



REV.APLC(MD)No.5 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 23.01.2025

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH
AND
THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE A.D.MARIA CLETE**

REV.APLC(MD)No.5 of 2025
in
W.A.(MD).No.2398 of 2024
and
C.M.P.(MD).No.473 of 2025

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
St.George Fort,
Chennai.
- 2.The Director,
Department of School Education,
DPI Compound,
Chennai.
- 3.The Chief Educational Officer,
Tirunelveli District,
Tirunelveli.
- 4.The District Educational Officer,
Tirunelveli District,
Tirunelveli.
- 5.The Block Educational Officer,
Palayamkottai Nagar,
Tirunelveli District.

... Petitioner

Vs.



REV.APLC(MD)No.5 of 2025

1.J.Joseph Dharmaraj

2.The Correspondent,
Hameem Middle School,
Melapalayam,
Tirunelveli.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Review Application filed under Order 47 rule 1 and 2 read with Section 114 of Civil Procedure Code, praying to review the order dated 21.11.2024 made in W.A.(MD).No.2398 of 2024.

For Petitioners : Mr.R.Baskaran
Additional Advocate General
assisted by Mr.J.Ashok
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by M.S.RAMESH,J.)

On the sole ground that the service of the first respondent herein was regularized only with effect from 01.06.2006 and not from 20.01.2003, as recorded in the order passed in the Writ Appeal, the present Review Application has been filed.

2. However, we find from the records that the appointment of the first respondent herein was approved with effect from 20.01.2003 by the District



REV.APLC(MD)No.5 of 2025

Elementary Educational Officer, Tirunelveli through his proceedings dated 25.10.2004. The document, which the review petitioners rely upon, is the proceedings of the Assistant Elementary Educational Officer, Palayamkottai dated 11.10.2006, which only places the first respondent in a time scale of pay with effect from 01.06.2006, which date cannot be treated as a date of approval of appointment. As such, there is no error apparent on the face of record and hence, there are no other reasons to interfere with the order passed in the Writ Appeal.

3. Accordingly, the Review Application stands dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition stands closed.

(M.S.R.,J.) (A.D.M.C.,J.)
23.01.2025

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
Lm



WEB COPY



REV.APLC(MD)No.5 of 2025

M.S.RAMESH,J.
and
A.D.MARIA CLETE,J.

Lm

REV.APLC(MD)No.5 of 2025
in
W.A.(MD).No.2398 of 2024

23.01.2025