



WEB COPY



Rev.Appl.No.113 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 04.09.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R. SURESH KUMAR

AND

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE K. GOVINDARAJAN THILAKAVADI, J.

Rev.Appl.No.113 of 2025 against W.A.No.72 of 2019

A.Munusamy

.. Applicant

Vs.

1. Secretary to Government for Women and Child
Welfare Department, Puducherry.

2. Chairperson
Puducherry Women's Commission
Puducherry.

3. E.Vengadesan

4. S.Velumurugan

5. D.Soupramanian

6. C.Ramamurthy

7. P.Vengadabady

8. P.Sattivelane

9. K.Rajeswary

10. H.Arulmozhi

.. Respondents

Prayer: Review Application filed under Order XLVII Rule 1 and 2 r/w
Section 114 of the Civil Procedure Code, to review the order dated
16.06.2023 passed in W.A.No.72 of 2019.

For the Applicant : Mr.P.G.Thiyagu
for Ms.S.Meenakshi

For the Respondents : Mr.R.Sreedhar
Addl. Government Pleader (P)
for R1 and R2



Rev.Appl.No.113 of 2025

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by R.SURESH KUMAR, J.)


WEB COPY

This review application has been filed seeking to review the order passed by the Division Bench in W.A.No.72 of 2019 by the order dated 16.06.2023.

2. In fact, it was a common order passed in a number of writ appeals, that is W.A.Nos.69 to 72 and 74 of 2019. Those appeals were filed against a common order passed by the Writ Court in a batch of writ petitions.

3. The writ petitioners approached the Writ Court seeking the benefit of regularization from the second respondent Commission, where, they claim to have been worked on consolidated pay. Those writ petitions were allowed, against which, the Government of Union Territory of Puducherry has filed the said writ appeals.

4. While deciding the batch of writ appeals through the impugned order, the Division Bench has considered the factual matrix, as well as the legal position. The claim that has been made by the employees, who claim to have been worked under the second respondent Commission on daily rate wage basis, had been denied, as, at least from March, 2011, according to the affidavit



Rev.Appl.No.113 of 2025

filed before the Court, they had been disengaged.

WEB COPY

5. Based on this factual matrix and also considering the legal position by citing various decisions of the Hon'ble Apex Court, the Division Bench has come to the conclusion that the employees were not entitled to seek any regularization and therefore, the order passed by the Writ Court, having been set aside, the writ appeals were allowed through the order dated 16.06.2023.

6. As against the said order passed by the Division Bench, though this review application has been filed seeking to review the order, *Mr.P.G.Thiyagu*, learned counsel appearing for the review applicant would submit that, leave alone the plea made by them for getting regularization, at least from the year 2011, that is March, 2011, till date, the review applicant and the similarly placed persons could be considered for paying the salary.

7. In this context, it is claimed by the learned counsel appearing for the review applicant that, as per the file noting recorded by the second respondent Commission, which has been received by way of RTI information, still, they have been continuously working without any salary from March, 2011.



Rev.Appl.No.113 of 2025

8. We are afraid to note these kinds of pleas, that too in a review application. The reason being that, once the plea raised by them seeking regularization since has been turned down by the orders of the Division Bench, which is sought to be reviewed herein, the stand of the review applicant, as projected by the learned counsel, that, insofar as the plea raised by them for regularization is concerned, they are not pressing it and they, in fact, cannot press for it, how could they make a claim to get salary from March, 2011, when the Division Bench has already taken note of the stand taken by the second respondent Commission that these daily rate wage employees have been disengaged from the year 2011 onwards.

9. In the review jurisdiction, unless apparent error is found while passing the order sought to be reviewed, the Court would not entertain such application. Here, in the case in hand, no such apparent error could be found out from the orders passed by the Division Bench, which is sought to be reviewed. Therefore, this review application, in fact, is liable to be rejected.

10. If at all the review applicant is having confidence that he could establish his case by letting evidences to state that, from the year 2011, continuously, he has been working in the second



Rev.Appl.No.113 of 2025


respondent Commission without getting salary, which is a new factor that has been surprisingly brought before this Court without any evidence and even if any evidence is produced before this Court, at this stage, it cannot be gone into. Therefore, if at all the review applicant wants to establish his case by letting evidences, he could agitate the issue in the manner known to law by approaching the proper Forum, but, the present review application, at no stretch of imagination, could be entertained for the said reasons projected by the learned counsel appearing for the review applicant.

11. Hence, the present review application is liable to be rejected, accordingly, the review application is dismissed. However, there is no order as to costs. Consequently, C.M.P.No.13601 of 2025 is closed.

(R.S.K., J.) (K.G.T., J)
04.09.2025

Speaking Order/Non-Speaking Order
Index:Yes/No
Internet:Yes/No
Neutral Citation:Yes/No

drm



Rev.Appl.No.113 of 2025

To:

WEB COPY

1. Secretary to Government for Women and Child
Welfare Department, Puducherry.
2. Chairperson
Puducherry Women's Commission
Puducherry.



WEB COPY



Rev.Appl.No.113 of 2025

R. SURESH KUMAR, J.
AND
K. GOVINDARAJAN THILAKAVADI, J.

(drm)

Rev.Appl.No.113 of 2025

04.09.2025