



Rev.Aplc(md)No.33 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.33 of 2026
and C.M.P.(MD)No.3726 of 2026**

1. The Director of Elementary Education,
College Road, Chennai-006.
2. The District Educational Officer,
O/o.The District Educational Office,
Paramakudi, Ramanathapuram District.
3. The Block Educational Officer-I,
O/o.The Block Educational Office,
Paramakudi-SB401,
Ramanathapuram District.

... Petitioners

Vs.

- 1.J.Shanthi Pushpakumari
- 2.The Correspondent,
TELC Primary School,
Venkittankurichi, Paramakudi,
Ramnathapuram 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 26.07.2023 made in W.A.(MD)No.1162 of 2023.



Rev.Aplc(md)No.33 of 2026

For Petitioners : Mr.R.Baskaran,
Addl. Advocate General assisted by
Mr.J.Ashok,
Addl. Govt. Pleader

For Respondents : Mr.M.Mohamed Zamil for R1
No Appearance for R2

ORDER

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

This Review Application is filed seeking to review the order dated 26.07.2023 made in W.A.(MD)No.1162 of 2023.

2. The brief factual background in which the review Application arises is that the first respondent herein was appointed as Secondary Grade Teacher on 29.04.1998 and at that time, she possessed B.A.History and B.Ed. Degree. After appointment, she subsequently, completed M.A. Degree in History in the year 2013 and when incentive has been claimed for the said degree, the same was rejected based on the undertaking. Since the higher qualification ie., B.A., and B.Ed., were taken in lieu of the original qualification of possessing Teacher Training Course, an undertaking was obtained from the petitioner. Considering the fact that the said issued was already covered by the judgment in W.A.



Rev.Aplc(md)No.33 of 2026

(MD)No.511 of 2011 and the Special Leave Petition preferred by the Government was also dismissed, the Writ Appeal was dismissed.

3. The learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the review petitioners would submit that the qualification itself amounted to over-qualification, and that it was not claimed at the time of appointment. It was claimed only after the incentive increment for the M.A. degree was rejected.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the first respondent would submit that after the Writ Appeal was dismissed, the petitioner had also filed Contempt Application and the order also stands complied with.

5. We have considered the rival submissions and perused the records.

6. The arguments made by the learned Additional Advocate General are nothing but the same arguments, which are made in the Writ Appeal and has been expressly considered and rejected in paragraph No.



Rev.Aplc(md)No.33 of 2026

2 of the Writ Appeal's order. Therefore, the review cannot be a disguise for an appeal, and the very same grounds cannot be urged in a review of litigation. Moreover, the order is also stated to have been complied with.

7. For all the above reasons, we find no merit in the Review Application and accordingly, the same is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

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

vsm
Index :Yes/No
NCC :Yes/No



WEB COPY



Rev.Aplc(md)No.33 of 2026

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

vsm

Rev.Aplc(md)No.33 of 2026

13.03.2026