



WP(MD)No.1395 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 16.07.2026

CORAM

**THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE C.V.KARTHIKEYAN
AND
THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE R.SAKTHIVEL**

WA.(MD)No.1395 of 2025 and CMP(MD) No.8373 of 2025

1. The Director Directorate of School Education, Chennai 6
2. The Chief Educational Officer Office of the Ceo,
Thalakulam, Madurai
3. The District Educational Officer, Madurai, Madurai District.
4. The Head Master Government High School, Ayyanpappakudi,
Avaniyapuram, Madurai 12

... Petitioner(s) in WA(MD). 1395/ 2025

- Vs. -

1. Nirmala M Wife of S.Elangovan,
Graduate Teacher (Maths)
Government High School, Ayyanpappakudi,
Avaniyapuram, Madurai 12

... Respondent(s) in WA(MD). 1395/ 2025

Prayer in WA(MD). 1395/ 2025 :Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of Letters Patent, praying to prefer this Memorandum of Grounds of Writ Appeal against the order dated 12.04.2024 passed in WP(MD). No.5103 of 2024.



WEB COPY



WP(MD)No.1395 of 2025

For Appellant : Mr.M.P.Senthil
Counsel for State

For Respondents : Mr.A.Rajaram

JUDGMENT

(Judgment of the Court was delivered by C.V.KARTHIKEYAN, J.)

The writ appeal had been filed by the respondents in WP(MD) No. 5103 of 2024 aggrieved by the order of the learned Single Judge dated 12.04.2024, by which order the writ petition had been allowed.

2. The writ petition had been filed seeking second incentive increment for qualifying M.Phil degree through Correspondence. The respondents in the writ petition had refused to grant such second incentive increment on the ground that the M.Phil degree had been studied through correspondence and not through regular stream. Challenging the refusal order, the writ petition had been filed. The learned Single Judge had examined the earlier orders of this Court, wherein, a distinction had been made with respect to studying in Correspondence and such distinction was vis-a-vis against a candidate, who had qualified in correspondence course



WP(MD)No.1395 of 2025

and seeks employment in the initial stage, with a candidate, who acquires additional qualification during the course of employment through correspondence education.

3. Courts have consistently held that during the course of employment, additional qualification may be obtained through correspondence education and obtaining such qualification would not be a bar or cannot a ground to deny grant of second incentive increment. The issue is no longer res integra. The learned Single Judge had correctly applied the law and had granted second incentive increment. We agree with the findings of the learned Single Judge. A direction is given to the appellants herein to comply with the said order and grant second incentive increment within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

The writ appeal stands dismissed accordingly. No costs. Consequently connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

(C.V.K.,J.) (R.S.V,J.)
16.07.2026

RR



WEB COPY



WP(MD)No.1395 of 2025

**C.V.KARTHIKEYAN, J
AND
R.SAKTHIVEL, J**

RR

WA(MD) No.1395 of 2025

16.07.2026