



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 14-08-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MUMMINENI SUDHEER KUMAR

WP No. 31760 of 2026

P.Bhuvaneswari

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. Chettinad Vidhyashram School
Represented by its President,
Mr. Vijayakumar Reddy, Raja
Annamalaipuram, Chennai-28
2. The Principal Dr. Meena Muthiah,
Chettinad Vidhyashram School,
Raja Annamalaipuram, Chennai-28
3. The Principal, Dr. S. Amutha Lakshmi,
Chettinad Vidhyashram School,
Raja Annamalaipuram, Chennai-28

..Respondent(s)

Writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a writ of mandamus, directing the 3rd Respondent to dispose of the Appeal filed dated 12.11.2024 within the time limit specified by this Honble Court and further direct the 3rd Respondent hand over the petitioners original certificates.

For Petitioner(s) : M/s.L. Jyothy

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed seeking a direction to the third respondent to dispose of the appeal dated 12.11.2024 and further direct the third respondent to hand over the original certificates to the petitioner.



2. The petitioner herein claims that she was appointed as 'Swimming Teacher' in the respondent school with effect from 22.06.2015 and has been continuing as such in the said school as 'Swimming Teacher' for all these years. However, on a complaint made by some of the parents, the petitioner has been removed from service without following the due process of law and without conducting any enquiry.

3. Despite the petitioner submitting appropriate representations, the same have not been taken into consideration by the third respondent while removing the petitioner from service. Accordingly, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no orders have been passed to discontinue the services of the petitioner. She further submits that the respondents are under an obligation to follow due process of law, if they intend to remove the petitioner from service. In the instant case, according to the learned counsel for the petitioner, no such procedure has been followed.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner has submitted yet another representation dated 12.11.2024 before the third respondent requesting him to reconsider the entire issue and to continue the petitioner in service. As the third respondent has not taken any action in this



regard, the petitioner has approached this Court by filing the present writ petition.

WEB COPY

5. Taking into consideration the nature of relief sought in the present writ petition, this Court does not deem it necessary to issue notice to the respondents, as this Court is not inclined to go into the merits of the matter and, instead, is of the view that it is for the third respondent to consider the representation dated 12.11.2024 said to have been submitted by the petitioner.

6. In the circumstances, without going into the merits of the matter, the writ petition is disposed of directing the third respondent to consider the representation dated 12.11.2024 submitted by the petitioner and pass appropriate orders thereon as expeditiously as possible, at any rate, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs. The connected miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

14-08-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
skr



WEB COPY

WP No. 31760 of 2



MUMMINENI SUDHEER KUMAR, J.

skr

WP No. 31760 of 2026

14-08-2026