

transfers of the staff from one school to another in the said management, has been going on for decades together and it was legally recognized vide the Government Memorandum dated 11.06.1960 in No. 45181/E2/60-2. Based on the said proceedings, the subordinate educational authorities have been directed to accord approval to the transfers among the schools of the respondent management. While transferring the staff within the corporate management, it is always the general norm that is followed by the 7th respondent that the condition of service, the seniority, the pay scale and the other emoluments are kept in mind, without prejudicing the person transferred. In the light of the factual position explained above, the averments in para 28 is wrong. The averments in para 29 only reflects the malafide intention of the writ petitioner, wherein he has requested the authorities "not to confer or approve corporate status to the schools run by the 7th respondent". The petitioner is reaching beyond his brief and is attempting to interfere into the official duties of the competent authorities.

13. I humbly submit that the grounds raised by the petitioner are untenable. The very Act under Rule 15(4) (ii) (c) provides for the corporate management in respect of the corporate body, running more than one school, wherein all these schools under the said body shall be treated as one unit. There is no gainsay for the petitioner by wrongly holding that each school is a separate unit, because recognition is granted separately; posts are sanctioned individually and grant-in-aid is given for the respective school. Actually the claim of the petitioner that the grant-in-aid is given to individual school is wrong, because that grant-in-aid is sanctioned only for the post and not to the school, while the post itself being transferable. There is no necessity to get the common seniority list of the minority management to be approved by the