

level. The averments in para 18 regarding some cases are too generic, and does not warrant any explanation, as no specific case is mentioned.

9. I humbly submit that the averment in respect of the decision of the Full Bench of this Hon'ble Court, as reported in 1998 4 LLN 804, is admitted as true. The writ petitioner is making references to the Full Bench judgment according to his convenience, without wholistically understanding the import of the judgment and the subsequent verdicts of this Hon'ble Court and the Apex Court. The averment in para 22 is denied as false, because the 7th and 8th respondents are strictly following the provisions of law and the spirit of the judgment.

?

10. I humbly submit that the averment in para 23 that the 7th respondent has no corporate status to treat all the schools as one unit run by the management is denied as false. The corporate status of the 7th respondent management has been accepted by the department, for the purpose of transfer of their staff from one school to another within the same management, vide proceedings dated 11.06.1960 in Memorandum No. 45181/E2/60, on the file of the Deputy Secretary to the Government, Education and Public Health Department. The averment regarding the reply under The Right to Information Act, by the 2nd respondent dated 28.01.2008, is not correct and is liable to be rejected, as per the documentary evidence.

Why the director says as single unit?
 Veerampalwar
 Xantim
 Cate.

11. I humbly submit that the Full Bench Order of this Hon'ble Court dated 30.04.1998 and made in W.A.No.275 of 1989 was later reviewed, on a petition filed by this respondent, in Review Petition No. 139 of 2009 by this