



W.A.(MD)No.72 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 21.01.2025

WEB COPY

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH

and

THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE A.D.MARIA CLETE

W.A.(MD)No.72 of 2025

and

C.M.P.(MD)No.385 of 2025

1.The District Educational Officer,
(Elementary Education),
Sivagangai, Sivagangai District.

2.The Block Educational Officer – 2,
Ilayangudi,
Sivagangai District.

: Appellants

Vs.

1.T.Estharmary

2.The Correspondent,
R.C. Primary School,
Kundukulam – 630 709,
Sivagangai District.

: Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of Letters Patent,
praying to set aside the order dated 10.09.2024 made in W.P.
(MD)No.20829 of 2024 and allow this Writ Appeal.



WEB COPY



W.A.(MD)No.72 of 2025

For Appellants : Mr.J.Ashok,
Additional Government Pleader
For Respondent : Ms.A.Amala

JUDGMENT

[Judgment of the Court was delivered by **M.S.RAMESH, J.**]

Challenge is made to the order of the learned Single Judge dated 10.09.2024 made in W.P.(MD)No.20829 of 2024.

2.Having granted approval of the appointment made by the respondent school, the proceedings of the appellants herein refusing to release the grant on the ground that the concerned teacher is not qualified in TET was challenged before the Writ Court. The learned Single Judge had placed reliance on the earlier decisions of this Court and held that qualification in TET is not mandatory for a minority institution and accordingly, directed the respondents to confer all the monetary benefits to the respondent school, through the order passed in W.P.(MD)No.20829 of 2024 dated 10.09.2024.

3.The Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as several decisions of the Co-ordinate Benches of this Court have been consistently taking a stand that possession of TET qualification for



W.A.(MD)No.72 of 2025

a teacher in a minority institution is not mandatory. The appellant herein, having granted approval of the appointment, are not justified in insisting for TET qualification for the concerned teacher and therefore, the consequential action of withholding the financial grant cannot be justifiable. The earlier decisions taken by this Court in this regard have been relied upon by the learned Single Judge while allowing the writ petition. We do not find any illegality or infirmity in the said order. As such there are no merits in this Writ Appeal.

4. Accordingly, this Writ Appeal stands dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

[M.S.R.,J.] & [A.D.M.C.,J.]

21.01.2025

Neutral Citation : Yes/No

Index : Yes/No

Internet : Yes/No

MR



WEB COPY



W.A.(MD)No.72 of 2025

To

1.The District Educational Officer,
(Elementary Education),
Sivagangai, Sivagangai District.

2.The Block Educational Officer – 2,
Ilayangudi,
Sivagangai District.



WEB COPY



W.A.(MD)No.72 of 2025

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

MR

JUDGMENT MADE IN
W.A.(MD)No.72 of 2025

21.01.2025