



OP(KAT) NO. 152 OF 2026

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL K. NARENDRAN

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MURALEE KRISHNA S.

TUESDAY, THE 19TH DAY OF MAY 2026 / 29TH VAISAKHA, 1948

OP(KAT) NO. 152 OF 2026

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT DATED 28.07.2025 IN OA (EKM) NO.613 OF
2025 OF KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, ADDITIONAL BENCH,
ERNAKULAM

PETITIONERS/APPLICANTS NO.1 TO 13

- 1 DR SUMITH S. PILLAI,
AGED 34 YEARS, S/O R SURENDRAN PILLAI,
VRINDAVANAM HOUSE, N. MAZHUVANNOOR P.O,
AIRAPURAM, KILIKULAM, ERNAKULAM., PIN - 686669
- 2 DR MUFEEDA.E.K., AGED 34 YEARS
D/O MOOSAKUTTY.E.K., EANDENKUZHIYIL HOUSE,
ELAYUR, IRUVETTY.P.O., MALAPPURAM., PIN - 673639
- 3 DR AMRITHAVANI.A, AGED 34 YEARS
W/O PRAVEESH.V., NANDANAM, VILLA NO.5, AMBADY
VILLA, KADUNGAMANGALAM.P.O.,
ERNAKULAM, PIN - 682305
- 4 SNEHA ANNE TITUS, AGED 31 YEARS
W/O MICHELL MATHEW.M, THYPARAMBIL HOUSE,
CHERANELLUR.P.O., ERNAKULAM, PIN - 682034
- 5 DR NIKITHA MATHEW, AGED 37 YEARS
W/O ARUN ANTONY, PANTHALADICKAL HOUSE,
VILANGAD.P.O. KOZHIKODE., PIN - 673506
- 6 SHILPA JAYAN.T, AGED 31 YEARS



D/O JAYAGOVINDAN.T, THYTHODAN HOUSE,
KARUVANTHIRUTHY, FEROKE.P.O.,
KOZHIKODE, PIN - 673631

- 7 DR.DHANYA T.B, AGED 35 YEARS
W/O PRAKASH.K, AMMINI SADANAN, THRITHALA.P.O.,
PATTAMBI (VIA), PALAKKAD KERALA., PIN - 679534
- 8 DR.ATHIRA UNNIKRISHNAN, AGED 35 YEARS
D/O UNNIKRISHNAN U, UMBROTTIL HOUSEL
ALIPARAMBA.P.O., ANAMGAD VIA,
MALAPPURAM ., PIN - 679357
- 9 DR.UMA.V, AGED 36 YEARS
W/O JITHESH KARTHIKEYAN, SRA 10F, AMRITHAM,
SAHRDAYA NAGAR LANE, PUTHIYAKAVU, THEKKUMBHAGAM,
TRIPUNITHURA, PIN - 682301
- 0 DR RAHMAT P.K, AGED 42 YEARS
D/O ABDUL MAJEED.R.K., PALLIKKAD HOUSE,
MANNATHUPARAMBA, EDAYUR NORTH.P.O.,
MALAPPURAM, PIN - 676552
- 11 DR ANU.K ACHUTHAN, AGED 33 YEARS
W/O SUNEESH.E, KIZHAKKEKKARA HOUSE, ERAMANGALAM
POST, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT, PIN - 679578
- 12 DR SURYA SUDHAKARAN, AGED 36 YEARS
D/O SUDHAKARAN.T.S., MALIYAKKAL HOUSE,
POONITHURAP.O, ERNAKULAM., PIN - 682038
- 13 DR.NEETHU HARSHA, AGED 31 YEARS
D/O M.V.HARSHA KUMAR, 'SREENAYANAM', TNRA HOUSE
NO.108, THRIKKAKARA TEMPLE ROAD, CUSAT.P.O.,
KOCHI ., PIN - 682022

BY ADVS. SHRI.T.C.GOVINDASWAMY
SMT.KALA T.GOPI
SHRI.KAILESH T. GOPI
SMT.NISHITHA BALACHANDRAN
SMT.AKHILA S.

RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS 1 TO 6 IN THE O.A:

- 1 STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY THE CHIEF SECRETARY, GOVERNMENT OF
KERALA, STATE SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,
KERALA., PIN - 695001
- 2 THE ADDITIONAL CHIEF SECRETARY
AYUSH DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT OF KERALA, STATE
SECRETARIATE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - KERALA.,
PIN - 695001
- 3 THE DIRECTOR
AYURVEDA MEDICAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT,
AROGYABHAVAN, P.B.NO.182, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,
PIN - 695001
- 4 THE KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
PATTON PALACE, THULASI HILLS, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
THROUGH ITS SECRETARY., PIN - 695004
- 5 THE DIRECTOR
INDIAN SYSTEMS OF MEDICAL DIRECTORATE M.G.ROAD,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM., PIN - 695001
- 6 KERALA UNIVERSITY OF HEALTH SCIENCES
MULANKUNNATHKAVU, THANGALLOOR, THRISSUR, KERALA -
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR., PIN - 680596

SMT. PRINCY XAVIER, SR. GP
SRI. P.C SASIDHARAN, SC
SRI. S GANESH, SC

THIS OP KERALA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL HAVING COME UP
FOR ADMISSION ON 19.05.2026, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY
DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

**JUDGMENT****Anil K. Narendran, J.**

The petitioners are the applicants in O.A.(EKM)No.613 of 2025 on the file of the Kerala Administrative Tribunal, (Additional Bench, Ernakulam), an original application filed under Section 19 of the *[Administrative Tribunals Act], 1985, seeking the following reliefs:

- “(i) Declare that the non-feasance on the part of the respondents to consider the qualification of Postgraduate Diploma in Manasik Swasthya Vigyan (Ayurveda) (Diploma in Psychiatry) for appointment to the post of Medical Officer (Manasik) as notified in Annexure A1 is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to law and unconstitutional;
- (ii) Declare that the non-inclusion of qualification of the Postgraduate Diploma in Manasik Swasthya Vigyan (Ayurveda) in Annexure A7 special rules for appointment to the post of Medical Officer (Manasik) is arbitrary, discriminatory, unreasonable and hence, unconstitutional;
- (iii) Call for the records leading to the issue of Annexure A1 and quash the same to extent it does not include the qualification of Postgraduate Diploma in Manasik Swasthya Vigyan and quash the same to that extent;
- (iv) Call for the records leading to the issue of Annexure A7 recruitment rules and quash the same to the extent it does not include the qualification of Postgraduate Diploma in Manasik Swasthya Vigyan (Ayurveda) as an alternate qualification in place of MD/MS for appointment to the post of Medical Officer (Manasik);

*Corrected as per the order dated 26.05.2026



(v) Direct the respondents to consider the applicants for appointment to the post of *[Medical Officer (Manasik)] against the vacancies as notified in Annexure A1 with all consequential benefits arising therefrom.”

2. In O.A.(EKM)No.613 of 2025, the 4th respondent Kerala Public Service Commission filed Ext.P3 reply statement dated 07.07.2025.

3. On 28.07.2025, when O.A.(EKM)No.613 of 2025 came up for consideration along with a connected matter, i.e., O.A.(EKM)No.595 of 2025, the Tribunal dismissed both the original applications. Paragraphs 5 to 9 and also the last paragraph of Ext.P1 order dated 28.07.2025 of the Tribunal in the aforesaid original applications read thus;

“5. Question as to what should be the qualifications to be prescribed while framing the Special Rules, which is in exercise of subordinate legislative powers of the State Government, is a subject matter fully coming within policy decision of the State Government and it is a matter coming within purview of the legislative wisdom of the State Government. Merely because the applicants are aspirants to any particular post in civil service of the State Government, they cannot in any manner dictate that the qualifications possessed by them shall also be included as alternative qualifications, which can be accepted as sufficient for appointment to the posts in question. Merely because the applicants are aspirants to the post, they do not have locus



standi to challenge any decision of the Government, which was taken as a policy by the Government, in exercise of its wisdom. Of course, constitutional validity or unreasonableness or arbitrariness of such subordinate legislation can be challenged by the applicants, probably in their capacity as a representative of the citizenry. Even assuming such a right is vested on the applicants, they can do it in their capacity as 'pro bono publico'. In such case the forum for agitating such cause is not this Tribunal.

6. Learned counsel for the applicants contended that, this Tribunal has got jurisdiction to entertain challenge against validity of the Special Rules, since it is a matter concerning the recruitment. As already observed, disputes with respect to 'recruitment' and disputes with respect to 'matters concerning recruitment', based on questions of suitability or sufficiency of the qualifications can be entertained only if the applicants could successfully challenge the notifications inviting applications. But when it comes to question of challenging constitutional validity of the Special Rules, it cannot in any manner be considered as a subject in relation to which this Tribunal is vested with jurisdiction under Section 15(1)(a) of the Administrative Tribunals Act.

7. Learned counsel for the applicants placed reliance on a judgment of the Division Bench of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala, in O.P.(KAT)No.31 of 2024, dated 17.07.2024. The Hon'ble High Court had set aside an order passed by this Tribunal in O.A.(EKM)No.39 of 2024, dated 19.01.2024. In the said Original Application the challenge was only against the stipulations of qualifications contained in the respective notifications issued by the PSC. There was no challenge



against the Special Rules. On the other hand, challenge was only against two Government Orders, which mandated registration with the Kerala Para Medical Council, as mandatory for appointment to the posts to which the selection was conducted. Findings of this Tribunal that there exist no valid challenge against the process of recruitment or with respect to any matters concerning recruitment, was reversed by the Hon'ble High Court by relying upon the rulings in Tomy Philip v. Chief General Manager, Telecommunications [2001 (2) KLT 490], Sojimol T.J. v. State of Kerala and others [2012 (3) KHC 287] and Dr.Suresh Babu P. IAS v. State of Kerala and another [2019 (3) KHC 295].

8. But it is pertinent to notice that, dictum contained in all those rulings are to the effect that, dispute regarding any 'matters concerning recruitment', including pre-recruitment disputes and post-recruitment disputes, will fall within the ambit and scope of Section 15(1)(a) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985. But there is no dictum contained in any of those rulings; nor in any other judgment placed for reliance that, challenge against constitutional validity of any subordinate legislation is a dispute regarding any 'matter concerning recruitment'. Therefore, challenge against validity of the Special Rules, raised by any aspirants, who is not in the civil service of the State Government, cannot in any manner be considered, either as a 'service matter' falling within the purview of Section 15(1)(b) or (c); nor it could be considered as a dispute relating to 'recruitment' or dispute with respect to 'matters concerning recruitment', falling within the purview of Section 15(1)(a) of the



Administrative Tribunals Act.

9. In the result, challenge against Annexure A1 notification fails and the same is hereby dismissed. Challenge against validity of the Special Rules, as it stood amended through Annexure A7, is hereby rejected since this Tribunal is not conferred with jurisdiction to adjudicate upon to such challenges with respect to constitutional validity of the Rules. Consequently, the original applications are hereby dismissed.

However, it is made clear that the above order will not stand in the way of the applicants approaching any appropriate authority having jurisdiction, raising challenge against the validity of the Special Rules.”

4. Challenging the order dated 28.07.2025 of the Tribunal in O.A.(EKM)No.613 of 2025, the petitioners-applicants have filed this original petition, invoking the supervisory jurisdiction of this Court under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

5. Heard arguments of the learned counsel for the petitioners-applicants, the learned Senior Government Pleader for respondents 1 to 3 and 5, the learned Standing Counsel for Kerala Public Service Commission for the 4th respondent and also the learned Standing Counsel for Kerala University of Health Sciences for the 6th respondent.

6. The issue that requires consideration in this original petition is as to whether Ext.P1 order dated 28.07.2025 of the



Tribunal in O.A.(EKM)No.613 of 2025 can be sustained in law.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioners-applicants would contend that the reasoning of the Tribunal in Ext.P1 order for not entertaining O.A(EKM)No.613 of 2025 is per se arbitrary and patently illegal. Therefore, interference of this Court in exercise of the supervisory jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India is warranted. The learned Standing Counsel for the Kerala Public Service Commission would also submit that the reasoning of the Tribunal for not entertaining the original application cannot be sustained in view of the law laid down by this Court in **Sadhiq M.M. v. State of Kerala and others [2025 (1) KHC 402]**.

8. As already noticed hereinbefore, the declaratory relief sought for in O.A.(EKM)No.613 of 2025 is that the non-inclusion of the qualification of *[Postgraduate Diploma in Manasik Swasthya Vigyan] (Ayurveda) for appointment to the post of *[Medical Officer (Manasik)] in the Department of Indian Systems of Medicine, in Annexure A7 Indian Systems of Medicine (Kerala) Service Amendment Special Rules, 2020, is arbitrary, discriminatory, unreasonable and hence, unconstitutional. Consequential relief was also sought as relief No.(iv).



9. The Parliament enacted the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 to provide for the adjudication or trial by Administrative Tribunals of disputes and complaints with respect to recruitment and conditions of service of persons appointed to public services and posts in connection with the affairs of the Union or of any State or of any local or other authority within the territory of India or under the control of the Government of India or of any corporation owned or controlled by the Government and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto. By Section 2 of the Administrative Tribunals (Amendment) Act, 1986, in the long title of the Principal Act, for the words "any corporation owned or controlled by the Government" the words, figures and letter "any corporation or society owned or controlled by the Government in pursuance of Article 323A of the Constitution" were substituted. The provisions of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, in so far as they relate to the Central Administrative Tribunals came into force on 01.07.1985, vide notification G.S.R. No.527(E) dated 01.07.1985. The provisions of the said Act, in so far as they relate to the State Administrative Tribunal for Kerala came into force on 01.01.1986, vide notification G.S.R. No.956(E) dated 31.12.1985.

10. In **L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India [(1997) 3**



SCC 261] the Constitution Bench of the Apex Court held that clause 2(d) of Article 323A and clause 3(d) of Article 323B of the Constitution of India, to the extent they exclude the jurisdiction of the High Courts and the Supreme Court under Articles 226/227 and 32 of the Constitution, are unconstitutional. Section 28 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the 'exclusion of jurisdiction' clauses in all other legislations enacted under the aegis of Articles 323A and 323B of the Constitution would, to the same extent, be unconstitutional. The jurisdiction conferred upon the High Courts under Articles 226/227 and upon the Supreme Court under Article 32 of the Constitution is a part of the inviolable basic structure of our Constitution. While this jurisdiction cannot be ousted, other courts and Tribunals may perform a supplemental role in discharging the powers conferred by Articles 226/227 and 32 of the Constitution.

11. In **L. Chandra Kumar [(1997) 3 SCC 261]** the Constitution Bench held that the Tribunals created under Article 323A and Article 323B of the Constitution are possessed of the competence to test the constitutional validity of statutory provisions and rules. All decisions of these Tribunals will, however, be subject to scrutiny before a Division Bench of the High Court



within whose jurisdiction the Tribunal concerned falls. The Tribunals will, nevertheless, continue to act like courts of first instance in respect of the areas of law for which they have been constituted. It will not, therefore, be open for litigants to directly approach the High Courts even in cases where they question the vires of statutory legislation (except where the legislation which creates the particular Tribunal is challenged) by overlooking the jurisdiction of the Tribunal concerned.

12. Section 28 of the Administrative Tribunals Act deals with the exclusion of jurisdiction of courts except the Supreme Court under Article 136 of the Constitution. As per Section 28, on and from the date from which any jurisdiction, powers and authority becomes exercisable under the Act by a Tribunal in relation to recruitment and matters concerning recruitment to any service or post or service matters concerning members of any service or persons appointed to any service or post, no court except the Supreme Court; or any Industrial Tribunal, Labour Court or other authority constituted under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 or any other corresponding law for the time being in force, shall have, or be entitled to exercise any jurisdiction, powers or authority in relation to such recruitment or matters concerning



such recruitment or such service matters.

13. In **L. Chandra Kumar [(1997) 3 SCC 261]**, after holding that Section 28 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the 'exclusion of jurisdiction' clauses in all other legislations enacted under the aegis of Articles 323A and 323B of the Constitution, to the extent they exclude the jurisdiction of the High Courts and the Supreme Court under Articles 226/227 and 32 of the Constitution, are unconstitutional, the Apex Court held that it will not be open for litigants to directly approach the High Courts even in cases where they question the vires of statutory legislation (except where the legislation which creates the particular Tribunal is challenged) by overlooking the jurisdiction of the Tribunal concerned.

14. In **Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan v. Subhas Sharma [(2002) 4 SCC 145]** a Two-Judge Bench of the Apex Court was dealing with a case in which the 1st respondent in Civil Appeal No.5021 of 2001 and the sole respondent in Civil Appeal No. 5448 of 2000 were the employees of Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan and as some dispute arose regarding their service conditions, they filed two writ petitions under Article 226 of the Constitution of India before the High Court of Jammu and Kashmir



for adjudication. In the said writ petitions, Kendriya Vidyalaya filed two separate applications for transfer of the writ petitions to the Central Administrative Tribunal on the ground that under the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, the Tribunal has got jurisdiction to decide the disputes. By the impugned orders, both the applications were dismissed. The High Court, relying on a Full Bench decision in **Kuldip Khud v. Masud Ahmad Chodhry [1994 JKLR 25 : 1994 SLJ 287]** held that the writ court has jurisdiction to decide service disputes of the present nature and, therefore, rejected the prayer for transfer holding that the writ petitions were maintainable. Before the Apex Court, it was contended that in view of clause (a) of subsection (2) of Section 1 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, the said Act extends to the State of Jammu and Kashmir and as the respondents are employees of Kendriya Vidyalaya, which is an autonomous body registered under the Societies Registration Act and controlled by the Government of India, such disputes regarding service matters are exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Central Administrative Tribunal. It was contended further that though the High Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India or Section 103 of the Jammu and Kashmir Constitution has wide powers, in view of the



restraint imposed by the judgment of the Constitution Bench of the Apex Court in **L. Chandra Kumar [(1997) 3 SCC 261]** the High Court ought not to have entertained the writ petition.

15. In **Subhas Sharma [(2002) 4 SCC 145]** the Apex Court found that Kendriya Vidyalaya is an autonomous body registered under the Societies Registration Act and controlled by the Government of India and that being the position, the Central Administrative Tribunal has jurisdiction concerning service matters of the employees of Kendriya Vidyalaya, in view of subclause (iii) of Section 14(1)(b) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, read with the notification of the Government of India dated 17.12.1998 issued under sub-section (2) of Section 14 of the Act. Therefore, service disputes concerning the employees of Kendriya Vidyalaya would come under the jurisdiction of the Central Administrative Tribunal. It does not make any difference that the institution is located in Jammu and Kashmir and the respondents are working there.

16. In **Subhas Sharma [(2002) 4 SCC 145]** the TwoJudge Bench noticed that the Constitution Bench in **L. Chandra Kumar [(1997) 3 SCC 261]** has clearly held that the Tribunals set up under the Administrative Tribunals Act shall



continue to act as the courts of first instance in respect of areas of law for which they have been constituted. It was further held that it will not be open for litigants to directly approach the High Court even in cases where they question the vires of statutory legislation (except where the legislation which creates the particular Tribunal is challenged) by overlooking the jurisdiction of the Tribunal concerned. In view of the clear pronouncement of the Constitution Bench, the High Court erred in law in directly entertaining the writ petitions concerning service matters of the employees of Kendriya Vidyalaya, as these matters come under the jurisdiction of the Central Administrative Tribunal. Therefore, the Two-Judge Bench held that the High Court committed an error by declining to transfer the writ petition to the Central Administrative Tribunal. Consequently, the Apex Court set aside the impugned orders of the High Court and directed the High Court to transfer both the writ petitions to the Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench, which may, in its turn, make over the case to the Circuit Bench in the State of Jammu and Kashmir, for disposal in accordance with law.

17. In **Sadhiq M.M. [2025 (1) KHC 402]**, a Division Bench of this Court in which both of us were parties, held that in



view of the law laid down by the Constitution Bench in **L. Chandra Kumar [(1997) 3 SCC 261]**, the Central Administrative Tribunal, Ernakulam Bench and the Kerala Administrative Tribunal will act like courts of first instance in respect of the areas of law for which they have been constituted. Therefore, it will not be open for litigants to directly approach the High Court even in cases where they question the vires of statutory legislation (except where the legislation which creates the particular Tribunal is challenged) by overlooking the jurisdiction of the Tribunal concerned. However, the Central Administrative Tribunal, Ernakulam Bench or the Kerala Administrative Tribunal shall not entertain any question regarding the vires of their parent statute, i.e., Administrative Tribunals Act, since the said Tribunals, which are creatures of the said statute, cannot declare the very Act to be unconstitutional. In such cases alone, the litigants can approach the High Court concerned directly.

18. In view of the law laid down as above, the Kerala Administrative Tribunal will act like courts of first instance in respect of the areas of law for which it has been constituted. Therefore, even in cases where the vires of statutory legislation (except that of the Administrative Tribunals Act) is under



challenge, litigants have to approach the Kerala Administrative Tribunal, invoking the provisions under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985. In such circumstances, the reasoning of the Tribunal in Ext.P1 order dated 28.07.2025 for not entertaining O.A.(EKM)No.613 of 2025, which is patently illegal, cannot be sustained in law.

19. By the judgment dated 27.01.2026 in O.P.(KAT)No.507 of 2025, this Court has already set aside the order dated 28.07.2025 of the Tribunal in O.A.(EKM)No.595 of 2025 and remanded the matter to the Tribunal for consideration on merits, in accordance with law, with notice to both sides.

In the result, this original petition is allowed by setting aside Ext.P1 order 28.07.2025 of the Tribunal in O.A(EKM).No.613 of 2025 and by remanding the matter to the Tribunal for consideration on merits, in accordance with law, with notice to both sides.

Sd/-

ANIL K. NARENDRAN, JUDGE

Sd/-

MURALEE KRISHNA S., JUDGE

(cntd.....19)

Correction

As per order dated 26.05.2026, the judgment dated 19.05.2026 in O.P(KAT)No.152 of 2026 is corrected as follows;

1. "Kerala Administrative Tribunals Act" occurring in the 1st paragraph of the judgment will stand corrected as "Administrative Tribunals Act".
2. "Medical Officers (Netra)" occurring in relief No.(v) is corrected as "Medical Officer (Manasik)".
3. "Postgraduate Diploma in Netra Roga Vigyan" occurring in the 3rd line of 8th paragraph at page No.9 is corrected as "Postgraduate Diploma in Manasik Swasthya Vigyan".
4. So also "Medical Officer (Netra)" occurring in the 4th line of paragraph 8 at page No.9 is corrected as "Medical Officer (Manasik)".

Sd/-

Joint Registrar

APPENDIX OF OP(KAT) NO. 152 OF 2026

PETITIONER ANNEXURES

Annexure-A1	A TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION BEARING CATEGORY NO.571/2024, PUBLISHED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT-KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION.
Annexure-A2	A TRUE COPY OF THE PROSPECTUS FOR ADMISSION TO THE PG DIPLOMA COURSES IN AYURVEDA - 2020-21, AS PUBLISHED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF KERALA.
Annexure-A3	A TRUE COPY OF THE REGULATION 2010 PUBLISHED IN THE GAZETTE OF INDIA DATED 13.07.2010.
Annexure-A4	A TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE OF DIPLOMA IN NETRA ROGA VIGYAN IN OPHTHALMOLOGY (AYURVEDA) ISSUED BY THE KERALA UNIVERSITY OF HEALTH SCIENCES, BEARING REGISTRATION NO.205250003 DATED 02.08.2023, ISSUED AS REGARDS THE FIRST APPLICANT
Annexure-A5	A TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE BEARING NO.1470/2024 /A1/ ACADEMIC/AYUSH/KUHS(1) DATED 07.01.2025 ISSUED BY THE KERALA UNIVERSITY OF HEALTH SERVICES IN RESPECT OF ONE OF THE APPLICANTS COLLEAGUES.
Annexure-A6	A TRUE COPY OF THE REGISTRATION OF ADDITIONAL MEDICAL QUALIFICATION ISSUED BY THE COUNCIL OF INDIAN SYSTEMS OF MEDICINE, KERALA STATE BEARING REGISTRATION NO.12745 DATED 29.11.2024, ISSUED AS REGARDS THE SEVENTH APPLICANT.
Annexure-A7	A TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION BEARING NO.2540 DATED 27.10.2020, A TRUE COPY OF WHICH IS PUBLISHED IN THE KERALA GAZETTED EXTRA ORDINARY DATED 27.10.2020.
Annexure-A8	A TRUE COPY OF THE A CLASS REGISTRATION NO.12745 DATED 15.06.2017 ISSUED BY THE MEDICAL COUNCIL AS REGARDS THE SEVENTH APPLICANT
Annexure-A9	A TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION SUBMITTED BY THE SECOND APPLICANT ALONG WITH SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS DATED 09.01.2025, ADDRESSED TO THE DIRECTOR,



	DEPARTMENT OF AYURVEDIC MEDICAL EDUCATION.
Annexure-A10	A TRUE COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION TO THE PRINCIPAL, GOVERNMENT AYURVEDA COLLEGE/THIRUVANANTHAPURAM/THRIPUNITHURA BEARING NO.E5/1403/2024/DAME DATED 18.01.2025
Annexure-A11	A TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER BEARING NO.E5/1403/2024/DAME DATED 25.01.2025
Annexure-A12	A TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION 20.03.2025 SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF PG DIPLOMA HOLDERS/AYURVEDA, NETRA ROGA AND MANASIKA SWASTHA VIGYAN ADDRESSED TO THE ADDITIONAL CHIEF SECRETARY.
Annexure-A13	A TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION ON BEHALF OF PG DIPLOMA STUDENTS REPRESENTATIVES, LESS ITS ANNEXURES DATED 21.03.2025.
Annexure-A14	A TRUE COPY OF COMMUNICATIONS DATED 20.12.2024, ADDRESSED TO THE DIRECTOR INDIAN SYSTEMS OF MEDICINE, AROGYA BHAVAN, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
Annexure-A15	A TRUE COPY OF COMMUNICATIONS DATED 20.12.2024, ADDRESSED TO THE KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION.
Annexure-A16	A TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED BY THE DIRECTORATE OF AYURVEDA MEDICAL EDUCATION BY A COMMUNICATION BEARING NO.E5/1403/2024/DAME DATED 26.12.2024.
Annexure-A17	A TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION PUBLISHED BY THE DELHI TRANSPORT CORPORATION FOR RECRUITMENT TO THE POST OF SENIOR MEDICAL OFFICERS (ALLOPATHIC) AS DOWNLOADED FROM THE WEBSITE, WITH THE LAST DATE OF APPLICATION BEING 14.03.2022.
Annexure-A18	A TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION ISSUED BY THE KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION IN THE GAZETTE DATED 11.11.2016 WHICH DEALS WITH THE POST OF JUNIOR CONSULTANT (GENERAL MEDICINE).
Annexure-A19	A TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION BEARING NO.545/A/11/11/GR.A&B/CHE/10 (ADM) VOL-XIII DATED 20.12.2024, ISSUED BY THE ESIC HOSPITAL, EZHUPUNNA, KOLLAM INVITING APPLICATION FOR THE POST OF SENIOR RESIDENTS.



Annexure-A20	A TRUE COPY OF THE ADVERTISEMENT ISSUED BY THE CENTRAL ARMED POLICE FORCES FOR RECRUITMENT TO THE VARIOUS POSTS IN THE MEDICAL DEPARTMENT WITH LAST DATE OF APPLICATION BEING 14.11.2024.
Annexure-A21	A TRUE COPY OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR INDIAN SYSTEM OF MEDICINE ACT, 2020, PUBLISHED IN THE GAZETTE OF INDIA DATED 21.09.2020
Annexure-A22	A TRUE COPY OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR INDIAN SYSTEM OF MEDICINE (MINIMUM ESSENTIAL STANDARDS, ASSESSMENT AND RATING FOR POSTGRADUATE INSTITUTIONS AND MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR POSTGRADUATE EDUCATION IN AYURVEDA) REGULATIONS, 2024 DATED 01.10.2024
Exhibit-P1	A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER OF THE LEARNED K.A.T., IN O.A.(EKM)NO.613/2025 DATED 28.07.2025
Exhibit-P2	A TRUE COPY OF THE O.A.(EKM) DATED 07.04.2025 ALONG WITH ITS ANNEXURES FILED BEFORE THE LEARNED K.A.T, ADDITIONAL BENCH AT ERNAKULAM
Exhibit-P3	A TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY STATEMENT FILED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT IN O.A.(EKM) NO.613/2025 DATED 07.07.2025