



Rev.Aplc(md)No.31 of 2026

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: **13.03.2026**

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY

Rev.Aplc(MD)No.31 of 2026

1.The Chief Educational Officer,
Tirunelveli, Tirunelveli District.

2.The District Educaational Officer,
Cheranmahadevi,
Tirunelveli District.

... Petitioners

Vs.

1.I.Thavamani Panneerdoss

2.The Headmaster,
Since the School is under Direct Payment,
CMS Higher Secondary School,
Karisal, Tirunelveli District.

... Respondents

PRAYER:- Review Petition filed under Order 47 Rules 1 and 2 of C.P.C.
read with Section 114 of Civil Procedure Code praying to review the
order dated 11.09.2023 made in W.A.(MD)No.1340 of 2022.

For Petitioners	: Mr.R.Baskaran, Addl. Advocate General assisted by Mr.J.Ashok, Addl. Govt. Pleader
For Respondents	: Mr.T.Pon Ramkumar for R1 No Appearance for R2



Rev.Aplc(md)No.31 of 2026

ORDER

WEB COPY (Order of the Court was made by **D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.**)

The prayer in this Review Petition is seeking to review the order passed in W.A.(MD)No.1340 of 2022 dated 11.09.2023.

2. The brief factual background in which the review arises is that the first respondent/Writ Petitioner is a Secondary Grade Teacher. While so, she got incentive increment on the basis of the post graduate degree obtained by her.

3. The contention of the review petitioners is that the first respondent/Writ Petitioner did not obtain prior approval from the appropriate authority. The said ground did not find favour with the learned Single Judge, and the Writ Appeal filed by the review petitioner was also dismissed by the order under review.

4. The learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the review petitioners would submit that the first respondent/Writ Petitioner had to obtain prior approval vide G.O.M.s.No.944, Education (D2) Department, dated 29.07.1989. He would further submit that the learned



Rev.Aplc(md)No.31 of 2026

Single Judge proceeded on the ground that it is only an additional qualification. In any event, once such a requirement exists, the teacher should have complied with the same.

5. In reply, the learned counsel appearing for the first respondent/Writ Petitioner would submit that G.O.M.s.No.944, Education (D2) Department, dated 29.07.1989 was put to challenge before this Court in W.P.(MD)No.14085 of 2015 and by judgment dated 26.11.2020 already the said Government Order has been quashed. Aggrieved by the same, the review petitioners herein had also filed W.A. (MD)No.570 of 2021 which was also dismissed and the order of the learned Single Judge stood confirmed by the judgment of this Court dated 14.11.2025.

6. In view thereof, the reason stated in the review no longer exists, and finding no merit, the review stands dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

[N.S.K., J.] & [D.B.C., J.]
13.03.2026

vsm
Index :Yes/No
NCC :Yes/No



WEB COPY



Rev.Aplc(md)No.31 of 2026

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.
AND
D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

vsm

Rev.Aplc(md)No.31 of 2026

13.03.2026