



C.M.P.(MD) No.10634 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 10.02.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE **DR.JUSTICE G.JAYACHANDRAN**

AND

THE HONOURABLE **MS.JUSTICE R.POORNIMA**

C.M.P.(MD)No.10634 of 2024

in

Rev.Aplc.(MD)No.SR46277 of 2024

Vijila

... Petitioner

-Vs-

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Principal Secretary to the Government,
Home Department, Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Commandant,
TSP IX Battalion,
Manimuthar, Tirunelveli District.
3. The Principal (Thalavai),
Tamil Nadu Special Police Force,
TSP IX Battalion,
Manimuthar, Tirunelveli District.
4. The Vice Principal (Asst. Thalavai),
Tamil Nadu Special Police Force,
TSP IX Battalion,
Manimuthar, Tirunelveli District.
5. The Director General of Police,
Santhome, Chennai -5.

... Respondents



C.M.P.(MD) No.10634 of 2024

PRAYER in C.M.P.(MD)No.10634 of 2024: Petition filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, to condone the delay of 847 days in filing the Review Petition.

PRAYER in Rev.Aplc.(MD)No.SR46277 of 2024: Petition filed under Section 114 of Civil Procedure Court r/w Order 47 Rule 1, to review the order passed in WA(MD)No.32 of 2021.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Thalaimuthurasu

For Respondents : Mr.N.Ramesh Arumugam

Government Advocate

ORDER

DR.G.JAYACHANDRAN, J.
AND
R.POORNIMA, J.

This civil miscellaneous petition is filed to condone the delay of 847 days in preferring the review petition as against the order passed by the Division Bench in WA(MD)No.32 of 2020.

2. The petitioner was removed from service in view of the continuous unauthorized absence. However, considering the fact, the learned Single Judge as well as the Division Bench has reinstated the petitioner into service with all backwages for the period of her absence. The present petition is filed to review



C.M.P.(MD) No.10634 of 2024

the said order. However, the review petition is not filed in time, but with a delay of 847 days.

3. The learned Government Advocate appearing for the State would submit that the reasons stated to condone the delay of 847 days is not supported by any valid reasons and the review petition is only to re-adjudicate the same cause that has already been heard and decided by the Division Bench.

4. This Court, on perusing the affidavit filed in support of the application to condone the delay, could not find any valid reasons. Maternity leave and the family dispute could not be a reason to condone the extraordinary delay of 847 days and hence, this Court finds no reason to entertain the condone delay petition. Hence, this civil miscellaneous petition stands dismissed. Consequently, connected review petition is also dismissed at SR stage itself. No costs.

[G.J., J.] & [R.P., J.]
10.02.2025

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Sm



WEB COPY



C.M.P.(MD) No.10634 of 2024

DR.G.JAYACHANDRAN, J.

AND

R.POORNIMA, J.

Sm

Order made in
C.M.P.(MD)No.10634 of 2024
in
Rev.Aplc.(MD)No.SR46277 of 2024

Dated:
10.02.2025