



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 01-06-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE S. M. SUBRAMANIAM

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

WP No. 9997 of 2026

M.Rekha
Junior Bailiff,
Currently working at
Principal District court Ariyalur,
D/o. S.Manickam,
1/144 Mudaliyar Street, Retti palayam,
Muthuservamadam post,
Udaiyar Palayam Taluk,
Ariyalur district 612 903

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Registrar General
High Court Madras,
Chennai-104
2. Principal district Judge
Principal district Court,
Ariyalur 621 704

..Respondent(s)

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India issuing writ of certiorarified mandamus calling for the records relating to the Official Memorandum dated 21.11.2025 on the file of 2nd respondent and quash the same as unconstitutional, ex-facie, illegal arbitrary and violative of the Tamil Nadu Judicial Ministerial Service Rules and further direct the respondents to reconsider the petitioners review application dated 02.09.2025 in regard for proper fixation of seniority and promotional consideration in accordance with the Tamil Nadu Judicial Ministerial Service rules, The Tamil Nadu Government Gazette dated 20.01.2016.



For Petitioner(s):

Ms.R.Sripriya

For Respondent(s):

Mr.Haja Mohideen Gisthi
for R1 & R2

WEB COPY


ORDER**(Order of the Court was made by S.M.Subramaniam J.)**

Writ on hand has been instituted to set aside the Official Memorandum dated 21.11.2025 on the file of 2nd respondent, and direct the respondents to reconsider the petitioner's review application dated 02.09.2025 in regard for proper fixation of seniority and promotional consideration in accordance with the Tamil Nadu Judicial Ministerial Service rule and the Tamil Nadu Government Gazette dated 20.01.2016.

2. Appellate authority decided the appeal filed by the petitioner by passing a speaking order in proceeding dated 30.05.2022. However, subsequent review order alone is under challenge in the present writ proceedings. Thus the writ petition is not entertainable.

3. However, the learned counsel for the petitioner seeks liberty to challenge the original order passed in the appeal.

4. Learned counsel for the 2nd respondent would submit that the said order was passed in the year 2022, and there is an enormous delay and in order to circumvent the period of limitation, the present writ petition has been filed challenging the review order.



5. May that as it be, if any remedy is available to the petitioner under the law, she is at liberty to exhaust the same.

WEB COPY

6. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions, if any, are closed.

(S.M.S.,J.) (N.S.,J.)
01-06-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

GD

To

1. The Registrar General
High Court Madras,
Chennai-104
2. Principal district Judge
Principal district Court,
Ariyalur 621 704



WEB COPY



**S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.
AND
N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.**

GD

WP No. 9997 of 2026

01-06-2026