAGAR REDHILLS

CHENNAI 52 REP BY CORRESPONDENT T.

GNANAPRAGASAM NO.185 BALAGANESA NAGAR

REDHILLS CHENNAI 52

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION DEPT.

FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI

2 THE INSPECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS THIRUVALLUR AND DT

3 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL

OFFICER THIRUVALLUR AND DT

4 THE SPECIAL OFFICER

THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION

COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI

6

Prayer

calling for the records of the 4th respondent relating to the impugned order dt 3.6.2011 determining the fee in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and further consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the petitioners school in the matter of collection of fees from its students

W.P.No.23636 OF 2011

1 CHILDRENS PARADISE MAT. HR. [PETITIONER] SEC. SCHOOL REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT R.

VIJAYA W/O.N.RAJAN NO.3/127A KAMBAR ST M.

A. NAGAR RED HILLS CHENNAI 52

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENT] THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION DEPT.

FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI

2 THE INSPECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS THIRUVALLUR AND DT

3 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL

OFFICER THIRUVALLUR AND DT

4 THE SPECIAL OFFICER

THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION

COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the 4th respondent relating to the impugned order dt 3.6.2011 determining the fee in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and further consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the petitioners school in the matter of collection of fees from its students

W.P.No.23651 OF 2011

1 ELITE MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] SIRUPUZHAI PETTAI GUMMIDIPOONDI THIRUVALLUR

DT 601 201 REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT T.

GNANAPRAGASAM NO.185 BALAGANESA NAGAR RED

HILLS CHENNAI 52

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION DEPT.

FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI

2 THE INSPECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS THIRUVALLUR AND DT

3 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL

OFFICER THIRUVALLUR AND DT

4 THE SPECIAL OFFICER

THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION

COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI

6

Prayer

calling for the records of the 4th respondent relating to the impugned order dt 3.6.2011 determining the fee in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and further consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the petitioners school in the matter of collection of fees from its students

W.P.No.23733 OF 2011

1 SRI AADHITHYA NURSERY AND [PETITIONER] PRIMARY SCHOOL REP.BY ITS CORRESPONDENT TMT.

G.SHYAMALA RAVIKUMAR NO.12 GANAPATHIPURAM

EXTENSION KARUNGALPALAYAM ERODE-638 003

ERODE TK & DIST.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REP.BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-600 009.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order passed by the 1st Respondent dated 27.05.2011 made in CC No.12224 and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the fees determined by them for the Academic year 2011-12 to 2013-14

W.P.No.23734 OF 2011

1 SHREE RAMAKRISHNAN NURSERY [PETITIONER] AND PRIMARY SCHOOL REP.BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

TMT.S.KARUNAIAMMAL PANDIAN STREET KATTUR

ROAD CHENNIMALAI-638 051 ERODE DIST.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REP.BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-600 009.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Directing the respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the fees determined by them for the Academic year 2011-12 to 2013-14 instead of insisting the petitioner school to collect the School Fees determined by the 1st respondent committee by considering the objections dated 27.07.2010

W.P.No.23771 OF 2011

1 SRINIVASA VIDHYALAYA [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL NO.

97A BALAKRISHNAN STREET GANDHI NAGAR

UDUMALPET REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT T.R.

RAVINDARAN.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT ST. GEORGE FORT CHENNAI.

2 PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS

CHAIRMAN PTA BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

To call for the records from the file of the 1st Respondent relating to the Srinivasa Vidhyalaya Matriculation Higher Secondary School (33348) order (Under Section 6(4) of Act 22 of 2009) dated 27.05.2011 and quash the same

W.P.No.23789 OF 2011

1 PERKS MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL 54 PERKS COMPLEX

UPPILIPALAYAM COIMBATORE-641015.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

To call for the records on the file of the respondent in proceedings nil dated 27.05.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent and without jurisdiction

W.P.No.23795 OF 2011

1 BHARATHI VIDHYALAYA MATRIC [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL
REPRESENTED BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MR.P.R.VELUMANI 44A KARATOOR

GOBICHETTIPALAYAM ERODE DISTRICT-638476.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENT] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION
COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

To call for the records of the Respondent in order dated 27.05.2011 passed by the Respondent and quash the same after taking into consideration all the factors as mentioned in the above paragraphs

W.P.No.23876 OF 2011

1 VIDYA MANDIR MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL BEHIND SRINIVASA THEATRE
AVINASHI

ROAD TIRUPUR 641 603 REPBY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MRS.V. JAYANTHI MALA

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS
SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOL COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records from the 1st respondent relating to the impugned order dt 27.5.2011 passed under sec. 6 (4) of Act 22 of 2009 relating to the petitioner namely Vidya Mandir Matriculation School (33239) Behind Srinivasa Theatre Avinashi Road Tirupur 641 603 quash the same and further direct the 1st respondent to consider the written submissions made by the petitioner dt 23.3.2011 regarding fixation of fee

W.P.No.23879 OF 2011

1 INFANT PRE-MATRIC HR. SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL NO.383/370

PERIYAR NAGAR SOUTH VRIDDHACHALAM 606 001.

CUDDALORE DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT [RESPONDENTS] EDUCATION DEPT. GOVT. OF TAMIL NADU FORT

ST. GEORGE CHENNAI 9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the 2nd respondent in order dt.27.05.2011 issued by the 2nd respondent in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the request made to the committee.

W.P.No.24142 OF 2011

1 SWAMY MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SEC. SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

KALYANIPURAM ENJAMPALLI-NATHAMEDU P.K.

VALASU PO-638 104 ERODE DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION D.P.I.COMPOUND CHENNAI-6.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY SPECIAL OFFICER

P.T.A.BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

4 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

ERODE.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 3rd respondent dated 27.5.2011 in fixing the fee for the petitioner school and to quash the same

W.P.No.24161 OF 2011

1 SRI VIJAY VIDYALAYA MATRIC.HR. [PETITIONER] SEC.SCHOOL REP.BY ITS CORRESPONDENT 93

RAYAKOTTA ROAD NEAR DISTRICT STADIUM

KRISHNAGIRI-635001.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP.BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT

ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-600 009.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION D.P.I.COMPOUND CHENNAI-600 006.

3 THE PVT.SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER P.T.A.BUILDING D.P.I.CAMPUS

CHENNAI-600 006.

4 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

KRISHNAGIRI.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 3rd Respondent dated 27.05.2011 in fixing the fee for the Petitioners school and to quash the same

W.P.No.24168 OF 2011

1 RELIANCE MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL (14184) REP.BY ITS

SECRETARY MRS.R.KARTHIKEYANI

KUPPANDAPALAYAM ERODE-8 NAMAKKAL DIST.

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY/ SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

CHENNAI-600 002.

To call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in proceedings nil dated 27.05.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent

W.P.No.24169 of 2011

1 SRI VANI MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL (14084) REP.BY ITS

SECRETARY MR.S.GUNASEKARAN THOPPAPPATTY

(PO) NAMAGIRIPET (VIA) RASIPURAM TALUK

NAMAKKAL DIST.

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY/ SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

CHENNAI-600 002.

Prayer

To call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in proceedings nil dated 27.05.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent

W.P.No.22485 OF 2011

1 THENI MELAPETTAI HINDU NADAR [PETITIONER] URAVINMURAI MATRICULATION HR.SEC.SCHOOL REP.

BY ITS SECRETARY K.P.R.BASKARAN P.B.NO.25

EDAMAL ST THENI-625 531 MUTHUVENPATTI

THENI DIST.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

2 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP.BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT

ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-600 009.

Prayer

To call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in proceedings No Nil dt.27.05.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent and without jurisdiction

W.P.No.24303 OF 2011

1 BHARATHI VIDYA MANDIR [PETITIONER] SANJEEVI EDUCATIONAL TRUST NAGALAPURAM

SRIRANGAPURAM POST THENI DT ADMINISTRATIVE

OFFICE AT BESANT NAGAR REP BY CORRESPONDENT

MR.S.RAJAGOPAL

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPT. SECRETARIAT ANNA

SALAI CHENNAI 2

Prayer

calling for the records relating to the order dt 27.5.2011 Ref. No. 07068 passed by the 1st respondent and quash the same and all consequential proceedings

W.P.NO.24348 of 2011:

A.M.G.MATRIC HIGHER SECONDARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT
PREMALATHA

BOMMIDI NADOOR-635 301 PAPPYREDDYPATTI

TALUK DHARMAPURI DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL
EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION D.P.I.COMPOUND CHENNAI-6.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER P.T.A.BUILDING D.P.I.CAMPUS

CHENNAI-6.

4 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

DHARMAPURI

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 3rd respondent dated 3.6.2011 in fixing the fee for the petitioner school to quash the same

W.P.NO.24443 of 2011:

A.K.T.ACADEMY MATRIC HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL REP.BY ITS
CORRESPONDENT

A.K.T.NAGAR NEELAMANGALAM KALLAKURICHI-

606202 VILLUPURAM DIST.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP.BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL
EDUCATION FORT

ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-600 009.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION D.P.I.COMPOUND CHENNAI-600 006.

3 THE PVT.SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER P.T.A.BUILDING D.P.I.CAMPUS

CHENNAI-600 006.

4 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

VILLUPURAM.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 3rd Respondent dated 03.06.2011 in fixing the fee for the Petitioners School and
to quash the same

W.P.NO.24446 of 2011:

YAGAPPA MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] ARUL GARDENS NEELAGIRI THERKU
THOTTAM

THANJAVUR 613 004. REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

MR.A.EDWARD AROKIARAJ.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL
EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI 9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI COMPOUND CHENNAI 6.

3 THE PVT. SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY TIS COORDINATOR

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6.

4 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL

OFFICER THANJAVUR.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 3rd respondent dt.27.05.2011 in fixing the fee for the petitioners school and to QUASH the same.

W.P.NO.24456 of 2011:

ST.PAULS NURSERY AND PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL(14207) REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MR.

S.P.MURUGESAN.

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PVT. SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI

COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

CHENNAI 2.

To call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in proceedings dated 27.05.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent.

W.P.NO.24457 of 2011:

THE SALEM COOPERATIVE SUGAR [PETITIONER] MILL MATRICULATION HR. SEC. SCHOOL (14077).

REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MR.G.AJEETHAN

MOHANUR 637 015. NAMAKKAL DT.

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENT S] PVT. SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI

COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

CHENNAI 2.

Prayer

To call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in proceedings dated 27.05.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent.

W.P.NO.24458 of 2011:

VALARAIGATE VIDHYALAYA NURSERY [PETITIONER] AND PRIMARY SCHOOL (14208) REP. BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MR.A.SELVAKUMAR VALARAIGATE

THIRUCHENGODE NAMAKKAL DT.

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PVT. SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI

COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

CHENNAI 2.

Prayer

To call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in proceedings dated 27.05.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent.

W.P.NO.24459 of 2011:

BRINDAVAN MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL (14152) REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

MR.P.MANI POTHANUR 638 181 P.VELUR TALUK

NAMAKKAL DT.

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PVT. SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI

COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

CHENNAI 2.

Prayer

To call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in proceedings dated 27.05.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent.

W.P.NO.24759 of 2011:

SANTINIKETAN MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL
MUTHUTHEVANPATTI

THENI 625531 REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MR.L.

S.PRABHAKARAN.

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY PRIVATE SCHOOL [RESPONDENTS] FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE
DPI COMPOUND

COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPT. SECRETARIAT ANNA

SALAI CHENNAI 2.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order dt.3.06.11 RefC. CNo7085 passed by the first respondent and quash the same and all consequential proceedings.

W.P.NO.24771 of 2011:

AYIRA VAISYA MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL 5/1 MUTHALAMMAN KOVIL
PADITHURAI

STREET PARAMAKUDI-623 707 RAMANATHAPURAM

DISTRICT REP.BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MR.P.N.

SENTHILKUMAR

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT ST.

GEORGE FORT CHENNAI-9.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order dated 27.05.2011 Ref.C.C.No.4146 passed by the first respondent and quash the same

W.P.NO.24774 of 2011:

VALLIAPPA VIDHYALAYAM MAT. [PETITIONER] HR. SEC. SCHOOL (14127) REP BY ITS

AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE MR.V. MOHANRAJ

4/456 SANKARI MAIN ROAD PALLIPALAYAM 638

008 NAMAKKAL DT

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY [RESPONDENTS] SPECIAL OFFICER PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI COMPOUND

COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

CHENNAI 2

Prayer

to call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in proceedings nil dt 27.5.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent

W.P.NO.24775 of 2011:

SRI VIDYAMANDIR MAT. HR. SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL (14167) REP BY ITS
CORRESPONDENT MR.

V. RAMASAMY KATTUR ROAD RASIPURAM

NAMAKKAL DT

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY [RESPONDENTS] SPECIAL OFFICER PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE
DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI COMPOUND

COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

CHENNAI 2

Prayer

to call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in proceedings nil dt 27.5.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent

W.P.NO.24782 of 2011:

INDIAN MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] (23350) NO.9 REDDIPALAYAM ROAD
ESWARI

NAGAR THANJAVUR-613004 REP. BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MR.A.H.A.ANSARI.

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY TO
GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.

GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL EDUCATION

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 27.05.2011 made in order No.Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents and permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee

W.P.NO.24783 of 2011:

MUVENDAR MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL (23266)
SENGAMANGALAM POST

AMMAIYANDI PERAVURANI-614804 THANJAVUR

DISTRICT REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT V.A.T.

SAMIAPPAN.

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY TO
GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.

GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL EDUCATION

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 03.06.2011 made in order No.Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents and permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee

W.P.NO.24784 of 2011:

SRI SWAMI MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HR. SEC. SCHOOL NSP GARDEN

SEELANAYAKANPATTY SALEM-636201 REP. BY ITS

SECRETARY MR.L.SRINIVASAN.

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY TO
GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.

GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL EDUCATION

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6 REPRESENTED BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 27.05.2011 made in order No.Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee

W.P.NO.24794 of 2011:

SRI KRISHNA MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL REP. BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT BEHIND KRISHNA PLAZA

ODDANCHATRAM DINDUGAL DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION D.P.I. COMPOUND CHENNAI-6.

3 THE PVT. SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER P.T.A. BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

CHENNAI-6.

4 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

DINDUGAL.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 3rd Respondent dated 27.5.2011 in fixing the fee for the Petitioner school and to quash the

W.P.NO.24855 of 2011:

SRI SAVITRI VIDYALAYA MAT. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL (23344) 889 PARASURAMAR ST

KARANTHAI THANJAVUR 613 002 REP BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT T. CHANDRAMOULEESWARAN

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE ITS SECRETARY TO GOVT. DEPT. OF
SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL OF

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the 3rd respondent dt 27.5.2011 made in order No. Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents and permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee

W.P.NO.24856 of 2011:

CARMELS MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] (20333) CARMEL GARDENS RAMALINGA
NAGAR

WEST EXTENSION WORAIYUR TRICHY-620 003

REPD. BY ITS CORRESPONDENTD BY BHAGHIYA

JOTHI DEVADASS

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.

GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

OF EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD

CHENNAI-6.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 27.05.2011 made in order No.Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents and permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the committee.

W.P.NO.24977 of 2011:

TAN ACADEMY MAT. HR. SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT NO.30

GANDHI NAGAR NORTH KUMBAKONAM-612001.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION D.P.I. COMPOUND CHENNAI-6.

3 THE PVT. SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER P.T.A. BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

CHENNAI-6.

4 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

THANJAVUR.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 3rd Respondent dated 27.5.2011 in fixing the fee for the Petitioner school and to quash the same

W.P.NO.25102 of 2011:

SUNSTARS HIGH SCHOOL (14154) [PETITIONER] REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT
MR.K.MANIAM

VADAKARAIATTUR POST JEDARPALAYAM VIA

PARAMATHI VELUR TALUK NAMAKKAL DISTRICT-637 213.

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY/ SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE
DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

CHENNAI-2.

Prayer

To call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in proceedings NIL dated 27.05.2011 and quash the
same as illegal incompetent

W.P.NO.25103 of 2011:

SUN STAR NURSERY & PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL (14147) REP. BY ITS
CORRESPONDENT MR.

K.MANIAM VADAKARAIATTUR POST PARAMATHI

VELUR TK NAMAKKAL DISTRICT-637 213.

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY/ SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE
DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

CHENNAI-2.

Prayer

To call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in proceedings NIL dated 27.05.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent

W.P.NO.25104 of 2011:

SHRI RENGA VIDYALAYA HR. SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL (14190) REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MR.

E.R.SAKTHIVEL RAYARPALAYAM NAMAKKAL MAIN

ROAD TIRUCHENGODE TALUK NAMAKKAL DISTRICT

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY/ SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

CHENNAI-2.

Prayer

To call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent in proceedings NIL dated 27.05.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent

W.P.NO.25283 of 2011:

SRI VIJAY VIDYALAYA MATRIC. [PETITIONER] HR. SEC. SCHOOL (BOYS) REP BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT PENNAGARAM ROAD DHARMAPURI

636 703

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT

ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION D.P.I. COMPOUND CHENNAI 6

3 THE PVT. SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER P.T.A. BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

CHENNAI 6

4 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

DHARMAPURI

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 3rd respondent dt 3.6.2011 in fixing the fee for the petitioners school and to quash the same

W.P.NO.25707 of 2011:

V.S.K.D.NADAR MATRIC HR. SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL (6215) REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT 113

BADRAKALIAMMAN KOVIL ST SIVAKASI 626 123

VIRUDHUNAGAR DT

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

to call for the records relating to the impugned order of the 1st respondent herein dt 27.5.2011 under Sec. 6 (4) of Act 22 of 2009 and to quash the same as illegal and consequently permit the petitioner collect the existing fee structure charged for the year 2009-10 with permissible periodic enhancement as per law

W.P.NO.25799 of 2011:

SHRI VETHATHIRI VIDHYALA [PETITIONER] MATRIC AND HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL

SAMINATHAPURAM ERODE-638 104 ERODE TALUK

AND DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING CPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REP. BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

4 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order dated 27/05/2011 Ref.C.C.No.12079 passed by the 1st respondent and quash the same

W.P.NO.25989 of 2011:

P.S.MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL NO.214 R.K.MUTT ROAD

MYLAPORE CHENNAI 4

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION DEPT.

FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI

2 CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

CEO CAMPUS CHENNAI

3 THE SPECIAL OFFICER

THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION

COMMITTEE CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 3rd respondent relating to the fee determined in respect of the petitioner school by its order dt 3.6.2011 and quash the same and consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the petitioners school in the matter of collection fees from its students

W.P.NO.26049 of 2011:

SHEBA NURSERY & PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL 85 AVOOR MUTHIAH MAISTRY ST
CHENNAI-600 081 REP.BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

MR.BENJAMIN VIMAL.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP.BY ITS
SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CMPUS CHENNAI-

600 006.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOL COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for records on the file of the first respondent dated 03.06.2011 passed under Sec.6(4) of Act 22/2009 relating to the petitioner school namely Sheba Nursery & Primary School 31089) 85 Avoor Muthiah Maistry Street Chennai-600 081 and quash the same and direct the respondents to approve the fee structure in trms of the statement of fee as submitted by the petitioner school to the Committee dated 25.04.2011 with proportionate increase for ensuing three academic years

W.P.NO.26050 of 2011:

SHEBA MATRICULATION HR.SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL 198 T.H.ROAD NEW
WASHERMENPET REP.

BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MR.BENJAMIN VIMAL.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP.BY ITS
SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-

600 006.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOL COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer Calling for records on the file of the first respondent dated 03.06.2011 passed under Sec.6(4) of Act 22/2009 relating to the petitioner school namely Sheba Matriculation Hr.Sec.School (31089) 198 T.H.Road New Washermenpet chennai-600 081 and quash the same and direct the respondents to approve the fee structure in terms of the statement of fee as submitted by the petitioner school to the Committee dated 25.04.2011 with proportionate increase for ensuing three academic years

W.P.NO.26167 of 2011:

MALAR MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS COLONY
PARAMATHI

NAMAKKAL DISTRICT-637 207. REP.BY ITS

SECRETARY R.KANDASAMY

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP.BY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

CEO CAMPUS NAMAKKAL.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records comprised in the order made in No.14137 dated 27.05.2011 on the file of the 3rd respondent imposing directions for collection of fees by the petitioner School and quash the same and consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the Petitioners School in the matter of collection of fees from its students

W.P.NO.26168 of 2011:

VETHA LOGA VIDHAYALAYA [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION HIGHER SECONDARY
SCHOOL

SENDAMANGALAM NAMAKKAL DISTRICT-637 409.

REP.BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MR.M.K.GURU.

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP.BY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

CEO CAMPUS NAMAKKAL.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

Calling for the records comprised in the order made in No.14112 dated 27.05.2011 on the file of the 3rd respondent imposing directions for collection of fees by the petitioner School and quash the same and consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the Petitioners School in the matter of collection of fees from its students

W.P.NO.26169 of 2011:

GOKULAM NURSERY AND PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL POTHANUR POST P.VELUR TALUK

NAMAKKAL DISTRICT-637 181 REP.BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT M.ELANGO VAN

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP.BY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

CEO CAMPUS NAMAKKAL.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

Calling for the records comprised in the order made in No.14142 dated 27.05.2011 on the file of the 3rd respondent imposing directions for collection of fees by the petitioner School and quash the same and consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the Petitioners School in the matter of collection of fees from its students

W.P.NO.26218 of 2011:

R.M.K.MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL REP. BY ITS
CHAIRMAN R.S.

MUNIRATHINAM R.S.M.NAGAR KAVARAIPETTAI-601

206 GUMMIDIPOONDI TALUK THIRUVALLUR

DISTRICT

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION
COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REP. BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the first respondent committee and the order passed by the first respondent
Committee dated 03.06.2011 and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner school and
consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the Tuition Fees fixed by the
petitioner school for the Academic year 2010-2011

W.P.NO.26270 of 2011:

ISLAMIAH MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT /
SECRETARY M.M.K.

MOHIDEEN IBRAHIM HAVING OFFICE AT SOUTH

STREET KILAKARAI RAMANATHAPURAM DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS
SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records from the 1st respondent relating to the impugned order dated 27/5/2011 passed under Section 6(4) of the TN Act 22 of 2009 relating to the determination of fee in respect of the petitioner school i.e. ISLAMIAH MATRICULATION SCHOOL and to quash the same and further direct the 1st respondent herein to consider the valid objections raised by the petitioner school management by its letters dated 14/6/2010 4/3/2011 and 15/9/2011

W.P.NO.26297 of 2011:

K.R.P.NURSERY & PRIMARY SCHOOL [PETITIONER] CODE NO.(13166) REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

DR.CHITRA MOHAN 27-A POST OFFICE ROAD

SNAKARI-637 301.

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT FORT ST.

GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-

6.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records pertaining to the impugned order dated 27.05.2011 passed by the 3rd respondent herein in proceedings No.Nil and to quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents to permit the petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee

W.P.NO.26298 of 2011:

K.R.P.MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL CODE NO.(14128) REP. BY

ITS CORRESPONDENT DR.CHITRA MOHAN PACHAMPALAYAM

SANKARI WEST-637 303 NAMAKKAL DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT FORT ST.

GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD

CHENNAI- 6.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records pertaining to the impugned order dated 03.06.2011 passed by the 3rd respondent herein in proceedings No.Nil and to quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents to permit the petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee

W.P.NO.26381 of 2011:

LITTLE ANGELS MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL ANIYAPURAM NAMAKKAL DISTRICT-637

017 REP.BY ITS SECRETARY R.BALAKRISHNAN.

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP.BY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

CEO CAMPUS NAMAKKAL.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records comprised in the order made in No.14109 dated 27.05.2011 on the file of the 3rd respondent imposing directions for collection of fees by the petitioner school and quash the same and consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise

issuing directions to the Petitioners School in the matter of collection of fees from its students

W.P.NO.26382 of 2011:

LITTLE ANGELS HIGHER SECONDARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL ANIYAPURAM NAMAKKAL DISTRICT-637

017 REP.BY ITS SECRETARY R.BALAKRISHNAN.

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP.BY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

CEO CAMPUS NAMAKKAL.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records comprised in the order made in No.14110 dated 27.05.2011 on the file of the 3rd respondent imposing directions for collection of fees by the petitioner school and quash the same and consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the Petitioners School in the matter of collection of fees from its students

W.P.NO.26384 of 2011:

VIVEKANANDA HIGHER SECONDARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL PAUNDAMANGALAM NAMAKKAL DISTRICT

REP.BY ITS CORRESPONDENT DR.R.SUBRAMANIAN

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

ANNA SALAI CHENNI-600 002.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order No.NIL dated 27.05. 2011 passed by the first respondent and to quash the same and all consequential proceedings

W.P.NO.26385 of 2011:

VIVEKANANDA MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL PAUNDAMANGALAM NAMAKKAL DISTRICT

REP.BY ITS CORRESPONDENT DR.R.SUBRAMANIAN

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

ANNA SALAI CHENNI-600 002.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order No.NIL dated 27.05.2011 passed by the first respondent and to quash the same and all consequential proceedings

W.P.NO.26386 of 2011:

1 VIVEKANANDA NURSERY & PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL PAUNDAMANGALAM NAMAKKAL DISTRICT

REP.BY ITS CORRESPONDENT DR.R.SUBRAMANIAN

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

ANNA SALAI CHENNI-600 002.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order No.NIL dated 27.05. 2011 passed by the first respondent and to quash the same and all consequential proceedings

W.P.NO.26431 of 2011:

PARAMAKUDI LIONS MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL
THELICHATHANALLUR

PARAMAKUDI RAMNAD DISTRICT 623 707 REPBY

ITS CORRESPONDENT MR.RM. KANNAPPAN

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION
COMMITTEE

DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

2 THE SECRETARY GOVT.

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPT. SECRETARIAT ANNA

SALAI CHENNAI 2

Prayer

calling for the records relating to the order dt 27.5.2011 Ref. C.C. No. 04148 passed by the 1st respondent and quash the same

W.P.NO.26454 of 2011:

ALAGAPPA SCHOOLS PREPARATORY [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION & HIGHER
SECONDARY SCHOOL 49

GANGADESWARAR KOIL ST PURASAWALKAM CHENNAI-

600 084 REP.BY ITS CORRESPONDENT TMT.

UMAYAL RAMANATHAN

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP.BY ITS
SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-

600 006.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOL COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

Calling for records on the file of the first respondent dated 03.06.2011 passed under sec.6(4) of Act 22/2009 relating to the petitioner school namely Alagappa Schools Preparatory Matriculation & Higher Secondary School (31044) Chennai-600 084 and quash the same and direct the respondents to approve the fee structure in terms of the statement of fee as submitted by the petitioner school to the Committee dated 18.04.2011 with proportionate increase for ensuing three academic years

W.P.NO.26593 of 2011:

KAMARAJAR HIGHER SECONDARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL BOMMIKUTTAIMEDU
NAMAKKAL DISTRICT-

637019 REPRESENTED BY ITS CORRESPONDENT M.

ANNAMALAI.

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY TO
GOVERNMENT

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI-9.

2 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

CEO CAMPUS NAMAKKAL.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records comprised in the order made in No.14115 dated 27.5.2011 on the file of the 3rd respondent imposing directions for collection of fees by the petitioner School and quash the same and consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the Petitioner School in the matter of collection of fees from its students

W.P.NO.26594 of 2011:

KAMARAJAR MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] BOMMIKUTTAIMEDU
SELLAPPAMPATTY NAMAKKAL

DISTRICT-637019 REPRESENTED BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT M.ANNAMALAI.

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI-9.

2 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

CEO CAMPUS NAMAKKAL.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records comprised in the order made in No.14119 dated 27.5.2011 on the file of the 3rd respondent imposing directions for collection of fees by the petitioner School and quash the same and consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the Petitioner School in the matter of collection of fees from its students

W.P.NO.26619 of 2011:

SRI MAHABHARATHI HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL KOOLIPATTI REDDIPATTI

POST NAMAKKAL DISTRICT-637 002 REP.BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT JOSEPHINE RANI.

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP.BY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

CEO CAMPUS NAMAKKAL.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records comprised in the order made in CC No.14079 dated 03.06.2011 on the file of the 3rd respondent imposing directions for collection of fees by the petitioner School and quash the same and consequentially forbear the respondents from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the Petitioners School in the matter of collection of fees from its students

W.P.NO.26644 of 2011:

LAKSHMI GARDEN MATRIC HR.SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MR.T.

RAJENDIRAN RUN BY GEETHANJALI CHARITY

FOUNDATION NO.26 OFFICERS LINE VELLORE 632

001

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENT] REP BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT DEPT. OF

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL OF

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI

6

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

4 THE SPECIAL OFFICER

PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD

CHENNAI 9

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order passed by the 4th respondent dt 3.6.11 and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School concerned and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to collect the fee determined by them

W.P.NO.26645 of 2011:

SHRISHTI MATRIC. HR. SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MR.T.
RAJENDIRAN RUN BY MAKHIJA FOUNDATION NO.34

NEWRY SHREYA 4TH STREET F BLOCK ANNA

NAGAR EAST CHENNAI

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT DEPT.
OF

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL OF

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI

6

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

4 THE SPECIAL OFFICER

PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD

CHENNAI 9

Calling for the records relating to the order passed by the 4th respondent dt 27.5.11 and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School concerned and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to collect the fee determined by them

W.P.NO.26893 of 2011:

ASHRAM MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL (12096) REPBY ITS

CORRESPONDENT DR.A. SENGOTTAIAH GANDHIJI ST

KARUR BYPASS ROAD KOLLAMPALAYAM ERODE AND

DT 638 002

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS
MEMBER

SECRETARY P.T.A. BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI 6

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPT. FORT ST.GEORGE

CHENNAI 9

3 THE DIRECTOR OF

MATRICULATION SCHOOLS GOVT. OF TAMILNADU D.

P.I. CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM

CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records in respect of the impugned order passed by the 1st respondent vide its order dt 27.5.2011 in respect of the petitioner School (12096) and quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to reconsider and re fix a revised fee structure taking into consideration of the relevant factors and in commensuration with the actual per capita expenditure incurred by the petitioner school for three consecutive academic years from 2010-2011 after affording a reasonable opportunity of being heard within the time frame as may be fixed by this Honourable Court

W.P.NO.27214 of 2011:

RAHMATH GIRLS MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL NO.140

ABDUL KASIM NAGAR PKT ROAD MUTHUPET

TIRUVARUR DISTRICT REP. BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT M.A.MUSTAFA

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DTERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-3.

Prayer

Calling for the records on the file of the first respondent dated 27.05.2011 and quash the same and consequently forbear the respondent from taking any steps by way of enforcing or imposing or otherwise issue

direction to the petitioner School in the matter of Collection of Fees from its students

W.P.NO.27293 of 2011:

SRI VIJAY VIDYALAYA MAT.HR. [PETITIONER] SEC.SCHOOL REP.BY ITS CORRESPONDENT
DNC

COMPOUND GANDHI NAGAR DHARMAPURI-636701.

Vs

THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP.BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL
EDUCATION FORT

ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-600 009.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION D.P.I.COMPOUND CHENNAI-600 006.

3 THE PVT.SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER P.T.A.BUILDING D.P.I.CAMPUS

CHENNAI-600 006.

4 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

DHARMAPURI.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 3rd Respondent dated 03.06.2011 in fixing the fee for the Petitioners school and
to quash the same

W.P.NO.27573 of 2011:

M.A.K.MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL REP BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT/ADMN. 125A KABILARB ST

THIRUNAGAR JAFFARKHANPET CHENNAI 83

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY SECRETARY TO GOVT. SCHOOL
EDUCATION

DEPT. FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS EX-

OFFICIO MEMBER/SECRETARY P.T.A. BUILDINGS

D.P.I. CAMPUS CHENNAI 19

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION D.P.I. CAMPUS CHENNAI 19

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 2nd respondent relating to the impugned order dt 3.6.2011 passed by the 2nd respondent and the fee determined in respect of the petitioner School and quash the said order and consequentially direct the respondents to forbear from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing or otherwise issuing directions to the petitioners School in the matter of collection of fees from its students

W.P.27574 OF 2011

SRI KRISHNASWAMY MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL REP BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT B-77 36TH ST 7TH SECTOR

K.K. NAGAR CHENNAI 78

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY SECRETARY TO GOVT. SCHOOL EDUCATION

DEPT. FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS EX-

OFFICIO MEMBER/SECRETARY P.T.A. BUILDINGS

D.P.I. CAMPUS CHENNAI 19

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION D.P.I. CAMPUS CHENNAI 19

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 2nd respondent relating to the impugned order dt 3.6.2011 passed by the 2nd respondent and the fee determined in respect of the petitioner School and quash the said order and consequentially direct the respondents to forbear from taking any steps towards enforcing or imposing

or otherwise issuing directions to the petitioners School in the matter of collection of fees from its students.

W.P.27601 OF 2011

GOLDEN GATES MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT
R.RAVICHANDRAN VENKATESAPURAM

PERAMBALUR-621 212

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL
EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION D.P.I. COMPOUND CHENNAI-6.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER P.T.A.BUILDING D.P.I.CAMPUS

CHENNAI-6.

4 THE CHIEF EDUCATION OFFICER

PERAMBALUR.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 3rd respondent dated 27.5.2011 in fixing the fee for the petitioner school and to
quash the same.

W.P.27925 OF 2011

E.S.MATRICULATION HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REP.BY ITS
CORRESPONDENT

25/1 MAMBALAPATTU ROAD VILLUPURAM

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP.BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL
EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION D.P.I. COMPOUND CHENNAI-6

3 THE PVT. SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER P.T.A. BUILDING D.P.I CAMPUS

CHENNAI-6

4 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

VILLUPURAM

Prayer

calling for the records of the 3rd respondent dated 3.6.2011 in fixing the fee for the petitioners school and to quash the same.

W.P.NO.28084 OF 2011

JOSHUA MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] 62B AMBEDKAR STREET EXTN.

OLD PERUNGALATHUR CHENNAI-600 063.

REP.BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MRS.S.EDITH

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION [RESPONDENTS] COMMITTEE, REP.BY ITS SPECIAL OFFICER

COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS

CHENNAI-600 006.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOL COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

Calling for records on the file of the first respondent dated 27.05.2011 passed under Sec.6(4) of Act 22/2009 relating to the petitioner school namely Joshua Matriculation School (29385)62B Ambedkar Street Extension Old Perungalathur Chennai 600 063 and quash the same and direct the respondents to approve the fee structure in terms of the statement of fee as submitted by the petitioner school to the Committee dated 18.04.2011 with proportionate increase for ensuing three academic years.

W.P.NO.28216 OF 2011

ST. THOMAS MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL (30298)

GANAPATHY NAGAR CHENNAI-51

REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT T.RAJAN MATHEWS

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL EDUCATION

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 03.06.2011 made in order No.Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents to permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee.

W.P.NO.28217 OF 2011

ST. THOMAS MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL (30303) SAI NAGAR

CHINNASEKKADU MANALI CHENNAI-68

REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT T.RAJAN MATHEWS

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.

GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL EDUCATION

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 03.06.2011 made in order No.Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents to permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee.

W.P.NO.28228 OF 2011

WASHINGTON NURSERY AND [PETITIONER] PRIMARY SCHOOL (31063) REP BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MRS. D. ROSELET LOPEZ

NO.22 IRUSAPPA GRAMANI STREET TRIPLICANE

CHENNAI-5.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS MEMBER

SECRETARY P.T.A BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI 6

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI 9

3 THE DIRECTOR OF

MATRICULATION SCHOOLS GOVT. OF TAMILNADU

D.P.I. CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM

CHENNAI 6

Calling for the records in respect of the impugned order passed by the 1st respondent vide its order dt 27.5.2011 in respect of the petitioner School (31063) and quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised fee structure taking into consideration of the relevant factors and in commensuration with the actual per capita expenditure incurred by the petitioner school for three consecutive academic years from 2010-2011 after affording a reasonable opportunity of being heard within a time frame as may be fixed by this Honourable Court.

W.P.NO.28229 OF 2011

WASHINGTON NURSERY AND [PETITIONER] PRIMARY SCHOOL (31035) REP BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MRS. D. ROSELET LOPEZ NO.91

T.P. KOIL STREET TRIPLICANE CHENNAI 5

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS MEMBER

SECRETARY P.T.A BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI 6

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI 9

3 THE DIRECTOR OF

MATRICULATION SCHOOLS GOVT. OF TAMILNADU D.

P.I. CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM

CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records in respect of the impugned order passed by the 1st respondent vide its order dt 27.5.2011 in respect of the petitioner School (31035) and quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised fee structure taking into consideration of the relevant factors and in commensuration with the actual per capita expenditure incurred by the petitioner school for three consecutive academic years from 2010-2011 after affording a reasonable opportunity of being heard within a time frame as may be fixed by this Honourable Court.

W.P.NO.28230 OF 2011

EVE MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL (31129) REP BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MRS. D. ROSELET LOPEZ NO.25

AZUDIN KHAN BAHADUR STREET TRIPLICANE

CHENNAI 5

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS MEMBER

SECRETARY P.T.A BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI 6

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI 9

3 THE DIRECTOR OF

MATRICULATION SCHOOLS GOVT. OF TAMILNADU D.

P.I. CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM

CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records in respect of the impugned order passed by the 1st respondent vide its order dt 3.6.2011 in respect of the petitioner School (31129) and quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised fee structure taking into consideration of the relevant factors and in commensuration with the actual per capita expenditure incurred by the petitioner school for three consecutive academic years from 2010-2011 after affording a reasonable opportunity of being heard within a time frame as may be fixed by this Honourable Court.

W.P.NO.28287 OF 2011

21ST CENTURY INTERNATIONAL [PETITIONER] MATRIC HR. SEC. SCHOOL REP BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MRS.S. YAMUNAH NACHIAR

KANJIRANGAL POST THIRUPPATHUR ROAD

SIVAGANGAI 630 562

Vs

1 GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REPBY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner school and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 5.4.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012.

W.P.NO.28297 OF 2011

ST.JOHNS MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SEC. SCHOOL NO.15 NEW COLONY

ALWARTHIRUNAGAR CH-87 REP. BY ITS

ADMINISTRATOR MR.J.VINOD DIRAVIYARAJ NO.

25A NEW COLONY ALWARTHIRUNAGAR CH-87

Vs

1 THE SECRETARY [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

ANNA SALAI CHENNAI-2.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order No.NIL dated 03.06.2011 passed by the first respondent and to quash the same and all consequential proceedings.

W.P.NO.28304 OF 2011

ST. JOSEPH MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL (29526)

MRS. JHANCY THOMPSON 5/26-C II SEVEN WELL STREET

BUTT ROAD ST. THOMAS MOUNT CHENNAI-16.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS MEMBER

SECRETARY P.T.A BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS GOVT. OF TAMILNADU D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records in respect of the impugned order passed by the 1st Respondent vide its order dated 3.6.2011 in respect of the Petitioner School (29526) and quash the same and direct the 1st Respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised fee structure taking into consideration of the relevant factors and in commensuration with the actual per capita expenditure incurred by the Petitioner School for three consecutive academic years from 2010-2011 after affording a reasonable opportunity of being heard within the time frame as may be fixed by this Honourable Court.

W.P.NO.28305 OF 2011

ST. JOSEPH NURSERY & PRIMARY SCHOOL [PETITIONER] (30133) REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

MRS. JHANCY THOMPSON NO.49 NAMBI STREET

POONAMALLEE CHENNAI-56.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS MEMBER

SECRETARY P.T.A BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS GOVT. OF TAMILNADU D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records in respect of the impugned order passed by the 1st Respondent vide its order dated 27.5.2011 in respect of the Petitioner School (30133) and quash the same and direct the 1st Respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised fee structure taking into consideration of the relevant factors and in commensuration with the actual per capita expenditure incurred by the Petitioner School for three consecutive academic years from 2010-2011 after affording a reasonable opportunity of being heard within the time frame as may be fixed by this Honourable Court

W.P.NO.28306 OF 2011

THE CORRESPONDENT [PETITIONER] ST. JOSEPH MATRICULATION HIGHER

SECONDARY SCHOOL BISHOP HOUSE CAMPUS

NAGERCOIL-629001.

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY ITS SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

3 THE CHAIRMAN

PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPLEX COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for records relating to the impugned determination of fee by the 3rd respondent Committee for the petitioner school vide proceedings dated 03.06.2011 Quash the same and further direct the respondents to permit the petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the statement of fees as submitted by the petitioner to the 3rd respondent Committee dated 02.03.2011.

W.P.NO.28553 OF 2011

PUNJAB ASSOCIATION (REGD.) [PETITIONER] REPTD. BY ITS GENERAL SECRETARY

170-172 PETERS ROAD CHENNAI-14

MANAGING ANNA ADARSH MAT. HR. SEC. SCHOOL

ANNA NAGAR CHENNAI.

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI-9.

2 PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REPRESENTED BY ITS

CHAIRMAN DPI COMPLEX CHENNAI-6.

3 DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI COMPLEX CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records on the file of the 2nd Respondent relating to its order under Sec. 6(4) of Act 22 of 2009 dated 11.11.2011 and quash the order of the 2nd Respondent dated 11.11.2011.

W.P.NO.28554 OF 2011

PUNJAB ASSOCIATION (REGD.) [PETITIONER] REPTD. BY ITS GENERAL SECRETARY

170-172 PETERS ROAD CHENNAI-14

MANAGING GILL ADARSH MAT. HR. SEC. SCHOOL

ROYAPETTAH CHENNAI-14.

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI-9.

2 PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REPRESENTED BY ITS

CHAIRMAN DPI COMPLEX CHENNAI-6.

3 DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI COMPLEX CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records on the file of the 2nd Respondent relating to its order under Sec. 6(4) of Act 22 of 2009 dated 11.11.2011 and quash the order of the 2nd Respondent dated 11.11.2011.

W.P.NO.28555 OF 2011

KONGU KALVI NILAYAM MATRIC [PETITIONER] AND HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL
RANGAMPALAYAM

ERODE-638 009 ERODE DIST.

Vs

1 SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE
PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

2 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP.BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-600 009.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

4 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order dated 27.05.2011 Ref.C.C.No.12236 passed by the 1st respondent
and quash the same.

W.P.NO.29003 OF 2011

M.R.MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL NO.69 NERKUNDRAM
HIGH ROAD

CHENNAI-600 107 REP.BY ITS SECRETARY R.PREM KUMAR

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP.BY ITS
SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-

600 006.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOL COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records on the file of the 1st Respondent dated 03.06.2011 passed under Section 6(4) of Act 22/2009 relating to the petitioner school viz. M.R.Matriculation Higher Secondary School No.69 Nerkundram High Road Chennai-600 107 and quash the same and direct the Respondents to approve the fee structure in terms of the statement of fee as submitted by the Petitioner School to the Committee dated 26.04.2011 with proportionate increased for ensuing three academic years.

W.P.NO.29825 OF 2011

KAMARAJ MATRICULATION SPECIAL SCHOOL [PETITIONER] SCHOOL NO.26243 REP. BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT C.R.LAKSHMIKANTHAN

VAYALUR-608 002 CHIDAMBARAM TALUK

CUDDALORE DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION SECRETARIAT FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION D.P.I.CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD

CHENNAI-6.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICUTLATION

SCHOOLS D.P.I.CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

4 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE D.I.E.R.T CAMPUS

REP. BY SPECIAL OFFICER D.P.I.CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records pertaining to the order made in Nil dated 27.05.2011 passed by the 4th respondent and quash the same and consequently directing the 1st and 3rd respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the School and submitted to the School Fee Determination Committee.

W.P.NO.29826 OF 2011

VENUS MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL SCHOOL NO.26088

REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT S.KUMAR

NO.14 THERADI PILLAIYAR KOIL STREET

CHIDAMBARAM-608 001, CUDDALORE DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION SECRETARIAT FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION D.P.I.CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD

CHENNAI-6.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICUTLATION

SCHOOLS D.P.I.CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

4 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE D.I.E.R.T CAMPUS

REP. BY SPECIAL OFFICER D.P.I.CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records pertaining to the order made in Nil dated 27.05.2011 passed by the 4th respondent and quash the same and consequently directing the 1st and 3rd respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the School and submitted to the School Fee Determination Committee.

W.P.NO.29827 OF 2011

KAMARAJ MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL SCHOOL NO.26087

REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT C.R.LAKSHMIKANTHAN

70 VENGAN STREET CHIDAMBARAM-608 00

CUDDALORE DT.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION SECRETARIAT FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION D.P.I.CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD

CHENNAI-6.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICUTLATION

SCHOOLS D.P.I.CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

4 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE D.I.E.R.T CAMPUS

REP. BY SPECIAL OFFICER D.P.I.CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records pertaining to the order made in Nil dated 27.05.2011 passed by the 4th respondent and quash the same and consequently directing the 1st and 3rd respondents to permit the petitioner school to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the School and submitted to the School Fee Determination Committee.

W.P.NO.30218 OF 2011

KONGU MATRICULATION HR. SEC.SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

MORAPPUR-635305

DHARMAPURI DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL
EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION D.P.I. COMPOUND CHENNAI-6.

3 THE PVT. SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER P.T.A. BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

CHENNAI-6.

4 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

DHARMAPURI.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 3rd Respondent dated 03.06.2011 in fixing the fee for the Petitioner school and to quash the same.

W.P.NO.255 OF 2012

AL AMEEN MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL (23301) 133-B

NEW RAILWAY ROAD KUMBAKONAM-612001

REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL-S.SYED ABDUL SUBAHAN.

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.

GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL EDUCATION

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 03.06.2011 made in Order No.Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents to permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee.

W.P.NO.257 OF 2012

UNITY NURSERY AND PRIMARY SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT
VALLUVAR NAGAR

ODDAPATTI DHARMAPURI-636 705.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL
EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION D.P.I.COMPOUND CHENNAI-6.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER P.T.A.BUILDING D.P.I.CAMPUS

CHENNAI-6.

4 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

DHARMAPURI.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 3rd respondent dated 28.02.2011 in fixing the fee for the petitioner school and to quash the same.

W.P.NO.388 OF 2012

GRD-CPF MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REP.BY ITS CORRESPONDENT
MRS.CHITRA

VIDYAPRAKASH AVINASHI ROAD NEELAMBUR

COIMBATORE-641014.

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP.BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE

CHENNAI-600 009.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP.BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-

600 006.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-

600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the impugned order dated 27.05.2011 passed by the Second respondent and to quash the same and consequently direct the second respondent committee to consider the objections raised by the petitioner and to permit the petitioner school to collect the fees as requested by their letter dated March 16 2011.

W.P.NO.462 OF 2012

ST. MARY NURSERY & PRIMARY SCHOOL [PETITIONER] (31363) REP. BY ITS
CORRESPONDENT

MR.L.PALAMALAI NO.5 EVEREADY COLONY

KODUNGAIYUR CHENNAI-118.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS
MEMBER-

SECRETARY P.T.A BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS GOVT. OF TAMILNADU D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records in respect of the impugned order passed by the 1st Respondent vide its order dated 27.05.2011 in respect of the Petitioner School (31363) and quash the same and direct the 1st Respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised fee structure taking into consideration of the relevant factors and in commensuration with the actual per capita expenditure incurred by the Petitioner school for three consecutive academic years from 2010-2011 after affording a reasonable opportunity of being heard within the time frame as may be fixed by this Honourable Court.

W.P.NO.463 OF 2012

ST. MARY MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL (30267) REP. BY ITS
CORRESPONDENT MR.L.PALAMALAI NO.2/537

THIRUVALLUR KOOTU ROAD REDHILLS CHENNAI-52.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS
MEMBER-

SECRETARY P.T.A BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS GOVT. OF TAMILNADU D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records in respect of the impugned order passed by the 1st Respondent vide its order dated 03.06.2011 in respect of the Petitioner School (30267) and quash the same and direct the 1st Respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised fee structure taking into consideration of the relevant factors and in commensuration with the actual per capita expenditure incurred by the Petitioner school for three consecutive academic years from 2010-2011 after affording a reasonable opportunity of being heard within the time frame as may be fixed by this Honourable Court

W.P.NO.464 OF 2012

ST. MARY MATRICULATION BOYS [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL (31789) REP.
BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MR.L.PALAMALAI 117

RAGHAVAN STREET PERAMBUR CHENNAI-11.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS
MEMBER-

SECRETARY P.T.A BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS GOVT. OF TAMILNADU D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records in respect of the impugned order passed by the 1st Respondent vide its order dated 03.06.2011 in respect of the Petitioner School (31789) and quash the same and direct the 1st Respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised fee structure taking into consideration of the relevant factors and in commensuration with the actual per capita expenditure incurred by the Petitioner school for three consecutive academic years from 2010-2011 after affording a reasonable opportunity of being heard within the time frame as may be fixed by this Honourable Court.

W.P.NO.465 OF 2012

ST. MARYS MATRICULATION GIRLS [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL (31790)
REP. BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MR.L.PALAMALAI 37 MADURAI

SAMIMADAM STREET PERAMBUR CHENNAI-11.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS
MEMBER-

SECRETARY P.T.A BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS GOVT. OF TAMILNADU D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records in respect of the impugned order passed by the 1st Respondent vide its order dated 03.06.2011 in respect of the Petitioner School (31790) and quash the same and direct the 1st Respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised fee structure taking into consideration of the relevant factors and in commensuration with the actual per capita expenditure incurred by the Petitioner school for three consecutive academic years from 2010-2011 after affording a reasonable opportunity of being heard within the time frame as may be fixed by this Honourable Court.

W.P.NO.694 OF 2012

A.V.MEIYAPPAN MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL (31045) 155
V STREET

AVM COLONY VIRUKAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-

600 092. REP.BY ITS MRS.NIDHYA RAJESWARI

GUHAN CORRESPONDENT

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP.BY THE ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.

GEORGE CHENNAI-600 009.

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL OF

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-

600 006.

3 THE SPECIAL OFFICER

THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION

COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-

600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 03.06.2011 made in order No.Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents and permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee.

W.P.NO.862 OF 2012

KALAIMAGAL VIDYALAYA [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION HR.SEC.SCHOOL (31186)

424 SURIYA NARAYANAN CHETTY ST ROYAPURAM

CHENNAI-21 REP.BY ITS SECRETARY &

CORRESPONDENT MR.J.SARAVANAKUMAR

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI COMPOUND COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT

ANNA SALAI CHENNAI-600 002.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order No.NIL dated 03.06.2011 passed by the first respondent and to quash the same and all consequential proceedings.

W.P.NO.1450 OF 2012

BROTHERHOOD MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HR. SEC. SCHOOL 3/387 KAZURA GARDEN

NEELANKARAI CHENNAI-41 REPRESENTED BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MR.S.APPOLINE FERNANDO.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOL COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for records on the file of the first respondent dated 03.06.2011 passed under Sec.6(4) of Act 22/2009 relating to the petitioner school namely Brotherhood Matriculation Hr. Sec. School (29484) at 3/387 Kazura Garden Neelankarai Chennai-41 and quash the same and direct the respondents to approve the fee structure in terms of the statement of fee as submitted by the petitioner school to the Committee dated 19.04.2011 with proportionate increase for ensuing three academic years.

W.P.NO.1978 OF 2012

SRI SATHYA SAI MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] CHITTODE-638102 ERODE DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP.BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT

ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-600 009.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION D.P.I.COMPOUND CHENNAI-600 006.

3 THE PVT.SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER P.T.A.BUILDING D.P.I.CAMPUS

CHENNAI-600 006.

4 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

ERODE.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 3rd Respondent dated 27.05.2011 in fixing the fee for the Petitioners School and to quash the same.

W.P.NO.2806 OF 2012

UNITY MATRICULATION HR. SEC.SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT
BEHIND

COLLECTOR BUNGALOW A.JETTIHALLI POST

DHARMAPURI-636 807.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL
EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION D.P.I.COMPOUND CHENNAI-6.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER P.T.A BUILDING D.P.I.CAMPUS

CHENNAI-6.

4 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

DHARMAPURI.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the 3rd respondent dated 03.06.2011 in fixing the fee for the petitioner school and to
quash the same.

W.P.NO.2967 OF 2012

LADY ANDAL VENKATASUBBA [PETITIONER] RAO MAT. HR. SEC. SCHOOL (1 UNIT OF THE
MADRAS SEVA SADAN FOUNDED BY SIR & LADY

M.VENKATASUBBA RAO NO.7 HARRINGTON ROAD

CHETPET CHENNAI 31

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY ITS SECRETARY (EDUCATION) FORT
ST.

GEORGE SECRETARIAT CHENNAI

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order dt 3.6.2011 of the 2nd respondent herein and quash the same.

W.P.NO.3547 OF 2012

CENTURY FOUNDATION [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION HR.SEC.SCHOOL

69 RACKIYAPALAYAM VIJAYAPURAM POST NALLUR

TIRUPUR.REP.BY ITS AUTHORISED

REPRESENTATIVES & TRUSTEE M.MITHRA HARI KUMAR

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP.BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-

600 006.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records from the 1st Respondent relating to the impugned order dt.27.05.2011 passed under Sec.6(4) of Act 22 of 2009 relating to the petitioner namely Century Foundation Matriculation Higher Secondary School (33304) 69 Rackiyapalayam Vijayapuram Post Nallur Tirupur-641 606 quash the same and further direct the 1st Respondent to consider the Written submissions made by the petitioner dt.24.03.2011 regarding fixation of fee.

W.P.NO.3548 OF 2012

CENTURY FOUNDATION [PETITIONER] NURSERY & PRIMARY SCHOOL

20-B VENKATESAPURAM LAKSHMINAGAR

TIRUPUR-641 602. REP.BY ITS AUTHORISED REPRESENTATIVE & TRUSTEE M.MITHRA HARI KUMAR

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP.BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-

600 006.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF ELEMENTARY

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records from the 1st Respondent relating to the impugned order dt.27.05.2011 passed under Sec.6(4) of Act 22 of 2009 relating to the petitioner namely Century Foundation Nursery & Primary School (33154) 20-B Venkatesapuram Lakshmi Nagar Tirupur-641602 quash the same and further direct the 1st Respondent to consider the objections raised by the petitioner dt.19.05.2010 regarding fixation of fee.

W.P.NO.3756 OF 2012

ANNAI INDIRAGANDHI MATRIC.SCHOOL [PETITIONER] (23328) (RENAMED AS S.E.T.VIDHYADEVI

MATRIC.SCHOOL) KONDIKULAM-ALIVALAM PO

THANJAVUR DIST. REP.BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

L.GOVINDARAJU

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP.BY THE ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.

GEORGE CHENNAI-600 009.

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL OF

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-

600 006.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 27.05.2011 made in order No.Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee.

W.P.NO.4129 OF 2012

C.S.I.EWART MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL R22/1A1

SOUNDARYA COLONY ANNA NAGAR WESTERN EXTN

CHENNAI-101 REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MRS.E.M.VICTOR.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOL COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records from 1st respondent relating to the impugned order dated 03/06/2011 passed under Sec.6(4) of Act 22 of 2009 relating to the petitioner namely C.S.I.Ewart Matriculation Higher Secondary School (30688) R22/1A1 Soundarya Colony Anna Nagar Western Extn. Chennai-101 quash the same and further direct the 1st respondent to consider the written submissions made by the petitioner dated 27.4.2011 regarding fixation of fee.

W.P.NO.4321 OF 2012

EVANS MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER]SECONDARY SCHOOL (01286) REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MR.V.PITCHAIMONI N.G.O.

COLONY GANDHIPURAM NAGERCOIL-629002

KANYAKUMARI DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS MEMBER-

SECRETARY P.T.A BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS GOVT. OF TAMILNADU D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records in respect of the impugned order passed by the 1st Respondent vide its order dated 27.5.2011 in respect of the Petitioner School (01286) and quash the same and direct the 1st Respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised fee structure taking into consideration of the relevant factors and in commensuration with the actual per capita expenditure incurred by the Petitioner school for three consecutive academic years from 2010-2011 after affording a reasonable opportunity of being heard within the time frame as may be fixed by this Honourable Court.

W.P.NO.4607 OF 2012

PUNJAB ASSN. (REGD.) [PETITIONER]

REP BY ITS GENERAL SECRETARY

170-172 PETERS ROAD CHENNAI 14

MANAGING MGR ADARSH MAT. HR. SEC. SCHOOL

11 TH BLOCK KANNADASAN ST

MOGAPPAIR CHENNAI 37

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS CHAIRMAN

DPI COMPLEX CHENNAI 6

3 DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI COMPLEX CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records on the file of the 2nd respondent relating to its order under Sec. 6 (4) of Act 22 of 2009 dt 3.6.2011 and direct the 2nd respondent to consider the objections of the petitioner and re-determine the fees chargeable by the petitioner in a manner known to law.

W.P.NO.4608 OF 2012

PUNJAB ASSOCIATION (REGD.) [PETITIONER] REP BY ITS GENERAL SECRETARY

170-172 PETERS ROAD CHENNAI 14

MANAGING GILL ADARSH MAT. HR. SEC. SCHOOL

ROYAPETTAH CHENNAI 14

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS CHAIRMAN

DPI COMPLEX CHENNAI 6

3 DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI COMPLEX CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records on the file of the 2nd respondent relating to its order under Sec. 6 (4) of Act 22 of 2009 dt 22.12.2011 and quash the order of the 2nd respondent dt 22.12.2011 and direct the 2nd respondent to consider the objections of the petitioner and re-determine the fees chargeable by the petitioner in a manner known to law.

W.P.NO.4609 OF 2012

PUNJAB ASSN. (REGD.) [PETITIONER] REP BY ITS GENERAL SECRETARY 170-172 PETERS ROAD

CHENNAI 14 MANAGING PND ADARSH VIDYALAYA

MAT. HR. SEC. SCHOOL ROYAPETTAH CHENNAI 14

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS CHAIRMAN

DPI COMPLEX CHENNAI 6

3 DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI COMPLEX CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records on the file of the 2nd respondent relating to its order under Sec. 6 (4) of Act 22 of 2009 dt 22.12.2011 and quash the order of the 2nd respondent dt 22.12.2011 and direct the 2nd respondent to consider the objections of the petitioner and re-determine the fees chargeable by the petitioner in a manner known to law.

W.P.NO.4610 OF 2012

PUNJAB ASSN. (REGD.) REP BY [PETITIONER] ITS GENERAL SECRETARY 170-172 PETERS ROAD

CHENNAI 14 MANAGING ANNA ADARSH MAT. HR.

SEC. SCHOOL ANNA NAGAR CHENNAI 40

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS CHAIRMAN

DPI COMPLEX CHENNAI 6

3 DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI COMPLEX CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records on the file of the 2nd respondent relating to its order under Sec. 6 (4) of Act 22 of 2009 dt 22.12.2011 and quash the order of the 2nd respondent dt 22.12.2011 and direct the 2nd respondent to consider the objections of the petitioner and re-determine the fees chargeable by the petitioner in a manner known to law.

W.P.NO.4628 OF 2012

K.R.P.NURSERY & PRIMARY SCHOOL [PETITIONER] (130026) REP. BY ITS
CORRESPONDENT NO.3738

JALAGANDAPURAM ROAD AVANIPERUR MELMUGAM

EDAPADDI SALEM DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
SCHOOL

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6 REP. BY ITS SPECIAL OFFICER.

Prayer

Calling for the records pertaining to the impugned order dated 08.11.2011 passed by the 3rd respondent herein
in proceedings No.Nil and to quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents to permit
the petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee.

W.P.NO.4629 OF 2012

K.R.P.NURSERY & PRIMARY SCHOOL [PETITIONER] (130027) REP. BY ITS
CORRESPONDENT NEAR

BUS STAND KONGANAPURAM EDAPPADI TALUK

SALEM DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
SCHOOL

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE

CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-

6.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6 REP. BY ITS SPECIAL OFFICER.

Prayer

Calling for the records pertaining to the impugned order dated 08.11.2011 passed by the 3rd respondent herein in proceedings No.Nil and to quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents to permit the petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee.

W.P.NO.5037 OF 2012

P.D.R. VELLACHIAMMAL MAT. HR. [PETITIONER] SEC. SCHOOL (16151) REP BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MR.R. TAMILMANI SEKKAMPATTI

HARUR TALUK DHARMAPURI DISTRICT 636 902

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS MEMBER

SECRETARY P.T.A. BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI 6

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE

CHENNAI 9

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS GOVT. OF TAMILNADU D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records in respect of the impugned order passed by the 1st respondent vide its order dt 3.6.2011 in respect of the petitioner School (16151) and quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised fee structure taking into consideration of the relevant factors and in commensuration with the actual per capita expenditure incurred by the petitioner school for three consecutive academic years from 2010-2011 after affording a reasonable opportunity of being heard within a time frame

as may be fixed by this Honourable Court.

W.P.NO.5050 OF 2012

1 SHRI KRISHNASWAMY MAT. HR. [PETITIONER] SEC. SCHOOL (31543) REP BY ITS DIRECTOR MR.

K.B. KRISHNANAND AC-48 3RD STREET 6TH

MAIN ROAD ANNA NAGAR CHENNAI 40

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE [RESPONDENTSS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS MEMBER

SECRETARY P.T.A. BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI 6

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE

CHENNAI 9

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS GOVT. OF TAMILNADU D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records in respect of the impugned order passed by the 1st respondent vide its order dt 3.6.2011 in respect of the petitioner School Shri Krishnaswamy Matriculation Higher Secondary School (31543) Chennai quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised fee structure taking into consideration of the relevant factors and in commensuration with the actual per capita expenditure incurred by the petitioner school for three consecutive academic years from 2010-2011 after affording a reasonable opportunity of being heard within a time frame as may be fixed by this Honourable Court.

W.P.NO.5051 OF 2012

SHRI KRISHNASWAMY MAT. HR. [PETITIONER] SEC. SCHOOL (3431033) REP BY ITS DIRECTOR

MR.K.B. ARUN NO.7/3 A TYPE SIDCO NAGAR

VILLIVAKKAM CHENNAI 49

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS MEMBER

SECRETARY P.T.A. BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI 6

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE

CHENNAI 9

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS GOVT. OF TAMILNADU D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records in respect of the impugned order passed by the 1st respondent vide its order dt 22.12.2011 in respect of the petitioner School Shri Krishnaswamy Matriculation Higher Secondary School (3431033) Chennai quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised fee structure taking into consideration of the relevant factors and in commensuration with the actual per capita expenditure incurred by the petitioner school for three consecutive academic years from 2010-2011 after affording a reasonable opportunity of being heard within a time frame as may be fixed by this Honourable Court.

W.P.NO.5052 OF 2012

SHRI KRISHNASWAMY MAT. HR. [PETITIONER] SEC. SCHOOL (31253) REP BY ITS DIRECTOR MR.

K.B. KRISHNANAND NO.8 4TH CROSS STREET

STERLING ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI34

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE [RESPONDENT] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS MEMBER

SECRETARY P.T.A. BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI 6

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST.GEORGE

CHENNAI 9

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS GOVT. OF TAMILNADU D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records in respect of the impugned order passed by the 1st respondent vide its order dt 3.6.2011 in respect of the petitioner School Shri Krishnaswamy Matriculation Higher Secondary School (31253) Chennai quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised fee structure taking into consideration of the relevant factors and in commensuration with the actual per capita expenditure incurred by the petitioner school for three consecutive academic years from 2010-2011 after affording a reasonable opportunity of being heard within a time frame as may be fixed by this Honourable Court.

W.P.NO.5288 OF 2012

1 KALAIMAGAL KALVI NILAYAM [PETITIONER] GIRLS MATRICULATION SCHOOL REP.BY ITS

SECRETARY 327 BROUGH ROAD ERODE-638 001

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTs] REP.BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT CHENNAI-9

2 PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP.BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6

Prayer

calling for the records of the respondents relating to the orders of the 2nd respondent in Rc.No.8/PSFDC/PC/2010 dated 7.5.2010 27.5.2011 and 14.10.2011 and quash the same in so far as the petitioner herein is concerned and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner Institution to follow the fee-structure proposed in the Memorandum of Objection dated 22.8.2011 for the academic year 2011-2013

W.P.NO.5562 OF 2012

SRI SANKARA VIDYASALA [PETITIONER] METRICULATION HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL

(12-187) REP. BY ITS SECRETARY SIVAGIRI

ERODE TALUK ERODE DISTRICT

Vs

1 THE GOVT. OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTs] REP. BY THE SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-600 009

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6

Prayer

to call for the entire records of the 2nd respondent committee which culminated in the Order dated 08.11.2011 under Sec 6(4) of Act 22 of 2009 made with respect to the petitioner School and quash the same as Arbitrary Unreasonable and illegal and further direct the 2nd respondent herein to re-consider the representations made by the petitioner herein with respect to Fixation of Fee for classes from LKG to XII Std of the Petitioner School by following the directions of this Honble court in the Judgment in Tamilnadu Nursery Matriculation and Higher Secondary Schools Association vs State of Tamilnadu reported in 2010 (2) LW 726 by giving an opportunity to the petitioner herein to put forth its case.

W.P.NO.5689 OF 2012

MEASI MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL (23362)

ANGAPPA NAICKEN STREET CHENNAI-1

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTs] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6

Prayer

to call for the records relating to the impugned order of the first respondent herein dated 30.6.2011 under Sec.6(4) of Act 22 of 2009 and to quash the same as illegal and consequently permit the petitioner to enhance the existing fee by a minimum of 30% over & above the already existing fee structure charged for the year 2009-2010.

W.P.NO.5781 OF 2012

RAAGHAVENDRA NURSERY AND [PETITIONER] PRIMARY SCHOOL REP. BY ITS
CORRESPONDENT

S.GOPALAKRISHNAN KATTABOMMAN STREET

SURAMPATTI VALASU ERODE-638 009.

Vs

1 SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTs] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI--600 006.

2 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU

REP.BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-600 009.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the order dated 27.05.2011 made in CC.No.12022 passed by the 1st
Respondent and quash the same and consequently direct the Respondents to permit the Petitioner School to
collect the fees determined by them for the Academic Year 2011-12 to 2013-14.

W.P.NO.6007 OF 2012

BRINDAVAN MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL REP. BY ITS
CHAIRMAN

KEEL BOOMI KODAIKANAL 624 101

DINDIGUL DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE GOVT. OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTs] REP. BY THE SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF
SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-600 009

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6

Prayer

calling for the records of the respondents relating to the order of the 2nd respondent committee dated 03.06.2011 and quash the same and directing 2nd respondent to pass orders considering the representations of the petitioner dated 25.08.2011 praying for redetermination of fee chargeable by the petitioner school.

W.P.NO.6086 OF 2012

SMS VIMAL MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HR. SEC. SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

MRS. VIMALA THIRUMALAI ARUNDHADHI PALAYAM

JAI BEEM NAGAR ARAKKONAM 631003 VELLORE DT

Vs

1 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY IT SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI 9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6.

3 THE SPECIAL OFFICER THE

PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order dt.27.05.2011 passed by the third respondent in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents to permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees interms of the fixed by the school and submitted to the committee.

W.P.6317 OF 2012

A.R.R. MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REP BY ITS AUTHORISED REPRESENTATIVE SCHOOL

NO. 23354 NO.30 PERUMPANDI MAIN ROAD

MELACAUVERY KUMBAKONAM TANJORE DIST

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINING COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records pertaining to the records of impugned proceedings dt 27.5.2011 passed by the 2nd respondent in respect of the petitioner School and quash the same and consequently quash the consequential notice dt 3.3.2012 and refix the fee structure as proposed by the petitioner school based on the statement filed on 22.3.2011 before the 2nd respondent

W.P 6318 OF 2012

A.R.R. MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL REP BY ITS AUTHORISED

REPRESENTATIVE SCHOOL NO. 23368 NO.156 A.R.

R. ROAD A.R.R. NAGAR KUMBAKONAM 612 001

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINING COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records pertaining to the records of impugned proceedings dt 3.6.2011 of the 2nd respondent in respect of the petitioner School and quash the same and direct the 2nd respondent to fix the fee structure as proposed by the petitioner school based on the statement filed on 22.3.2011 before the 2nd respondent

W.P 6415 OF 2012

1 TAGORE MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL REP. BY ITS AUTHORISED

REPRESENTATIVE BLOCK 29 NEYVELI-607807

CUDDALORE DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS REP. BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT CHENNAI-9.

2 PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS

SPECIALOFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Respondents relating to the order of the 2nd Respondent Committee dated 27.05.2011 and quash the same and directing the 2nd Respondent to pass orders considering the representation of the Petitioner dated 12.10.2011 praying for re-determination of fee chargeable by the Petitioner School

W.P 6416 OF 2012

1 TAGORE MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL REP. BY ITS AUTHORISED

REPRESENTATIVE JAYAPURAM TINDIVANAM-604001

VILLUPURAM DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT CHENNAI-9.

2 PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS

SPECIAL OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Respondents relating to the order of the 2nd Respondent Committee dated 27.05.2011 and quash the same and directing the 2nd Respondent to pass orders considering the representation of the Petitioner dated 12.10.2011 praying for re-determination of fee chargeable by the Petitioner School

W.P 6644 OF 2012

1 KALIGI RANGANATHAN [PETITIONER] MONTFORD MATRICULATION HR. SEC. SCHOOL

(31526) REP BY ITS EXECUTIVE OFFICER NO.8A

PARTHASARATHY STREET AYANAVARAM CHENNAI 23

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

to call for the entire records of the respondent committee which culminated in the Order dt 3.6.2011 under Sec 6 (4) of Act 22 of 2009 made with respect to the petitioner School and quash the same as arbitrary unreasonable and illegal and further direct the respondent herein to re-consider the representations made by the petitioner herein with respect to Fixation of Fee for Classes from LKG to XII Std of the Petitioner School by following the directions of this Honourable Court in the Judgment in Tamilnadu Nursery Matriculation and Higher Secondary Schools Association vs State of Tamilnadu reported in 2010 (2) LW 726 by giving an opportunity to the petitioner herein to put forth its case

W.P. 6650 OF 2012

1 KALIGI RANGANATHAN [PETITIONER] MONTFORD MATRICULATION HR. SEC. SCHOOL

(31526) REP BY ITS CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

NO. 8 ANANTH VELU STREET PERUMBUR CHENNAI

11

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

to call for the entire records of the respondent committee which culminated in the Order dt 3.6.2011 under Sec 6 (4) of Act 22 of 2009 made with respect to the petitioner School and quash the same as arbitrary unreasonable and illegal and further direct the respondent herein to re-consider the representations made by the petitioner herein with respect to Fixation of Fee for Classes from LKG to XII Std of the Petitioner School by following the directions of this Honourable Court in the Judgment in Tamilnadu Nursery Matriculation and Higher Secondary Schools Association vs State of Tamilnadu reported in 2010 (2) LW 726 by giving an opportunity to the petitioner herein to put forth its case

W.P 6856 OF 2012

1 SPK MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL KADACHANALLUR ERODE MAIN

ROAD TIRUCHENGODE T.K. NAMAKKAL DIST. 638

008 REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT P. SENGODAN

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENT] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER COLLEGE ROAD DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI 6

2 THE DIRECTOR OF

MATRICULATION SCHOOL COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

3 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records from the 1st respondent relating to the impugned order dt 27.5.2011 passed under Sec.6 (4) of Act 22 of 2009 relating to the petitioner namely sPK Matriculation Higher Secondary School (14176) Kadachanallur Erode Main Road Tiruchengode T.K. Namakkal Dist 638 008 quash the same and further direct the 1st respondent to consider the written submissions made by the petitioner dt 2.5.2011 regarding fixation of fee

W.P 6861 OF 2012

1 KALAIMAHAL MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL REP. BY ITS
CORRESPONDENT MR.K.NEDUNCHEZHIAN MAIN ROAD
SEMBANARKOIL THARANGAMBADI TALUK
NAGAPATTINAM DISTRICT-609309.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS
MEMBER

SECRETARY P.T.A BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

OF TAMIL NADU SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS D.P.I. CAMPUS NUNGAMBAKKAM

CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for records in respect of the impugned order issued by the 1st Respondent vide its order dated 27/05/2011 redetermining the fee pertaining to the petitioner institute and quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised reasonable fee structure after taking into consideration of all the relevant expenditure being incurred by the petitioner institute for three academic years commencing from 2010-11

W.P 6862 OF 2012

1 AL AMAN MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MR.K.
NEDUNCHEZHIAN NANDHAVANA STREET

SANKARANPANDHAL THARANGAMBADI TALUK

NAGAPATTINAM DISTRICT-609308.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS MEMBER

SECRETARY P.T.A BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

OF TAMIL NADU SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS D.P.I. CAMPUS NUNGAMBAKKAM

CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for records in respect of the impugned order issued by the 1st Respondent vide its order dated 27/05/2011 redetermining the fee pertaining to the petitioner institute and quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised reasonable fee structure after taking into consideration of all the relevant expenditure being incurred by the petitioner institute for three academic years commencing from 2010-11

W.P 6863 OF 2012

1 KALAIMAHAL NURSERY AND PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MR.K.

NEDUNCHEZHIAN AYAPPADI THARANGAMBADI TALUK

NAGAPATTINAM DISTRICT-609303.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS MEMBER

SECRETARY P.T.A BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
OF TAMIL NADU SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION
SCHOOLS D.P.I. CAMPUS NUNGAMBAKKAM
CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for records in respect of the impugned order issued by the 1st Respondent vide its order dated 27/05/2011 redetermining the fee pertaining to the petitioner institute and quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised reasonable fee structure after taking into consideration of all the relevant expenditure being incurred by the petitioner institute for three academic years commencing from 2010-11

W.P 6864 OF 2012

1 JAYAKUMAR NURSERY AND PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY ITS
CORRESPONDENT MR.K.

NEDUNCHEZHIAN NO.3 KARUVAZHAKARAI-MELAIYUR
THARANGAMBADI TALUK NAGAPATTINAM DISTRICT-
609304.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS
MEMBER

SECRETARY P.T.A BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS
COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
OF TAMIL NADU SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION
SCHOOLS D.P.I. CAMPUS NUNGAMBAKKAM

CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for records in respect of the impugned order issued by the 1st Respondent vide its order dated 27/05/2011 redetermining the fee pertaining to the petitioner institute and quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised reasonable fee structure after taking into consideration of all the relevant expenditure being incurred by the petitioner institute for three academic years commencing from 2010-11

W.P 6865 OF 2012

1 KALAIMAHAL NURSERY AND PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MR.K.

NEDUNCHEZHIAN ATHUR MAYILADUTHURAI TALUK

NAGAPATTINAM DISTRICT-609204.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS MEMBER

SECRETARY P.T.A BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

OF TAMIL NADU SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS D.P.I. CAMPUS NUNGAMBAKKAM

CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for records in respect of the impugned order issued by the 1st Respondent vide its order dated 27/05/2011 redetermining the fee pertaining to the petitioner institute and quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised reasonable fee structure after taking into consideration of all the relevant expenditure being incurred by the petitioner institute for three academic years commencing from 2010-11

W.P 6919 OF 2012

1 A.V.M.S.MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

MR.B.R.VIJAYAKUMAR VELIPATTANAM-623 504

RAMANATHAPURAM.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 27/05/2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure being proposed by the petitioner school for the Academic Year 2011-2012

W.P. 6920 OF 2012

1 D.D.VINAYAGAR HIGHER SECONDARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY ITS SECRETARY MR.P.MOKHAN

VELIPATTANAM RAMANATHAPURAM-623 504.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENT] REP. BY THE SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 03/06/2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure being proposed by the petitioner school for the Academic Year 2011-2012

W.P 6955 OF 2012

1 KALAIMAHAL NURSERY AND PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MR.K.

NEDUNCHEZHIAN MAIN ROAD KEELAPERUMPALLAM

THARANGAMBADI TALUK NAGAPATTINAM DISTRICT-

609107.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS MEMBER

SECRETARY P.T.A BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

OF TAMIL NADU SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS D.P.I. CAMPUS NUNGAMBAKKAM

CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for records in respect of the impugned order issued by the 1st Respondent vide its order dated 27/05/2011 redetermining the fee pertaining to the petitioner institute and quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised reasonable fee structure after taking into consideration of all the relevant expenditure being incurred by the petitioner institute for three academic years commencing from 2010-11

W.P 6956 OF 2012

1 KALAIVANI NURSERY AND PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY ITS
CORRESPONDENT MR.K.

NEDUNCHEZHIAN NEW STREET KADALANGUDI

MAYILADUTHURAI TALUK NAGAPATTINAM DISTRICT-

609204.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS
MEMBER

SECRETARY P.T.A BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

OF TAMIL NADU SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS D.P.I. CAMPUS NUNGAMBAKKAM

CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for records in respect of the impugned order issued by the 1st Respondent vide its order dated 27/05/2011 redetermining the fee pertaining to the petitioner institute and quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised reasonable fee structure after taking into consideration of all the relevant expenditure being incurred by the petitioner institute for three academic years commencing from 2010-11

W.P .6957 OF 2012

1 KALAIMAHAL MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT
MR.K.

NEDUNCHEZHIAN GANDHI STREET AKKUR

THARANGAMBADI TALUK NAGAPATTINAM DISTRICT-

609 301.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS MEMBER

SECRETARY P.T.A BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

OF TAMIL NADU SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS D.P.I. CAMPUS NUNGAMBAKKAM

CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for records in respect of the impugned order issued by the 1st Respondent vide its order dated 27/05/2011 redetermining the fee pertaining to the petitioner institute and quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised reasonable fee structure after taking into consideration of all the relevant expenditure being incurred by the petitioner institute for three academic years commencing from 2010-11

W.P 6958 OF 2012

1 KALAIMAHAL NURSERY AND PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MR.K.

NEDUNCHEZHIAN BHARATHI STREET AKKUR

THARANGAMBADI TALUK NAGAPATTINAM DISTRICT-

609 301.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS MEMBER

SECRETARY P.T.A BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

OF TAMIL NADU SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS D.P.I. CAMPUS NUNGAMBAKKAM

CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for records in respect of the impugned order issued by the 1st Respondent vide its order dated 27/05/2011 redetermining the fee pertaining to the petitioner institute and quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised reasonable fee structure after taking into consideration of all the relevant expenditure being incurred by the petitioner institute for three academic years commencing from 2010-11

W.P. 6989 OF 2012

1 KALAIMAHAL MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MR.K.

NEDUNCHEZHIAN MAIN ROAD THIRUKKADAIYUR

THARANGAMBADI TALUK NAGAPATTINAM DISTRICT-

609311.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS MEMBER

SECRETARY P.T.A BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

OF TAMIL NADU SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS D.P.I. CAMPUS NUNGAMBAKKAM

CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for records in respect of the impugned order issued by the 1st Respondent vide its order dated 27/05/2011 redetermining the fee pertaining to the petitioner institute and quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised reasonable fee structure after taking into consideration of all the relevant expenditure being incurred by the petitioner institute for three academic years commencing from 2010-11

W.P 7002 OF 2012

1 HYDER GARDEN MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL (N-31633) NO.1 HYDER GARDEN
EXTN

CHENNAI-12 AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE MR.

HUSSAIN BAPPU

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.

GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL OF

EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI- 6.

3 THE SPECIAL OFFICER

THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION

COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI- 6.

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 3.6.2011 made in Order No.Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents and permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee

W.P 7003 OF 2012

1 TAGORE VIDYALAYAM [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL

SADASIVA NAGAR MADURAI-625 020

REP. BY ITS MR.S.KARTHIKEYAN AUTHORISED

REPRESENTATIVE

Vs

1 STATE OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION F
ORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL OF
EDUCATION DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD
CHENNAI- 6.

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE DETERMINATION
COMMITTEE DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE ROAD
CHENNAI- 6.

Prayer

Calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 3.6.2011 made in Order No.Nil in respect of the petitioner school and quash the same and consequently permit the writ petitioner to collect the fees in terms of the fee fixed by the school and submitted to the Committee.

W.P 7111 OF 2012

1 KALAIMAHAL NURSERY AND PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY ITS
CORRESPONDENT MR.K.
NEDUNCHEZHIAN MAIN ROAD THIRUKKADAIYUR
THARANGAMBADI TALUK NAGAPATTINAM DISTRICT-
609311.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS
MEMBER
SECRETARY P.T.A BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS
COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
OF TAMIL NADU SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS D.P.I. CAMPUS NUNGAMBAKKAM

CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for records in respect of the impugned order issued by the 1st Respondent vide its order dated 27/05/2011 redetermining the fee pertaining to the petitioner institute and quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised reasonable fee structure after taking into consideration of all the relevant expenditure being incurred by the petitioner institute for three academic years commencing from 2010-11

W.P. 7112 OF 2012

1 KALAIMAHAL NURSERY AND PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MR.K.

NEDUNCHEZHIAN MAIN ROAD THIRUVILALIYATTAM

THARANGAMBADI TALUK NAGAPATTINAM DISTRICT-

609306.

Vs

1 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE [RESPONDENTS] DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS MEMBER

SECRETARY P.T.A BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD NUNGAMBAKKAM CHENNAI-6.

2 THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

OF TAMIL NADU SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS D.P.I. CAMPUS NUNGAMBAKKAM

CHENNAI-6.

Calling for records in respect of the impugned order issued by the 1st Respondent vide its order dated 27/05/2011 redetermining the fee pertaining to the petitioner institute and quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to reconsider and re-fix a revised reasonable fee structure after taking into consideration of all the relevant expenditure being incurred by the petitioner institute for three academic years commencing from

2010-11

W.P. 7154 OF 2012

1 SENGUNTHAR NURSERY AND [PETITIONER] PRIMARY SCHOOL REP. BY ITS
CORRESPONDENT

BROUGH ROAD ERODE 638 001.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL [RESPONDENTS] NADU REP. BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL
EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI 9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION D.P.I COMPOUND CHENNAI 6.

3 THE PVT SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS

SPECIALOFFICER P.T.A. BUILDING DPI CAMPUS

CHENNAI 6.

4 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

ERODE.

Calling for the records of the 3rd respondent dt.27.05.2011 in fixing the fee for the petitioners school and to
quash the same.

W.P 7159 OF 2012

1 SENGUNTHAR GIRLS HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL REP.BY ITS
CORRESPONDENT

THILLAI NAGAR ERODE- 638 001

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP.BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL
EDUCATION FORT

ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION D.P.I. COMPOUND CHENNAI-6

3 THE PVT.SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER P.T.A. BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

CHENNAI-6

4 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

ERODE

Prayer

calling for the records of the 3rd respondent dated 27.5.2011 in fixing the fee for the petitioners school and to quash the same

W.P 7160 OF 2012

1 M.A.M.MATRIC HIGHER SECONDARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP.BY ITS CORRESPONDENT
MATHAIYAN

KUTTAI POST METTUR DAM TALUK SALEM DIST-

636452

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP.BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL
EDUCATION FORT

ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION D.P.I. COMPOUND CHENNAI-6

3 THE PVT.SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER P.T.A. BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

CHENNAI-6

4 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

SALEM

Prayer

calling for the records of the 3rd respondent dated 27.5.2011 in fixing the fee for the petitioners school and to quash the same

W.P 7287 OF 2012

1 MEENAKSHI SUNDARANAR [PETITIONER] SENGUNTHAR HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL
REP.BY

ITS CORRESPONDENT KANAGAPURAM ROAD

RANGAMPALAYAM ERODE-638009

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP.BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL
EDUCATION FORT

ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION D.P.I. COMPOUND CHENNAI-6

3 THE PVT.SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER P.T.A. BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

CHENNAI-6

4 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

ERODE

Prayer

calling for the records of the 3rd respondent dated 27.5.2011 in fixing the fee for the petitioners school and to quash the same

W.P 7439 OF 2012

1 SAGAR VIDHYA BHAVAN [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION SCHOOL REP. BY
C.SUNDARAJAN

CORRES NO.147 SAGAR NAGAR SALIPALAYAM

BHAVANI MAIN RD (NH-47) PERUNDURAI ERODE

DT-638 052.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION D.P.I.COMPOUND CHENNAI-6.

3 THE PVT. SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER P.T.A.BUILDING D.P.I.CAMPUS

CHENNAI-6.

4 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

ERODE DISTRICT.

Calling for the records of the 3rd respondent dated 14.10.2011 in fixing the fee for the petitioner school and to quash the same

W.P. 7484 OF 2012

1 SENTHIL MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL 2-D NARASHIMMACHARI ROAD

(SOUTH) DHARMAPURI 636701 REP. BY ITS

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER C.SAKTHIVEL

Vs

1 THE GOVT. OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION D.P.I. COMPOUND CHENNAI-6

3 THE PVT. SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER P.T.A. BUILDING D.P.I. CAMPUS

CHENNAI-6

4 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL

OFFICER DHARMAPURI

Prayer

calling for the records of the 3rd respondent dated 3.6.2011 in fixing the fee for the petitioners school and to quash the same

W.P 7499 OF 2012

1 KONGU VELLALAR KALVI NIRUVANAM [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL REP.

BY HIS CORRESPONDENT KUMARAN MALAI

KANJIKOVIL PERUNDURAI TALUK ERODE DIST-638 116

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY HIS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-600 009.

2 THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL EDUCATI

D.P.I. CAMPOUND CHENNAI-600 006

3 THE PRIVATE SCHOOL FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER P.T.A. BUILDING D.P.I. COMPOUND

CHENNAI-600 006.

4 THE CHIEF EDUCATIONAL OFFICER

ERODE.

Calling for the records of the 3rd respondent dated 27/05/2011 in fixing the fee for the petitioners school and quash the same

W.P 8214 OF 2012

1 SPJ MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] (S.PALANICHAMY NADAR EDUCATIONAL TRUST) REP.

BY ITS CHAIRMAN S.P.JEYAPRAGASAM KALKULAM

AVANIYAPURAM MADRUAI-625012.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REP. BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE INSPECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS TALLAKULAM MADURAI.

Prayer

To call for the records on the file of the respondent in proceedings NIL dated 27.5.2011 and quash the same as illegal incompetent and without jurisdiction and for consequential orders

W.P 8385 OF 2012

1 MAHATMA MONTESSORI [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL REP.

BY ITS SECRETARY & CORRESPONDENT S.

PREMALATHA GOPALAKRISHNAN GROUNDS K.K.

NAGAR MADURAI-625020.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS]

PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REP. BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE INSPECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS MADURAI.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the first respondent committee and the order passed by the first respondent committee dt. 3.6.2012 and quash the same

W.P 8386 OF 2012

1 MAHATMA MONTESSORI [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL
REP.

BY ITS SECRETARY & CORRESPONDENT S.

PREMALATHA GOPALAKRISHNAN GROUNDS K.K.

NAGAR MADURAI-625007.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTS] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION
COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REP. BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE INSPECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS MADURAI.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the first respondent committee and the order passed by the first respondent committee dt. 3.6.2012 and quash the same

W.P 8387 OF 2012

1 MAHATMA MONTESSORI [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION RESIDENTIAL HIGHER SECONDARY

SCHOOL REP. BY SECRETARY & CORRESPONDENT S.

PREMALATHA GOPALAKRISHNAN GROUNDS

ALAGARKOIL MADURAI.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENTs] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REP. BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE INSPECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS MADURAI.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the first respondent committee and the order passed by the first respondent committee dt. 3.6.2012 and quash the same

W.P. 8573 OF 2012

1 OUR LADY MATRICULATION HR.SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT P.

ELIZABETH RANI OUR LADY NAGAR MADURAVOYAL

VALASARAVAKKAM CHENNAI-95.

Vs

1 THE SPECIAL OFFICER [RESPONDENT] PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEES DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

2 THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU

REP. BY ITS SECRETARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

3 THE DIRECTOR OF MATRICULATION

SCHOOLS DPI CAMPUS CHENNAI-6.

Calling for the records of the first Respondent Committee and the orders passed by the First Respondent under S.6(1) & 6(4) of the Act dated 10.11.2011 and 10.11.2011 Committee dated and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the Petitioner School to collect the tuition fees collected by the Petitioner School.

Writ petitions relating to minority institutions

W.P.18037 of 2011:

ROSARY MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV. SR. LILY D SOUZA 11 PAPANASAM SIVAN

ROAD SANTHOME CHENNAI 4

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTs] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINING COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 3.6.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 26.4.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

W.P.18092 of 2011:

1 C.S.I. BAIN SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MRS.E.M.VICTOR 42-

48 ORMES ROAD KILPAUK CHENNAI 10

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTs] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINING COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 3.6.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 27.4.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

W.P.18093 of 2011:

DON BOSCO MATRIC HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

REV. SR. LIMCY 27 ETHIRAJ SAMI KOIL ST

ERUKKANCHERRY CHENNAI 118

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTs] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINING COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 3.6.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed in the Memorandum of Objections dt 31.5.2010 for the academic year 2011-2012

W.P.18419 of 2011:

C.S.I. JESSIE MOSES [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION HR. SEC. SCHOOL REPT. BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT MRS. E.M.VICTOR Z183 NEW NO.

37 VTH AVENUE ANNA NAGAR CHENNAI-40.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINING COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 03.06.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the Petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 27.04.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

W.P.18420 of 2011:

C.S.I. EWART MARTICULATION [PETITIONER] HR. SEC. SCHOOL REPT. BY ITS
CORRESPONDENT

MRS. E.M.VICTOR 93 DR.ALAGAPPA ROAD

CHENNAI-84.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINING COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 03.06.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the Petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 27.04.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

W.P.18718 of 2011:

ST.JOSEPHS MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL REP. BY ITS
CORRESPONDENT REV. FR. AROKIA THADAYUS
ONDIPUDUR COIMBATORE-641 016.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS REP. BY SECRETARY DEPARTMENT
OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the Order dated NIL on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner school and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to follow the Fee Structure proposed during the personal hearing on 17.3.2011 for the Academic Year 2011-2012

W.P.18744 of 2011:

CARMEL GARDEN MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HR. SEC. SCHOOL REP BY ITS
CORRESPONDENT

REV. FR. A. MARIA JOSEPH RAMANATHAPURAM

POST COIMBATORE 641 045

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF
SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 17.3.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

W.P.19126 of 2011:

NIRMALA MATHA CONVENT [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL
REP.

BY TIS CORRESPONDENT REV.MOTHER LAMBERT

SAKTHI EASWARI NAGAR VELLALORE POST

COIMBATORE-641 111.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner school and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the Fee Structure proposed during the personal hearing on 16.3.2011 for the Academic Year 2011-2012

W.P.19127 of 2011:

NIRMALA MATHA CONVENT [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION SCHOOL REP. BY TIS

CORRESPONDENT REV.MOTHER VINCENTIA

MOOLAKKARAI NASIYANUR POST ERODE-638 107

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner school and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the Fee Structure proposed during the personal hearing on 27.12.2010 for the Academic Year 2011-2012

W.P.19144 of 2011:

MONTFORT MATRIC HR. SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REPT BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV.
BRO.

SELVIN ANTONY MANJAMPATTY MANAPPARAI 621

307 TRICHY DT

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF
SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 3.6.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 18.3.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

W.P.19145 of 2011:

1 MONTFORT ACADEMY MAT. SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REPT BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV.
BR. S. DAVID

NO.1 SULLIVAN ST MYLAPORE CHENNAI 4

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF
SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 3.6.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fees annexed to the Questionnaire and enclosed with the Memorandum of Objections dt 27.5.2010 for the academic year 2011-2012

W.P.19165 of 2011:

ST. ANNES NURSERY AND PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REPT BY ITS CORRESPONDENT
REV. SR.

PHILIPMARY KRISHNAGIRI 635 001 KRISHNAGIRI

DT

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF
SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 3.1.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

W.P.19166 of 2011:

ST. JUSTINS MATRIC HR. SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REPT BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV. SR.

BENET MADURAI ROAD SIVAGANGAI 630 581

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 5.4.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

W.P.19171 of 2011:

HOLY ANGELS NURSERY AND [PETITIONER] PRIMARY SCHOOL REPT BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

REV. SR. ROSE MARY SALEM MAIN ROAD

TIRUCHENGODE 637 211 NAMAKKAL DT

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 29.12.2010 for the academic year 2011-2012

W.P.19172 of 2011:

FATIMA NURSERY AND PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REPT BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV. SR.

PATRICIA H.C.F.P.O. MATHIGIRI 635 110

KRISHNAGIRI DT

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 3.1.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

W.P.19183 of 2011:

HOLY ANGELS MATRICULATION HR. [PETITIONER] SEC. SCHOOL REPT BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV.

SR. JOSEPH MARY FAIRLANDS SALEM 636 016

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 25.3.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

W.P.19192 of 2011:

HOLY FAMILY CONVENT MAT. HR. [PETITIONER] SEC. SCHOOL REPT BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV.

SR. MAGGIE 62 MEDAVAKKAM MAIN ROAD

KEELKATTALAI CHENNAI 117

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 18.4.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

W.P.19193 of 2011:

LITTLE FLOWER MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REPT BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV. FR.

JOSEPH PUTHIYATH THANTHONIMALAI MANAVADI

POST KARUR 639 005

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 27.12.2010 for the academic year 2011-2012

W.P.19491 of 2011:

CARMEL NURSERY & PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REPT BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV. SR.

SARIKA SOODAMANI NAGAR KARAUKUDI 630 003

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINING COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 1.12.2010 for the academic year 2011-2012

W.P.19492 of 2011:

1 VIMAL JYOTHI CONVENT MAT. HR. [PETITIONER] SEC. SCHOOL REPT BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV.

SR. SUSHMA SARAVANAMPATTY POST COIMBATORE

641 035

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 16.3.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012 W.P.19521 of 2011:

STELLA MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REPT BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV. SR. LOURDU

MARY ASHOK NAGAR CHENNAI 83

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 26.4.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

W.P.NO.19522 OF 2011

ST. MARYS MAT. HR. SEC. SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REPT BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV. SR. EMILIANA

KURUPANAICKENPALAYAM METTUR MAIN ROAD

BHAVANI 638 304

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENT S] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINING COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 23.3.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012.

W.P.NO.19537 OF 2011

HOLY ANGELS MAT. HR. SEC. SCHOOL [PETITIONERS] REPT BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV. SR.

ROSE MARY SALEM MAIN ROAD TIRUCHENGODE 637 209 NAMAKKAL DT

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENT] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 8.4.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012.

W.P.NO.19545 OF 2011

CLUNY MATRIC HR. SEC. SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REPT BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV. SR. ALPHONSA

8 D RAMAKRISHNA ROAD SALEM 636 007

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 25.3.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012.

W.P.NO.19557 OF 2011

INFANT JESUS MAT. SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT FR.A. PAULRAJ

KUMAR NAGAR GANDHI NAGAR (P.O) TIRUPUR 641 603

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 25.3.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012.

W.P.NO.19558 OF 2011

LITTLE FLOWER CONVENT MAT. HR. [PETITIONER] SEC. SCHOOL REPT. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV.

SR. JASMINE ANDIPALAYAM TIRUPPUR 641 687

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 3.6.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 23.3.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012.

W.P.NO.19596 OF 2011

ST. JOHN BOSCO GIRLS HR. SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REPT. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV. SR.

PRAGASA MARY DENKANIKOTTAI ROAD SHANTHI

NAGAR HOSUR 635 109 KRISHNAGIRI DT

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 3.6.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 15.3.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012.

W.P.NO.20304 OF 2011

ST. MARYS HOME MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REPBY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV. SR.

LIDWIN MARY NEAR KAMARAJ SQARE KOTAGIRI

THE NILGIRIS 643 217

Vs

1 THE GOVT. OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINING COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 3.6.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 11.4.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012.

W.P.NO.20322 OF 2011

CHRISTHU JYOTHI MATRIC HR. SEC [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT
REV. SR.

REINA PERIA AGRAHARAM BHAVANI ROAD ERODE

DISTRICT-638 005.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 27.05.2011 on the file of the 2nd
respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the
respondents to permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on
23.3.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012.

W.P.NO.20326 OF 2011

INFANT JESUS MAT. HR. SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV.
SR.T.

C.LILLY SUKKAMPALAYAM PO PERUMPALI

PALLADAM TIRUPPUR-641 662.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 03.06.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 24.3.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012.

W.P.NO.20338 OF 2011

ST. JOSEPH MAT. HR.SEC. SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REPT. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV.SR.

KOCHUTRESA THOMAS 1591 TRICHY ROAD

COIMBATORE-18.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 27.05.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the Petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 16.03.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012.

W.P.NO.20339 OF 2011

ANNAI MARY NURSERY & PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REPT. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV.SR.

REDEMPTA KARAIVAIKKAL ERODE DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 27.05.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the Petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 22.12.2010 for the academic year 2011-2012.

W.P.NO.20340 OF 2011

ST. JOSEPHS MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REPT. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT
REV.SR.

MARY PHILIP NORTHPET SATHYAMANGALAM

ERODE-638 401.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 27.05.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the Petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 23.03.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012.

W.P.NO.20351 OF 2011

TRINITY MAT. HIGHER SECONDARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REPT. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT
REV. FR.

GEORGE NARIKUZHI RAMANATHAPURAM

COIMBATORE-641 045.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 27.05.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the Petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 16.03.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012.

W.P.NO.20371 OF 2011

AVILA CONVENT MATRIC. HR. SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REPT. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT
REV.SR.

ATHAMA VELANDIPALAYAM COIMBATORE-641025.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 27.05.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the Petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed in the Memorandum of Objection dated 26.05.2010 for the academic year 2011-2012.

W.P.NO.20372 OF 2011

VIMALA MATRICULATION HR.SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REPT. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT
REV. SR.

REINA THOPPUPALAYAM (P.O)

CHENNIMALAI 638 051 ERODE DT

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF
SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent
and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to
permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 23.3.2011 for
the academic year 2011-2012.

W.P.NO.20387 OF 2011

SAHAYAMATHA MATRIC. HR. SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REPT. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT
REV. SR.

HELEN ROSE K.K. NAGAR KALANIVASAL

KARAIKUDI 630 002

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF
SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINING COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 5.4.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012.

W.P.NO.20410 OF 2011

HOLY REDEEMERS MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REPT. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT
REV. SR.

OCTAVIA EX SERVICEMEN COLONY

BHAVANISAGAR 638 451 ERODE DT

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF
SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINING COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 23.3.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012.

W.P.NO.20416 OF 2011

ST. ANN S MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REPT. BY THE CORRESPONDENT SR.
DONATA

MEDABALIMI MELAMIYUR VALLAM B.O.

CHENGALPATTU 603 002

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF
SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 18.2.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012.

W.P.NO.20425 OF 2011

AROCKIAMATHA NURSERY AND [PETITIONER] PRIMARY SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

REV.SR.SILA MAHALINGAPURAM

POLLACHI-643 002.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENT S] REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 27.05.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the Petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed in the Memorandum of Objection filed in June 2010 for the Academic Year 2011-2012.

W.P.NO.20819 OF 2011

MERCY MAT. HR. SEC. SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REPT. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV. SR.

PHILOMENE CHACKO KADAIYUR KANGAYAM

THIRUPUR 638 701

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINING COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 24.3.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012.

W.P.NO.20843 OF 2011

SHANTHI RANI MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HR. SEC. SCHOOL REPT. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

REV.SR. VELANGANNI KALLAL-630305

KARAIKUDI TALUK SIVAGANGAI DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 27.05.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the

respondents to permit the Petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 05.04.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012.

W.P.NO.20845 OF 2011

ST. ANTONYS MATRIC HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL REPT. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

REV. SR. SUSAN GRACE ANDANKOVIL

KARUR 639 002.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REPLY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 14.3.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012.

W.P.NO.21030 OF 2011

AROCKIAMATHA MAT. HR. SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REPT. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV. SR.

MARIA JOHN UDUMALAI ROAD POLLACHI 642 003

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 16.3.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012.

WP.No.21054/2011:

1 MARY RANI NURSERY AND PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REPT. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV. SR.

SOSAMMA JOHN SATHY ROAD GANDHIPURAM

COIMBATORE 641 012

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENT] REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV. SR. SOSAMMA

JOHN SATHY ROAD GANDHIPURAM COIMBATORE

641 012

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure proposed in the personal hearing dt 20.12.2010 for the academic year 2011-2012

WP.No.21099/2011:

1 HOLY SPIRIT MATRICULATION HR. [PETITIONER] SEC. SCHOOL REPT. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

REV. SR. PULCHARIA MINJ KALLAL ROAD

SEEGOORANI KALAYAR KOVIL 630 551

SIVAGANGAI DT

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENT] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 5.4.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

WP.No.21127/2011

1 ST.MICHAELS ACADEMY [PETITIONER] MATRICULATION HR. SEC. SCHOOL REP. BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT AND PRINCIPAL REV.BRO.JOHNSON

REX DHANABAL 4TH MAIN ROAD GANDHI NAGAR

ADYAR CHENNAI-20.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 03.06.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure proposed in the personal hearing dt 26.04.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

WP.No.21131/2011

1 LOURDU MATHA CONVENT MAT. HR. [PETITIONER] SEC. SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV.

SR.ROSE MARY BODIPATTI PO UDUMALPET-642

154 TIRUPPUR DISTRICT.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 27.05.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 24.03.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

WP.No.21136/2011

1 SACRED HEART MATRICULATION HR. [PETITIONER] SEC. SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV.

SR. MARGARET TOWER CHURCH PARK CHENNAI-6.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 03.06.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure given in the Memorandum of Objections dated 03.06.2010 for the academic year 2011-2012

WP.No.21266/2011

1 ST. JOSEPHS MATRICULATION HR. [PETITIONER] SEC. SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV.

SR.ANITA PENSION LINE GUGAI SALEM-636 006.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 03.06.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure proposed in the personal hearing dt 25.03.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

WP.No.21268/2011

1 ST.ANNS MATRICULATION HR. SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV. SR.

GNANA SUNDARI MADANADAPURAM PORUR CHENNAI-

116 KANCHEEPURAM DISTRICT

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 27.05.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure given in the Memorandum of Objections dated 24.05.2010 for the academic year 2011-2012

WP.No.21430/2011

1 ST. JOSEPH MATRICULATION HR. [PETITIONER] SEC. SCHOOL REPT. BY ITS
CORRESPONDENT REV.

SR.SAGAYAM MADURANTAKAM-603306.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENT] REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 03.06.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the Petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 19.04.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

WP.No.22769/2011

1 DON BOSCO MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL REPT. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

DR.FR.JOHN ALEXANDER SDB 13 CASA MAJOR

ROAD EGMORE CHENNAI-8.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 03.06.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the Petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 26.04.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

WP.No.22993/2011

1 ST. JOSEPH MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL REPT. BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT REV.SR.JOSIA KRISHNAPURAM

AMBATTUR CHENNAI-53.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 03.06.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the Petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 21.04.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

WP.No.23364/2011

1 ST.ANNES NURSERY AND PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY THE CORRESPONDENT REV.SR.

MARY DULA 58/65 WEST MADHA CHURCH STREET

ROYAPURAM CHENNAI-600 013.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-600 009.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 27.05.2011 on the file of the 2nd Respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the Respondents to permit the Petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 25.02.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012.

WP.No.23963/2011

1 ST. ANNES MATRICULATION HR. [PETITIONER] SEC. SCHOOL REP. BY THE CORRESPONDENT REV.

SR. MARY CELINE J.N.ROAD THIRUVALLUR-602 001.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 03.06.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 20.4.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

WP.No.24048/2011

1 CHRIST MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV. FR.
JOHNSON

XAVIER CMI PRESHITHA NAGAR SENNEERKUPPAM PO

POONAMALLEE CHENNAI 56

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF
SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 3.6.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to

permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 20.4.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

WP.No.24170/2011

1 CLUNY MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV. SR. ANNE

AUGUSTINE VENKATESHAPURAM KATPADI VELLORE

DT 632 007

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 30.3.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

WP.24497/2011

1 DON BOSCO HR. SEC. SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REP. BY THE CORRESPONDENT FR. P. ANTONY

JOSEPH BOSCO MAIYAM SAGAYA NAGAR

PALLITHAMMAM POST KALAIYARKOVIL SIVAGANGAI 630 551

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the Memorandum of Objection on 24.5.2010 for the academic year 2011-2012

WP.No.24498/2011

1 ANNE MARIE MATRIC HR. SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL (28298) REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

SISTER BERCHMANS THIRUPARKADAL

KAVERIPAKKAM P.O. VELLORE DT 632 508

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 30.3.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

WP.No.24499/2011

1 ST.JOHNS MATRICULATION HR. [PETITIONER] SEC.SCHOOL REP. BY THE CORRESPONDENT REV.

SR. K.V. ROSAMMA KATPADI ROAD GUDIYATTAM

VELLORE DT

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENT] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 3.6.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 30.3.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

WP.No.24500/2011

1 LOURDES MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REP. BY THE CORRESPONDENT REV. SR. MARY

BERNADETTE NO.30 BUNDER GARDEN ST PERAMBUR

CHENNAI 11

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 3.6.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed in the Memorandum of Objection on 20.5.2010 for the academic year 2011-2012

WP.No.24501/2011

1 CARMEL MATRICULATION HR. SEC. [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV. FR.

E.K. SAVIRIAR KOLLAMPALYAM BY PASS ROAD

ERODE 638 002

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 27.5.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 23.3.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

WP.No.24857/2011

1 DON BOSCO MATRICULATION HR. [PETITIONER] SEC. SCHOOL REP. BY THE CORRESPONDENT REV.

FR.CAMILLUS FERNANDO SDB DON BOSCO ROAD

YAGAPPA NAGAR THANJAVUR-613 007.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-600 009.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 03.06.2011 on the file of the 2nd Respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the Respondents to permit the Petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 22.03.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012.

WP.No.24858/2011

1 DON BOSCOR MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY THE CORRESPONDENT
REV.SR.

THERESE G.N.T. ROAD KARANODAI CHENNAI-600 067.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-600 009.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 27.05.2011 on the file of the 2nd Respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the Respondents to permit the Petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 20.04.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012.

WP.No.24859/2011

1 LISIEUX MATRICULATION HIGHER [PETITIONER] SECONDARY SCHOOL REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT

REV.FR. P.R.PHILIPS BHARATHI PARK CROSS

ROAD SAIBABA COLONY PO. COIMBATORE -641 011.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-600 009.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 27.05.2011 on the file of the 2nd Respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the Respondents to permit the Petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed Memorandum of Objection dated 27.05.2010 for the academic year 2011-2012.

WP.No.25024/2011

1 ST. MICHAELS HIGH SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REP. BY THE PRINCIPAL REV. FR.AROCKYA

ANTHONI RAJU MADHAKOTTAI THANJAVUR-613051.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REP. BY THE SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 27.05.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure proposed during the Memorandum of Objection on 22.05.2010 for the academic year 2011-2012

WP.No.25841/2011

1 ST. ANNE MATRICULATION SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REP. BY THE CORRESPONDENT
REV.SR.MARGARET

MARY MINJUR PONNERI TALUK THIRUVALLUR-

601203.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENTS] REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 27.05.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the Petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 02.05.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

WP.No.25874/2011

1 ST. ANNES MAT. HR. SEC. SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REP BY ITS CORRESPONDENT REV. SR.
MARY GEMMA

23 GANDHI NAGAR KUMBAKONAM 612 001

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTS] REP BY THE SECRETARY DEPT. OF
SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 3.6.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 22.3.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

WP.No.25916/2011

1 DON BOSCO MATRICULATION [PETITIONER] HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL REP. BY ITS

CORRESPONDENT REV.FR. P.S.KANICKAIRAJ NO.6

PAPER MILL ROAD PERAVALLUR CHENNAI-82.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENT] REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF

SCHOOL EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 03.06.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the Petitioner School to follow the fee structure submitted during the personal hearing on 25.04.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

WP.No.28507/2011

1 ST. ANNES NURSERY AND PRIMARY [PETITIONER] SCHOOL REP. BY THE
CORRESPONDENT REV.SR.

MARIA PERUNGUDI MADURAI-625 022.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENT] REP. BY THE SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER P.T.A.BUILDING D.P.I.CAMPUS

COLLEGE ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 27.05.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 8.12.2010 for the academic year 2011-2012

W.P.No.243 of 2012

1 C.S.I. BAIN SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REP. BY ITS CORRESPONDENT MRS.E.M.VICTOR

42-48 ORMES ROAD KILPAUK CHENNAI-10.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENT] REP. BY THE SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINING COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-600 006.

Calling for the records pertaining to the order dated 03.06.2011 on the file of the 2nd Respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the Petitioner School and consequently direct the Respondents to permit the Petitioner School to follow the fee structure proposed during the personal hearing on 02.05.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012.

W.P.No.2606 of 20121

SEVENTH DAY ADVENTIST SCHOOL [PETITIONER] REP BY ITS PRINCIPAL AND
CORRESPONDENT

MR.J. JOHNSON KINSLEY 16 VALLIAMMAL ROAD VEPERY

CHENNAI 7

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU [RESPONDENTs] REPBY THE SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST.GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINING COMMITTEE REP BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI 6

Prayer

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dt 20.10.2011 on the file of the 2nd
respondent and quashthe same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the
respondents to permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure proposed in the Memorandum of
Objections on 24.5.2011 for the academic years 2011-2013

W.P.No.3619 of 2012

1 OUR LADY FATIMA NURSERY AND [PETITIONER] PRIMARY SCHOOL REP. BY ITS
CORRESPONDENT

REV.SR.DEPHINAL BALTAZAR 1252 BIG BAZAR

STREET COIMBATORE-641 001.

Vs

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU [RESPONDENT] REP. BY THE SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION FORT ST. GEORGE CHENNAI-9.

2 THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS FEE

DETERMINATION COMMITTEE REP. BY ITS SPECIAL

OFFICER PTA BUILDING DPI CAMPUS COLLEGE

ROAD CHENNAI-6.

Calling for the records of the Committee pertaining to the order dated 19.09.2011 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner School and consequently direct the respondents to permit the petitioner school to follow the fee structure proposed by the petitioner school during the personal hearing on 29.8.2011 for the academic year 2011-2012

For petitioner in W.P.No.19761 : Mr.A.L.Somayaji, of 2011 Senior Counsel

for

Mr.K.Harishnkar

For Petitioner in W.P.Nos.19635 : Mr.R.Muthukumaraswamy to 19637 of 2011 Senior Counsel

for

Mr.T.K.Bhaskar

For Petitioner in W.P.No.21528 : Mr.R.Krishnamurthy, of 2011 Senior Counsel

for

Mr.S.Thanka Sivan

For Petitioner in W.P.Nos.17452 : Mr.R.Krishnamurthy, and 21644 of 2011 Senior Counsel

for

Mr.R.Bharath Kumar

For Petitioner in W.P.Nos.16488 : Mr.S.Silambanan

to 16490,16972 to 16974, 22419 to Senior Counsel 22421,23210,23423, 24782 to 24784, for

28216 and 28217 of 2011 and 255, M/s.Profexs Associates 3756, 7002 and 7003 of 2012

For Petitioner in W.P.No.23213 : Mr.S.Silambanan and 23238 to 23240 of 2011 Senior Counsel and 5689 of 2012 for

Mr.M.J.Jaseem Mohmed

For Petitioner in W.P.Nos.22223, : Mr.N.R.Chandran

22224, 22235 and 22263 of 2011 Senior Counsel

for

M/s.Profexs Associates

For Petitioner in W.P.Nos.17533 : Mr.N.R.Chandran

,22050,22051 and 26218 of 2011 Senior Counsel

for

Mr.R.Natarajan

For Petitioner in W.P.No.17754: Mr.N.R.Chandran

of 2011 Senior Counsel

for

Mr.R.Kannan

For Petitioner in W.P.Nos.18453 of 2011 : Mr.N.R.Chandran, Senior Counsel

for

Mr.N.Sivakumar

For Petitioner in W.P.No.16234 of 2011 : Mr.Vijaya Narayanan Senior Counsel

for

Dr.P.Vasudevan

For Petitioner in W.P.Nos.19476 : Mr.Muthukumaraswamy to 19478 of 2011. Senior Counsel

for

Mr.R.Venkatavaradan

For Petitioner in W.P.Nos.16023, : Mr.AR.L.Sundaresan 16025 of 2011 Senior Counsel

for

Mr.L.Murali Krishnan

For Petitioner in W.P.No.19607, 26644 : Mrs.Chitra Sampath and 26645 of 2011 Mr.T.S.Baskaran

For Petitioner in W.P.Nos.15212 to 15214, : Mr.V.Raghavachari 16116, 21177, 21183, 21288, 23498 and 23789 of 2011.

For Petitioner in W.P.Nos.18037, 18092, 18093,:

Mr.Fr.A.Xavier Arulraj

18419, 18420, 18718, 18744, 19126, 19127,

19144, 19145, 19165, 19166, 19171, 19172,
19183, 19192, 19193, 19491, 19492, 19521,
19522, 19537, 19545, 19557, 19558, 19596,
20304, 20322,20326, 20338 to 20340, 20351,
20371, 20372, 20387, 20410, 20416, 20425,
20819, 20843, 20845, 21030, 21054, 21099,
21127, 21131, 21136, 21266, 21268, 21430,
22769, 22993, 23364, 23963, 24048, 24170,
24497 to 24501, 24857, 24858, 24859,25024,
25841, 25874, 25916 and 28507 of 2011 and
243,2606, 3619, 6919 and 6920 of 2012

For Petitioner in W.P.Nos.16373, 18853 to : Mr.B.Rabu Manohar 18859,19377,19379, 21646, 21679, 22054
Mr.B.Kannan & and 23876 of 2011 and 3547, 3548,4129 Mr.P.Harikrishnan and 6856 of 2012

For Petitioner in W.P.Nos.8489 of 2011 : Mr.A.L.Somayaji, Senior Counsel for

Mr.T.K.Bhaskar

Mr.K.Harishankar

Mr.Srinath Sridevan

For Petitioner in W.P.Nos.19738 and 25989 : Mr.K.Harishankar of 2011

For Petitioner in W.P.No.16853 of 2011 : Mr.Srinath Sridevan

For Petitioner in W.P.No.21097 and : Mr.R.Bharath Kumar, 21630 of 2011 Mr.S.Venkatesh

Mr.M.Senthil Kumar

For Petitioner in W.P.No.14143 of 2011 : Mr.A.Ramesh

For Petitioner in W.P.No.15374 to 15376 : Mr.B.Rabu Manohar of 2011

For Petitioner in W.P.Nos.16913, : Mr.L.Murali Krishnan 19683, 19684, 20869, 20870, 21561 and
24285 of 2011 and 8214 and 8385 to 8387

of 2012

For Petitioner in W.P.No.16246 of 2011 : Mr.K.Rajasekaran

For Petitioner in W.P.Nos. 16921 : Mr.S.Silambanan 24855, 24856, of 2011 and Sr.Counsel 694, 7002 and 7003 of 2012 for M/s.Profex Associates.

For Petitioner in W.P.No.16498 of 2011 : Mr.T.N.Sugesh

For Petitioner in W.P.No.16583, 21305, : Mr.G.Sankaran 23281 to 23283, 26049, 26050, 26454, 28084 and 29003 of 2011 and 1450 of 2012

For Petitioner in W.P.No.16920 of 2011 : Mr.Cherien Mathews

For Petitioner in W.P.Nos.16930, 16931, : Mr.Isaac Mohanlal 17011, 17046, 17403, 18193,22697 and 28306 of 2011

For Petitioner in W.P.No.16937 and : Mr.Satish Parasaran 18260 of 2011

For Petitioner in W.P.No.17062 and 1706: Mr.T.Sai Krishnan of 2011 for M/s.Sai Bharath and Ilan

For Petitioner in W.P.No.17098 of 2011: Mr.S.Thanjai P.N.Chezhan

For Petitioner in W.P.No.17124 to 17126,: Mr.T.E.Badrinathan 18004, 22717 and 23879 of 2011

For Petitioner in W.P.No.17196 of 2011 : Mr.P.Venugopal

For Petitioner in W.P.No.17219 of 2011 : Mr.T.Gandhi

For Petitioner in W.P.No.17680 and 22513 : Mr.A.S.Thambuswamy of 2011

For Petitioner in W.P.No.17724 of 2011 : Mr.C.P.Sivamohan

For Petitioner in W.P.No.17879, 17907, : Mr.N.Umapathi 18014, 18347, 18540, 18541, 19060, 19667, 23321, 24759, 24771 and 26431 of 2011.

For Petitioner in W.P.No.18031, 21096 and M/s.Royan Law Associates 21451 of 2011

For Petitioner in W.P.No.18116 of 2011 : Mr.N.Aravindkumar

For Petitioner in W.P.No.18191 of 2011 : Mr.Ravindran for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co.,

For Petitioner in W.P.No.18461 of 2011 : Mr.S.Kamadevan

For Petitioner in W.P.No.18464 of 2011 : Mr.N.Anand Venkatesh

For Petitioner in W.P.No.18847 of 2011 : M/s.Aiyar and Dolia

For Petitioner in W.P.Nos.19308, 20596, : Mr.R.Suresh Kumar 20597, 21598, 26893, 28228 to 28230, 28304, 28305 of 2011, 462 to 465, 4321,

5037, 5050 to 5052 of 2012,

For Petitioner in W.P.Nos.19404 to 19411,: Mr.M.Naraayanaswamy 21111 to 21115, 22124 and 23795 of 2011

For Petitioner in W.P.Nos.19548, 19549, : Mr.N.Manokaran 20550, 20551, 21025 to 21028, 21328, 22140,22141, 22395, 23007, 23733,23734,

25799, 28555 of 2011 and 5781 of 2012

For Petitioner in W.P.No.19604 of 2011 : Mr.S.Vijayakumar

For Petitioner in W.P.Nos.19647 an : Mr.K.Kuppusamy 19648 of 2011

For Petitioner in W.P.No.19694 :Mr.R.Shankaranarayanan and19699 of 2011.

For Petitioner in W.P.No.20098 to 20100, : Mr.R.Karthikeyan 20282 to 20285, 20605, 20606,20858, 20859, 22842, 22843, 26167 to 26169,

26381, 26382, 26593, 26594 and

26619 of 2011.

For Petitioner in W.P.No.20311 of 2011 : M/s.L.Surya Associates

For Petitioner in W.P.No.21049, 21330 : Mr.Ravi Kumar Paul, and 22052 of 2011 for M/s.Paul and Paul

For Petitioner in W.P.Nos.21361 and : Mr.V.Srinivasa Babu 21362 of 2011

For Petitioner in W.P.No.21383 and : Mr.P.Satish 21384 of 2011

For Petitioner in W.P.No.22093 of 2011 : Mr.N.V.N.Margandeyan

For Petitioner in W.P.Nos.22124 and : Mr.M.Naraayanaswamy 23795 of 2011

For Petitioner in W.P.No.23318 of 2011 : Mr.V.Sanjeevi For Petitioner in W.P.Nos. 23597 to : Mr.A.D.Jagadish 23599, 23634, 23636 and 23651 of Chandira 2011

For Petitioner in W.P.No.23771 of 2011 : Mr.K.Kalyanasundaram For Petitioner in W.P.No.24142, 24161, : Mr.Srinivasa Mohan 24348, 24443, 24446, 24794, 24977, and

25283, 27293, 27601, 27925 and 30218 Mr.V.G.Suresh Kumar of 2011 and 257, 1978, 2806, 7154,

7159, 7160, 7287, 7439, 7484 and 7499

of 2012

For Petitioner in W.P.No.24168, 24169, : Mr.S.K.Balashanmugam 24774, 24775, 25102 to 25104 of 2011

For Petitioner in W.P.No.24303 of 2011 : Mr.C.K.M.Appaji

For Petitioner in W.P.No.24456 to 24459 : Mr.R.Murugabharathi of 2011

For Petitioner in W.P.No.25707 of 2011 : Ms.G.Thilakavathy

For Petitioner in W.P.No.26270 of 2011 : Mr.S.Sathyanarayanan

For Petitioner in W.P.No.26297, 26298 , : Mr.S.Saravanan of 2011 and 4628, 4629 of 2012

For Petitioner in W.P.No.26384 to 26386,: Mr.M.Govindarraj 28297 of 2011 and 862 of 2012

For Petitioner in W.P.No.27214 of 2011 : Mr.B.T.Seshadri

For Petitioner in W.P.No.27573 and 27574: Mr.R.Krishnamurthy, of 2011 Senior Counsel for
Mr.V.Ayyadurai

For Petitioner in W.P.No.28287 of 2011 : Mr.K.Lavan

For Petitioner in W.P.No.28553, 28554 : M/s.S.B.S.Raman of 2011 and 4607 to 4610 of 2012 and Associates

For Petitioner in W.P.No.29825 to 29827 : Mr.P.Nagaraju of 2011

For Petitioner in W.P.No.388 of 2012 : Mr.V.V.Giridhar

For Petitioner in W.P.No.2967 of 2012 : Mr.N.R.Chandran, Senior Counsel
for

M/s.Sunil Sudhakar

Shankar

For Petitioner in W.P.No.5288, 6007, : Mr.Kandhavadivel 6415 and 6416 of 2012 Doraisami for
Mr.Muthumani

Doraisami

For Petitioner in W.P.No.5562, 6644 and : Mr.V.P.Sengottuvel 6650 of 2012

For Petitioner in W.P.No.6086 of 2012 : Mr.C.K.Chandrasekar for Mr.T.Sundaravadanam

For Petitioner in W.P.No.6317, : Mr.R.Neelakandan

6318 of 2012

For Petitioner in W.P.Nos.6861 to : Mr.R.Ramachandran 6865, 6955,to 6958, 6989, 7111
and 7112 of 2012

For Petitioner in W.P.No.8573 of 2012 : Mr.A.Jenasenan For Respondents in all W.Ps
:Mr.A.Navaneethakrishnan, Advocate General,

assisted by

Mr.S.Venkatesh,

Govt.Pleader

Mr.E.Sampathkumar,

Spl.Govt.Pleader (Edn.)

Mr.P.Sanjaigandhi,

Addl. Govt. Pleader (Edn.)

COMMON ORDER

R.BANUMATHI,J.

The writ petitioners, who are unaided private schools, have filed these writ petitions challenging the final order/ fee structure prescribed by School Fee Determination Committee on the ground of arbitrariness and that it is not in conformity with Tamilnadu Schools (Regulation of Collection of Fee) Act 2009 (Tamil Nadu Act 22 of 2009).

2. All the writ petitioners are self financing schools and not getting any financial aid from the Government or other Government sources. Some of the writ petitioners are recognised under Tamil Nadu Private Schools Regulation Act; few others are recognised under Code of Regulations for Matriculation Schools or Code of Regulations for Anglo Indian Schools. In so far as Schools recognised under CBSE Regulations or ICSE regulations, the applicability of Tamilnadu Schools (Regulation of Collection of Fee) Act, 2009 is under challenge and those writ petitions challenging the applicability of the Act were ordered to be segregated. Since common points for determination arise in all these writ petitions, all of them were heard together and shall stand disposed of by this common judgment.

3. Background facts:- Till 2009, all private unaided schools like the writ petitioner schools were fixing their own fee structure and collecting the same from the students either as annual fee or term fee or monthly fee. Tamil Nadu Government enacted a law - Tamilnadu Schools (Regulation of Collection of Fee) Act, 2009 (hereinafter, referred to as "the Act") on 07.08.2009 to provide for the regulation of collection of fee by the Schools in the State of Tamil Nadu and matters connected therewith and incidental. Section 2 of the Act contains definitions.

4. As per Section 3 of the said Act, there was a prohibition on Government school or aided school from collecting fee in excess of the fee fixed by the Government for admission of pupils to any Standard or course of study in the school. In terms of Sub-Section (2) of Section 3, no fee in excess of the fee determined by the Committee under the Act shall be collected for admission of pupils to any Standard or course of study in a private school. Section 6 of the Act stipulates the factors to be taken into account to determine the fee leviable by a private school. Section 7 deals with the powers and functions of the Committee and the procedure to be followed by the Committee.

5. Section 16 is the enabling provision to make rules for carrying out all or any of the purposes of the Act. In exercise of the powers conferred under Section 16 of the Act, Tamilnadu Schools (Regulation of Collection of Fee) Rules 2009, Government framed the Rules, which came into force on 7.12.2009. The vires of the Act and the Rules were challenged in a batch of writ petitions. In the judgment dated 9.4.2010 in the case of Tamilnadu Nursery Matriculation and Higher Secondary Schools Association (Regd.) rep.by its General Secretary Vs. The State of Tamilnadu rep.by the Principal secretary, Department of School Education, Fort St.George, Chennai -9 and 4 others (2010(4) CTC 353), First Bench of this Court upheld its validity except

Section 11 of the Act and Rules 4(4) and 4(5) of the Rules, which gave power to the educational authorities for entering the School for such inspection and seizure. As against the said judgment, Special Leave Petition was filed before the Supreme Court in S.L.P.No.13428 of 2010 and the same was dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court by order dated 11.05.2010.

6. Even before the challenge to the validity of the Act, the Government by G.O.(Ms) No.320, School Education Department, dated 7.12.2009, constituted the Committee under the Chairmanship of Justice K.Govindarajan, a retired Judge of this Court and the Committee prepared the questionnaire and sent the same to 10934 private schools through Chief Educational Officer. After getting response from the individual schools, on 7.5.2010, orders were issued by the Fee Determination Committee fixing the fee to be collected for the years 2010-2011 to 2012-13. On receipt of such fee determination orders, about 6400 schools have submitted their objections under Section 6(3) of the Act objecting to the determination of fee fixed by the Committee. The Committee also issued a Press Release on 11.08.2010 about the receipt of representations and stating that revised fee would be fixed after re-inspection of the schools and in so far as the Government Order 2010-2011, the fee already fixed will be in force.

7. The Orders passed by the Committee and the Press Release were challenged in a batch of writ petitions. In the miscellaneous petitions, the writ petitioners thereon prayed for stay of the operation of the fee fixation committee and the press release. By Order dated 14.9.2010 in M.P.Nos.2 of 2010 in W.P.No.18854 of 2010, single judge of this Court granted injunction restraining the State from enforcing the order of the Fee Fixation Committee for the academic year 2010-11. As against the said interim order, State as well as the parents have preferred appeals. By Order dated 5.10.2010, First Bench set aside the order of the single judge dated 14.9.2010. In order to give quietus to the entire controversy, the First Bench disposed of the appeals in P.B.Prince Gajendra Babu Vs. Federation of Association of Private Schools in T.N. (2010(5) CTC 721). First Bench interalia issued directions, directing the Committee to consider the objections of the 6,400 Institutions by affording opportunity of personal hearing to the Institutions to enable them to submit materials for consideration of the Committee and thereafter pass individual orders by considering all the materials as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. In the meanwhile Court directed the Institutions not to demand any fee more than what has been indicated in the order.

8. The said order was taken on appeal to the Supreme Court by way of Special Leave Petition and the Special Leave Petition was dismissed by the Supreme Court on 16.12.2010 deleting the period of four months fixed by the High Court. In the mean time, a review petition was also filed before High Court to review the said order dated 5.10.2010 and the said review petition also came to be dismissed on 2.12.2010.

9. In the meanwhile, since the former Chairman of the Committee Justice K.Govindarajan resigned, Justice K.Raviraja Pandian was appointed as the Chairman of School Fee Determination Committee. As per the above said order, fresh questionnaires were sent to the schools and upon submission of filled in questionnaires by the Schools, personal hearing was given to each one of the schools. The grievances of the respective schools were heard by a Committee of three members and taking into account the various factors stated in Section 6(1) of the Act, final orders fixing the fee structure were passed in respect of each individual schools.

10. By the impugned order, the Committee fixed fee structure and determined it as a fee to be collected for the next three academic years i.e., 2010-11 to 2012-13 or until further orders of the Committee, whichever is earlier. On the ground of arbitrariness and that the fee fixed are in conformity with Tamilnadu Schools (Regulation of Collection of Fee) Act 2009, challenging the orders determining fee to be collected, the private schools have filed the writ petitions. 11. In these batch matters, about 300 writ petitions arise from the orders passed by the former Committee headed by Justice K.Raviraja Pandian. Two writ petitions arise out of the order passed by the Committee headed by Justice K.Govindarajan. Twelve writ petitions arise out of order passed by the present Committee. Four Other writ petitions arise out of the order rejecting the objections filed by the schools for the second time.

12. Challenge in the Writ Petitions:-

Main challenge in the writ petitions is that the Committee had failed to provide reasonable opportunity to the writ petitioners while hearing their objections/representations by the Committee and that there was violation of principles of natural justice. As per T.M.A. Pai Foundation case [(2002) 8 SCC 481], private Educational Institutions have right and freedom to fee structure and therefore, entitled to fix their fee structure including surplus for expansion and development of the Educational Institutions. As per the provisions of the Act and decision in 2010 (5) CTC 721, duty, power and responsibility of the Committee is to see whether the fees collected by the schools can be approved and only in cases where the fees proposed to be collected is exorbitant and is in nature of profiteering or charging capitation fee, then only the Committee can go into reasonableness of the proposal made. Basis of calculation was prepared by Chartered Accountants and absolutely, there is no match between the expenditure and the infrastructure facilities available and the fees to be collected. The statement of accounts produced by the schools were not considered by the Committee. Committee has delegated its power to the Auditors and Auditors have fixed the fee structure and there was total non application of mind and the impugned order suffers from arbitrariness. Committee did not consider the Auditors' report submitted by the writ petitioner Institutions and the expenditure on many items were either restricted or disallowed, thereby making the Institutions to suffer loss.

13. Counter averments:-

Tracing the earlier litigations and traversing the allegations raised in the writ petitions, respondents have filed separate counter contending that sufficient opportunity was afforded to all the individual schools. It is further averred that the Committee had complied with all the mandatory provisions and taking into account all the relevant factors before passing the final orders and that Committee had also considered infrastructure amenities provided by the writ petitioners and remarks of the educational authorities and therefore the question of arbitrariness, unreasonableness and discrimination does not arise. According to respondents, the Committee has re-determined the fee taking into account the various factors as stipulated in Section 6(1) of the Act. The School Fee Fixation Committee is a neutral statutory body and they have no bias with any private institution and therefore the issue of discrimination would not arise for consideration.

14. Learned Senior Counsel Mr.R.Krishnamoorthy [in W.P.Nos.17452, 21528, 21644, 27573 and 27574 of 2011] has contended that as per the decisions of the Supreme Court, what is sought to be prevented is only commercialization or profiteering and diversion of funds for other purposes. By adopting its own parameter, the Fee Determination Committee has imposed a rigid fee structure upon the Private Educational Institutions. It was further submitted that the duty, power and responsibility of the Committee is to see whether the fees claimed or the fees collected by the schools can be approved and only when the Committee is satisfied with the fees proposed to be collected is exorbitant and is in the nature of profiteering, then only the Committee can fix the fees and while so, absolutely, there is no match between the fees fixed by the Committee and the expenditure. Learned Senior Counsel has also drawn our attention to some of the Writ Petitions where there are some factual errors.

15. Placing reliance upon Tamil Nadu Nursery Matriculation case, (2010(4) CTC 353), learned Senior Counsel Mr.A.L.Somayaji [in W.P.No.19761 of 2011] has contended that the limited function assigned to the Committee is to verify whether the fee structure amounts to profiteering or charging exorbitant fee and the question of determination of fee by the Committee will arise only, if the Committee records the jurisdictional finding that the fee collected is exorbitant and amounts to profiteering. Placing reliance upon Arun Kumar and others Vs. Union of India, (JT 2006 (12) SC 121), it was submitted that existence of the jurisdiction is thus sine quo non for exercise of power and without recording such finding that the fee collected is exorbitant, Committee erred in assuming the jurisdiction for determining the fee.

16. Taking us through T.M.A.Pai Foundation case, ((2002) 8 SCC 481) and P.A.Inamdar case, ((2005) 6 SCC 537) and Modern School case ((2004) 5 SCC 583)), learned Senior Counsel Mr.R.Muthukumaraswamy [in

W.P.Nos.17533, 19476 to 19478, 19635 to 19637 and 26218 of 2011] submitted that every unaided educational institution is to devise its own fee structure subject to the limitation that there can be no profiteering or charging of capitation fee and the Committee has fixed only the rigid fee, which is forbidden as per the principles laid down by the Supreme Court. Taking us through the guidelines, learned Senior Counsel submitted that the guidelines fixed are arbitrary and fixation of fee on the basis of the guidelines is per se illegal. It was further submitted that power was given to the Committee to determine the fees and the power was delegated to the Auditors and as per the provisions of Statute, when the powers are to be exercised in a particular manner and the same has to be exercised in that manner and such delegation vitiates the fee fixed by the Committee.

17. Learned Senior Counsel Mr.N.R.Chandran (in W.P.Nos.17754, 18453, 18454, 22050, 22051, 22223, 22224, 22235, 22263 of 2011 and 2967 of 2012) has contended that any order passed by the quasi judicial authority, which involves civil consequences, must be consistent with the principles of natural justice. It was further submitted that hearing afforded by the Committee was only an empty formality and sufficient opportunity was not afforded to the educational institutions. Taking us through the typed set of papers, it was submitted that there is total non-application of mind and fixing lower fee is unacceptable and the entire exercise is pre-determined to deprive the schools to meet the expenditure and also to have reasonable surplus.

18. Learned Senior Counsel Mr.Vijay Narayan [in W.P.No.16234 of 2011] has contended that absolutely no reasonings are given as to why the accounts submitted by the educational institutions were not taken into account and by fixing the fees for three years, the educational institutions are not in a position to make statutory payments like VI Pay Commission salary, Employees Provident Fund, Payment of ESI and other statutory payments. We have also heard Mr.AR.L.Sundaresan, learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of Mr.L.Muralikrishnan for Petitioners in W.P.Nos.16023 and 16025 of 2011.

19. Learned Senior Counsel Mr.Silambanan [in W.P.Nos.16488 to 16490, 16972 to 16974, 22050, 22051, 22419 to 22421, 23210, 23213, 23238 to 23240, 23423, 24782 to 24784, 28216, 28217 of 2011, 255 and 3756 of 2012] has submitted that the object under the Act is to see that the schools do not go on spree of profiteering and there cannot be a complete straight jacket formula in fixing the fee and that the fee fixed by the Committee must be commensurate with what the school is providing. Learned Senior Counsel would further submit that normally as long as the fee levied does not amount to profiteering or charging capitation fee, the Committee has to only approve the fee structure. It was further submitted that once the fee is fixed that has to be followed for three years and the school cannot be called to collect the fees which does not reflect the actual expenditure.

20. Learned counsel Mr.Satish Parasaran [in W.P.Nos.16937 and 18260 of 2011] has contended that as per the decision in Modern School case, private education institutions are entitled to have reasonable surplus 10 to 15% and as per the decision of Supreme Court in Unaided Private Schools of Delhi Vs. Director of Education, (2009) 10 SCC 1, so long as there is no profiteering and surplus amount remains in the educational stream, the educational institutions cannot be said to have fixed an exorbitant fee and absolutely, there is no reason as to why the Committee should reduce the fee proposed by the schools.

21. Learned counsel Mr.Srinivasa Mohan [in W.P.Nos.24142, 24161, 24348, 24443, 24446, 24794, 24977, 25283, 27293, 27601, 27925, 30218 of 2011, 257, 1978 and 2806 of 2012] has submitted that without recording the finding that the proposed fee amounts to profiteering or charging capitation fee, the Committee did not have jurisdiction to determine the fee and the error outside the jurisdiction cannot be rectified. Learned counsel has drawn our attention to some of the Writ Petitions to substantiate his point that there were factual errors.

22. Learned counsel Ms.Chitra Sampath [in W.P.Nos.19607, 26644 and 26645 of 2011] submitted that the lease rent paid by the school has not been taken into account. It was further submitted that the expenditure per student given is also not taken into account by the Committee.

23. Learned counsel Mr.Rabu Manohar (in W.P.Nos.16373, 18853 to 18859,19377,19379, 21646, 21679, 22054 and 23876 of 2011 and 3547, 3548,4129 and 6856 of 2012) contended that the object of the Committee is to see that the schools do not levy exorbitant fee. It was further submitted that as long as the normal fee is levied by the school, the committee is only to approve the fee structure. Taking us through the typed set of papers, learned counsel would contend that similarly situated schools in the same location Tiruppur, Committee fixed higher fee structure, whereas for the writ petitioner school (W.P.No.21646 of 2011), the Committee fixed very low fee structure. The learned counsel would further contend that the Committee has not kept in view various infrastructure and building facilities available in the writ petitioner schools.

24. Learned counsel Mr.V.Raghavachari [in W.P.Nos.15212 to 15214, 16116, 21177, 21183, 21288, 23498 and 23789 of 2011] has submitted that the impugned order was passed by the Chairman and two Members and the constitution of the Committee is not as per the statutory requirement of Section 5(1) of the Act and the Committee members cannot unilaterally reduce the constitution of the Committee in violation to the statutory provisions.

25. On behalf of M/s.T.S.Gopalan & Co. [in W.P.No.18191 of 2011], it was contended that the Writ Petitioner school is run by a Trust and the teaching and non-teaching staff have to pay salary as per the Minimum Wages Act and if the minimum wages are not paid, the Writ Petitioner school will be subjected to penal consequences and the same was not kept in view by the Committee.

26. Learned counsel Mr.A.S.Thambusami [in W.P.Nos.17680 and 22513 of 2011] has contended that the school being run by the Co-operative Sugar Mill mainly for the children of the staff of Co-operative Sugar Mill and due to fixation of low fee by the Committee, the school is not in a position to meet the expenditure and prayed for remanding the matter.

27. Learned counsel Mr.Kandavavel Doraisamy [in W.P.Nos.5288 and 6007 of 2012] has submitted that the Writ Petitioner school was recognised as A category and that the said school for a long number of years has excelled in performance by getting 100% result and State ranks for number of years which could be accomplished by employing number of teaching staff. It was further submitted that as against the strength of 101 teaching staff, the Committee has taken only 51 teaching staff and the strength of non-teaching staff was not taken into account by the Committee and by fixation of less teachers and staff strength, the school is facing lot of difficulties.

28. We have heard the arguments of Mr.N.Manoharan [in W.P.Nos.19548 and 19549 of 2011]; Mr.R.Sureshkumar [in W.P.Nos.19308, 20596, 20597, 21598, 21630, 21634, 26893, 28288 to 28230, 28304, 28305 of 2011, 462 to 465, 4321, 5037, 5050 and 5052 of 2012]; M/s.S.B.S.Raman and Associates [in W.P.Nos.28553, 28554 of 2011, 4607 and 4610 of 2012]; Mr.Harishankar [in W.P.Nos.19737, 19738 and 25989 of 2011]; Mr.Srinath Sridevan [in W.P.No.16853 of 2011]; Mr.T.E.Badrinathan [in W.P.Nos.17124 to 17126, 18004, 22717 and 23879 of 2011]; Mr.S.Sathyanarayanan [in W.P.No.26270 of 2011]; Mr.V.P.Senguttuvel [in W.P.No.5562 of 2012]; Mr.P.Nagaraju [in W.P.Nos.29825, 29826, 29827 of 2011]; Mr.Ravikumar Paul [in W.P.Nos.21049, 21330, 22052, 22093, 22124, 22140, 22141 and 22668 of 2011]; Mr.Issac Mohanlal [in W.P.Nos.16930, 16931, 17046, 17403, 18193, 22697, 28306 and 17011 of 2011].

29. In so far as the Writ Petitions filed by minority educational institutions, Mr.A.Xavier Arulraj made forcible submissions contending that the minorities have a right of administration as enshrined in Article 30(1) of the Constitution of India and the impugned order of the Fee determination Committee is violative of the right of administration enshrined in Article 30(1) of the Constitution and the Order amounts to restriction on the right of minorities to administer their educational institutions. He would also contend that the fee structure was fixed without proper appreciation of available infrastructure and facilities available, salaries paid to the teachers and non-teaching staff and increments and statutory payments to be made. The learned counsel would also submit that future plans for expansion and the corporate financial management of the minority institutions and the cultural network of the minority institutions were not taken into account.

30. We have heard the arguments of Mr.A.Navaneethakrishnan, learned Advocate General appearing for the State along with Mr.S.Venkatesh, Government Pleader and Mr.Sampathkumar, Special Government Pleader (Education). Learned Advocate General submitted that the committee had taken in to account factors stipulated in Section 6(1) of the Act and Rule 3 of Rules to determine the fee structure. It was further submitted that the Committee had carefully gone into the information furnished by writ petitioner schools and passed orders taking into consideration the various factors. Taking us through various columns in the work sheet, the learned Advocate General had submitted that the work sheet clearly demonstrates the factors taken into consideration by the Committee and the question of arbitrariness and unreasonable does not arise. The learned Advocate General urged that the Committee was conscious that by fixation of fee, entire financial burden is shifted to the parents and the Committee adopted a balanced approach in determining the fee without casting heavy financial burden upon the parents and at the same time keeping in view the interest of the schools also.

31. We have carefully examined the contentions and carefully gone through the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The following common points arise for consideration in these writ petitions:- "1. Whether the contention that no proper opportunity was given to the schools by School Fee Determination Committee is correct and whether the order suffers from violation of principles of natural justice?

2. Whether there is non-application of mind in fixing the fee and whether the fee fixed by the Committee is vitiated by arbitrariness?

3. Whether the writ petitioners/schools are right in contending that the Committee committed a jurisdictional error in determining the fee without recording a finding that the proposed fee amounts to profiteering or charging exorbitant fees?

4. Whether the petitioners are right in contending that the Committee has abdicated its responsibility by delegating its work to the auditors?

32. Constitution of Committee:-

Section 5 refers to the Constitution of Committee. As per Section 5(1) of the Act, the functions of the Committee is for the purpose of determination of the fee for admission to any Standard or course of study in private schools. As per Section 5(2), the Committee shall consist of a retired High Court Judge nominated by the Government and other Ex.Officio members viz., Director of School Education, Director of Matriculation Schools, Director of Elementary Education, Joint Chief Engineer (Buildings), Public Works Department and Additional Secretary to Government, school Education Department (Ex.Officio Member Secretary).

33. Re.Contention. Constitution of the Committee:-

Taking note of the fact that all the five Members of the Committee are full-time office bearers of the Department, in its meeting dated 09.11.2010, the Committee unilaterally resolved to fix the quorum of the Committee for the purpose of hearing the objections as three i.e. the Chairperson with Member Secretary and one Member. The impugned orders were passed by the quorum consisting of Chairman, Member Secretary and Member.

34. Mr.V.Raghavachari, learned counsel has contended that when the statutory requirements of the Committee consist of five members, the Committee members cannot unilaterally reduce the constitution of the Committee and cannot resolve to reduce the quorum. In support of his contention, learned counsel placed reliance upon a decision of Division Bench of this Court in P.Balamurugan Vs. District Level Vigilance (Community Verification) Committee, Salem rep.by its Chairman & District Collector,Salem and another, (2011 (6) CTC 28). In the said case, decision concerning with issuance of community certificate was passed by the Sub Collector and two Members in which the Collector was absent during enquiry. The Court

has quashed the order on the ground that the Committee was not comprised of all Members as per the mandatory requirement.

35. The above contention is unsustainable in view of saving clause Sub-section (5) of Section 5 in the Act. As per Section 5(5) of the Act no act or proceeding of the committee shall be invalid by reason only of the existence of any vacancy in or any defect in the constitution of the Committee.

36. The fact that excepting three Members of the Committee, the other members have not signed the order will not vitiate the order as there is no contention that the other Members were not present at the time of decision making process. The Director of Matriculation School and other Members, being full-time officers of the Department, the Committee thought fit to have the quorum of three and the orders cannot be challenged on the score that the quorum consisted of Chairman plus two Members. In this context, we may usefully refer to the decision of the Supreme Court in G.N.Nayak v. Goa University [(2002) 2 SCC 712].

37. Legal provisions of Tamil Nadu Schools (Regulation of Collection of Fee) Act, 2009:- At this stage it would be apt to reproduce the relevant statutory provisions. Section 2 of the Act deals with definitions; "private school" is defined in Section 2(j) of the Act as under:- "Section 2 (j) "private school" means any pre-primary school, primary school, middle school, high school, or higher secondary school, established and administered or maintained by any person or body of persons and recognized or approved by the competent authority under any law or code or regulation for the time being in force, but does not include:-

(i)an aided school;

(ii)a school established and administered or maintained by the Central Government or the State Government or any local authority. (iii)a school giving providing or imparting religious institution alone but not any other institutions.

38. As per Section 6(1) of the Act, the Committee shall determine the fee leviable by a private school taking into account the factors indicated thereon. Rule 3 of the Rules provides that the Committee while determining the fee leviable by a private school, in addition to the factors specified in sub-section (1) of section 6 of the Act, also take into account the factors indicated in Rule 3. Section 7 deals with the powers and functions of the Committee and the procedure to be followed by the Committee. As per Section 7(4) of the Act, the Committee shall have the powers to regulate its own procedure in all matters and it shall have all the powers of a Civil Court under the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 regarding summoning and attendance of witness and related matters. Therefore, the Committee would be within their powers to get the factors verified in respect of the claim made by the institution, to approve their fee structure, as against the fee determined by the Committee. The fee so prescribed would be in operation for a period of three years and at the end of such period, it would be open to the institution to make an application for revision of fees.

39. Guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court:- (i) T.M.A. Paid Foundation and others v. State of Karnataka [(2002) 8 SCC 481: The Hon'ble Supreme Court considered the question of minorities' right to establish and administer the Educational Institutions of their choice and whether the State's power which regulate facet of administration would interfere with the minorities right to establish and administer the Educational Institutions. On 03.04.2002, Hon'ble Supreme Court framed nine questions for consideration. On 10.04.2002, in modification of the earlier order dated 03.04.2002, nine questions were reframed as ten questions [(2002) 8 SCC 712]. As per the law laid down by the Supreme Court in T.M.A.Pai Foundation case, maximum autonomy has to be given to the institutions, which exist by virtue of the funds generated by themselves in the matter of administration and quantity of fee to be charged. In the said judgment, the Supreme Court observed that in the establishment of an educational institution, the object should not be to make a profit in as much as education is essentially charitable in nature. Observing that the object should not be to make a profit or charging capitation fee and that the collection of fee could be regulated, in paragraph

Nos.55, 56 and 57, the Supreme Court has held as under: "54. The right to establish an educational institution can be regulated; but such regulatory measures must, in general, be to ensure the maintenance of proper academic standards, atmosphere and infrastructure (including qualified staff) and the prevention of maladministration by those in charge of management. The fixing of a rigid fee structure, dictating the formation and composition of a governing body, compulsory nomination of teachers and staff for appointment or nominating students for admissions would be unacceptable restrictions.

55. the essence of a private educational institution is the autonomy that the institution must have in its management and administration. There, necessarily, has to be a difference in the administration of private unaided institutions and the government-aided institutions. Whereas in the latter case, the Government will have greater say in the administration, including admissions and fixing of fees, in the case of private unaided institutions, maximum autonomy in the day-to-day administration has to be with the private unaided institutions. Bureaucratic or governmental interference in the administration of such an institution will undermine its independence. While an educational institution is not a business, in order to examine the degree of independence that can be given to a recognized educational institution, like any private entity that does not seek aid or assistance from the Government, and that exists by virtue of the funds generated by it, including its loans or borrowings, it is important to note that the essential ingredients of the management of the private institution include the recruiting students and staff, and the quantum of fee that is to be charged.

56. ... One cannot lose sight of the fact that providing good amenities to the students in the form of competent teaching faculty and other infrastructure costs money. It has, therefore, to be left to the institution, if it chooses not to seek any aid from the government, to determine the scale of fee that it can charge from the students. One also cannot lose sight of the fact that we live in a competitive world today, where professional education is in demand. We have been given to understand that a large number of professional and other institutions have been started by private parties who do not seek any governmental aid. In a sense, a prospective student has various options open to him/her where, therefore, normally economic forces have a role to play. The decision on the fee to be charged must necessary be left to the private educational institution that does not seek or is not dependent upon any funds from the Government.

57. We , however, wish to emphasize one point, and that inasmuch as the occupation of education is, in a sense, regarded as charitable, the Government can provide regulations that will ensure excellence in education, while forbidding the charging of capitation fee and profiteering by the institution. Since the object of setting up an educational institution is by definition charitable , it is clear that an educational institution cannot charge such a fee as is not required for the purpose of fulfilling that object. To put it differently, in the establishment of an educational institution, the object should not be to make a profit, inasmuch as education is essentially charitable in nature. There can, however, be a reasonable revenue surplus, which may be generated by the educational institution for the purpose of development of education and expansion of the institution." (ii) Islamic Academy of Education v. State of Karnataka [(2003) 6 SCC 697] The Constitution Bench interpreted the judgment in T.M.A. Pai Foundation case and also considered the question of regulation of fee collected. Observing that there can be no fixing of rigid fee structure by the Government and that each institute must have freedom to fix its own fee structure, in Paragraph No.7 of the said judgment, the Supreme Court held as under: "7. So far as the first question is concerned, in our view the majority judgment is very clear. There can be no fixing of a rigid fee structure by the Government. Each institute must have the freedom to fix its own fee structure taking into consideration the need to generate funds to run the institution and to provide facilities necessary for the benefit of the students. They must also be able to generate surplus which must be used for the betterment and growth of that educational institution. In paragraph 56 of the judgment it has been categorically laid down that the decision on the fees to be charged must necessarily be left to the private educational institutions that do not seek and which are not dependent upon any funds from the Government. Each institute will be entitled to have its own fee structure. The fee structure for each institute must be fixed keeping in mind the infrastructure and facilities available, the investments made, salaries paid to the teachers and staff, future plans for expansion and/or betterment of the institution etc. Of course there can be no profiteering and capitation fees cannot be charged. It thus needs to be

emphasized that as per the majority judgment imparting of education is essentially charitable in nature. Thus the surplus/profit that can be generated must be only for the benefit/use of that educational institution. Profits/surplus cannot be diverted for any other use or purpose and cannot be used for personal gain or for any other business or enterprise. In the said judgment, the Supreme Court issued following directions to give effect to the judgment in T.M.A. Pai Foundation's case: "we direct that in order to give effect to the judgment in T.M.A. Pai case (2002) 8 SCC 481 the respective State Governments/concerned authority shall set up, in each State, a committee headed by a retired High Court Judge who shall be nominated by the Chief Justice of that State. The other member, who shall be nominated by the Judge, should be a Chartered Accountant of repute. A representative of the Medical Council of India (in short MCI) or the All India Council for Technical Education (in short AICTE), depending on the type of institution, shall also be a member. The Secretary of the State Government in charge of Medical Education or Technical Education, as the case may be, shall be a member and Secretary of the Committee. The Committee should be free to nominate/co-opt another independent person of repute, so that the total number of members of the Committee shall not exceed five. Each educational institute must place before this Committee, well in advance of the academic year, its proposed fee structure. Along with the proposed fee structure all relevant documents and books of accounts must also be produced before the Committee for their scrutiny. The Committee shall then decide whether the fees proposed by that institute are justified and are not profiteering or charging capitation fee. The Committee will be at liberty to approve the fee structure or to propose some other fee which can be charged by the institute. The fee fixed by the Committee shall be binding for a period of three years, at the end of which period the institute would be at liberty to apply for revision. Once fees are fixed by the Committee, the institute cannot charge either directly or indirectly any other amount over and above the amount fixed as fees. If any other amount is charged, under any other head or guise e.g. donations, the same would amount to charging of capitation fee. The Governments/appropriate authorities should consider framing appropriate regulations, if not already framed, whereunder if it is found that an institution is charging capitation fees or profiteering that institution can be appropriately penalised and also face the prospect of losing its recognition/affiliation." (iii) Modern School v. Union of India

[(2004) 5 SCC 583]

Challenging the abnormal fee hike in various schools in Delhi, by way of Public Interest Litigation, the Federation of Parents' Association moved the Delhi High Court. The grievance was about the large scale commercialization of education and the failure of the Government in performing statutory functions under Delhi School Education Act. One of the complaint was that the unaided recognized schools were transferring funds of schools to the parent society/trust and/or other schools run by the same society/trust. There was also a complaint about huge amounts being collected under the caption "building fund" which remain unutilized and were being transferred. The Delhi High Court appointed Committee chaired by Justice Santosh Duggal and the Committee submitted its report which was accepted by the Government and the Director of Education (DOE) issued certain directions to management committees of all recognized unaided schools. Modern School and other schools appealed against the order of the Delhi High Court constituting the "Duggal Committee'. During the pendency of the appeal, Duggal Committee submitted its report and directions were issued by the Director of Education. All these issues were considered by the Supreme Court in MODERN SCHOOL VS. UNION OF INDIA ((2004) 5 SCC 583). The Supreme Court considered the concept of reasonable surplus, profit, income and yield and as to what constitutes reasonable surplus. In paragraph Nos.14, 15 and 16, the Supreme Court held as under:- "14. At the outset, before analysing the provisions of the 1973 Act, we may state that it is now well settled by a catena of decisions of this Court that in the matter of determination of the fee structure unaided educational institutions exercise a great autonomy as they, like any other citizen carrying on an occupation, are entitled to a reasonable surplus for development of education and expansion of the institution. Such institutions, it has been held, have to plan their investment and expenditure so as to generate profit. What is, however, prohibited is commercialisation of education. Hence, we have to strike a balance between autonomy of such institutions and measures to be taken to prevent commercialisation of education. However, in none of the earlier cases, this Court has defined the concept of reasonable surplus, profit, income and yield, which are the terms used in the various provisions of the 1973

Act.

15. T.M.A. Pai Foundation case for the first time brought into existence the concept of education as an occupation , a term used in Article 19(1)(g) of the Constitution. It was held by majority that Articles 19(1)(g) and 26 confer rights on all citizens and religious denominations respectively to establish and maintain educational institutions. In addition, Article 30(1) gives the right to religious and linguistic minorities to establish and administer educational institution of their choice. However, the right to establish an institution under Article 19(1)(g) is subject to reasonable restriction in terms of clause (6) thereof. Similarly, the right conferred on minorities, religious or linguistic, to establish and administer educational institution of their own choice under Article 30(1) is held to be subject to reasonable regulations which inter alia may be framed having regard to public interest and national interest. In the said judgment, it was observed (vide para 56) that economic forces have a role to play in the matter of fee fixation. The institutions should be permitted to make reasonable profits after providing for investment and expenditure. However, capitation fee and profiteering were held to be forbidden. Subject to the above two prohibitory parameters, this Court in T.M.A. Pai Foundation case held that fees to be charged by the unaided educational institutions cannot be regulated. Therefore, the issue before us is as to what constitutes reasonable surplus in the context of the provisions of the 1973 Act. This issue was not there before this Court in T.M.A. Pai Foundation case.

16. We are concerned with the first question, namely, whether the educational institutions are entitled to fix their own fee structure. It was held that there could be no rigid fee structure. Each institute must have freedom to fix its own fee structure, after taking into account the need to generate funds to run the institution and to provide facilities necessary for the benefit of the students. They must be able to generate surplus which must be used for betterment and growth of that educational institution. The fee structure must be fixed keeping in mind the infrastructure and facilities available, investment made, salaries paid to teachers and staff, future plans for expansion and/or betterment of institution subject to two restrictions, namely, non-profiteering and non-charging of capitation fees. It was held that surplus/profit can be generated but they shall be used for the benefit of that educational institution. It was held that profits/surplus cannot be diverted for any other use or purposes and cannot be used for personal gains or for other business or enterprise. The Court noticed that there were various statutes/regulations which governed the fixation of fee and, therefore, this Court directed the respective State Governments to set up a committee headed by a retired High Court Judge to be nominated by the Chief Justice of that State to approve the fee structure or to propose some other fee which could be charged by the institute. (iv) Action Committee, Unaided private Schools and others v. Director of Education, Delhi and others [(2009) 10 SCC 1] Application for review the order dated 27.04.2004 came to be filed. In Modern School case, the Supreme Court held as under:- "Clause 8 of the Order issued by DoE dated 15.12.1999 is in consonance with Rule 177. Although the Court cannot impose restrictions by travelling beyond the scope, object and purport of the Act and the Rules, the majority view in Modern School case, (2004) 5 SCC 583, found that Clause 8 was not beyond Rule 177 or in conflict therewith as alleged." In the review petitions, it was contended that Clause 8 of the order issued by Director of Education dated 15.12.1999 is causing administrative difficulties and that directions needs to be clarified. Accepting the arguments advanced on behalf of the Action Committee/Management, the Supreme Court clarified that transfer of amount from the fund of recognised unaided school to school under the management of the same society or trust is permissible. In Paragraph 21, the Supreme Court held as under:- "21. The 1973 Act and the Rules framed thereunder cannot come in the way of the Management to establish more schools. So long as there is a reasonable fee structure in existence and so long as there is transfer of funds from one institution to the other under the same management, there cannot be any objection from the Department of Education." In other aspects, the review sought was rejected by the Supreme Court. (v) P.A. Inamdar v. State of Maharashtra [(2005) 6 SCC 537] Holding that every institute is free to devise its own fee structure subject to the limitations that there can be no profiteering or charging of capitation fee, in P.A.INAMDAR VS. STATE OF MAHARASHTRA, ((2005) 6 SCC 537), the Supreme Court again reiterated the powers of educational institutions to devise its own fee structure. In Paragraph Nos.139 and 141 of the said judgment, the Supreme Court held as under: "139. To set up a reasonable fee structure is also a component of the right to establish and administer an institution within the meaning of Article 30(1) of the

Constitution, as per the law declared in *Pai Foundation* (2002) 8 SCC 481). Every institution is free to devise its own fee structure subject to the limitation that there can be no profiteering and no capitation fee can be charged directly or indirectly, or in any form (paras 56 to 58 and 161 [answer to Question 5(c)] of *Pai Foundation* are relevant in this regard).

141. Our answer to Question 3 is that every institution is free to devise its own fee structure but the same can be regulated in the interest of preventing profiteering. No capitation fee can be charged."

40. In a catena of judgments, the Supreme Court has reiterated the position that educational institutions were free to fix its own fee structure, but the same can be regulated to prevent profiteering or charging of capitation fee. The principle that there shall not be profiteering or charging the capitation fee was upheld. Leverage was allowed to educational institutions to generate reasonable surplus to meet the cost of expansion and augmentation of facilities, which would not amount to profiteering.

41. From a combined reading of the judgments of the Supreme Court, the clear legal position, which emerges, is that the schools cannot indulge in commercialization of education, which would mean that the fee structure has to be kept within the bound so as to avoid profiteering. At the same time "reasonable surplus" is permissible as fund in the form of such surplus may be required for development of various activities in the schools for the benefit of the students themselves. The guiding principle in the process is "to strike a balance between autonomy of such institution and measures to be taken in avoiding commercialization of education". The autonomy of the schools can be ensured by giving first right to such schools to increase the fee. At the same time, quantum of fee to be charged by unaided schools is subject to regulation by the State and as per the provisions in the Act. In the light of above well settled principles and provisions of Act No.22 of 2009 and rules framed thereunder, the contentions raised are to be considered.

42. Impugned Orders passed by the Committee:- Considering the scope of sections 6(1) and 7(1) of the Act, in *Tamil Nadu Nursery Matriculation case*, (2010(4) CTC 353), the First Bench of this Court summarised the procedure, which shall be followed by the Committee. In paragraph Nos.20 and 21, First Bench held as under:

"20. On this background, when we look to the committee constituted under Section 5(1) of this Act, it shows that the initial function of the committee is to approve the fees structure formulated by the concerned institution. It is only when the committee finds the fee structure to be objectionable and cannot be approved, then it will determine some other fee, and the private schools will be asked to charge the same. Sections 6(1) and 7(1) of the Act lays down the procedure which will be followed by the committee: - (a)The Committee has to call upon the private institutions to place before it the proposed fee structure of the institution with all relevant documents and books of accounts for scrutiny within the period to be indicated by the Committee in the given notice. (The Committee has already circulated the questionnaire to the institutions which contains details) about the fee component. (b)After the receipt of the proposal from the concerned institution, the Committee has to verify as to whether the fee proposed by the Private School is justified and it does not amount to profiteering or charging of exorbitant fee.

(c) In case the Committee is of the view that the fee structure proposed by the institution appears to be correct, taking note of the various facilities provided and that there was no profiteering or collection of exorbitant fee under the guise of capitation fee, it has to approve the fee structure. (d) In case the Committee is of the view that the fee structure forwarded by the institution is exorbitant and that there is an element of profiteering, the Committee has to determine some other fee. (e) While fixing some other fee, the Committee has to follow certain procedures taking into consideration the factors as found mentioned under Section 6(1) as well as Rule 3 of the Rules. (f) The determination of the fee as made by the Committee should be intimated to the concerned institution and there upon the institution has got a right to submit their objections within fifteen days. (g) The objections so submitted by the institution shall be examined by the Committee. The Committee has to consider it objectively. The Committee was not expected to reject the objection summarily.

21. The observation of the Supreme Court was against the Government fixing the rigid fee in respect of private institutions. The impugned Act, in no way fixes the rigid fee. It only calls upon the management to forward their fee structure with details as to how they arrive at such a fee structure. The main idea is to see as to whether under the guise of collection of fees they are indirectly collecting the capitation fee or indulging in profiteering. That is why the Act initially uses the term Approval of the fee structure and only in such cases where the committee is of the view that the fee structure proposed is exorbitant and is in the nature of capitation fee or profiteering, it intervenes in the matter and for the purpose of fixing the correct fee, the private institution is given liberty to specify their fee structure, taking into account the expenditure necessary for running the institution as well as its future needs. Thus, it proceeds to determine the fee structure thereafter. In that process, it considers the objections given by the management to the fees proposed by the Committee. The consideration of objections by the Committee cannot be treated as an empty formality. The Committee has to consider the objections made by the institution in an objective manner and if necessary, by inspecting the institution and calling upon the management to produce the records in their possession in respect of various facets and to arrive at a decision as to whether the fee determined by the Committee was the correct one or it requires modification. It cannot be ignored that the committee is a high powered committee headed by a retired High Court Judge. "

43. As pointed out earlier, in P.B.Prince Gajendra Babu Vs. Federation of Association of Private Schools in T.N. (2010(5) CTC 721), the first Bench inter alia issued direction directing the Committee to afford opportunity of personal hearing to the Institutions to enable them to submit materials for consideration of the Committee and thereafter pass individual orders by considering the materials. Therefore, fresh questionnaires were sent to the schools and the schools submitted filled in questionnaires.

44. Committee considered details furnished in the questionnaires and also the objections at the time of personal hearing. Committee formulated certain guidelines and Committee had taken the assistance of auditors to examine the statement of accounts produced by the schools. Taking the existing fee in the school and also intimated fee by the Committee, which ever was high, was taken and the same was increased by certain percentage i.e., increase was given from 5% to 10% depending on the location and average expenditure was calculated. Worksheet was prepared by the auditors; based on the details in the work sheet, Committee fixed the fee in respect of each individual school and the same was communicated to the Schools.

45. Re-contention Nomination of Auditors:-

In its resolution dated 21.12.2010, the Committee decided to have the assistance of Auditors - M/s.Sivram and Raj to "perform the task of fixation of fee". Fees of the Auditors was fixed at the rate of Rs.300/- per school. In pursuance to the resolution of the Committee, Government passed G.O.(2D) No.49 dated 26.8.2010 appointing M/s.Sivram & Raj, Auditors to assist the Committee and Auditors prepared the report, which is annexed to the impugned orders.

46. On behalf of Writ Petitioners it was contended that as per Section 6 of the Act, power of fixation or re-fixation of school fees in private schools vests only with the Committee and the essential power, which is adjudicatory in nature, cannot be delegated to any other extra-statutory person or entity. Contention of Writ Petitioners is that the School Fee Determination Committee has delegated the said power of re-fixation of fees to the auditors, which can be exercised only by the Committee and is ultra vires the provisions of the Act and hence liable to be set aside.

47. There is no merit in the above contention. By perusal of the records, it is seen that to facilitate the task of fee fixation of 6400 schools the Committee has resolved to take assistance of the Auditors. Analysis of the figures given in the questionnaire and details given by the Schools during personal hearing is a massive work. The Chairman and members of the Committee may not have the expertise of examining the accounts of each of the school. The purpose was only to get assistance from the experts. The Auditors were to perform only the ministerial act of going through the accounts and preparing their report and essential powers of fixation of fee

itself were not delegated. We do not find any force in the contention that the essential powers were delegated to the Auditors.

48. Fee determined by the Committee:- Section 6(1) of the Act provides that the Committee shall determine the fee leviable by the private school taking into account the following factors:- (a) the location of the private school;

(b) the available infrastructure;

(c) the expenditure on administration and maintenance; (d) the reasonable surplus required for the growth and development of the private school; (e) any other factors as may be prescribed.

The committee shall, on determining the fee leviable by a private school, communicate its decision to the school concerned.

49. Rule 3 of the Rules provides that the Committee while determining the fee leviable by a private school, in addition to the factors specified in sub-section (1) of section 6 of the Act, also take into account the following factors:-

3. Factors for determination of fee:- The Committee, constituted under section 5 of the Act, shall, while determining the fee leviable by a private school, in addition to the factors specified in sub-section (1) of section 6 of the Act, also take in account, the following factors, namely:- (a) Locality of the school, namely,

Rural area, Town panchayat,

Municipality, District

Head Quarters, Corporation.

(b) Strength of the students.

(c) Classes of study, and

(d) Status of the school, as indicated below:-

(1) Schools having minimum infrastructure facilities as prescribed by the Government from time to time. (2) Schools having infrastructure facilities more than that prescribed; (i) Schools having more than the minimum requirement of lab, more number of library books, classroom facilities and other sanitary and drinking water facilities. (ii) Schools having more than adequate classroom facilities, lab facilities, library area, number of books, very good sanitation facilities, highly protected drinking water facilities and other sanitary facilities together with high percentage of results. (iii) Schools fully equipped with modern facilities like Air Conditioner together with 100% results.

50. Guidelines:- It is stated that for Determination of fee based on Section 6(1) of the Act and Rule 3, the Committee formulated the guidelines as under: Salary:

As per list given in questionnaire or in the objection letter or during the hearing whichever is higher. If there is no list in objection letter, list given at the time of hearing may be considered. Correspondent salary should not be taken if it is not in the list of teachers particulars. If lump sum amount is mentioned in both objection letter and at the time of hearing, original list should be considered (i.e., list in questionnaire) Teaching staff salary to be restricted to 60% of the proposed fee income (as determined by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Modern School's case)

Proposed fees:

As per objection letter or as per personal hearing whichever is less may be taken. If proposed fees is not given in the objection letter, proposed fee given at the time of hearing maybe considered. Proposed fees is also arrived by Committee by adding certain percentage based on location to the existing fees or intimated fees whichever is higher. Proposed fees given by the school (or) proposed fees arrived at by the Committee whichever is less adopted as proposed fees.

Number of Students:

Student's strength as per questionnaire/ objection letter/ personal hearing whichever is higher. However actual strength only to be taken into consideration.

Expenses:

As per the original questionnaire or objection letter or personal hearing or latest audit report whichever is higher reasonable may be considered. For other sundry expenses such as Consumables, Printing and Stationery, Meetings and functions, Sports, Travelling and Conveyance, Advertisements, any fee payable to the private school to the Government or any other authority rate is fixed as follows: Village and Town Panchayat : Rs.650/- per student

Municipality, District Headquarters

And corporation : Rs.750/- per student

Repairs and Maintenance:

Building: If expenses claimed is unreasonable maybe restricted to Rs.10 per Sq.ft. on built up area Building area: as per the questionnaire or any addition is made, the addition can be taken for consideration.

Depreciation on Building, Furniture and Fixtures and Equipments: Rate adopted : 10% as per Income Tax Act.

If details are not available for depreciation on building and there is no claim, depreciation may be allowed @ 10% on estimated cost as under:

For RCC : Rs. 500/- per Sq.ft.

For other constructions : Rs. 200/- per Sq.ft.

Rent:

As per the agreement if agreement is available

As per the questionnaire If agreement is not available As per the latest audited Balance Sheet and Profit and Loss Account if the above details are not available. Otherwise as per abstract of the expenditure (or) as per appeal (or) as per personal hearing.

Surplus for development as per location as under:

Village : 5%

Town Panchayat : 6%

Municipality : 7%

District Headquarters: 8%

Corporation : 9%

Increase in fees as per infrastructure Grading:

D : 5%

C : 6%

B : 7%

A : 9%

Existing Fees:

Application fee is not considered for UKG to VIII Std. Admission Fee is not considered for UKG to VIII. If admission fee is higher then not considered for LKG also. If development fee is Rs.1000/- or more, then it should not be considered for LKG to VIII Std. Re-admission fee is not considered for LKG to VIII Std.

Re-determination of fees:

If proposed fees arrived at is less than the intimated fees, as per 6(1) of the Act, intimated fees has to be retained.

If expenses considered are more than the proposed fee arrived at, the deficit is ignored since the expenses considered are only notional and not supported by proper evidences and fees has to be determined accordingly.

51. Work Sheet:- For fixing fees, Committee has taken assistance of Chartered Accountants, who prepared Work Sheet. Serial No.I of Work Sheet is School Details:- (1) Name of the School;

(2) Location of the School;

(3) Strength of the School and

(4) No. of Classes in the School.

For expenses under the requirement of teachers for KG Classes are one and the same, KG classes are taken as a single unit. For Standards I to V, the same teachers are teaching the students in rotation and therefore Standards I to V are taken as another unit with teacher-student ratio at 1:30. Standards VI to VIII are taken as another unit with teacher-student ratio at 1:35. Students of Standards IX and X will have to attend laboratory work and to have access to the Library and hence student-teacher ratio is taken as 1:40. Likewise, Classes XI and XII are taken as another unit with teacher-student ratio at 1:40.

52. In Serial No.II of the Work Sheet, the factors under Section 6(1) of the Act and Rule 3 are reflected. . In Serial No.II of the Worksheet, details of infrastructural facilities are given. Minimum infrastructural facilities are prescribed by the Government for Elementary School, Middle School and Higher Secondary School.

Depending on the infrastructural facilities available in the Private Schools, Schools are categorised as A , B , C and D and increase in fees is given as under:

Schools

Grade

Increase

Modern facilities available

A

10%

More than adequate infrastructural facilities

B

5-9%

Available more than the requirement

C

5%

Minimum Infrastructural facilities

D

No increase

53. In Serial No.III of the Work Sheet, Expenditure on Administration i.e., (i) salary to teaching non-teaching staffs, (ii) property taxes, (iii) water charges, (iv) E.B. charges, (v) Postage, Telephone & Internet charges, (vi) Land/Building Lease Rent, (vii) Books & Periodicals and (viii) Miscellaneous Expenses, have been taken into consideration. In Serial No.IV, Expenditure on Maintenance/Depreciation i.e., (i) Equipment Maintenance, (ii) Furniture & Fixtures, (iii) Building Maintenance, and (iv) Depreciation on Building, Computer and Furniture & Equipment were taken into consideration. In respect of the other expenditure not so covered - on sundry expenses, in Serial No.V, a sum of Rs.750/- per student, Rs.650/- per student has been added with expenditure on administration, maintenance and expenditure on depreciation. Surplus for growth and development depending upon the locality of the school has been added up at Serial No.VI of the Work Sheet. From the total expenditure was divided by total number of students and average expenditure has been arrived at per student.

54. While determining the Income , the Committee has taken into consideration the proposed fee given by the Schools, the existing fee and intimated fee, whichever is higher was increased by percentage increased as per the location i.e., 5 to 10% increase was given depending on the location. Then the average has been arrived at unit-wise. The overall income per student has been arrived at based on the strength. If the average income is over and above the average expenses arrived at, the excess was converted into percentage, (vide Serial No.IV of the Work Sheet). If the difference is high, then the excess is neutralised by deducting the excess, which is available at Serial No.XII of the Work Sheet. If there was deficit, the same was left as it is.

The details contained in the Work Sheet were prepared by the Auditor and subsequently stated to be verified by the Committee.

55. Smart Class Note Books:- Certain expenses are just for smart classes, Unit Note Books, etc., which are not stated as factors in the Act and Rules and have been excluded from the determination of the Fees, which has been categorically stated in the penultimate paragraph of the Order.

56. Case of respondents is that factors, which are stated in the Act, were taken into consideration for determination of the Fees scrupulously and other expenses such as sundry expenses has also been taken into consideration.

57. Per contra, the contention of the Writ Petitioner Schools is that the impugned orders are not in accordance with Section 6(1) of the Act and Rule 3 and also the principles laid down by the Supreme Court. Our attention was drawn to number of writ petitions pointing out the discrepancies and also factual errors and the expenses on administration submitted by the Schools were not taken into consideration as per Committee's own guidelines.

58. School Fee determination Committee Extent of Judicial Review:- Let us first consider the extent of judicial review of the orders passed by the Committee. The Committee, being quasi judicial authority and was exercising a quasi judicial function, was to follow the provisions of the Act and also the principles laid down by the Supreme Court.

59. As against the order of the Committee, no appeal is provided for. In INDIAN AIRLINES VS. PRABHA D KANAN (2006) 11 SCC 67 = (2006) 12 Scale 58, the Supreme Court held as under: 5. A judicial review of such an order would be maintainable. In a case of judicial review, where no appeal is provided for, the High Court in exercise of its jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India would not confine its jurisdiction only to the known tests laid down therefor viz. illegality, irrationality, procedural impropriety. It has to delve deeper into the matter. It would require a deeper scrutiny.

60. The Committee, being quasi judicial authority, must pose itself correct question so as to arrive at a correct finding of fact. Judicial Review is permissible where quasi judicial authority did not take into consideration relevant factors. (vide Mathura Prasad Vs. Union of India (2007) 1 SCC 437)).

61. Considering the scope of judicial review of the orders passed by the quasi judicial authority, in S.N.CHANDRASHEKAR VS. STATE OF KARNATAKA, ((2006) 3 SCC 208), the Supreme Court held as under:- 5. In Hindustan Petroleum Corpn. Ltd. v. Darius Shapur Chenai (2005) 7 SCC 627 : (2005) 7 Scale 386, this Court referring to Cholan Roadways Ltd. v. G. Thirugnanasambandam (2005) 3 SCC 241 : 2005 SCC (L&S) 395 held: (SCC p. 637, para 14): 4. Even a judicial review on facts in certain situations may be available. In Cholan Roadways Ltd. v. G. Thirugnanasambandam (2005) 3 SCC 241 : 2005 SCC (L&S) 395 this Court observed: (SCC p. 253, paras 34-35) 4. It is now well settled that a quasi-judicial authority must pose unto itself a correct question so as to arrive at a correct finding of fact. A wrong question posed leads to a wrong answer. In this case, furthermore, the misdirection in law committed by the Industrial Tribunal was apparent insofar as it did not apply the principle of res ipsa loquitur which was relevant for the purpose of this case and, thus, failed to take into consideration a relevant factor and furthermore took into consideration an irrelevant fact not germane for determining the issue, namely, that the passengers of the bus were mandatorily required to be examined. The Industrial Tribunal further failed to apply the correct standard of proof in relation to a domestic enquiry, which is preponderance of probability and applied the standard of proof required for a criminal trial. A case for judicial review was, thus, clearly made out.

35. Errors of fact can also be a subject-matter of judicial review. (See E. v. Secy. of State for the Home Deptt. (2004) 2 WLR 1351 (CA)) Reference in this connection may also be made to an interesting article by Paul P.

Craig, Q.C. titled Judicial Review, Appeal and Factual Error published in 2004 Public Law, p. 788. (See also Sonepat Coop. Sugar Mills Ltd. v. Ajit Singh (2005) 3 SCC 232 : 2005 SCC (L&S) 387, SCC paras 23 & 24.)

62. Powers and functions of the Committee - Consequences of contravention of the provisions of the Act and the order of the Committee:- Section 7 deals with the powers and functions of the Committee and the procedure to be followed by the Committee. Section 7 reads as under:- Section 7 : Powers and functions of the committee

(1) The powers and functions of the committee shall be,-- (a) to determine the fee to be collected by private schools; (b) to hear complaints with regard to collection of fee In excess of the fee determined by it or fixed by the Government, as the case may be. If the committee, after obtaining the evidence and explanation from the management of the private school or aided school concerned or from the Government school, comes to the conclusion that the private school or the Government school or aided school has collected fee in excess of the fee determined by the committee or fixed by the Government, as the case may be, it shall recommend to the appropriate competent authority for the cancellation of the recognition or approval, as the case may be, of the private school or aided school or for any other course of action as it deems fit in respect of the private school or Government school or aided school. (2) The committee shall have power to,--

(i) require each private school to place before the committee the proposed fee structure of such school with all relevant documents and books of accounts for scrutiny within such date as may be specified by the committee; (ii) verify whether the fee proposed by the private school is justified and it does not amount to profiteering or charging of exorbitant fee; (iii) approve the fee structure or determine some other fee which can be charged by the private school. (3) The Committee shall have power to,--

(i) verify whether the fee collected by the School affiliated to the Central Board of Secondary Education commensurate with the facilities provided by the school; (ii) to hear complaints with regard to collection of excess fee by a school affiliated to the Central Board of Secondary Education; and (iii) to recommend to the Central Board of Secondary Education for disaffiliation of the school, if it comes to a conclusion that the school has collected excess fee.

63. Section 9 of the Act deals with penal consequences. As per Section 9(1), whoever contravenes the provisions of the Act, or rules made thereunder, shall, on conviction, be punished with imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than three years but which may extend to seven years and with fine which may extend to five thousand rupees. Proviso confers discretion upon the Court to impose a sentence of imprisonment for a term of less than three years for any adequate and special reasons to be mentioned in the judgment. Section 10 of the Act deals with offences by the Companies. Thus, the Act contains drastic provisions for any violation or contravention of the provisions of the Act and also the order passed by the Committee.

64. In some cases, after the School Fee was determined by the Committee, on complaints made by the parents, orders came to be passed directing the Educational authorities to take appropriate action against the Schools in accordance with the Act. Fee determined by the Committee is charges excluding the fee for imparting smart class, etc., books, note books, uniform and transport facilities, if any on complaints made by the parents against the Schools in W.P.Nos.28853 and 28854 of 2011 regarding the fee collected for smart classes, the Committee passed the order dated 11.11.2011 directing the authorities to take appropriate action against the Schools, which is the subject matter of challenge in W.P.Nos.28853 and 28854 of 2011.

65. Thus, the provisions of the Act contain drastic provisions conferring power upon the Committee in case of proved contravention of the provisions of the Act. The power is conferred on the Committee to recommend to the competent authority for cancellation of the recognition or approval of the private school or any other course of action as it deems fit in respect of the said school. In view of the drastic measures contained in the

Act, Section 6(1) and 7 of the Act should be construed in plain language. When the Committee is vested with wide discretion in recommending to the proper authority for cancellation of the recognition of approval, the Committee must call its attention to matters which the Committee is bound to consider.

66. Re.Contention Calculations in the work sheet do not reflect correct facts:- We are conscious that while exercising jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, Court cannot go into the questions of fact. We are also conscious that the Court cannot sit over the order of the quasi judicial authorities. But we are constrained to point out certain glaring instances as to how the accounts prepared by the auditors do not reflect the correct facts.

67. Our attention was drawn to number of writ petitions as to how the accounts prepared by the auditors do not reflect the correct facts and that they are not in accordance with the guidelines framed by the Committee. To avoid repetition of facts and contentions, we refrain from referring to each one of the individual writ petitions, where we noted that the accounts prepared by the auditors do not reflect the actual expenditure of the schools and thereby leaving huge deficit for the schools.

68. Our attention was drawn to some of the writ petitions, where there are factual mistakes i.e., instead of taking into consideration the fee proposed by the particular school, some other proposed fee was taken into consideration and the impugned orders came to be passed. Number of instances were pointed out where minimum wages payable to the staff was not taken into account; lease rent payable by the school was not taken into account; actual strength of teaching and non-teaching staff were not taken into account; School run by Co-operative Societies (W.P.No.17680 of 2011) - The writ petitioner school is run by Kallakurichi Co-operative Sugar Mills Society, which is mainly intended for the children of staff working in Kallakurichi Co-operative Sugar Mills and Children of Cane Growers, who have registered themselves with the Mills. Here again, the Committee fixed low fee structure resulting in huge loss to the school. Grievance of writ petitioner is that the sugar mill itself is running at a loss and while so the Cooperative sugar Mill would not be in a position to cope up the deficit cost in the school. Instances were also brought to our notice, where the built up area of the buildings and the space available were not taken into account.

69. The auditors arrived at average expenditure per student in Column No.VII and in Column No.X they calculated proposed fee per student. Then both the amounts are compared in column No.XI. It was noticed that in number of writ petitions that if there was surplus the Auditors proceeded to deduct the same from the proposed fee per student. Per contra, if there was deficit, auditors have totally ignored. If the said deficit is multiplied by the number of students, it runs to several lakhs, thereby causing huge deficit to the schools.

70. W.P.No.16853 of 2011:- The petitioner is a minority school and the Committee has fixed a fee of "ZERO" on the basis of the observation that the petitioner school is an unrecognized institution and the observation of the Committee reads as under: As the recognition granted to the school has not been renewed after 31.5.2004, as on date, the school is deemed to be unrecognized school. Therefore, in view of the statutory provision, no fee is fixed. The order dated 7.5.2010 stands cancelled and the school shall not collect any fees from the students.

71. According to the petitioner, the School had recognition until 2004 and thereafter its recognition was not renewed. Original fee Determination Committee headed by Justice K.Govindarajan has fixed fee by its order dated 7.5.2010 and the subsequently Committee fixed the fee at "ZERO" mainly on the ground that the school did not have the recognition. According to respondents, in respect of schools which did not have recognition, having regard to Section 2(j) of the Act, the Committee has not fixed the fee. The learned counsel for petitioner would further submit that had the petitioner been given an opportunity to explain the position regarding its status, the petitioner would have produced the relevant documents showing pendency of correspondence with Government. Considering the submission, the impugned order in W.P.No.16853 of 2011 is also set aside and the matter is remitted back to the Committee for consideration of the matter afresh by affording sufficient opportunity to the petitioner to produce the relevant documents.

72. W.P.Nos.28853 and 28854 of 2011:- In these Writ Petitions, on complaints made by the parents regarding the fees collected for smart class, the Committee recommended to the educational authorities to take action against the school. It is pertinent to note that the fee fixed by the Committee is excluding the fee for smart class, note books, etc., If the school is actually conducting smart class, the school is entitled to collect reasonable fee for the smart class. On complaint received from the parents, the Committee ought to have afforded opportunity to the School. On mere complaint from the parents, recommendation to the educational authorities is in violation of principles of natural justice. Therefore, the impugned orders in these two writ petitions are also set aside and remitted back to the Committee for consideration of the matter afresh for giving opportunity to the writ petitioners.

73. Re-contention Non-affording of sufficient opportunity:- While upholding the validity of the Act, in Tamil Nadu Nursery, Matriculation and HSS Association case (2010 (4) CTC 353), in Paragraph (21), the First Bench of this Court held that the provisions of the Act calls upon the Management to forward their fee structure with details as to how they arrived at such a fee structure and the main idea is to see as to whether under the guise of collection of fees they are indirectly collecting the capitation fee or indulging in profiteering. In P.B. Prince Gajendra Babu case (2010 (5) CTC 721, while remitting the matter to the Committee, the First Bench of this Court directed the Committee to consider the objections of 6400 Schools by affording opportunity of personal hearing to the Institutions to enable them to submit materials for consideration of the Committee and thereafter pass individual orders by considering all the materials as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of four months from the date of receipt of copy of the order. As per the order of the High Court, Madras dated 05.10.2010 in W.A.No.2035 of2010, the Committee took up the matter for consideration by giving personal hearing on various dates and also allowing the School to file additional materials, if any.

74. Grievance of the Writ Petitioners is that inspite of direction to afford opportunity of personal hearing to the Writ Petitioners, no proper opportunity was given to the Writ Petitioner Schools and the alleged opportunity afforded was only an empty formality.

75. Onbehalf of Writ Petitioners, it was submitted that after the direction of the Division Bench in P.B.Prince Gajendra's case, the Committee issued notice to the Writ Petitioner Schools to appear on a single day many number of Schools were called and the representative of each of the school was heard only for less than two minutes and that the hearing afforded was just an empty formality.

76. Grievance of the writ petitioners is that no sufficient opportunity was given to them at the time of personal hearing and that number of schools were called for on one single day and the Schools were asked to file their objections and also additional materials and no personal hearing was given to the petitioner Schools and subsequently they received the order copy and therefore no adequate opportunity was given to the petitioner schools to put forth their submissions. Further grievance is that Schools were not informed that the existing fee structure to be mentioned in the questionnaire will apply for three years and that leaving out all three fee structures submitted by the Schools, the Committee has proceeded to evolve its own proposed fee structure. Further submission is that when such guidelines are formulated by the Committee, opportunity should have been given to the petitioner schools. Contending that principles of natural justice is inherent by the nature of duty performed by the Committee, learned Senior Counsel Mr.N.R.Chandran placed reliance upon 2009 (2) CTC 185 (Uma Nath Pandey and others v. State of U.P. and another].

77. In the counter, it is categorically asserted that Writ Petitioners were given sufficient opportunity. It is also averred that questionnaire was sent to the schools, who sent their response and the filled up questionnaire was considered. Learned Advocate General would submit that during personal hearing, representative of the schools appeared and reasonable time was given to each one of the school and only upon consideration of their objections and materials placed, the Committee has passed the order.

78. In this regard, the learned Advocate General has also drawn our attention to the communications sent by other schools expressing their satisfaction regarding the personal hearing and as to how they were briefed in the assembly hall before meeting the Committee. It may not be necessary for us to refer to those letters sent by various schools expressing their satisfaction and gratitude for patient hearing by the Committee.

79. As we have pointed out earlier, contravention of the provisions of the Act/ orders of the Committee has serious consequences. In such circumstances, in our opinion, sufficient opportunity has to be afforded to each one school. Observing that adherence to principles of natural justice as recognised by all civilized States is of supreme importance when a quasi-judicial body embarks on determining disputes between the parties, in Uma Nath Pandey case, ((2009) 12 SCC 40), the Supreme Court held as under:- 0. Principles of natural justice are those rules which have been laid down by the Courts as being the minimum protection of the rights of the individual against the arbitrary procedure that may be adopted by a judicial, quasi-judicial and administrative authority while making an order affecting those rights. These rules are intended to prevent such authority from doing injustice.

80. When we consider the guidelines formulated by the Committee for determination of Fees i.e., (i) teaching staff salary is to be restricted to 60% of the proposed fee income; (ii) proposed fee given by the school or proposed fee arrived by the Committee, whichever ever, is less is adopted as proposed fee; (iii) Expenditure on maintenance and depreciation; (iv) sundry expenses are allowed for students i.e., rates were fixed ranging from Rs.600/- to Rs.750/- per student depending on the location and the other guidelines on depreciation of buildings, furniture and fixtures and equipments, etc., When the Committee formulated such guidelines for determination of fees, at the time when the Schools submitted their objections and materials, in our considered view, sufficient opportunity should have been given to the representatives of the Schools. When the Committee was to pass an order determining the fee having civil and criminal consequences, sufficient opportunity should have been given to the petitioner schools.

81. The concept of natural justice has undergone a great deal of change in recent years. Rules of natural justice are not rules embodied always expressly in a statute or in rules framed thereunder. They may be implied from the nature of the duty to be performed under a statute. What particular rule of natural justice should be implied and what its context should be in a given case must depend to a great extent on the facts and circumstances of that case, the framework of the statute under which the enquiry is held. To what extent principles of natural justice to be complied with would depend upon fact situation obtaining in each case.

82. At the time of personal hearing, the Schools have produced their accounts as well as the materials. In the impugned orders, no reasons are given as to why they were not taken into account and whether the proposed fee by the School amounts to profiteering or charging capitation fee. When the Committee has formulated guidelines for re-determination of fees and chosen to fix other fees than the one proposed by the Schools, adequate opportunity should have been given to the Schools. More so, in the light of guidelines framed by the Committee.

83. On this simple ground, we would have remitted the matter for affording sufficient opportunity to the writ petitioners and to determine the matter afresh. Since elaborate arguments were advanced on the rigidity of the guidelines formulated, we are constrained to examine the guidelines whether they are in accordance with the provisions of the Act and the principles laid down by the Supreme Court.

84. In respect of minority institutions, elaborate arguments were advanced that rigid parameters were adopted by the Committee infringing the right of administration enshrined in Article 30(1) of the Constitution of India and restricting the rights of the minority institutions. It has therefore become necessary for this Court to see as to whether the guidelines formulated and the direction of the Committee would curtail or restrict the right of administration of the minority institutions.

I

85. Guidelines For fixation of School Fee in respect of Non-Minority Educational Institutions: Regulation of Accounts:- The schools have produced audited accounts. Grievance of writ petitioner schools is that inspite of such audit report produced, vital expenses, which form part of the audit report, were not taken into account. Further grievance is that repairs and maintenance expenses allowed by the Committee is not with reference to audit report furnished by the schools. The annual depreciation and actual repairs and maintenance was not taken into account and the working sheet will go to show that fee determination has been made by the Committee with reference to its own policies and not with reference to actual expenditure of the schools. On behalf of the writ petitioner schools it was submitted that the Committee ought to have taken into account the audit reports submitted by the schools.

86. As per Section 8 of the Act, the Government may regulate the maintenance of accounts by the private schools in such manner as may be prescribed. It was stated that till date, a particular accounting system has not been prescribed by the Government. This circumstance can be distinguished from the Modern School case, [(2004) 5 SCC 583]. Dealing with the Delhi School Education Act, which stipulated elaborate accounting system, it came to be approved by the Honourable Supreme Court in accordance with the non-profit accounting system. In the absence of any particular stipulation by the Government, the educational authorities/ private schools have been following their own accounting system, each different from one another. Since there is no uniform accounting system prescribed by the Government as contemplated under the Act, it has become necessary for us to issue certain guidelines elaborating upon the factors to be taken into consideration as per Section 6(1) of the Act and Rule 3 and the financial administration of the private schools for determining the fee.

87. Learned Advocate General has also made elaborate submissions and also filed written submissions on the aspects of financial administration of private schools. In its written submissions, Government adverted to various aspects and the school fee components, which shall be considered by the Committee in determining the school fee.

88. Pay and allowances of teaching and non-teaching staff and Employees Welfare Schemes:- Grievance of the writ petitioners is that the statutory obligation of the Schools to pay salary as per VI Pay Commission and make the statutory payments like Employees Provident Fund and E.S.I. Payment were not taken into consideration. Further grievance is that the Committee has not taken into consideration the annual increments and incentives to be paid to the teaching staff.

89. It is the further case of petitioners that the salary fixed by the Committee is static for three years. The salary so fixed does not seem to have taken into account the salary payable under VI Pay Commission. By the time the orders came to be passed by the Committee, VI Pay Commission was implemented in the State of Tamil Nadu. The Writ Petitioner Schools were yet to implement the VI Pay Commission and proportionate increments are also payable. When that being so, the guideline restricting the salary of teaching staff to 60% of the proposed fee income may not be correct.

90. Teacher-student ratio:- Yet another grievance is that in the State of Tamil Nadu, the teacher-student ratio is fixed for the primary school level at 1:30, in the middle school level at 1:35; and for the higher classes at 1:40. For determining the fee Committee has adopted that ratio. Grievance of the writ petitioners that Government cannot impose restrictions on unaided private schools regarding teacher-student ratio. If teacher-student ratio is varied, the burden of excess salary to the teachers would be shifted to the students casting heavy burden upon the parents. When Committee adopted teacher-student ratio prevailing in the State of Tamil Nadu, private schools cannot have any valid grievance. The objection raised by the writ petitioner schools in respect of teacher-student ratio cannot be considered.

91. Fixed Salary to Teaching Staff:- In its written submissions, Government stated that by considering the market situation, availability of unemployed teachers, salary would be considered at Rs.6,000/- for nursery and primary school secondary grade teachers; Rs.9,000/- for Matriculation/Middle School Secondary Grade

teachers; Rs.14,000/- for B.Ed. teachers and Rs.15,000/- for Post Grade teachers. The Government is not justified in saying that in view of availability of unemployed teachers, the salary payable to the teaching staff has to be restricted.

92. Education is an important tool for all round development of an individual. Educational Institution is established to impart knowledge to the students to facilitate his development. In the beginning, even though educational institutions were established without profit motive, over the years, taking advantage of the demand, more number of private educational institutions were established, of course with profit motive. The rush for admission in private schools is occasioned by the standards maintained in such schools. It is in the interest of the public that such good quality schools are established. The schools should have autonomy in the right of appointment and selection of the teachers to maintain standards of education. For providing better quality education, private educational institutions have autonomy in selecting quality teachers. If quality teachers are not appointed, the standards will be lowered from excellence to a level of mediocrity.

93. To maintain the quality of education, private educational institutions also have the autonomy to select and retain experienced teachers to impart quality education. While so, the Government is not justified in saying in view of the availability of unemployed teachers salary of teaching staff could be fixed at Rs.6,000/- for nursery and primary school secondary grade teachers; Rs.9,000/- for middle school Secondary grade teachers; Rs.14,000/- for B.Ed. Teachers and Rs.15,000/- for Post Graduate teachers. By so restricting the salary of teaching staff, the private educational institutions cannot be compelled to compromise on quality of education imparted to young children. In such circumstances, the learned Advocate General has submitted that salary should be paid to teachers as per rules and the schools may be directed to open ECS account for each teacher, which in our considered view, merits acceptance. In so far as non-teaching staff, Minimum Wages Act is applicable and minimum wages are payable and if the minimum wages are not paid, the School authorities would be subjected to penal consequences.

94. In its written submission, the Government stated that the Pay, Allowances and Employees Welfare Schemes shall be considered and stated how it will be considered. Learned Advocate General contended that (i) Schools may be directed to open ECS (i) account for each teacher for paying salary and other allowances; (ii) insofar as EPF Contribution, ESI, Pension, Gratuity, the same shall be considered on the bills produced to the credit of the concerned account of Government. Insofar as, Christmas gift to Staff and Incentive for good results/festivals, learned Advocate-General submitted that this gets included in the allowances given at Rs.600/750 per annum per student. The said amount of Rs.600/750 per annum per student is allowed for sundry expenses. Therefore, it cannot be said that Christmas gift, incentive for good results/festivals could also be included under sundry expenses. Whatever is the expenditure towards Christmas gift, incentive for good results, the same shall be considered.

95. Non-Teaching Staff:- Grievance of the writ petitioners is that there was rigidity regarding number of non-teaching staff to be employed. The committee has chosen to fix the ratio for non-teaching staff as well as aayas.

96. In this regard, the learned Advocate General in his submissions as well as written submissions has submitted that as per G.O.No.245 dated 21.02.1970, there can be one Clerk, one Attender and one Waterman for the schools having strength of students of 250; if it is more than 1000 it can be taken as two each; if it is more than 1500 students strength, it can be taken as three each. That apart, they can have part time sweepers, scavengers and watchmen. Considering the realistic situation and other relevant circumstances the average monthly salary of Attender and Watermen may be fixed at Rs.3000/- per month and that of Junior Assistant may be taken as Rs.4000/-; and for part time Sweepers, scavengers and watchmen for each of them the monthly average salary may be fixed as Rs.2000/- each.

97. The number of non-teaching staff to be employed is fixed is in accordance with the Government Order. The Writ Petitioners cannot have any valid objection regarding strength of non-teaching staff, which is to be

correlated with that of the total students. In the written submissions, the learned Advocate General has submitted that as per the Statutory norms, strength and pay for non-teaching staff shall be as under: S.NO.

School having following student strength

Rs.4000 (clerk)

Rs.3000 (Attender/ Watermen)

Rs.2000 Sweepers/Scavengers/ Watchmen (Part-Time)

1

100

1

1

1

2

200

1

1

2

3

300

1

2

2

4

400

1

2

3

5

500

2

2

3

6

600

2

2

4

7

700

2

2

5

8

800

2

3

5

9

900

2

4

5

10

1000

2

4

5

11

1100

2

4

5

12

1200

3

4

5

The salary paid to non-teaching staff shall be considered subject to proof as per the statutory norms of appointments and payment of salary through ECS. In so far as statutory payments like EPF, ESI, uniforms and other payments, the observation in Para No.94 shall hold good.

98. The main contention of the petitioners is that the obligations of the School to pay the statutory dues like contribution towards EPF and ESI and salary as per VI Pay Commission and periodical increments were not kept in view by the Committee. Objections were also raised as to the guidelines formulated by the Committee - teaching staff salary pay restricted to 60% of the proposed fee income and also by fixing the teacher-student ratio.

99. Salary and Allowances to Teaching and Non-teaching Staff: i. Salary & Allowances (Basic + DPA + DA + HRA + CCA + MED. AL) Earned Leave + Yearly increment and Arrears based on shift in slabs.

ii. E.P.F. Contribution)

iii. E.S.I)

iv. Pension)

v. Gratuity)

vi. Christmas Gift to Staff & Pen/

vii. Incentive for Good Results/)

Festivals)

viii.Retirement Purse

ix.Ex gratia

x.Worker's Uniform

xi.Staff Uniform

xii.Staff Welfare

xiii.Staff Insurance

Since salary should be paid to teachers as per Rules schools may be advised to open ECS A/c for each teacher and the actual salary credited may be taken as salary Component. Subject to a maximum pay as recommended in 6th Pay Commission.

Considered based on bills produced to the credit of concerned account of Government instead of the school itself. To be considered subject to proof.

To be considered subject to proof.

Will be considered subject to proof.

100. Administration and Maintenance:- Grievance of the writ Petitioners is that even though the petitioner schools have produced the proof regarding payment of property tax, electricity charges, water consumption charges and other expenses, the same was not taken into consideration by the Committee. Yet another grievance was that because of prevailing power-cut, the Schools are forced to operate generator set for which the schools will have to bear expenses for operation and its maintenance. In this regard, the learned Advocate General has submitted that the following expenses will be considered towards administration and maintenance:

101. Administration:

a. Taxes

b. Water

Property Tax, Water tax etc will be considered.

c. Electricity Charges

Payment of electricity bill & fuel for Generator-will be considered excepting expenses of cost and installment of generator. d. Printing & Stationery

Printing of cash book, ledgers, fee receipts, school magazine, prospectus, application forms, report cards, circulars and purchase of office stationery items will be considered. e. Postage & Telephone

Internet/SMS service- will be considered.

f. Examination

Printing of Question papers, answer scripts, hand work material for students, projects will be considered. g. Books & Periodicals

Will be considered to a reasonable extent.

h. Laboratory Expenses

i. Administrative charges

j. Audit&Legal Fees

k. Hospitality

With a reasonable level so as not to burden the fee structure.

l. Teaching aid

Teaching aids to the necessary level may be considered along with expenses on Smart Class and software. That expenses of Smart Class may be bifurcated into

1. Investment on installation of software; and

2. Utility Services including contents of the CDs & DVDs and the expenses on the demonstrators. The second part alone may be put on the head of student as fees; first being the duty of the Proprietor of the school to install machine just like he makes construction of the building to get opening permission. m. Travelling and Conveyance

Will be considered along with fee fixation @ Rs.2/- per kilo meter rate for Van and bus etc., for utility of the students. n. Professional Fee

It is a personal obligation while continuing in any avocation of life. o. Advertisement

This may not go to the utility of the student; the advertisement regarding the calling for teachers may alone be admitted as it amounts to administrative charges. p. School recognition charges

q. Bank/Interest charges

It is a paramount duty of the proprietor for getting opening permission; it has nothing to do with student utility.

In our considered opinion the same shall be taken as guidelines for calculating expenditure on administration. As rightly contended by the learned Advocate General, those expenses that will go the utility of the student shall be taken into account by the Committee.

102. Other Miscellaneous Expenses and Maintenance:- Here again, the learned Advocate General has submitted that the expenditure on the following heads of maintenance shall be considered by the Committee:-

a. Campus Maintenance : Salary of sufficient number of Gardeners, whose services may be useful for such maintenance

shall be considered.

b. Building Maintenance : Subject to proof will be considered. c. Laboratory Maintenance : This will be considered. d. Equipment Maintenance : This will be considered. e. Vehicle Maintenance : Will be included in the charges for per running Kilo meter, fixable as additional fee prescribed on such head (as now it is being done). f. Sanitation : Services of Scavengers will be considered. Purchase of Phenyl, Acid, Brooms, Bleaching powder, brushes, mops etc. will be considered.

g. Security Services : This will be considered by employing part time watchmen with reasonable pay.

103. Depreciation on Building, furniture, fixtures and equipments:- Government in its written submission has stated that it is the duty of the owner of the building viz., the proprietor of the School to maintain it properly and therefore the depreciation will not be considered. It was further submitted that it is an actual concession given to tax payer only and not to allow it to the schools, since giving 10% depreciation to the buildings and furnitures will not go to the utility of the students.

104. Even though it was contended that depreciation of building, furniture and fixtures will not be considered, by perusal of the guidelines adopted by the Committee, it is seen that the Committee has formulated the guideline allowing depreciation on Building, furniture, fixtures and equipments as under: Rate adopted 10%

If details are not available for depreciation on building and there is no claim, Depreciation maybe allowed @ 10% on estimated cost as under: For RCC Rs.500 per sq.ft. For others Rs.200 per sq.ft. The above guideline is very reasonable.

105. Land and Lease Rent:- Our attention was drawn to several instances, where the Committee has not considered the lease rent payable. In this regard, in the written submissions, Government contended that it is the paramount duty of the proprietor of the School to get opening permission by providing land either on his own or on rental basis and therefore the said expenditure cannot be passed on to the student.

106. On behalf of Government, even though it was submitted that the rent cannot be considered, as per the guidelines formulated by the Committee, rent is one of the factors which the Committee thought it fit to be taken into consideration for determining the fee. The said guideline in respect of rent reads as under: Rent:

As per the agreement if agreements are available.

As per the questionnaire if agreement is not available. As per latest audited B/S and P&L if above both details are not available. Otherwise as per abstract of the expenditure (or) as per appeal (or) as per personal hearing. The above guideline is very reasonable.

107. Surplus for development:- In the guidelines formulated, the Committee has fixed the surplus for development as per location as under: .Village - 5%

2.Town Panchayat 6%

3.Municipality - 7%

4.Dist HQ - 8%

5.Corporation - 9%

108. In Modern School case,[(2004) 5 SCC 583], the Honourable Supreme Court upheld the collection of development fees by schools for supplementing resources for the purchase, upgradation and replacement of furnitures, fixtures and equipment. It permitted the Managements of unaided schools to charge development fees not exceeding 15% of the total annual tuition fees. In the Modern School case, the Supreme Court

considered the concept of reasonable surplus. The accounts of the schools as non-profit organisation development fee at the rate not exceeding 10-15% was held to be appropriate. In the said judgment, at paragraph No.25, the Supreme Court held as under: 5. In our view, on account of increased cost due to inflation, the management is entitled to create a Development Fund Account. For creating such development fund, the management is required to collect development fees. In the present case, pursuant to the recommendation of the Duggal Committee, development fees could be levied at a rate not exceeding 10% to 15% of total annual tuition fee. Direction No. 7 further states that development fees not exceeding 10% to 15% of total annual tuition fee shall be charged for supplementing the resources for purchase, upgradation and replacement of furniture, fixtures and equipments. It further stated that development fees shall be treated as capital receipt and shall be collected only if the school maintains a depreciation reserve fund. In our view, Direction No. 7 is appropriate. If one goes through the Report of the Duggal Committee, one finds absence of non-creation of specified earmarked fund. On going through the Report of the Duggal Committee, one finds further that depreciation has been charged without creating a corresponding fund. Therefore, Direction No. 7 seeks to introduce a proper accounting practice to be followed by non-business organisations/not-for-profit organisations. With this correct practice being introduced, development fees for supplementing the resources for purchase, upgradation and replacements of furniture and fixtures and equipments is justified. Taking into account the cost of inflation between 15-12-1999 and 31-12-2003 we are of the view that the management of recognised unaided schools should be permitted to charge development fee not exceeding 15% of the total annual tuition fee.

109. As per the Judgment of the Supreme Court in Modern School case, in case of unaided private educational institutions, reasonable surplus of 10 to 15% was held to be permissible. While so, the surplus for development fixed by the Committee for the Schools i.e., 5% for villages, 6% for town panchayats, 7% for Municipalities; 8% for District Headquarters, 9% for Corporations is not commensurate with the percentage of surplus as indicated in Modern School case.

110. In its written submission, Government submitted that the Committee may consider school development fund for a blanket fixed development charges of 15%. All the unaided private schools (other than minority educational institutions) in village and town panchayats, the surplus for development could be fixed as:-

Village and Town Panchayats ... 10%

Municipalities and

District Headquarters ... 12=%

Corporations ... 15%

111. Increase in Fees as per Infrastructure Grading:- Depending on the infrastructure available, Grades were assigned to the schools as under:- Requirement as per the Norms 'D' 6% Available more than the requirement 'C' 6% Available more than adequate 'B' 7% Available Modern Facilities 'A' 9% Here again, as per grading, the increase in fees could be increased to 7=% to 10% depending on the availability of infrastructure and location.

112. Sundry Expenses:- For sundry expenses, Committee allowed Rs.600/- per student up to middle school and Rs.750/- per student up to Higher Secondary School per student per annum. As per the decisions in T.M.A.Pai Foundation case and Inamdar case, in our considered view, taking the above amount of Rs.600/- / Rs.750/- per student as base amount for sundry expenses, increase in sundry expenses could be given depending on the location and availability of other extra curricular activities in the School.

113. Fee for specific purposes and Extra-Curricular Activities:- Liberty of Management of the educational institutions includes the liberty to define for itself various facets of education and other extra curricular

activities including sports and various methodology of teaching. In our considered view, the following guidelines shall be followed: Fee for specific purposes:

I. Students study needs Books, Note books, uniform, etc. It is submitted that this will be considered while fixing the fees on books and note books subject to the condition that the prices will be displayed there on by the schools.

II. (a) Games: -Purchase of Sports items & Sports Day.

(b) Functions and - Independence day, Republic day, Celebrations: Education day, Children's day, Parents Day, Annual Day, Sports Day, Festival Day etc.,

III. Teaching through

Technology(Smart Class): Separate fee is being fixed according the norms of utility, as per the utility to be fixed. IV. Medical: - Medical check up and medicine for students will be considered for appointment of sufficient number of part time Doctors and subject to proof. V. Seminars: - Those Seminars relevant to educations. VI. Music : - Dance/Brass Band/Orchestra/Sports/Yoga/etc., These will be considered according to strength of students and subject to proof. (Full time). VII. Books/periodicals -Table copies for teachers and News papers for student. It is pre-requisite for getting opening permission. However, annual fixed amount may be provided. VIII.Group Activities - Whatever expenses apart from the NCC/NSS/SCOUTS/ Government grant on this head

JRC/RSP may be considered."

114. Learned Advocate General has submitted that keeping in view the interest of the students and their parents Committee adopted a balanced approach and prayed to confirm the same. Learned Advocate General has further submitted that any increase in the fee structure would be a financial burden for parents.

115. This Court is also conscious of the burden of the parents, but at the same time, this Court cannot be oblivious of the fact that in view of the increasing awareness and global level competition, the parents want to impart quality education to their wards, irrespective of their financial position. They also want their wards to excel in various fields and participate in extra-curricular activities and to achieve all-round development. The desire of parents to give such quality education by getting admission in private schools is also to be kept in view. We hope that keeping in view the desire of parents to give such quality education to their wards, the Committee shall take a balancing approach.

116. At this juncture, we may also usefully refer to the recent Judgment of the Supreme Court dated 12.4.2012 upholding the constitutional validity of the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009. The unsuccessful challenge to the Act came from unaided private schools management, who are required to set apart 25% seats for poor children. The provisions of the Act shall apply to a school established, owned or controlled by the appropriate Government or a local authority; an aided school including aided minority school(s) receiving aid or grants to meet whole or part of its expenses from the appropriate Government or the local authority; a school belonging to specified category; and an unaided non-minority school not receiving any kind of aid or grants to meet its expenses from the appropriate Government or the local authority. Of course, the provisions of RTE Act, 2009 are not applicable in respect of unaided Minority Schools.

117. With the judgment of the Supreme Court, now children of the age 6-14 years from weaker sections can have access to good quality education. Under Right to Education Act, private schools are to admit 25% of the students from socially and economically backward families and thus private unaided schools are now made 'socially responsible'. As per Right to Education Act, schools will get subsidy from the Government for giving free education (65% of the subsidy will come from the Centre and 35% from States). Since the Government

will be reimbursing the tuition fees for underprivileged children admitted to unaided private educational institutions, it would prove to be a financial burden for the Government. We hope that the Committee shall also keep in view the financial burden of the Central and State Governments in implementing Right to Education Act.

II

Minority Educational Institutions

118. All the writ petitioners excepting the petitioners in W.P.Nos.18092, 18419 and 18420 of 2011 are established and administered by the various Catholic Dioceses and the different religious Congregations of the Catholic Church. The three writ petitioner Schools in W.P.Nos.18092, 18419 and 18420 of 2011 are established and administered by the Church of South India, Madras Diocese. W.P.No.26270 of 2011 is run by Muslim minority educational institution. The writ petitioners Schools run by various Catholic Dioceses and Congregations of the Catholic Church and Church of South India are running around 500 schools in Tamil Nadu and are the biggest private educational agency in Tamil Nadu. Most of the schools were established before Independence and some of the schools are more than 100 years old. Most of the Schools run in the rural areas are Tamil Medium Schools and very few schools are English Medium Schools. All the said Educational Institutions are governed under Article 30(1) of Constitution of India. Because of their minority character, the said educational institutions enjoy a constitutional guarantee and special protection to establish and maintain educational institutions of their choice.

119. Considering the right of religious and linguistic minorities, referring to the earlier judgments, in T.M.A. Pai Foundation v. State of Karnataka, (2002) 8 SCC 481, the Supreme Court has held as under: 16. While considering the right of the religious and linguistic minorities to administer their educational institutions, it was observed by Ray, C.J., at SCR p. 194, as follows: (SCC pp. 745-46 of (1974) 1 SCC 717, (Ahmedabad St.Xavier's College Society v. State of Gujarat), para 19) The right to administer is said to consist of four principal matters. First is the right to choose its managing or governing body. It is said that the founders of the minority institution have faith and confidence in their own committee or body consisting of persons elected by them. Second is the right to choose its teachers. It is said that minority institutions want teachers to have compatibility with the ideals, aims and aspirations of the institution. Third is the right not to be compelled to refuse admission to students. In other words, the minority institutions want to have the right to admit students of their choice subject to reasonable regulations about academic qualifications. Fourth is the right to use its properties and assets for the benefit of its own institution.

117. While considering this right to administer, it was held that the same was not an absolute right and that the right was not free from regulation. While referring to the observations of Das, C.J., in Kerala Education Bill, 1957 case (AIR 1958 SC 956) it was reiterated in St. Xaviers' College case (1974) 1 SCC 717) that the right to administer was not a right to maladminister. Elaborating the minority's right to administer at SCR p. 196, it was observed as follows: (SCC p. 748, para 30) The minority institutions have the right to administer institutions. This right implies the obligation and duty of the minority institutions to render the very best to the students. In the right of administration, checks and balances in the shape of regulatory measures are required to ensure the appointment of good teachers and their conditions of service. The right to administer is to be tempered with regulatory measures to facilitate smooth administration. The best administration will reveal no trace or colour of minority. A minority institution should shine in exemplary eclecticism in the administration of the institution. The best compliment that can be paid to a minority institution is that it does not rest on or proclaim its minority character.

118. Ray, C.J., concluded by observing at SCR p. 200, as follows: (SCC p. 752, paras 46-47)

6. The ultimate goal of a minority institution too imparting general secular education is advancement of learning. This Court has consistently held that it is not only permissible but also desirable to regulate

everything in educational and academic matters for achieving excellence and uniformity in standards of education.

47. In the field of administration it is not reasonable to claim that minority institutions will have complete autonomy. Checks on the administration may be necessary in order to ensure that the administration is efficient and sound and will serve the academic needs of the institution. The right of a minority to administer its educational institution involves, as part of it, a correlative duty of good administration.

120. The right to establish and administer an institution, the phrase as employed in Article 30(1) of the Constitution, comprises the following rights: (a) to admit students; (b) to set up a reasonable fee structure; (c) to constitute a governing body; (d) to appoint staff (teaching and non-teaching); and (e) to take action if there is dereliction of duty on the part of any of the employees. (vide Para No.118 in P.A.Inamdar v. State of Maharashtra, (2005) 6 SCC 537).

121. Some of the reasonable regulations are (a) to maintain the educational character and standard of such institution, e.g., to lay down qualifications or conditions of service to secure appointment of good teachers, to ensure interests of students, to maintain a fair standard of teaching; (b) to ensure orderly, efficient and sound administration and to prevent mal-administration, and to secure its proper functioning as an educational institution, to ensure that its funds are spent for the betterment of education and not for extraneous purposes; (c) to enforce the general laws of the land, applicable to all persons, e.g., taxation, sanitation, social welfare, economic regulations, public order, morality and (d) to ensure efficiency and discipline of the institution.

122. Since the right to 'administer' confers upon the minority institutions the right to manage the institution, and the right conferred by Cl.(1) is absolute; no 'restriction' can be imposed by the State on the right of the minority community to manage the institution. Such regulations are, however, permissible only insofar as they do not restrict the right of administration of the minority community but facilitate and ensure better and more effective exercise of that right for the benefit of the institution. They must allow the institution to retain its minority character.

123. Elaborating upon the the meaning and content of the expression 'minorities', in Article 30 of the Constitution of India and also the extent of protection and the nature of regulations, in paragraph No.161 of T.M.A. Pai Foundation case [(2002) 8 SCC 481], the Supreme Court formulated eleven questions. We may usefully refer to Question No.5(c) and the principles relied thereon, which reads as under: Q. 5. (c) Whether the statutory provisions which regulate the facets of administration like control over educational agencies, control over governing bodies, conditions of affiliation including recognition/withdrawal thereof, and appointment of staff, employees, teachers and principals including their service conditions and regulation of fees, etc. would interfere with the right of administration of minorities? A. So far as the statutory provisions regulating the facets of administration are concerned, in case of an unaided minority educational institution, the regulatory measure of control should be minimal and the conditions of recognition as well as the conditions of affiliation to a university or board have to be complied with, but in the matter of day-to-day management, like the appointment of staff, teaching and non-teaching, and administrative control over them, the management should have the freedom and there should not be any external controlling agency. However, a rational procedure for the selection of teaching staff and for taking disciplinary action has to be evolved by the management itself.

The State or other controlling authorities, however, can always prescribe the minimum qualification, experience and other conditions bearing on the merit of an individual for being appointed as a teacher or a principal of any educational institution.

Fees to be charged by unaided institutions cannot be regulated but no institution should charge capitation fee.

(underlining added)

124. Right to administer confers upon the minority institutions right to manage the institutions. Minority Institutions cannot resist the regulations, which are conducive to maintain the standard. However no regulation would be valid, if it has the effect of displacing the minority administration or restricting the right of the minorities to administer their educational institutions.

125. In order to be consonant with Article 30(1), a regulation imposed by the State upon a minority institution must be (a) reasonable and must be (b) regulative of the educational character of the institution and conducive to making the institution an effective vehicle of education for the minority community or other persons who resort to it. The State cannot impose any restriction on the right of the minorities to administer educational institutions so long as such institutions are unaided by the State, except to the limited extent that regulation can be made for ensuring excellence in education.

126. Though Article 30 itself does not lay down any limitations upon the right of minority to administer its educational institutions, the right is not absolute, but is subject to reasonable regulations. The regulation must satisfy a dual test -the test of reasonableness, and the test that it is regulative of the educational character of the institution and is conducive to making the institution an effective vehicle of education for the minority community or other persons who resort to it. (vide Ahmedabad St. Xavier's College Society v. State of Gujarat, (1974) 1 SCC 717). The regulation cannot go to the extent of inhibiting the right guaranteed by Article 30(1) of the Constitution of India.

127. In SECRETARY, MALANKARA SYRIAN CATHOLIC COLLEGE VS. T.JOSE, ((2007)1 SCC 386), the Supreme Court summarised the general principles relating to establishment and administration of educational institutions by minorities themselves. The Supreme Court held that the right to establish and administer educational institutions is not absolute and that there can be regulatory measures for ensuring educational standards and maintaining academic excellence. It was further held that subject to the eligibility conditions/qualifications prescribed by the State being met, the unaided minority educational institutions will have the freedom to appoint teachers/lecturers by adopting any rational procedure of selection.

128. Learned Advocate General contended that the constitution of the Committee for regulating the fees would not amount to infringement of the rights of minorities. In support of his contention, the learned Advocate General relied upon paragraph No.141 of P.A.Inamdar case, (2005) 6 SCC 537, which reads as under: 41. Our answer to Question 3 is that every institution is free to devise its own fee structure but the same can be regulated in the interest of preventing profiteering. No capitation fee can be charged.

129. Learned counsel appearing for minority educational institutions Mr.A.Xavier Arulraj pointed out the difference between a reasonable regulation under Article 19(6) and reasonable restriction under Article 19(1)(g). The learned counsel would submit that the regulation can be made to ensure maintaining excellence and educational standards thereof, apart from using it for the purpose of prevention of collecting exorbitant fees. He would further submit that these regulations must be under a way to facilitate and ensure better and more effective exercise of right for the benefit of the institution or otherwise it would affect the autonomy of the institution.

130. At the outset, learned counsel for the minority institutions made it clear that the applicability of Tamilnadu Schools (Regulation of Collection of Fee) Act 2009 (Act 22 of 2009) is not under challenge. He would only contend that the jurisdiction of the Committee is only to regulate the fee and they cannot interfere in the administration of the minority institutions by (i) restricting the income and expenditure; (ii) restricting the right of minority institutions to appoint their staff by restricting the numbers without authority; (iii) restricting the expenditure on certain heads i.e., religious and cultural activities of the minority institutions and the Committee cannot act by preventing minority institutions to have their own cultural social identity. The learned counsel submitted that the minority institutions are entitled to have their own fee structure as a part of

right to administer their educational institutions. It was submitted that inspite of regulating the fee charged by the minority schools, the Committee is arbitrarily restricting the income and expenditure by a rigid formula and thereby restricting the right of minority institutions in running educational expenses. In so far as legal position regarding protection afforded to minority educational institutions, the learned counsel placed reliance upon decisions of the Apex Court in:- (i) Re The Kerala Education Bill, AIR 1958 SC 956 Paras 9, 16, 18 and 33; (ii) W.Proost and others vs. State of Bihar, AIR 1969 SC 465 at Para 11; (iii) State of Kerala Vs. Very Rev. Mother Provincial, (1970) 2 SCC 417 at Paras 11 and 15;

(iv) The Ahmadabad St.Xavier's Vs. State of Gujarat (1974) 1 SCC 717, at Paras 40, 41 and 89. (v) The Gandhi Faiz-E-Am College vs. University of Agra (1975) 2 SCC 283 at Para 10. (vi) TMA Pai Foundation Vs. State of Karnataka, (2002) 8 SCC 481 at Paras 116, 122, 139 and 143 Q.5(C) (vii) P.A.Inamdar Vs. State of Maharashtra (2005) 6 SCC 537 at Page 605, Paras 41,91, 92, 139, 144 and 149. (viii) Unaided Private Schools of Delhi vs. Director of Education, (2009) 10 SCC 1 at Paras 17 and 20 (Modern School case).

131. Restricting the number of teaching and non-teaching staff- Infringement of rights of Minority Institutions: - Learned counsel for writ petitioners contended that minority educational institutions have the right to appoint their staff and while so, without any justification, the Committee restricted the numbers of both teaching and non-teaching staff. It was further submitted that such restriction would amount to restricting the right of administration of the minority educational institutions. Contention of Writ Petitioners is that by restricting the number of teaching and non-teaching staff, the right of writ petitioner schools is left with much deficit and thereby right of the minorities is crippled in running the educational institutions. In this regard, learned counsel for the writ petitioners has drawn our attention of this Court:- (i) In W.P.No.18420 of 2011, the Committee has considered salary only for the 105 teaching staff and 51 administrative staff and allowed only total salary per year at Rs.1,90,34,855/- and Rs.47,58,714/- respectively.

(ii) In W.P.No.18037 of 2011 (Rosary Matriculation Higher Secondary School), non-teaching staff (31) was restricted to 13; (iii) In W.P.No.18419 of 2011 (CSI Jessie Moses Matriculation Higher Secondary School), Teaching staff (70) and Non-teaching staff (40) was restricted to 65 and 34 respectively; (iv) In W.P.No.2306 of 2012 (Seventh Day Adventist Matriculation Higher Secondary School), Secondary Grade teachers (24), B.T.Teachers (27), P.G.Teachers (26) and Non-teaching staff (32) was restricted to Secondary Grade (38), B.T. (16), P.G. (10) and Non-teaching staff (30) respectively; and (v) In W.P.No.18744 of 2011 (Carmel Garden Matriculation Higher Secondary School), Non-teaching staff (28) was restricted to 16.

132. By restricting the total number of teaching and non-teaching staff, the Committee has considered only lesser salary and not actual salary paid and thereby the minority educational institutions are left with huge deficit, which amount to restricting the right of minority institutions.

133. Because of their constitutionally protected liberty of administration, the Minority Educational Institutions are entitled to decide number of staff, their pay scale, attendant benefits and welfare schemes, innovative methods for effectiveness of education and excellence. As rightly contended by the learned counsel for Minority Educational Institutions, the Committee cannot restrict any of the said activity or its expenditure in the name of regulation. Restrictions of staff and fixation of salary and sundry expenses also infringe into the constitutionally protected right of administration of Minority Educational Institutions. There shall not be restriction regarding the salary payable to teaching and non-teaching staff, which, of course, is subject to the Government Scale of Pay and Government Orders.

134. Being minority educational institutions, they have the autonomy to have the best teacher for better quality education to be imparted. Ill-equipped teachers and sub-standard staffs would bring down the quality in excellence. Like in unaided non-minority educational institutions, there cannot be any rigidity in respect of salary payable to the teachers. Any such stipulation would interfere with the overall administrative control by the Management and would infringe its rights to establish and administer the educational institutions.

135. The employment of expression 'right to establish and administer' and 'educational institutions of their choices' in Article 30(1) gives the right to minority institutions which is of very wide amplitude. Therefore, a minority educational institution has a right to employ teaching and non-teaching staff as per their requirement. Any restriction on the strength of teaching and non-teaching staff would amount to restricting right of administration of minority community, which is protected under Article 30(1) of the Constitution of India.

136. As per the guidelines, the Committee restricted teaching staff salary to the upper limit of 60% of the proposed fee income. Modern School case, (2004) 5 SCC 584 reviewed in (2009) 10 SCC 1 nowhere states that the salary component of the teaching staff is to be restricted to 60% of the fee income. In Paragraph No.16 of the Modern School case, the Supreme Court held as follows: 'The fee-structure must be fixed keeping in mind the infrastructure and facilities available, investments made, salary paid to teachers and staff, future plans for expansion and/or betterment of institution subject to two restrictions, namely non-profiteering and non-charging of Capitation fee.'

137. Stipulating a regulation by the Committee and imposing artificial restriction of 60% of proposed income as the upper limit of salary for the teaching staff is yet another restriction on the right of minority educational institutions. Some of the educational institutions are matriculation schools, which are governed under Code of Regulation for Matriculation Schools. Code of Regulation for Matriculation in Tamil Nadu under Rule 18(ii) stipulates as follows:- 'The staff in the Matriculation school will be paid at the rate of Government pay and they are eligible for selection grade after 10 years of service as in other recognised school.'

138. Thus, as per the said Code, staff in the Matriculation Schools will be paid the Government scale of pay. The Committee cannot interfere with the actual salary paid to the staff under the statute by imposing upper restriction of 60% of the proposed income as upper limit of salary for the teaching staff. Of course, any such regulation is subject to the Government Scale of Pay and Government Orders.

139. By going through materials in the above writ petitions, we find that in respect of the above minority educational institutions, the Committee unjustly restricted the strength of teaching staff as well as non-teaching staff. In so far as minority educational institutions, in our considered view, the Committee ought to have accepted the strength of teaching and non-teaching staff as submitted by those educational institutions supported with materials like attendance etc., Restriction of number of teaching and non-teaching staff strength has resulted in deficit for those institutions virtually crippling the administration of the minority institutions. Any such restriction regarding strength of teaching and non-teaching staff in Minority Schools is subject only to Government Orders.

140. Expenditure on certain heads relating to the minority cultural activity:- The minority institutions have their own cultural and social identity. The character of the institutions is sought to be tampered with by restricting the expenditure on certain heads relating to minority cultural activities like Christmas bonus to the staff and such other minority cultural activities. In this regard, learned counsel for petitioner has drawn our attention to the orders made in respect of Schools i.e., CSI Bains Matriculation Higher Secondary School (W.P.Nos.18092 of 2011); CSI Jessie Moses Matriculation Higher Secondary School (W.P.No.18419 of 2011); and C.S.I.Ewart Matriculation Higher Secondary School (W.P.No.18420 of 2011), wherein the claim of Christmas bonus to staff was disallowed. Such disallowing of expenses would negate the right of minority institutions to retain their character as minority institutions.

141. Other contentions:- In respect of minority schools, the learned counsel raised the following contentions:- Sundry expenses must be in tune with the facilities and curricular and extra-curricular activities of the School and not based on the location. Reasonable expenditure should be allowed for maintenance of land.

142. The committee did not keep in view the transaction between petitioner School and the educational agency and therefore the lease or the rentals advance drawn and repayments made have been left out resulting

in heavy deficit.

143. Financial Transactions and the Corporate management of Minority Educational Institutions run by Catholic Dioceses and various congregations:-

These schools are administered by various Catholic Dioceses and different religious Congregations of the Catholic Church. Those minority educational institutions run by various Catholic Dioceses and their different Congregations. These educational institutions are under the network of management. Additional written submission is filed elaborating upon the Corporate School Development Fund. The minority educational institutions in Tamil Nadu is said to have a track record of 300 educational services and are stated to be having cultural net work and are also having 'Corporate School Development Fund'. They are having 'Corporate School Development Fund' for deployment of funds to needy schools, which are run for poor and needy children and also Hill Tribes.

144. Any restriction to the financial transaction of the minority schools would amount to dismember the cultural network of the minority institutions and need to have sufficient reasonable surplus not only for its own development but also for the development of the cultural network.

145. Learned counsel placing reliance on an unreported judgment of Division Bench of this Court dated 17.12.1975 in W.P.Nos.4478 of 1974 etc., batch, contended that in the name of fee regulation, the Committee is destabilizing the foundation of resources and financial assets owned by the Committee, practised for more than a century, without any profiteering. In the said judgment, the Division bench of this Court held as under:

To ask for prior permission of the competent authority for utilisation of funds for bonafide purposes connected with the school involve a blanket power to the competent authority, which seriously affects the right to administer minority institutions. The right to administer a minority institution includes the right to administer its funds which means that the minority institution must have the liberty to invest the moneys in whichever way it thinks fit, and its freedom to invest or deposit in whichever way it would think safe or proper cannot be infringed upon.

146. Resources invested by the Educational Institutions run by Catholic are held in common by Corporate Educational Agencies. Therefore, the School Development Fund can be permitted to be held in common under the form of Corporate School Development Fund by the respective Educational Agencies for advantageous deployment of resources for needy schools and for expansion of the Educational Agencies. This centralization of School Development Fund into Corporate School Development Fund is meant for enhancing the educational stream and used for that purpose alone. Thus, the schools run by Catholic Dioceses and their various Congregations stand on different footing from other educational institutions.

147. Percentage of income to be allowed for school development is 15% of the total expenditure, but in none of the minority schools, Committee had given 15% for growth development. Based on the location of schools, Committee has allowed surplus for development only from 5% to 9%. The learned counsel Mr.Xavier Arulraj submitted that there are very good minority schools in rural areas (Like Montfort School in Yercaud) and while so, allowing surplus at 5% to 9% based on location of Schools is a misnomer. We find much force in the contention of learned counsel for petitioners. All the minority educational institutions need to have a reasonable surplus for its own development and also being member of Corporate Management.

148. As per the ratio of Modern School case, the minority educational institutions need to have reasonable surplus for its own development and also for development of cultural network of minority institutions. While for its own development the Minority Institutions are entitled to have 15% surplus, it should also be a member of cultural net work and enhance the educational stream. By being member of cultural net work for Corporate School Development Fund for deployment of resources for other needy school, it would be appropriate to allow another 10% surplus for Minority Educational Institutions run by Catholic Institutions.

149. For private unaided non-minority schools, in Para Nos. 109 and 110, we have fixed reasonable surplus at the slab of 10-15% depending upon the location. In so far as minority educational institutions run by Catholic Dioceses and their various Congregations, keeping in view 'Corporate Development Fund' maintained, it would be appropriate to allow 15% plus 10%, totalling 25% as surplus for the minority educational institutions irrespective of the location of the school. Likewise, reasonable increase in fee structure at the rate of 7% to 10% should be allowed to the minority educational institutions also depending on the availability of infrastructure upon the location.

150. Other Minority Educational Institutions Other Minority Educational Institutions other than run by Catholic Dioceses and their various Congregations also need to have reasonable surplus for its own development. Irrespective of location, those Minority Educational Institutions shall be entitled to 15% surplus irrespective of their location of the school. They shall also be entitled to reasonable increase in fee structure at the rate of 7% to 10% depending on the location.

151. Method of calculation adopted by the Committee virtually cripples the minority institutions: (i) Before the fee structure was fixed, there were three stages. The auditors seemed to have arrived at an average expenditure per student in Column No.8. In Column No.10, auditors calculated proposed fee per student. They compared both the amounts in Column No.11. If there is a surplus they proceeded to deduct the same from the proposed fee per student. If there was deficit they have totally ignored. The so called notional deficit per student, if multiplied by the number of students, runs to few crores or several lakhs virtually crippling the minority institutions. (ii) For example, in W.P.No.18420 of 2011, the total amount of alleged notional deficit calculated, works out to Rs.1,08,05,515/- (Rs.3565 x 3010 = Rs.1,08,05,515). The total amount allowed for sundry expenses is Rs.22 lakhs. The amount allowed for growth and development is Rs.35 lakhs. Put together, the amount allowed to sundry expenses and development, works out to a total of Rs.57 lakhs. The amount they ignored (Rs.1,08,05,515/-) is more than the amount fixed both for sundry expenses and development fund (Rs.57 lakhs). Therefore, the very calculation has effect of virtually crippling the institution. Likewise, in W.P.No.18037 of 2011, the total amount of notional surplus calculated works out to Rs.88,53,712/- (Rs.3437 x 2576 = Rs.88,53,712/-). The total amount allowed for sundry expenses is Rs.19,32,000/-. The amount allowed for growth and development is Rs.22,15,758/-. Put together, the amount allowed to sundry expenses and development works out to a total of Rs.41,47,758/-. The amount they deducted as surplus (Rs.88,53,712/-) is more than the amount fixed for sundry expenses and development fund (Rs.41,47,758/-). Therefore, in the entire transaction, Committee has neither provided for sundry expenses nor growth and development fund.

III- Conclusion

152. For the foregoing reasons, the impugned orders in all the writ petitions are set aside and the matters are remitted back to the School Fee Determination Committee for consideration of the matters afresh. Fee structure approval form shall be given to Writ Petitioner Schools calling upon them to produce the details and documents required to be furnished. All the Writ Petitioner Schools shall propose the fee structure afresh with fresh or additional materials/Audit statements showing the expenditure and income. The Committee shall give personal hearing to each of the Writ Petitioner Schools and also afford reasonable opportunity to all the Writ Petitioner Schools and pass final orders as expeditiously as possible, preferably by the end of December 2012. [Unaided Non-Minority Educational Institutions]

153. In respect of unaided Non-Minority Educational Institutions, the School Fee Determination Committee shall keep in view the guidelines in Para Nos.88 to 117 and 152 of this order. For the reasons stated in Para Nos.109 and 110, all the unaided Non-Minority Educational Institutions shall be entitled to surplus for development i.e., Village and Town Panchayats at 10%; Municipalities and District Headquarters at 12% and Corporations at 15%.

154. For the reasons stated in Para No.111, for Infrastructure Grading, there shall be an increase in fee - 7% to 10% depending on the availability of the infrastructure in the Schools. [Minority Educational Institutions]

155. The directions [except the observations regarding the RTE Act, 2009 in Para Nos.116 and 117] in respect of unaided Non-Minority Educational Institutions shall also hold good for the unaided Minority Educational Institutions. That apart, in respect of unaided Minority Educational Institutions, Committee shall keep in view the guidelines in Para Nos.118 to 151 and 152 and also the following guidelines:- (i) Audited Statement submitted by the Minority Educational Institutions may be accepted by the Committee; (ii) In case the Committee does not approve the auditors' statement submitted by the minority educational institutions, the Committee shall record its reasons for not accepting the report. Thereafter, the Committee shall afford reasonable opportunity to the minority institutions and thereafter shall pass the final order.

(iii) There shall not be restriction regarding the salary payable to teaching and non-teaching staff, which, of course, is subject to the Government Scale of Pay and Government Orders. The Committee shall not interfere with the expenditure of the minority educational institutions on its cultural and religious activities to retain its character as minority institutions.

(iv) For the reasons stated in Para Nos.143 to 149, as the minority institutions run by Catholic Dioceses and their various Congregations, they being a part of the body corporate and Corporate School Development Fund, irrespective of its location, all the minority educational institutions run by Catholic Dioceses and their various Congregations shall be entitled to 25% surplus.

(v) Other Minority Educational Institutions shall be entitled to surplus for development i.e. Village and Town panchayats at 10%; Municipalities and District Headquarters at 12% and Corporations at 15%. (vi) The Minority Educational Institutions (including the Institutions run by Catholic Dioceses and their various Congregations) shall also be entitled to 7% to 10% increase in fee structure on the infrastructure grading. IV - Interim arrangement

156. The academic year 2012-2013 already started. In view of the fee structure earlier fixed, many of the schools are said to be facing financial difficulties. Pending final orders of School Fee Determination Committee, Writ Petitioner Schools both Minority and Non-Minority Schools shall be entitled to collect 15% over and above the fee fixed earlier by the Committee. The interim arrangement is applicable only to the Writ Petitioner Schools and not to other Schools. Collection of enhanced fee is subject to the final orders to be passed by the Committee.

There is no order as to costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

157. Learned Advocate General has submitted that number of other private schools have so far not chosen to challenge the fee fixed by the School Fee Determination Committee headed by Justice K.Raviraja Pandian. The learned Advocate General urged us to specifically clarify that the interim arrangement in this order shall not be made applicable to the other schools, who have not so far challenged the order of the School Fee Determination Committee headed by Justice K.Raviraja Pandian. Lest, all other unaided private schools would try to take advantage of the interim arrangement in this order and thereby burdening the parents.

158. We find much force in the above contention of the learned Advocate General. We reiterate our observations in Para No.156. We make it clear that the other Schools, who have not so far chosen to challenge the order of the School Fee Determination Committee headed by Justice K.Raviraja Pandian, shall not claim the benefit of the interim arrangement made in this order. The cut-off date for availing the benefit of the interim arrangement made in this order is 2.5.2012. That is only those schools who filed writ petitions challenging the order of the School Fee Determination Committee headed by Justice K.Raviraja Pandian till 2.5.2012 shall alone be entitled to claim the benefit of the interim arrangement. That too, only after final orders are passed in those writ petitions on considering the facts and merits of each case. The Government

shall ensure strict monitoring in this regard.

Sd/-

Asst.Registrar.

/true copy/

Sub Asst.Registrar.

usk

M.P.No.1 of 2012

in

W.P.No.8489 of 2011 etc., batch

R.BANUMATHI, J.

and

S.VIMALA, J.

(Order of the Court was made by R.BANUMATHI, J.)

Apprehending that the order dated 03.05.2012 is likely to be misinterpreted and there is possibility that the schools other than the writ petitioner schools are likely to misinterpret the order to collect 15% hike in fees, Government has filed this petition seeking to further clarify the directions already issued by this Court in the Order dated 03.05.2012 made in W.P.No.8489 of 2011 etc., batch.

2. We have heard Mr.S.Venkatesh, learned Government Pleader and Mr.P.Sanjay Gandhi, learned Additional Government Pleader. There is no representation for the writ petitioner schools.

3. Considering the representations and urgency, we have taken up the matter.

4. In our Order dated 3.5.2012, in paragraph Nos.157 and 158, we made it clear that as per the interim arrangement only the writ petitioner schools covered under the order dated 03.05.2012 can collect 15% over and above the fees fixed by the School Fee Determination Committee for the academic year 2012-2013 and that 15% increase is subject to the final order to be passed by the Committee. We have also categorically made it clear that the interim arrangement was only for the writ petitioner schools and not for the other schools. The order dated 3.5.2012 including the names of the writ petitioner schools is also hosted in the High Court web site.

5. Considering the submissions of the learned Government Pleader and also the averments in the clarification petition, we also feel that the parents should be clearly informed that the interim arrangement of 15% increase in fee over and above the fee fixed by the Committee is only for the writ petitioner schools and not for the other schools. Even for the writ petitioner schools, the said 15% increase is subject to the final order to be passed by the School Fee Determination Committee.

6. To avoid any misinterpretation of the order dated 3.5.2012, it is clarified as under: (i) Only the writ petitioner schools covered under the order dated 03.05.2012 would be entitled to collect 15% fees over and

above the fee fixed by the Committee and that it is only for the academic year 2012-2013. Writ petitioner Schools cannot seek to collect the said 15% increase for the previous academic years.

(ii) It is mandatory that the writ petitioner schools covered by the order dated 03.05.2012 should display in their notice boards the fee earlier fixed by the School Fee Determination Committee and the number of the writ petition and also revised fee to be collected in view of the order of the High Court (dated 3.5.2012), separately showing the amount payable towards 15% increase. Notice should also indicate that the said 15% increase is subject to the outcome of the final decision of the Committee.

(iii) Receipt issued to the parents/students by the writ petitioner schools for the academic year 2012-2013 should also indicate separately the fee to be collected as per the Committee's original order and 15% increase over and above the fee earlier fixed by the Committee and also the total. The receipt also should indicate that 15% increase is subject to the outcome of the final decision of the Committee. (iv) The Government shall ensure that the notice board of the Offices of the District Educational Officer displays the names of the writ petitioner schools covered under the order of the High Court dated 03.05.2012.

7.If any school other than the writ petitioner schools collect higher fee, misinterpreting the order of the High Court, the Government/Education Department/School Fee Determination Committee is at liberty to take appropriate action against those erring schools in accordance with law. The Government/Education Department shall issue necessary circulars to all the Private Unaided Schools regarding this and ensure strict compliance. This order shall also form part of the order dated 03.05.2012. Accordingly, M.P.No.1 of 2012 is disposed of.

(R.B.I.J.) (S.V.J.)

09.05.2012

mmi

To

1. The Secretary to Government of Tamilnadu

School Education, Fort St.George,

Chennai.

2. The Director of School Education

DPI Compund, Chennai - 6.

3.The Special Officer,

Pvt. School Fee Determination Committee

PTA Building, DPI Campus, Chennai - 6.

4. The Chief Educational Officer, Perambalur.

5.The Chief Educational Officer, Villupuram

6.The Director of Matriculation School

College Road, Chennai - 6.

7.The Chairman,

Private School Fee Determination Committee,

DPI Complex, Chennai 6.

8, The Chief Educational Officer,

CEO Campus, Namakkal

9.The Chief Educational Officer,

Dharmapuri

10.The Chief Educational Officer, Erode.

11. The Chief Educational Officer, Krishnagiri

12.The Chief Educational Officer, Dharmapuri

13.The Chief Educational Officer, Villupuram

14.The Chief Educational Officer, Thanjavur

15.The Chief Educational Officer,Dindigul

16.The Chief Educational Officer, CEO Campus, Namakkal

17) The Inspector of Matriculation Schools,

Manavala Nagar, Thiruvallur District.

18) The Inspector of Matriculation Schools,

Madurai.

19) The Chief Educational Officer,

Salem.

20) The Inspector of Matriculation School,

CBE

21) The Chief Educational Officer,

CBE

22) Ex Officio Member Secretary (P)

Schools Fee Determination Committee

Addl.Secretary, Dept of School Education,
PTA Building, DPI Campus, College Road,
Chennai-6.

23) The Chief Educational Officer,
Madurai.

24) The Special Officer,
The Committee for Private Schools
Fee Determinational Headed by
Justice K.Govindarajan (Retired)
College Road,
DPI Campus, Chennai-6.

25) The Incharge of Matriculation
Schools, Virudhunagar.

26) The Inspector of Matriculation School,
Dr.Ambedkar Govt.School Building
Gandhi Irwin Road, Egmore, Chennai.

27) The Chief Educational Officer,
Kancheepuram.

28) The Managemnt Alagappa Matriculation
Higher Secondary School, Purasawakkam,
Chennai-7.

29) The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai-9.

30) The Chief Educational Officer,

Tirunelveli-9.

+ 3 ccs to Mr. P. Nagaraju, Advocate SR No.29533, 29534, 29532 + 1 cc to Mr. K. Lavan, Advocate SR No.29724

+ 5 ccs to Mr. G. Sankaran, Advocate SR No.29669, 29671, 29672, 29675, 29670 + 1 cc to Mr. S. Sathyanarayanan, Advocate SR No.29667 + 9 ccs to Mr. M. Naraayanaswamy, Advocate SR No.29641, 29636, 29635, 29634, 29633, 29645, 29646, 29638, 29637 + 1 cc to Mr. S. Vadivel Murugan, Advocate SR No.29651 + 1 cc to M/s. Royan Law Associates, Advocate SR No.29648 + 1 cc to Mr. C.P. Sivamohan, Advocate SR No.29632

+ 1 cc to Mr. Thanjai P.N. Cheztran, Advocate SR No.29625 + 4 ccs to Mr. L. Muralikrishnan, Advocate SR No.29719 + 1 cc to Mr. N. Anand Venkatesh, Advocate SR No.29554 + 1 cc to Mr. T. Gandhi, Advocate SR No.29553

+ 2 ccs to M/s. Profexs Associates, Advocate SR No.29557 + 3 cc to Mr. C.S. Associate, Advocate SR No.29582, 29583, 29584, + 6 ccs to Mr. S.B.S. Raman, Advocate SR No.29560,29558, 29561, 29563, 29562, 29559 + 1 cc to Mr. S.K. Chandrakumar, Advocate SR No.29547

+1CC to M/s.Muthumani Doraisami, Advocate SR.29453

+2CCs to Mr.R.Neelakandan, Advocate SR.29492

+1CC to M/s.Muthumani Doraisami, Advocate SR.29451

+1CC to M/s.K.Kalyanasundaram, Advocate SR.29565

+6CCs to M/s.A.D.Jagadish Chandira, Advocate SR.29593, 29592, 29591, 29594, 29595, 29590

+1CC to M/s.G.Sankaran, Advocate SR.29673

+1CC to M/s.M.Naraayanaswamy, Advocate SR.29642

+1CC to M/s.Paul & Paul, Advocates SR.29544

+1CC to S.Thankasivan, Advocate SR.29682

+1CC to M/s.Royan Law Associates SR.29649

+1CC to M/s.Paul & Paul, Advocates SR.29545

+1CC to M/s.G.Sankaran, Advocate SR.29674

+5CCs to M/s.M.Naraayanaswamy, Advocate SR.29639,

29647, 29644, 29643, 29640

+1CC to M/s.Royan Law Associates, Advocates SR.29650 +1CC to M/s.Paul & Paul, Advocates SR.29546

+1CC to S.Vijayakumar, Advocate SR.29541

1 cc to M/s.N.Manokaran, Advocate, Sr.No.29471

1 cc to M/s.R.Karthikeyan , Advocate, Sr.No.29504

1 cc to Mr.R.Karthikeyan , Advocate, Sr.No.29501

1 cc to Mr.N.Manokaran , Advocate, Sr.No.29472

4 cc to Mr.V.Rahavachari , Advocate, Sr.No.29461, 29460, 29459, 29466 1 cc to Mr.N.Manokaran , Advocate, Sr.No.29473

10 cc to Mr.N.Manokaran , Advocate, Sr.No.29474, 29483, , 29484, 29482,29480,29478,29476,29477,29475,29487 1 cc to Mr.V.Raghavachari , Advocate, Sr.No.29462

1 cc to Mr.G.Thilakavathi , Advocate, Sr.No.29520

5 cc to Mr.N.Manokaran , Advocate, Sr.No.29485,29488, 29489, 29481, 29479 5 cc to Mr.R.Karthikeyan , Advocate, Sr.No.29509, 29510, 29511, 29512,29513 1 cc to Mr.R.Karthikeyan, Advocate, Sr.No.29508

1 cc to Mr.Govindarraaj , Advocate, Sr.No.29518

2 cc to Mr.Govindarraaj , Advocate, Sr.No.29517, 29516 2 cc to Mr..Govindarraaj , Advocate, Sr.No.29519,29515 6 cc to Mr.R.Karthikeyan , Advocate, Sr.No.29502,29507,29506, 29505,29503, 29500 2 cc to Mr.V.V.Gridhar , Advocate, Sr.No.29486, 29449 1 cc to Mr.Muthumani Doraisami , Advocate, Sr.No.29452 3 cc to Mr.V.P.Sengottuvel , Advocate, Sr.No.29442

1 cc to Mr.T.S.Gopalan & Co., , Advocate, Sr.No.29443 1 cc to M/s.Aiyar & Dolia , Advocate, Sr.No.29450 4 cc to Mr.R.Bharath Kumar , Advocate, Sr.No.29496

1 cc to Mr. N.Margandeyan, Advocate, Sr.No.29469

1 CC to Mr.Srinath Sridevan, Advocate, SR.29539

1 CC to Ms.Chitra Sampath Advocate, SR.29536, 29537, 29538 1 CC to Mr.V.Raghavachari, Advocate, SR.29463, 29464, 29465 1 CC to Mr.B.Rabu Manohar, Advocate, SR.29457

1 CC to Dr.P.Vasudevan, Advocate, SR.29441

1 CC to Mr.V.Raghavachari, Advocate, SR.29458

1 CC to Mr.Sai, Advocate, SR.29436, 29437

1 CC to Mr.P.Venugopal, Advocate, SR.29470

1 CC to Mr.Isaac Mohanlal, Advocate, SR.29444

1 CC to Fr.A.Xavier Arul Raj, Advocate, SR.29445, 29448 1 CC to Mr.M.V.Swaroop Advocate, SR.29456

1 CC to Mr.T.K.Baskar,Advocate, SR.29491

1 CC to Mr.R.Kannan, Advocate, SR.29526

1 CC to Mr.R.Natarjan, Advocate, SR.29522, 29523, 29524, 29525 1 CC to Mr.N.Sivakumar, Advocate, SR.29521

1 cc To The Government Pleader, SR.29467

W.P.No.8489 of 2011

etc., batch.

All Cos