



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 11.02.2015

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K. RAVICHANDRABAABU

REVIEW APPLICATION (MD) No. 59 of 2013

in

W. P (MD) No. 4422 of 2011

& M. P (MD) No. 2 of 2013

The Secretary,
Arulmigu Palani Andavar Arts College
for Women,
Palani.

.. Applicant/1st Respondent

Vs.

1. P. Vanitha .. 1st Respondent/Writ Petitioner
2. Joint Director of Collegiate Education,
Madurai Region,
Vaidiya Nathaiyar Street,
Shenoy Nagar,
Madurai - 625 020.

.. 2nd Respondent/2nd Respondent

Prayer:- Review Application filed under Order XLI, Rules 1 & 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 read with Section 114 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 to review the order, dated 06.02.2012 made in W.P(MD)No.4422 of 2011 on the file of this Court.

Prayer in WP(MD). 4422/ 2011 :

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the 1st respondent to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 15.02.2011 to alter the date of birth of the petitioner in the light of the birth register of the Dindigul Municipality dated 05.01.2009 and in accordance with Government letter 23.06.2004.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Devaraj

For R - 1 : Mr.S.Govindan

For R - 2 : Mr.R.Anandharaj

Government Advocate

ORDER

This Review Application is filed seeking to review the order passed by this Court in W.P(MD)No.4422 of 2011, dated 06.02.2012. In the said order, this Court has only directed the first respondent to consider the application of the petitioner, dated 15.02.2011 and pass appropriate orders within a period of 12 weeks.



2. A perusal of the order would show that Mr.B.Pugalendhi, learned counsel appeared for R1 & R2. Now, it is stated that there is a separate counsel for the first respondent and therefore, the order was passed without hearing the first respondent. I am unable to appreciate the said contention for the simple reason that the order referred the Special Government Pleader as the counsel appearing for the respondents 1 and 2 and a direction was issued only to the first respondent to consider the representation of the petitioner, dated 25.01.2011. When that being the factual position, I do not find any ground to review the order already made. The petitioner has not made out any case to review the order.

3. It is also stated by the petitioner that pursuant to the order passed by this Court, the first respondent has also passed an order, dated 19.10.2012. When that being the factual position, the Review Application deserves no consideration and accordingly, the same is dismissed. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(writs)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

TO

The Joint Director of Collegiate Education,
Madurai Region,
Vaidiya Nathaiyar Street,
Shenoy Nagar,
Madurai - 625 020.

+1cc to Mr.S.Govindan, Advocate Sr.No.6383

+1cc to Mr.R.Devaraj, Advocate Sr.No. 6410

ps

AA/19.02.2015/2p- 4c/

REVIEW APPLICATION(MD)No.59 of 2013 in
W.P (MD)No.4422 of 2011
11.02.2015