



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
DATED : 04.01.2019
CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE T.S. SIVAGNANAM
and

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE R. THARANI
Review Application (MD) No.8 of 2019

and
C.M.P. (MD) No.622 of 2019

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep., by its Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai-9.
2. The District Collector,
Virudhunagar District,
Virudhunagar.
3. The Tahsildar,
Sathur Taluk,
Virudhunagar District. .. Petitners/Applicants

-vs-

K.Muthammal .. Respondent/Respondent

Review Application filed under Order 47 Rules 1 and 2 read with Section 114 of Code of Civil Procedure to review the judgment dated 15.03.2018 made in W.A. (MD) No.442 of 2018.

Prayer in WA(MD) . 442/ 2018 :

Begs to prefer this Memorandum of Grounds of Writ Appeal against the order dated 01.11.2016 made in W.P. (MD). No.20869 of 2016

Prayer in WP(MD) . 20869/ 2016 :

Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court To issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents to sanction and pay the pension arrears of the petitioners deceased husband Late.Karuppan for the period from 01.05.2000 to 01.10.2010 and family pension arrears from 02.10.2010 to till date to the petitioner by taking into account the service rendered by her husband in the post of Village Assistant prior to his regularization dated 01.06.1995 for the purpose of pension computation with the time limit that may be fixed by this Honble Court.

For Appellants : Mrs.S.Srimathi,

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>

Special Government Pleader

For Respondent : Mr.A.Raghul

**ORDER**

(Order of the Court was made by T.S.Sivagnanam, J.)

WEB COPY This review application has been filed seeking to review the judgment in W.A.(MD) No.442 of 2018, dated 15.03.2018.

2.We have perused the grounds of review and we find that the grounds canvassed in this review application are, in fact, the grounds which were canvassed in the writ appeal. The Court heard the submissions on either side and dismissed the writ appeal.

3.The learned Special Government Pleader now disputes that the respondent/writ petitioner had not even completed 10 years of service. This contention is wholly unsustainable, since the Government Order regularizing services of the writ petitioner clearly shows that incumbent had worked for ten years. In any event, a review is not an appeal in disguise.

4.Thus, for the above reasons, we find that the applicants have not made out any grounds to review the judgment in the writ appeal.

5.Accordingly, the review application fails and the same is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (AD-I)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar

Abr
MK/20.02.2019/2P/1C

Rev.Applc.(MD) No.8 of 2019
and C.M.P.(MD) No.622 of 2019
04.01.2019