



W.P(MD)No.10457 of 2025

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 12.08.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

W.P(MD)No.10457 of 2025

and

WMP (MD) No.7808, 7809 and 7810 of 2025

R.Visalakshi

... Petitioner

VS.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by its Secretary to Government,
School Education Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.

2. The Chairman,
Teachers Recruitment Board,
4th Floor,
EVK Sampath Maligai,
DPI Compound,
College Road,
Chennai - 600 006.

3. The Secretary,
Teachers Recruitment Board,
4th Floor,
Evk Sampath Maligai,
Dpi Compound,
College Road,
Chennai - 600 006.



W.P(MD)No.10457 of 2025

WEB COPY

4. The Commissioner of School Education,
O/o. the Commissionerate of School Education,
College Road,
Nungambakkam, Chennai.

5. The Additional Secretary to
The Director of Government Examinations,
Chennai 600 006.

6. The Commissioner of Technical Education,
the Directorate of Technical Education,
Guindy,
Chennai - 600 025.

... Respondents

PRAYER : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records relating to the impugned revised provisional list issued by the 2nd respondent vide his impugned proceedings Nil dated 20.03.2025 (published in the official website of TRB on 25.03.2025) and quash the same as illegal in so far as non inclusion of the petitioner is concerned and consequentially direct the respondents to consider the Petitioner for appointment to the post of Sewing Teacher taking into consideration of the marks secured by the Petitioner within the period.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Divakaran

For R1 – R6 : Mr.T.Amjad Khan
Government Advocate



W.P(MD)No.10457 of 2025

WEB COPY

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned revised provisional list dated 20.03.2025, issued by the second respondent and for a consequential direction to the respondents to consider the petitioner for appointment to the post of Sewing Teacher, taking into account the marks secured by the petitioner.

2.Heard Mr.M.Divakaran, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.T.Amjad Khan, learned Additional Government Pleader, who accepts notice on behalf of the respondents 1 to 6.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner, namely, R.Visalakshi, belonging to BC Community had applied for the post of Special Teachers (Sewing) vide notification dated 26.07.2017. Thereafter, she appeared for the written examination held on 23.09.2017 and following the publication of results, she was called for certificate verification under BC (G) Category on 13.08.2018. The petitioner had also filed an earlier writ petition in



W.P(MD)No.10457 of 2025

WEB COPY W.P.(MD) No.3334 of 2021 and this Court, by order dated 22.02.2021, directed the third respondent herein to consider the petitioner's representation dated 10.02.2021 within a period of six weeks on merits and in accordance with law. In compliance with the said order, the present impugned proceeding was passed. Challenging the same, the present writ petition has been filed by the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner falls under BC(W)(T) category and had submitted all the requisite documents, including the PSTM Certificate before the authority on 09.08.2018. The grievance of the petitioner is that despite securing 63% of marks in the written examination, she was not selected, whereas, candidates who secured lesser marks were selected. Specifically, at page 35 of the typed set of papers, at Sl.No.166, one Ms.Stella Mary has been selected with 62% of marks. Therefore, the learned counsel contends that the entire selection process is arbitrary and unsustainable and accordingly, prayed before this Court to allow the writ petition.

5. Per contra, the learned Government Advocate appearing on behalf of the respondents would submit that admittedly the petitioner had applied for the



W.P(MD)No.10457 of 2025

WEB COPY

post of Special Teachers (Sewing) pursuant to the notification dated 26.07.2017 under the BC (G) Category and had secured 63% of marks in the written examination. However, comparing the selected candidate, namely, Ms.Stella Mary with the petitioner is misplaced, as the provisional list was prepared based on the seniority determined by the date of birth of the candidates. In the present case, the petitioner's date of birth is 06.05.1985, whereas Ms.Stella Mary's date of birth is 19.03.1967. All the candidates selected were seniors in terms of age compared to the petitioner. Therefore, the petitioner cannot claim parity with Ms.Stella Mary. Secondly, Ms.Stella Mary falls under the BC (T) General category, whereas, the petitioner falls under the BC(G)(T) category. Furthermore, the PSTM certificate said to have been submitted by the petitioner was received by the authority only on 09.08.2019 nearly one year after the prescribed deadline for submission of certificates. Accordingly, he sought for dismissal of this writ petition.

6. The learned Government Advocate also relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in W.A.Nos.404 of 2020 etc., batch, dated 16.03.2020, wherein, the Hon'ble Division Bench had elaborately discussed the issue pertaining to the delayed submission of the documents and held as



W.P(MD)No.10457 of 2025

WEB COPY under

*“41. Coming to the other candidate who has asserted that a certificate was obtained and produced on 16.08.2018 viz., S.Southri., as already stated above, the alleged certificate was not produced admittedly on the date of certificate verification. Secondly, the certificate is not dated prior to the last date of the submission of the application form. No such averment or fact has been asserted to verify the same. The third issue urged by learned counsel for the petitioner is that the certificate even tendered after the last date but before the interview has been accepted by the Apex Court in the case of **Ram Kumar Gijroya vs. Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board and Ors.**, reported in **(2016) 4 SCC 754.**”*

7. Having regard to the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side and on perusal of the records, it is evident that the petitioner had applied for the post of Special Teachers (Sewing) under the BC (G) Category pursuant to the notification dated 26.07.2017 and secured 63% marks in the written examination. However, the claim of the petitioner seeking parity with the



W.P(MD)No.10457 of 2025

WEB COPY

selected candidate, Ms.Stella Mary, is wholly misplaced. The provisional selection list was prepared based on seniority determined by the date of birth of the candidates. In this regard, the petitioner's date of birth is 06.05.1985, while Ms. Stella Mary's date of birth is 19.03.1967, making her senior to the petitioner. Furthermore, all selected candidates were seniors in age compared to the petitioner. Additionally, Ms. Stella Mary falls under the BC (T) General category, whereas the petitioner belongs to the BC (G) (T) category, rendering any direct comparison untenable. The crux of the petitioner's grievance revolves around the non-consideration of the PSTM certificate, which was admittedly submitted to the authorities only on 09.08.2019, nearly one year after the prescribed deadline for submission of certificates. In this context, the judgment of the Hon'ble Division Bench in W.A.Nos.404 of 2020 etc., batch, dated 16.03.2020, squarely applies to the case on hand. The Division Bench, after elaborate discussion on the issue of delayed submission of documents, held that certificates not produced on the date of certificate verification or prior to the last date for submission of the application form, cannot be accepted. Applying the ratio of the aforesaid judgment to the facts of the present case, the delayed submission of the PSTM certificate by the petitioner cannot be entertained. The petitioner has failed to demonstrate any



W.P(MD)No.10457 of 2025

WEB COPY

valid ground for relaxation of the deadline or any error in the selection process that warrants interference by this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

8. For the foregoing reasons, the writ petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

12.08.2025

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes
PKN



W.P(MD)No.10457 of 2025

WEB COPY

To

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by its Secretary to Government,
School Education Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Chairman,
Teachers Recruitment Board,
4th Floor,
EVK Sampath Maligai,
DPI Compound,
College Road, Chennai - 600 006.
3. The Secretary,
Teachers Recruitment Board,
4th Floor,
Evk Sampath Maligai,
Dpi Compound, College Road,
Chennai - 600 006.
4. The Commissioner of School Education,
O/o. the Commissionerate of School Education,
College Road,
Nungambakkam, Chennai.
5. The Additional Secretary to
The Director of Government Examinations,
Chennai 600 006.
6. The Commissioner of Technical Education,
the Directorate of Technical Education,
Guindy, Chennai - 600 025.

9/10



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.10457 of 2025

M.DHANDAPANI,J.

PKN

**ORDER MADE IN
W.P(MD)No.10457 of 2025**

DATED : 12.08.2025

10/10