



WEB COPY

W.A.No.3131 of 2021 and W.A.No.196 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 13.10.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE R.SAKTHIVEL

W.A.No.3131 of 2021 and W.A.No.196 of 2022
and CMP.Nos.2908 and 1446 of 2022

W.A.No.3131 of 2021

1. Josphine Jeyashanthi
D/o. Irudaya Tasen, No. 42/54, 26
Kennedy Street, G.K.M. Colony,
Chennai, Presently Old No. 5, New
No.10, Vijay Nagar, 1st Main Road,
Velachery, Chennai 42.

... Appellant

Vs.

1. Government Of Tamil Nadu
Rep By Its Chief Secretary, Chennai.

2.The Loyola College
Rep. By Its Secretary And
Correspondent, Rev. Dr. M. Albert
William, S.J, Chennai 34

... Respondents



W.A.No.3131 of 2021 and W.A.No.196 of 2022

W.A.No.196 of 2022

WEB COPY

1. The Loyola College
Rep by its Secretary and
Correspondent, Chennai 34.

... Appellant

Vs.

1. Josephine Jeyashanthi
D/O.Irudayadawson, NO.42/54, 26th
Kennady St, G.K.R.Colony, Chennai.

2.Government Of Tamil Nadu
Rep by its Chief Secretary, Chennai.

... Respondents

PRAYER in W.A.No.3131 of 2021: Appeal is filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent, praying to set aside the order dated 22.12.2020 in W.P.No.7631 of 2014.

PRAYER in W.A.No.196 of 2022: Appeal is filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent, praying to set aside the order dated 22.12.2020 in W.P.No.7631 of 2014.

In W.A.No.3131 of 2021

For Appellant

: Mr.S.Lokesh for
M/s.MIRD Law Firm

For Respondents

: Mr.A.Selvendran
Special Government Pleader for R1
Mr.P.Godson Swaminathan
for M/s.Issac Chambers for R2



W.A.No.3131 of 2021 and W.A.No.196 of 2022

In W.A.No.196 of 2022

For Appellant : Mr.P.Godson Swaminathan
for M/s.Issac Chambers

For Respondents : Mr.Mr.S.Lokesh for
M/s.MIRD Law Firm for R1
Mr.A.Selvendran
Special Government Pleader for R2

COMMON JUDGMENT

(Judgment of this Court was delivered by M.S.RAMESH.J)

These Writ Appeals have been filed to set aside the order dated 22.12.2020 in W.P.No.7631 of 2014.

2. For the sake of convenience, the appellant in W.A.No.3131 of 2021 is referred as the 'Lecturer' and the second respondent as the 'Management College'.

3. On 14.06.2006, the Management College had appointed the Lecturer. Among the terms of the appointment order, Clause 7 reads as follows:

“7.The College Management Committee shall have the right to discharge the said lecturer without assigning



W.A.No.3131 of 2021 and W.A.No.196 of 2022

WEB COPY

any reason after a month's notice or a month's salary in lieu thereof."

4. Her appointment was confirmed on 01.08.2009, and thereafter, she was terminated from service on 28.02.2014 by the Management College, stating that her service was no longer required. The termination was made in accordance with the terms of her employment.

5. When the Lecturer had challenged the termination order in W.A.No.7631 of 2014, the Writ Petition was partly allowed by directing the Management College to pay compensation of Rs.6 Lakhs in lieu of reinstatement of the Lecturer. While passing such order, the Writ Court had taken note of the statement made by the counsel for the Lecturer, seeking for compensation in lieu of reinstatement. The said portion of the order reads as follows:

"10.Be that as it may. It is fairly conceded by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the relationship between the employer and the employee in this case has become strained and further the fact that the petitioner has since attained the age of superannuation, therefore, no useful purpose would be served in ordering



WEB COPY



W.A.No.3131 of 2021 and W.A.No.196 of 2022

reinstatement, as it would be an exercise in futility. In that backdrop, the sexual harassment meted out to the petitioner at the workplace deserves to be compensated in lieu of reinstatement.”

6. This order of compensation is put under challenge in these appeals.

7. We fail to understand as to how, when the Lecturer herself had admitted before the Writ Court that she would be satisfied if she was compensated in lieu of reinstatement with a sum of Rs.6 Lakhs, she would now be entitled to challenge the whole order. In other words, the order of the Writ Court appears to be a consented order, and if at all the Lecturer was aggrieved, she ought to have challenged only the quantum of compensation.

8. This apart, the Writ Court had taken note of the fact that the relationship between the Management and the Lecturer was strained and that she had also reached the age of superannuation. In our view, the sum of Rs.6 Lakhs awarded appears to be reasonable. Thereby, no interference is required to the order passed in the Writ Petition.



W.A.No.3131 of 2021 and W.A.No.196 of 2022

M.S.RAMESH, J.

and
R.SAKTHIVEL, J.

Anu

9. Accordingly, both the Writ Appeals stand dismissed. We hereby clarify that the present order in these appeals is being passed in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, and the same shall not act as a precedent to any other employee of the Management College. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

[M.S.R., J] [R.S.V.,J]

13.10.2025

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

To

The Government Of Tamil Nadu
Rep By Its Chief Secretary, Chennai.

W.A.No.3131 of 2021 and W.A.No.196 of 2022
and CMP.Nos.2908 and 1446 of 2022