



W.A(MD) No.5 of 2020

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Date : 18.02.2026

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.R.SWAMINATHAN  
AND  
THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE R.KALAIMATHI**

W.A(MD) No.5 of 2020

P.Jeyalakshmi

... Appellant / Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Director of School Education,  
DPI Compound, College Road,  
Nungampakkam,  
Chennai-6.

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

3.The District Educational Officer,  
Tenkasi Educational District,  
Tenkasi, Tirunelveli.

4.The Correspondent,  
Suyambu Lingam Higher Secondary School,  
T.N.Puthukudi, Puliyankudi,  
Tirunelveli District.

... Respondents / Respondents



**W.A(MD) No.5 of 2020**

**PRAYER:** Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent to set aside the order passed in W.P.(MD)No.19687 of 2013 dated 13.08.2019.

For Appellant : Mr.S.Chellapandian

For Respondents : Mr.T.Amjad Khan  
Government Advocate  
for R1 to R3

### **JUDGMENT**

(Judgment of the Court was made by **G.R.SWAMINATHAN, J.**)

Heard both sides.

2. The unsuccessful writ petitioner is the appellant before us. She was appointed as secondary grade teacher on 01.12.2011 in the fourth respondent school. Her appointment was approved on 13.12.2012. Subsequently, it was cancelled vide order dated 20.11.2013 by the District Educational Officer, Tenkasi pursuant to the order dated 07.11.2013 issued by the Director of School Education. Challenging these orders, the appellant filed W.P.(MD)No.19687 of 2013. The



**W.A(MD) No.5 of 2020**

ground for cancelling the petitioner's appointment was that she did not possess TET qualification. The learned single Judge took the view that the authorities were right in their approach and declined to grant relief to the petitioner. The writ petition was accordingly dismissed vide order dated 13.08.2019. Challenging the same, this writ appeal has been filed.

3. We need to take note of the intervening development. The issue regarding TET qualification was considered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No.1385 of 2025. Vide Judgment dated 01.09.2025, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had held as follows:-

“217. Insofar as in-service teachers recruited prior to enactment of the RTE Act and having more than 5 years to retire on superannuation are concerned, they shall be under an obligation to qualify the TET within 2 years from date in order to continue in service. If any of such teachers fail to qualify the TET within the time that we have allowed, they shall have to quit service. They may be compulsorily retired; and paid whatever terminal benefits they are entitled to. We add a rider that to qualify for the terminal benefits, such teachers must have put in the qualifying period of service, in accordance with the rules. If any teacher has not put in the qualifying service and there is some deficiency, his/her case may be considered by the appropriate department in the Government upon a representation being made by him/her.”



W.A(MD) No.5 of 2020

WEB COPY

4. Thus, the petitioner has two years window period. If she acquires TET qualification during this window period, her appointment will be deemed to have been approved and she will get all the consequential benefits. If she fails to get TET qualification during this window period, the order of the learned single Judge will hold good. The Writ Appeal is disposed of accordingly. No costs.

(G.R.S., J.) (R.K.M., J.)  
18.02.2026

Index : Yes / No  
Internet : Yes / No  
NCC : Yes / No  
rmi

To

1.The Director of School Education,  
DPI Compound, College Road,  
Nungampakkam,  
Chennai-6.

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



W.A(MD) No.5 of 2020

3.The District Educational Officer,  
Tenkasi Educational District,  
Tenkasi, Tirunelveli.



WEB COPY



W.A(MD) No.5 of 2020

**G.R.SWAMINATHAN, J.**  
**AND**  
**R.KALAIMATHI, J.**

rmi

W.A(MD) No.5 of 2020

18.02.2026