



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.M.MANOJ

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

WP(C) NO. 11844 OF 2019

PETITIONERS:

- 1 VIJIKUMAR R.,
AGED 40 YEARS
S/O. RAGHAVAN, REVATHY BHAVAN, KOVIL VILAKOM, KAZHIVOOR
P.O., THIRUVANANTHAPURAM--695526.
- 2 PRINTO K.V.,
AGED 31 YEARS
S/O. VARGHESE, KOLANNUR HOUSE, KARUMAL P.O., VELUR,
THRISSUR-680601.
- 3 BIJU P.M.,
AGED 43 YEARS
S/O. BHASKARAN, PANDYADATH MEETHAL, KIYAKUMMURI P.O.,
KOZHIKODE-673611.
- 4 RATHEESH K.,
AGED 33 YEARS
S/O. RAMAN, KAPPADAN HOUSE, KARADE P.O., KOOVAKKODE,
MALAPPURAM-679339.
- 5 DHANUSH K.,
AGED 34 YEARS
S/O. KITTU, PADINJARE VEEDU, VENNAKKARA, NOORANI P.O.,
PALAKKAD-678004.
- 6 BINEESH V.M.,
AGED 38 YEARS
S/O. MOHANAN V.R., VALIYAVEETIL HOUSE, RAJAKKAD P.O.,
IDUKKI-685566.
- 7 VINODAN K.E.,
AGED 42 YEARS
S/O. JANARDHANAN P., THAVIDISSERY, PORAKKUNNU, M.M. BAZAR
(VIA) KANNUR-670306.



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.

2

- 8 GOPAKUMAR,
 AGED 39 YEARS
 S/O. M.N. PRABHAKARAN NAIR, GOKULAM, AYMANAM P.O.,
 KOTTAYAM-686015.
- 9 BIJU MOHANAN K.,
 AGED 37 YEARS
 S/O. MOHANAN R., KURISHU PARAMBU, VATTAYAL WARD,
 THIRUVAMBADI, ALAPPUZHA-688002.
- 10 MUHAMMED SALI K.,
 AGED 41 YEARS
 S/O. KAMARUDEEN KUNJU, OLAKKATTUVILA, KOIVILA P.O.,
 KOLLAM-691590.
- 11 NISAM M.,
 AGED 41 YEARS
 S/O. MYDEEN KUNJU, ASARYSSERIL PADITAVIL, MARUTHOOR
 KULANGARA SOUTH, ALUMKADAVU P.O., KARUNAGAPPALLY,
 KOLLAM-690573.
- 12 BASHEER P.,
 AGED 39 YEARS
 S/O. ABDULLA, POLLA HOUSE, KANIAMBETTA, WAYANAD-673121.
- 13 DIVAKARAN M.M.,
 AGED 43 YEARS
 S/O. MINNAN, METHEPARAMBIL HOUSE, VISHNUPURAM, CHERANALLUR
 P.O., KOCHI-682034.
- 14 RAJESH M.,
 AGED 37 YEARS
 S/O. KOTTAN M.K., MAMUNI, EDATTUMMAL NORTH THRIKKARIPPUR,
 KASARAGOD-671310.

BY ADVS. SRI.P.NANDAKUMAR
 SRI.S.ANEESH
 SMT.AMRUTHA SANJEEV



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.

3

RESPONDENTS:

- 1 KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD,
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN AND MANAGING DIRECTOR,
VYDHYUTHI BHAVAN, PATTOM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695004.
- 2 THE CHIEF ENGINEER (HRM),
KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD, VYDHYUTHI BHAVAN, PATTOM,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695004.
- 3 THE KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, PATTOM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-
695004.
- 4 T. PETERKUTTY,
ANAKHAPURI HOUSE, MAKKADA P.O., KAKKODI, KOZHIKODE-673611.
- 5 ADDL. R5. NISHANTH KUMAR SHIVARAJ
AGED 52 YEARS, SON OF SIVARAJ P, CONTRACT LINE WORKER,
KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD LTD., KANNUR ELECTRICAL
DIVISION, KANNUR PIN - 670621, RESIDING AT NIVEDITHA, NEAR
S.N.COLLEGE, THOTTADA P.O., KANNUR PIN - 670007 ADDL. R5 IS
IMPLEADED AS PER ORDER DATED 08.12.2025 IN I.A-3/2019 IN
WP(C) NO. 11844/2019
- 6 ADDL.R6. SREEJITH.N.S.
AGED 40 YEARS, S/O.SUKUMARAN, NELLIYANIKUNNEL HOUSE,
CHOOOTHUPARA P.O., KENICHIRA, WAYANAD, PIN 0 673596
- 7 ADDL.R7. BINU.K.K.
AGED 35 YEARS, S/O.KUMARAN, KUNNEL HOUSE, VALAVAYAL P.O.,
MONNANAKUZHY, WAYANAD, PIN - 673596.
- 8 ADDL.R8. SURESH.V.R.
AGED 38 YEARS, S/O.RAJU, VADAKKEPUTHANPARA HOUSE,
PAYYAMPALLY P.O., MUTTANKARA, WAYANAD, PIN - 670646
- 9 ADDL.R9. RATHEESH.N.K.
AGED 39 YEARS, S/O.KUNHIKANNAN, NAGAMPURATH HOUSE,
THOLPATTY P.O., WAYANAD, PIN - 670646
- 10 ADDL.R10. RIJU.V.T.
AGED 45 YEARS, S/O.THANKACHAN, VARAVIL, PAMBRA P.O.,
IRULAMCHUNDAPOLLY, WAYANAD, PIN - 673592



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.

4

- 11 ADDL.R11. VINOD.R.
AGED 48 YEARS, S/O.RAVUNNI (LATE), PALONA HOUSE, CHUNDAYIL
P.O., WAYANAD, PIN - 673123
- 12 ADDL.R12. SANILKUMAR.P.P.,
S/O.THAMBAYI, PUTHIYAPURAYIL, NADAKKAVU, UDINOOR P.O.,
KASARAGOD, PIN -671310
- 13 ADDL.R13. LALEESH.P.
AGED 40 YEARS, S/O.KRISHNAKUTTY, PARAMUNDA HOUSE, PAYAMBRA
P.O., KUNNAMANGALAM VIA KOZHIKODE, PIN - 673571
- 14 ADDL.R14. RATHEESH KUMAR T.E.
AGED 44 YEARS, S/O.GOPALAN, THEEKEDAKKUNI HOUSE,
KUTTIKATTOR P.O., CHEMMALATHOOR, KOZHIKODE, PIN - 673008
- 15 ADDL.R15. AJAY KUMAR T.K.
AGED 37 YEARS, S/O.APPUKUTTAN NAIR, THAZHE KUNNATH,
PAYAMBRA P.O., KUNNAMANGALAM VIA KOZHIKODE, PIN - 673571
- 16 ADDL.R16. SHAJU.M.M.
AGED 38 YEARS, S/O.RAMANUNNIKUTTI NAIR, MAMMILI MEETHAL,
KAVIL P.O., NADAVANNUR VIA KOZHIKODE, PIN - 673614
- 17 ADDL.R17. SAJEEVAN.O.T.
AGED 47 YEARS, S/O.RAMANKUTTY, OTHAYOTH THAZHATH, MUDADI
P.O., KOYILANDI VIA, KOZHIKODE, PIN - 673307
- 18 ADDL.R18. SHAGIL.T.K.
AGED 35 YEARS, S/O.RAJAN T.K., NISHALAYAM HOUSE, PALAYAD
P.O., IRINGAL VIA, KOZHIKODE, PIN - 673521
- 19 ADDL.R19. ANEESH.K.P.
AGED 42 YEARS, S/O.GANGADHARAN, KUNDOTH MEETHAL HOUSE,
PARAMBIL P.O., MARIKKUNNU, KOZHIKODE, PIN - 673012
- 20 ADDL.R20. SHAJU.K.
AGED 48 YEARS, S/O.PERACHUTTY, KEYACHERY HOUSE, KONOTT
P.O., KUNNAMANGALAM VIA, KOZHIKODE, PIN - 673571
- 21 ADDL.R21. SHIBU.K.C.
AGED 46 YEARS, S/O.GANGADHARAN, KAREECHALIL HOUSE, PAYAMBRA
P.O., KUNNAMANGALAM VIA, KOZHIKODE, PIN - 673571
- 22 ADDL.R22. SHAJI.K.
AGED 44 YEARS, S/O.APPUKUTTY, KARAT HOUSE, PAYAMBRA P.O.,



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.

5

KUNNAMANGALAM VIA KOZHIKODE, PIN - 673571

- 23 ADDL.R23. JAMES.V.D.
AGED 39 YEARS, S/O.DEVADAS, THATTUMPURATH HOUSE, PAYAMBRA
P.O., KUNNAMANGALAM VIA KOZHIKODE, PIN - 673571
- 24 ADDL.R24. ANIL KUMAR N.M.
AGED 43 YEARS, S/O.CHANDUKUTTY, NANGARIMEETHAL,
CHEMMALATHOOR, KUTTIKATTOR, KOZHIKODE, PIN - 673008
- 25 ADDL.R25. SAJISH KUMAR K.
AGED 43 YEARS, S/O.KANNAN, KARUVARI THIRUVALLUR,
THIRUVALLUR P.O., KOZHIKODE, PIN - 673541.
- 26 ADDL.R26. ANEESH.C.A.
AGED 36 YEARS, S/O.APPUTTY, EZHUKALATHIL HOUSE,
CHUNDAPURAM, KODUVALLY P.O., KOZHIKODE, PIN - 673572
- 27 ADDL.R27. JAYAKUMAR.B.
AGED 40 YEARS, S/O.BALAKRISHNAN, SATHY BHAVANAM,
PUTHANSANGETHAM, KOIVILA P.O., KOLLAM, PIN - 691590
- 28 ADDL.R28. RETHISH.T.
AGED 41 YEARS, S/O.THANKAPPAN K., KARIKKATHIL VEEDU,
KARAVALOOR P.O., PUNALOOR, KOLLAM, PIN - 691333
- 29 ADDL.R29. BABU.B.
AGED 40 YEARS, S/O.BAHULAYAN, PALLOTTU THEKKETHIL, KOVOOR,
ARINALLUR P.O., KOLLAM, PIN - 690538
- 30 ADDL.R30. KARUNAN.R.
AGED 34 YEARS, S/O.REMA DEVI, NETHAJI COLONY,
THEKKUMBHAGAM, CHAVARA SOUTH, KOLLAM, PIN - 691584
- 31 ADDL.R31. SURESH.P.
AGED 43 YEARS, S/O.PRABHAKARAN PILLAI, KALADHY VILAYIL,
MALIBHAGOM, CHAVARA SOUTH P.O., KOLLAM, PIN - 691584
- 32 ADDL.R32. SYAM PRASAD
AGED 45 YEARS, S/O.KRISHNAN, VILAYIL VEEDU, VELANATHURUTH,
CHERIYAZHEEKAL P.O., KARUNAGAPALLY, KOLLAM, PIN - 690573
- 33 ADDL.R33. RETHEESH.R.
AGED 32 YEARS, S/O.RAVEENDRAN, CHITTOOM VEETIL, KIZHAKKE
VADAKKEVILAYIL, MUKUNDAPURAM P.O., CHAVARA, KOLLAM, PIN -
691585



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.

6

- 34 ADDL.R34. MANOJ.S.
AGED 40 YEARS, S/O.SURENDRAN, THAIKOOTTATHIL KOVILA P.O.,
KOLLAM, PIN - 691590
- 35 ADDL.R35. SURESH KUMAR S.
AGED 34 YEARS, S/O.SUGATHAN PILLAI, KOOTIL VADAKKETHIL,
PARIMANAM, NEENDAKARA P.O., KOLLAM, PIN - 691582
- 36 ADDL.R36. BAIJU.T.M.
AGED 43 YEARS, S/O.M.THANKACHAN, BIJU BHAVAN, MALAMEL,
PERUMANNOR P.O, KOLLAM, PIN - 691532 *
ADDL.RESPONDENTS 6 TO 36 ARE IMPEADED AS PER ORDER DATED
08.12.2025 IN I.A.1/2022 IN WP(C)NO.11844/2019.
- 37 ADDL.R37: GIREESH U
AGED 49 YEARS,
S/O. VASU, ULIKKANDAYIL HOUSE, ARIYALLUR P.O.,
MALAPPURAM, PIN- 676312
- 38 ADDL.R38: JAFAR T., AGED 37 YEARS
S/O. ABDULLA, THARASSERI HOUSE, KARAYA, PANDIKKAD P.O.,
MALAPPURAM, PIN - 676521
- 39 ADDL.R39 ABDUSSALAM K.P.,
S/O. MUHAMMAD K.P, KOTTAPPARAMBAN HOUSE, VETILAPPARA P.O.,
MALAPPURAM, PIN - 673639
- 40 ADDL.40: HYDARALI KADOORAN, AGED 45 YEARS,
S/O. UNNIMAMMAJAJI, KADOORAN HOUSE, PANNIPARA P.O.,
EDAVANNA, MALAPPURAM, PIN - 676541
- 41 ADDL.R41: SAJID M.T., AGED 40 YEARS,
S/O. MOIDEENKUTTY, MANNILTHODI HOUSE, KUTHUPARAMBA, MAITHRA
P.O., AREEKODE VIA, MALAPPURAM PIN - 673639
- 42 ADDL.R42: SUNILKUMAR P., AGED 49 YEARS,
S/O. SUKUMARAN, PUTHIYAKATH HOUSE, ARIYALLUR P.O.,
MALAPPURAM - 676312
- 43 ADDL.R43: MANOJ K C., AGED 48 YEARS
S/O. CHACKO, KAIPPAMPLACKAL HOUSE, KANJIKUZHI P.O.,
VAKACHUVADU, IDUKKI, PIN - 685606
- 44 ADDL.R44: DIPU JOSEPH, AGED 43 YEARS,
S/O. JOSEPH, ALACKAL HOUSE, CHELACHUVADU P.O.,



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.

7

IDUKKI, PIN - 685606

- 45 ADDL.R45: ANISH N P., AGED 44 YEARS,
S/O. PRABAKARAN, NEDIYANICKAL, MUKKUDAM P.O.,
IDUKKI, PIN - 685562
- 46 ADDL.R46: RENJITH MATHEW, AGED 44 YEARS,
S/O. MATHEW, THEEYANIYIL HOUSE, KOCHUKAMAKSHI, M K PADI
P.O. , IDUKKI, PIN - 685514
- 47 ADDL.R47: JIJIO P A., AGED 42 YEARS,
S/O. ANTONY, PUNNACHALIL HOUSE, CHITHIRAPURAM P.O.,
ANACHAL, IDUKKI, PIN - 685565
- 48 ADDL.R48: REJI MON K P., AGED 48 YEARS,
S/O. PARAMASWARAN, KANIYAPARAMPU HOUSE, KALTHOTTY P.O.,
IDUKKI, PIN - 685507
- 49 ADDL.R49: MAHESH C C., AGED 38 YEARS,
S/O. CHELLAPPAN, CHALAKKEKUDY HOUSE, VALARA P.O.,
IRUMPUPALAM, IDUKKI, PIN - 685561
- 50 ADDL.R50: DEVAN T., AGED 43 YEARS,
S/O. THANKAPPAN NAIR, SINDHU BHAVAN, VILAYIL, VADAKKE
JUNCTION, VILAPPILSALA P.O.,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695573
- 51 ADDL. R51. SHAJI N., AGED 46 YEARS,
S/O. NEELAMBARAN, PUTHUVEL PUTHEN VEEDU, THIRUNELUYOOR
LINE, PALLIMUKKU, PEYAD P.O. THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
PIN - 695573
- 52 ADDL. R52 SHAJU K S, AGED 49 YEARS,
S/O. KRISHNANKUTTY N, MARUTHARA VILAKAM PUTHEN VEEDU,
EDAVAL, OTTASEKARAMANGALAM P.O., THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
PIN - 695125
- 53 ADDL. R53. MAHI M, AGED 41 YEARS,
S/O. P K MOHANAN, KALARIPPARAMBHU HOUSE, C M C 17,
CHERTHALA P.O. , ALAPPUZHA PIN - 688524.
- 54 ADDL. R54. GIRISH K V, AGED 46 YEARS,
S/O. ROHINI, KOLLASERILL, C M C 1, CHERTHALA P.O.,
ALAPPUZHA PIN - 688524.
- 55 ADDL. R55. TOMY C E., AGED 51 YEARS,



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.

8

S/O. EESU KUTTY, CHULLICKAL HOUSE, KADAKKARAPALLY P.O.,
CHERTHALA ALAPPUZHA PIN - 688529.

- 56 ADDL. R56. SHINOJ P P, AGED 45 YEARS,
S/O. RAJAMMA, PUTHEN PURACKAL, KADAKKARAPALLY P.O.,
CHERTHALA ALAPPUZHA PIN - 688529.
- 57 ADDL. R57. AZEEB N, AGED 44 YEARS,
S/O. NASEER, KULAMAKKI COLONY, KALAVOOR P.O., ALAPPUZHA PIN
- 688522.
- 58 ADDL. R58. LIJOMON T O, AGED 39 YEARS,
S/O. OUSEPH, THEKKEVEEDU HOUSE, MARARIKULAM P.O.,
PIN - 688523
- 59 ADDL. R59. MANOJ P M, AGED 44 YEARS,
S/O. P K MOHANAN, C M C 17, CHERTHALA P.O. ALAPPUZHA PIN -
688524
- 60 ADDL. R60. JAYAN K T, AGED 42 YEARS,
S/O. THANGAPPAN, KARIYILLAPARAMBU, CHETHI P.O. ALAPPUZHA
PIN - 688530
- 61 ADDL. R61. RAJEEV G, AGED 40 YEARS,
S/O. GIREESH KUMAR, CHARALUVILA PUTHENVEEDU, KOTTUKALKONU,
KATTACHALKUZHI P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM PIN - 695501
- 62 ADDL. R62. SHIBU P K, AGED 49 YEARS,
S/O. PEETHAMBARAN, PUNNOR VEEDU, ANGAMOOZHY P.O.,
PATHANAMTHITTA PIN - 689662
- 63 ADDL. R63. SHAIJU Y, AGED 44 YEARS,
S/O YOHANNAN, PUTHEN PURACKAL, MAROOR P.O, ELAMANNOOR,
PATHANAMTHITTA PIN - 694524. ADDL. R37 TO ADDL. R63 ARE
IMPLEADED AS PER ORDER DATED 06.12.2025 IN 1.A-2/2025 IN
WP(C) NO. 11844/2019.
- 64 ADDL. R64. SUBHASH S., AGED 36 YEARS,
S/O. SUKUMARAN. A, PUTHAN POTTA, 8/91, NEDUMANI, NENMENI
P.O., KOLLENGODE, PALAKKAD PIN - 678506
- 65 ADDL. R65. APPUKUTTAN. R, AGED 37 YEARS,
S/O. RAMMAN, THEKKETHIL HOUSE, KANAKKANNOOR, MANAPPADAM
P.O. PALAKKAD PIN - 679505
- 66 ADDL. R66. SAJITH. R, AGED 41 YEARS,



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.

9

S/O. RAJAN, MUNDIYAN PARAMBU HOUSE, ANAMARI P.O.,
KOLLENGODE, PALAKKAD PIN - 678506

- 67 ADDL. R67. ANUSH S, AGED 40 YEARS,
S/O. SANKARAN, KALATHIL HOUSE, KARUPPANKADU, KUNISSERY
P.O., PALAKKAD PIN - 678681
- 68 ADDL. R68. MURUKANANDAN N K., AGED 46 YEARS,
S/O. KARTHIKEYAN, NIVARATHIL, THYKKAL P.O., CHERTHALA,
ALAPPUZHA PIN - 688503
- 69 ADDL. 69. SHYJU K A, AGED 48 YEARS,
S/O. AYYAPANKUTTY, KAPPUMKUZHIYIL HOUSE, VALAD P.O.,
WAYANAD PIN - 670644 ADDL. R64 TO ADDL. R69 ARE IMPEADED
AS PER ORDER DATED 06.12.2025 IN I.A-3/2025 IN WP(C) NO.
11844/2019.

BY ADVS.

SMT.ANEETHA A.G., SC, KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD
LIMITED

SRI.B.ASHOK SHENOY

SRI.VIVEK VIJAYAKUMAR

SMT. THEJASWI P. R.

SMT.NANDANA R.

SRI.VINEETH V.T.

SRI.C.JOSEPH ANTONY

SRI.JOSEPH JOSE

SRI.RAJU JOSEPH (SR.), SC

SRI.K.V.GEORGE

SRI.P.N.RAJAGOPALAN NAIR

SRI.P.S.GIREESH

SRI.RIYAL DEVASSY

SRI.VISHNU DAS

SRI.ANU CHANDRAKUMAR

SRI.AMAL MURALEEDHARAN

SRI.P.C. SASIDHARAN, SC, KPSC

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 08.12.2025,
ALONG WITH WP(C).1609/2020, 10367/2019, 10359/19 AND COC 2069/25, THE
COURT ON 29.01.2026 DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



2026:KER:6763

WP(C) No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.

96

P.M. MANOJ, J

WP(C) Nos. 11844, 10367, 10359 of 2019
WP(C) No. 1609 of 2020
and
Contempt Case (Civil) No. 2069 of 2025

Dated this the 29th day of January, 2026

JUDGMENT

WP(C) No.11844 of 2019 was preferred by persons from various districts who were included in the rank list for the post of Mazdoor (Electricity worker). WP(C) No.10359 of 2019 was preferred by persons from Thrissur District and WP(C) No.10367 of 2019 was preferred by persons from Kozhikode District in the rank list noted above whereas WP(C) No.1609 of 2020 was preferred by persons who were working as Contractors and contract line workers and who were beneficiaries of award dated 15.12.2004, passed by the Industrial Tribunal, Palakkad in ID No.27 of 2002. In the award, it was declared that 25% of the existing vacancies and the vacancies that might arise during the succeeding 5 years shall be reserved for these persons in the category of Electricity Worker. The Tribunal clarified in the award that the qualification



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.

97

prescribed for the post shall be strictly adhered to. However, the Board and the PSC included the persons who passed SSLC, which is against the prescribed qualifications, against which, the said writ petition is preferred. COC No. 2069 of 2025 was preferred by the petitioners in WP(C) No. 1609 of 2020, alleging violation of the directions in the interim order dated 25.06.2025. For the convenience of reference, the documents marked in WP(C) No.11844 of 2019 will be mentioned as exhibits.

2. The common issue in these cases involves the illegal appointments made by the Board to the post of Mazdoor (Electricity Worker). These appointments were made in violation of the qualifications prescribed under the official Notification and the Special Rules. Consequently, individuals included in the rank lists published by the Kerala Public Service Commission (KPSC) for the post of Mazdoor were denied their rightful opportunity for appointment. Similarly, persons covered by the Industrial Tribunal award dated 15.12.2004—who satisfied the specific criteria of having passed Standard IV but not Standard X—also lost their opportunity. This was due to the unlawful



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.

98

inclusion of candidates who had already passed SSLC (Standard X), thereby breaching the prescribed qualification limits.

3. The issue originated from an award passed by the Industrial Tribunal, Palakkad, on 15.12.2004. This award directed the Kerala State Electricity Board (KSEB) to reserve 25% of both existing and future vacancies arising within five years from the date of award for the post of Electricity Worker, for petty contractors and contract line workers. To facilitate this, a state-wide seniority list was to be prepared, consisting of individuals who had completed at least 1,200 days of work preceding the date of the award. The Tribunal further clarified that all persons included in the final seniority list would be eligible for appointment, provided they satisfied the qualifications prescribed by the management as on the date of the award, with the sole exception of the maximum age limit.

4. The award was challenged in WP(C) No.28835 of 2005 and was dismissed on 16.11.2007. The Writ Appeal preferred against the said judgment was also dismissed as per the judgment in WA No.627 of 2008 dated 10.07.2008. The Special Leave Petition preferred was also



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.
99

dismissed by the Apex Court on 12.03.2010. Consequently, the award passed by the Industrial Tribunal, Palakkad, has attained finality.

5. On 31.03.2011, the KPSC issued a notification for selection to the post of Mazdoor in the KSEB. Subsequently, on 30.09.2013, the KPSC published district-wise rank lists, which were valid for a period of three years, expiring on 29.09.2016. On 30.12.2016, the KPSC extended the validity of all rank lists that were set to expire between 31.12.2016 and 29.06.2017, up to 30.06.2017. Following this, in compliance with the Industrial Tribunal's award, the KPSC issued a notification on 21.04.2017, announcing a suitability test for appointment to the post of Mazdoor. This test was specifically for petty contractors and contract line workers from the final seniority list. The notification also explicitly identified the vacancies to be filled from the final seniority list for each district, which are as follows :

- | | |
|-----------------------|-----|
| 1. Thiruvananthapuram | 133 |
| 2. Kollam | 111 |
| 3. Pathanamthitta | 74 |
| 4. Alappuzha | 77 |
| 5. Kottayam | 109 |



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.
100

6. Idukki	42
7. Ernakulam	158
8. Thrissur	188
9. Palakkad	130
10.Malappuram	135
11.Kozhikode	112
12.Wayanad	23
13.Kannur	142
and	
14.Kasargode	52

6. The notification further stipulated the requisite qualifications, specifically stating that candidates should have passed Standard IV but should not have passed Standard X. However, pursuant to an interim direction in WP(C) No. 28758 of 2016 and connected cases, the KPSC was directed to accept applications from petty contractors who had passed SSLC, provided their names were included in the lists prepared by the Labour Commissioner.



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.

101

7. Accordingly, the KPSC conducted the suitability test on May 29, 2017, and subsequently published the final seniority list via notification dated September 25, 2017. During the interregnum, various rank holders—including some petitioners herein—filed WP(C) Nos. 21130 and 21121 to 21129 of 2017. They claimed entitlement to the vacancies remaining after the appointment of petty contractors and contended that several candidates included in the final seniority list dated 25.09.2017, were unqualified. These writ petitions were disposed of by a common judgment dated 7.02.2018, wherein this Court directed that, if the vacancies reported to the KPSC for the absorption of petty contractors exceeded the number of qualified hands, the remaining vacancies must be filled by advising candidates from the rank list dated 30.03.2013. Consequently, the KSEB was directed to report the number of such surplus vacancies in each district to the respective District PSC offices. This reporting was to occur immediately upon the finalisation of the list of qualified petty contractors, and in any event, within three weeks from that date.

8. In the meantime, this Court in WP(C) No. 4178 of 2017 declared that the condition in the notification dated 30.06.2016, which excluded



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.
102

rank lists that had already been extended, was arbitrary. The Court held that all rank lists that were due to expire on 31.12.2016 were entitled to an extension up to 30.06.2017, or for a total period of 0.5 years, whichever was earlier. Subsequently, on 25.09.2017, the KPSC published the final seniority list of petty contractors and contract line workers. This list comprised a total of 2,488 candidates and was deemed valid effective from the date of publication.

9. The petitioners herein impleaded themselves in WP(C) No. 28758 of 2016, which was filed by petty contractors who remained in the final seniority lists despite having passed Standard X. This writ petition was dismissed by judgment dated 16.11.2017, wherein the Court held that only those candidates who possessed the prescribed qualifications as on the date of the award were eligible to apply. The appeals preferred by the petty contractors and contract line workers against the said judgment were subsequently dismissed by a common judgment dated 21.05.2018. Consequently, 801 unqualified candidates were deleted from the Ext.P18 notification. However, the petty contractors and contract line workers challenged the common judgment of 21.05.2018, before the Apex Court in SLP (C) No. 20024 of 2018 and



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.

103

connected matters. These SLPs were disposed of on 20.08.2018, permitting the petitioners therein to submit appropriate representations before the 1st respondent. The 1st respondent was granted liberty to consider such representations independently, with the Court clarifying that neither the original award nor the impugned judgment should preclude the Board from taking an independent view in the matter.

10. Subsequently, the KPSC issued an erratum notification dated 08.03.2019, re-including the previously deleted candidates who had passed Standard X. The modified list noted that these candidates were included based on directions from the Apex Court; however, it is contended that the Apex Court's order dated 20.08.2018, contained no such specific direction. Following this, the 1st respondent issued an Office Order dated 25.01.2019, deciding to include petty contract workers who had passed SSLC among the candidates eligible for regularization in the KSEB. This order was furnished neither to the affected parties nor to the KPSC. Notably, the order made no reference to the erratum notification dated 08.03.2019. Under these circumstances, it is contended that the notification dated 08.03.2019 (Ext.P22) and the order dated 25.08.2019 (Ext.P23) were issued



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.

104

clandestinely. These actions are alleged to be contrary to the prescribed qualifications for appointment to the post of Mazdoor under the 1st respondent and are, therefore, legally untenable.

11. The contentions raised in WP(C) No. 10359 of 2019, WP(C) No. 10367 of 2019, and WP(C) No. 11844 of 2019 are on similar lines. Similarly, the petitioners in WP(C) No. 1609 of 2020 challenge the same final seniority list, primarily on the grounds that individuals who had passed Standard X were illegally included.

12. The primary contention in these writ petitions is that the inclusion of candidates who have passed Standard X is wholly illegal. It is further argued that both the KPSC and the Board misinterpreted the direction of the Apex Court, which merely granted liberty to take an independent view regarding the representations preferred by those candidates. The Industrial Tribunal, Palakkad categorically stated that " all persons whose names figured in final seniority list and who satisfy all the qualifications for appointment of Electricity Workers as per the orders of the Management which are in force as on the date of this award, except the condition of maximum age limit shall be eligible for submitting application for appointment in terms of this award."



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.
105

13. As per Ext.P1 notification, the qualification prescribed was that;

1. Candidates should have passed Standard IV and should not have passed Standard X.
2. A knowledge of cycling (for male candidates only)
3. Physical standards:
 - a) Minimum height (i) for male candidates – 5' 2" (157.48 cms) (ii) for Female candidates -4' 9"
 - b) Vision – Normal free from colour blindness.
 - c) must be physically fit for outdoor works.

These qualifications were prescribed as per Board Order dated 30.07.1998. The Tribunal did not dilute any of these qualifications, except the upper age limit.

14. Based on the aforementioned contentions, the petitioners seek to establish that the inclusion of candidates who have passed Standard X is highly illegal. There was no specific direction from the Hon'ble Apex Court to include such candidates; rather, the Court merely allowed the Board to consider their representations independently. Consequently, Ext.P22 and Ext.P23 cannot withstand legal scrutiny, as the re-inclusion of candidates who were previously deleted is contrary to both the



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.
106

Board's own orders and the prescribed qualifications set forth in the original notification.

15. It is further contended that recruitment to the post of Mazdoor/Electricity Worker is strictly district-wise in nature. However, in total disregard of the principles governing district-wise recruitment, the 1st respondent appointed candidates to districts other than those for which they had applied. Such actions are inherently arbitrary, illegal, and in violation of the established norms of the recruitment process.

16. In this scenario, this Court directed the Board to file a district-wise break-up of the appointments made. This was intended to pinpoint any appointments made in excess of the vacancies earmarked for each district, and to ascertain the specific details regarding the accommodation of such candidates. Pursuant to this direction, the KSEB filed an affidavit explicitly admitting that candidates from other districts had indeed been accommodated against vacancies for which they were not originally listed. The details furnished by the Board are as follows:



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.

107

Sl. No.	District	No. of Vacancies as per notification	No. of Candidates as per rank list	No. of Candidates Excess/Short	Proposal for district out posting & priority
1	Thiruvananthapuram	133	199	66+	
2	Kollam	111	136	25+	
3	Pathanamthitta	74	37	37-	Tvpm-37 (Higher rank 1 st) (From 134 to 170)
4	Alappuzha	77	84	7+	
5	Kottayam	109	100	9-	Tvpm-9 (Higher Rank 2 nd) (from 171 to 179)
6	Idukki	42	90	48+	
7	Ernakulam	158	127	31	Tvpm-20 (Lower rank) (From 180 to 199) Alappuzha -7 (from 78-84) Kollam -4 (Higher Rank) (from 122 to 115)
8	Thrissur	188	65	123-	Kollam-21 (Lower Rank) (From 116-136) Idukki-48 (from 43 to 90) Kozhikkode -16 (from 113 to 128) Waynad- 38 (lower rank) (from 27 to 64)
9	Palakkad	130	113	17-	Kannur -28 (Lower rank) (from 171 to 184) Kasaragod -3 (from 53 to 55)
10	Malappuram	135	104	31-	Kannur -28 (Higher Rank) (from 143 to 170) Waynad -3 (Higher rank) (from 24 to 26)



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.

108

11	Kozhikode	112	128	16+	
12	Wayanad	23	64	41+	
13	Kannur	142	184	42+	
14	Kasaragod	52	55	3+	
		1486	1486	248/248	Total -248

17. A total of 1486 candidates were identified under the 25% quota reserved for petty contractors and contract line workers. As shown in the table above, 25% of vacancies in each district were specifically earmarked for these candidates. However, the Board exceeded this quota by appointing candidates and accommodating them in other districts—a fact clearly reflected in the data. The petitioners contend that such inter-district deployment is per se illegal, as these candidates were recruited on a district-wise basis. Furthermore, individuals who had passed Standard X (SSLC) were included in the final list and appointed across various districts. This inclusion directly contravenes the qualifications mandated by the Industrial Tribunal award, which excluded those with higher educational qualifications.

18. Under the pretext of complying with the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the SLP (Ext.P21), the Board issued the final seniority list (Ext.P22) via a corrigendum notification. This new list improperly included individuals who had passed Standard X and deleted



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.

109

those who had crossed the age of 50. It is contended that Ext.P22 cannot withstand legal scrutiny insofar as it includes candidates who have passed Standard X. This inclusion violates the qualifications prescribed in the Board Order dated 21.09.1987. Since the recruitment notification was based on that specific Board Order, neither the KSEB nor the KPSC has the authority to unilaterally alter those qualifications while preparing Ext.P22. The eligibility criteria are strictly confined to the terms of the Industrial Tribunal award, where the only permitted deviation was the relaxation of the upper age limit. While the Apex Court in Ext.P21 granted the KSEB the liberty to take an independent decision, this did not authorise the inclusion of unqualified candidates. Consequently, neither the KSEB nor the KPSC can take shelter under Ext.P21 to justify these appointments. As this legal position has already been clarified by both the Single Bench and the Division Bench and remained undisturbed by the Apex Court, it has attained finality.

19. Consequently, 624 unqualified candidates who had passed Standard X were improperly included in the seniority list. These individuals must be excluded from the final list, an action that would provide the necessary relief to the petitioners in WP(C) No. 1609/2020.



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.

110

Regarding the petitioners in the other related writ petitions, they are entitled to a total of 248 vacancies across the districts of Pathanamthitta, Kottayam, Ernakulam, Thrissur, Palakkad, and Malappuram.

20. Per contra, the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the respondent Board contended that, pursuant to Notification No. 1(2)1171, steps were initiated to appoint candidates earmarked for the petty contractor/line worker quota. Due to protracted litigation, there was a significant delay in finalizing the seniority list in compliance with the award dated 15.12.2004, which was eventually finalized on 12.06.2019. Although only 165 vacancies were initially available, the seniority list contained 2,488 candidates. To comply with the award's requirement to appoint 1,486 persons, the Board created supernumerary posts and appointed an additional 1,321 persons. Consequently, the Board maintains that the Industrial Tribunal's award has been fully satisfied and the list prepared pursuant to it has since lost its relevance. Furthermore, future vacancies for Workmen and Linemen would no longer be filled through the previous selection process. In accordance with the Central Electricity Authority (Measures



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.

111

relating to Safety and Electric Supply) Regulations of 2010 and 2023, which stipulate qualifications for Engineers, Supervisors, and Technicians, the Board has framed and published new Special Rules in 2025. Under these rules, only candidates who have passed Standard X would be appointed to the skilled category of Mazdoor/Electricity Worker. The Board is currently in a transitional period, implementing modern technology that requires more highly qualified personnel to manage distribution works. This shift aims to reduce the incidence of electrocution and fatal accidents, which have increased significantly. During the interregnum, due to a shortage of qualified personnel, the KSEB has engaged experienced retired employees for short-term periods.

21. Furthermore, with regard to the violation of interim orders passed by this court staying appointments to the post of Electricity Worker, the Board contends that a lack of sufficient experienced personnel necessitated emergency measures. To ensure the continuity of day-to-day operations, the Board took steps to appoint qualified and experienced retired employees on a temporary basis. The Board further contends that the other pending writ petitions improperly seek



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.

112

appointments from an expired list. The list published by the KPSC, pursuant to the Industrial Tribunal award, came into force on 30.09.2013, and, upon expiry of the three-year validity period, no regular appointments could be legally made from it.

22. It is further contended that recruitment to the post of Electricity Worker in the KSEB is conducted on a district-wise basis. However, the rank list prepared and furnished by the KPSC was not district-wise. Through a communication dated 09.03.2018, the KPSC directed the Board to effect appointments based on the seniority established in the rank list by allocating candidates to specific districts. The KPSC further directed that, in the absence of vacancies in a candidate's home district, they could be accommodated in adjacent districts, strictly in the order of seniority. Consequently, 248 Electricity Workers who could not be accommodated in their respective domicile districts were placed in neighbouring districts. As evident from the affidavit dated 16.09.2025, it became evident that the number of eligible candidates (1,486) exceeded the vacancies available in their domicile districts at that time. Given that vacancies in the domicile districts were unlikely to arise for a considerable period, appointments



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.
113

were carried out in adjacent districts following the specific directions of the KPSC.

23. Sri. Liju V. Stephen, Sri. Arun Thomas, Sri. T.P. Sajan, and Sri. P. Sajeev Kumar, the learned counsel appearing for the respondents in WP(C) No. 1609 of 2020, represent the category of persons who have passed Standard X. They contend that the Hon'ble Supreme Court granted the Board the leeway to consider their claims by taking an independent view of the matter. The Court further directed the KSEB to make every endeavour to ensure that neither party suffers in the bargain; consequently, the Board decided to consider the claims of individuals like the respondents. Therefore, the petitioners cannot legally challenge these appointments.

24. The Industrial Tribunal award dated 15.12.2004 directed the respondent Board to assess the eligibility of the concerned workmen for appointment as Electricity Workers, subject to specific conditions. The Board was directed to nominate an officer, not below the rank of Deputy Labour Commissioner, to prepare a state-wide seniority list of petty contract line workers who had completed the stipulated period of service. The Tribunal further mandated that 25% of existing and future



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.
114

vacancies (occurring within five years of the award) be reserved for such appointments, while strictly adhering to the communal reservation policies mandated by the Constitution of India.

25. Counsel further argues that the appointment of these respondents is perfectly justified based on humanitarian considerations—and noting that these respondents worked alongside other beneficiaries of the award—they should not be discarded simply for having passed Standard X. Having met the requirements of the suitability test, their inclusion is neither arbitrary nor illegal, but rather a fair exercise of the Board's discretion as permitted by the Apex Court.

26. The KPSC has also filed a counter-affidavit stating that, in compliance with the verdict of the Industrial Tribunal, the Commission issued a notification inviting applications for an eligibility test from petty contractors included in the final seniority list, published by the KSEB. According to the terms of the Notification, eligibility was restricted to candidates who had passed Standard IV but had not passed Standard X. Only those meeting these specific educational criteria were entitled to apply for the eligibility test.



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.
115

27. The initial challenge against these appointments was successful; this Court directed the KPSC to advise candidates only after excluding those who had passed Standard X, a decision subsequently upheld by the Division Bench. However, the aggrieved parties approached the Apex Court. Taking note of the extensive experience of those engaged as Electricity Workers/Mazdoor, the Apex Court provided the Board with the leeway to take an independent view of the matter, untrammelled by the impugned award. Under these circumstances, a decision was taken to include petty contract workmen who had passed Standard X among the candidates eligible for regularisation within KSEB Ltd.

28. I have heard Sri.P.Nandakumar for the petitioners in WP(C) No.11844 of 2019, Smt.Rekha Vasudevan for the petitioners in WP(C) No.10359 of 2019, Sri.Kaleeswaram Raj for the petitioners in WP(C) No. 10367 of 2019 and Sri.Mathew Kuriakose for petitioners in WP(C) No.1609 of 2020. Sri.P.C. Sasidharan, learned Senior Counsel for PSC, Sri.Raju Joseph, learned Senior Counsel, instructed by Sri.Joseph Antony, Sri.Liju Stephen, Sri.Arun, Sri.B. Sajeev Kumar, the respective



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.
116

counsel appearing for the additional respondents and the learned Government Pleader.

29. In light of the aforementioned contentions, the primary issue can be summarised as follows:

Whether the final seniority list (Ext. P22) for the post of Mazdoor/Electricity Worker—prepared from among petty contractors and contract line workers, pursuant to the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Palakkad—is legally sustainable.

30. By the award dated 15.12.2004, the Tribunal directed that 25% of existing vacancies for Electricity Workers, as well as vacancies arising within five years of the award date, be reserved for petty contractors and contract line workers, subject to appropriate communal reservations. The Tribunal further directed the Board to take effective steps to prepare a final seniority list in consultation with the Government, by appointing an officer not below the rank of Deputy Labour Commissioner for this purpose. In recognition of the experience of those who had worked at least 1,200 days prior to the award, and following a suitability test, the Tribunal granted an age relaxation up to



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.
117

50 years as of the notification date. However, the Tribunal explicitly observed in Paragraph 44 that:

"It would not be appropriate to ignore the normal recruitment procedure and qualifications for the appointment of Electricity Workers while directing the regularisation of the services of the workmen herein."

Accordingly, under Paragraph 48 of the award, only those petty contractors and contract line workers who satisfied all prevailing qualifications for the post of Electricity Worker as of the award date were eligible. As the present dispute concerns educational requirements, for that I shall address the prescribed qualification: that a candidate should have passed Standard IV but should not have passed Standard X.

31. In this case, the primary challenge concerns the improper accommodation of candidates who have passed Standard X, along with the violation of the mandate for district-wise appointments. By appointing these candidates from the final seniority list, the Board has effectively denied opportunities to two distinct groups:

1. Candidates who meet the strict qualifications prescribed by the Board Order dated 21.09.1987 (Standard IV pass but not Standard X).



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.
118

2. Candidates entitled to appointments through general recruitment (KPSC) in districts where sufficient eligible contract workers are unavailable to fill the 25% quota.

The petitioners in WP(C) Nos. 11844, 10359, and 10367 of 2019 were candidates from the then-valid KPSC rank list for Electricity Workers/Mazdoor, which remained in force until 30.06.2017. Their claim is supported by Paragraph 48(h) of the Tribunal award, which explicitly directs:

"If sufficient candidates are not available for filling up the 25% vacancies in terms of this award, the remaining posts shall be treated as general."

The petitioners contend that by filling these vacancies with unqualified candidates, who have passed Standard X, and deployment of district-wise candidates in the inter-district manner, the Board illegally bypassed the "general recruitment" requirement, thereby infringing upon the rights of those on the regular KPSC rank list, who are entitled to the excess posts available in each districts in the absence of district-wise candidates from among the petty contractors and contract line workers as per the award.

32. Upon evaluating these contentions, it appears that by preparing the impugned seniority list, the KPSC, and by subsequently



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.
119

making appointments from said list, the Board committed a dual error. First, they illegally included individuals who had passed Standard X. Second, by appointing candidates to vacancies in districts other than their domicile districts, both the Board and the KPSC flouted the core objective of district-wise recruitment. These actions ultimately resulted in a clear violation of the directives set forth in the Industrial Tribunal award, specifically Paragraph 48(h), which mandated that vacancies revert to the general category if qualified candidates were not available within the prescribed parameters.

33. It is true that the Apex Court, acknowledging the extensive field experience of these Electricity Workers, permitted them to submit appropriate representations to the KSEB. The Board was granted the liberty to consider these claims independently, untrammelled by the original award or the impugned judgment. However, this "leeway" does not authorise the KSEB to completely disregard the educational qualifications prescribed by its own standing orders. The contention raised by the KSEB—that a recent decision was taken to appoint candidates with higher qualifications to mitigate the rise in electrocution accidents—is not tenable in this context. The core issue pertains to



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.
120

appointments made between 2013 and 2017. A subsequent policy decision to enhance qualifications cannot be applied retrospectively to justify or affect recruitment processes intended for the 2013–2017 period.

34. Based on the affidavit dated 16.09.2025 and the counter-affidavit filed by the KSEB, it is evident that the Board disregarded the mandate for district-wise recruitment by making appointments across different districts. Consequently, 248 vacancies that should have been available to open market candidates, in accordance with the Tribunal's directions, were improperly filled. This action constitutes an arbitrary exercise of power by both the Board and the KPSC, as it bypassed the established recruitment procedure and deprived eligible general category candidates of their rightful opportunities.

35. From the above, it is clear that the impugned final seniority list dated 08.03.2019 cannot sustain the test of law to the extent it includes candidates who had passed Standard X, as the same is contrary to the qualifications prescribed by the respective Board Orders dated 21.09.1987 and 13.07.1998. The appointments made by the Board on the basis of such a seniority list, in complete disregard of district-wise



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.
121

recruitment, are also liable to be interfered with.

On the basis of these findings, the following directions are issued:

1. The corrigendum notification dated 08.03.2019 is set aside to the extent it included candidates who had passed Standard X. Consequently, 624 candidates shall be removed from the respective list. Against these 624 vacancies, candidates who had not passed Standard X shall be included in the list. A revised list shall accordingly be published by accommodating such candidates, and they shall be regularised against the said vacancies. The decision regarding the consequential service benefits to them is left open to be determined by the Board, in accordance with law.
2. While accommodating the candidates against 624 vacancies as aforementioned, if there are no sufficient candidates to be accommodated and regularised against a particular district, the excess vacancies shall be filled by appointing candidates from the then PSC rank list, in accordance with their rank, irrespective of the fact that validity of the said rank list has already expired.
3. However, in light of the directions issued by the Apex Court in its order dated 21.05.2018 in SLP Nos. 20024/2018, the KSEB is at liberty to take an independent decision with respect to the said 624 candidates as to whether they can be accommodated by creating supernumerary posts till their retirement.



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.
122

4. As 248 candidates were accommodated in violation of the principles of district-wise recruitment, the vacancies in Pathanamthitta, Kottayam, Ernakulam, Thrissur, Palakkad and Malappuram Districts, numbering 37, 9, 31, 123, 17 and 31 respectively, shall be filled by appointing candidates from the then existing PSC rank list, strictly in accordance with their rank.

5. Further, the Board is restrained from appointing retired hands on a temporary basis against any existing vacancy. In the event of any immediate necessity to engage temporary hands against the existing vacancies in the absence of a rank list, the board shall grant temporary appointments only to candidates from the list furnished by the concerned employment exchange.

In view of the above, these writ petitions are disposed of. Consequently, the Contempt Petition is closed.

Sd/-

**P.M.MANOJ
JUDGE**

tth



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.
123

APPENDIX OF WP(C) NO. 11844 OF 2019

RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

Exhibit R70(a) . A TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT EXTRACTS OF THE RANKED LIST PUBLISHED BY THE KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION FOR THE POST OF MAZDOOR (ELECTRICITY WORKER) UNDER CATEGORY NO. 011/2011 IN THE KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD FOR THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DISTRICT DATED 30.09.2013

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT P1 TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT EXTRACT OF RANKED LIST DATED 30/09/2013 FOR THE POST OF MAZDOORS IN THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DISTRICT.

EXHIBIT P2 TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT EXTRACT OF RANKED LIST DATED 30/09/2013 FOR THE POST OF MAZDOORS IN THRISSUR DISTRICT.

EXHIBIT P3 TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT EXTRACT OF RANKED LIST DATED 30/09/2013 FOR THE POST OF MAZDOORS IN KOZHIKODE DISTRICT.

EXHIBIT P4 TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT EXTRACT OF RANKED LIST DATED 30/09/2013 FOR THE POST OF MAZDOORS IN MALAPPURAM DISTRICT.

EXHIBIT P5 TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT EXTRACT OF RANKED LIST DATED 30/09/2013 FOR THE POST OF MAZDOORS IN PALAKKAD DISTRICT.

EXHIBIT P6 TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT EXTRACT OF RANKED LIST DATED 30/09/2013 FOR THE POST OF MAZDOORS IN IDUKKI DISTRICT.

EXHIBIT P7 TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT EXTRACT OF RANKED LIST DATED 30/09/2013 FOR THE POST OF MAZDOORS IN KANNUR DISTRICT.

EXHIBIT P8 TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT EXTRACT OF RANKED LIST DATED 30/09/2013 FOR THE POST OF MAZDOORS IN KOTTAYAM DISTRICT.

EXHIBIT P9 TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT EXTRACT OF RANKED LIST DATED 30/09/2013 FOR THE POST OF MAZDOORS IN ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT.

EXHIBIT P10 TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT EXTRACT OF RANKED LIST DATED 30/09/2013 FOR THE POST OF MAZDOORS IN PATHANAMTHITTA DISTRICT.



2026:KER:6763

WP(C)No.11844 of 2019,
COC No.2069 of 2025 & Conn. Cases.

124

EXHIBIT P11	TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT EXTRACT OF RANKED LIST DATED 30/09/2013 FOR THE POST OF MAZDOORS IN KOLLAM DISTRICT.
EXHIBIT P12	TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT EXTRACT OF RANKED LIST DATED 30/09/2013 FOR THE POST OF MAZDOORS IN WAYANAD DISTRICT.
EXHIBIT P13	TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT EXTRACT OF RANKED LIST DATED 30/09/2013 FOR THE POST OF MAZDOORS IN ERNKULAM DISTRICT.
EXHIBIT P14	TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT EXTRACT OF RANKED LIST DATED 30/09/2013 FOR THE POST OF MAZDOORS IN KASARAGOD DISTRICT.
EXHIBIT P15	TRUE COPY OF ORDER DATED 16/04/2018 IN SLP(C) NOS.9111-9124/2018.
EXHIBIT P16	TRUE COPY OF ORDER DATED 12/03/2010 IN SLP(C) NO.23872/2008.
EXHIBIT P17	TRUE COPY OF NOTIFICATION DATED 21/04/2017 ISSUED BY THE 32RD RESPONDENT.
EXHIBIT P18	TRUE COPY OF NOTIFICATION PUBLISHED BY THE PSC DATED 25/09/2017.
EXHIBIT P19	TRUE COPY OF COMMON JUDGMENT DATED 07/02/2018 IN WPC NO.21130, 21121 TO 21129 OF 2017.
EXHIBIT P20	TRUE COPY OF COMMON JUDGMENT DATED 21/05/2018 IN WA NO. 88/2018.
EXHIBIT P21	TRUE COPY OF COMMON ORDER DATED 20/08/2018 IN SLP (C) NO.20024/18.
EXHIBIT P22	TRUE COPY OF ERRATUM NOTIFICATION DATED 08/03/2019.
EXHIBIT P22	TRUE COPY OF MODIFIED FINAL SENIORITY LIST.
EXHIBIT P23	TRUE COPY OF OFFICE ORDER DATED 25.01.2019 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT.
EXHIBIT P24	TRUE COPY OF THE FIRST AND LAST PAGES OF THE SELECT LIST PUBLISHED BY THE PSC.