

W.P.(MD).No.11044 of 2019

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 30.07.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

W.P.(MD).No.11044 of 2019
and
W.M.P.(MD).No.8407 of 2019

J.Gnanam

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.The District Educational Officer,
Tuticorin.

2.The Block Educational Officer,
Karunkulam, Tuticorin District.

3.The Correspondent,
T.N.D.T.A. Middle School,
Alwarkarkulam, Tuticorin District.


.. Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a *writ of Certiorarified Mandamus* calling for the records pertaining to the orders passed by the 1st respondent in his proceedings in Na.Ka.No. 402/A2/2019 dated 01.02.2019 and the consequential order passed by the 2nd respondent in his proceedings in O.Mu.No.365/A2/2018 dated 22.02.2019 and quash the same and direct the respondents to approve the appointment of the petitioner as a Pre-Vocational Instructor (Tailoring) from the date of appointment i.e. 20.03.2013 with all the consequential benefits.

For Petitioner : M/s.V.Paneerselvam

For Respondents : Mr.N.Satheesh Kumar

Additional Government Pleader



W.P.(MD).No.11044 of 2019

WEB COPY

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed to quash the impugned proceedings passed by the 1st respondent in Na.Ka.No.402/A2/2019 dated 01.02.2019 wherein the 1st respondent has returned the application submitted by the 3rd respondent for approving the appointment of the petitioner.

2. According to the petitioner, she was appointed as early as 2013, and the proposal for approval was also forwarded immediately. However, it was returned on 25.10.2013 with certain queries. The queries were promptly addressed, and a reply was forwarded to the concerned authorities. Again, the proposal was returned with further queries, which, according to the petitioner, were merely delay tactics to avoid granting approval.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner further submitted that several correspondences took place between the school and the third respondent in connection with seeking approval. On 23.03.2013, additional information was sought by the first respondent, and accordingly, on 24.08.2013, all relevant details and necessary documents were submitted. Instead of passing a final order, the first respondent once again returned the



W.P.(MD).No.11044 of 2019

approval petition, seeking further documents on 04.02.2019, which, according to the petitioner, were unnecessary and intended solely to delay the approval process.

4. The learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents submitted that no final order has been passed by the concerned authority, and that only additional information was sought for the school and on submission of the additional information final orders will be passed.

5. I have considered the submissions and perused the material documents available on records.

6. On perusal of the typed set of papers, it is evident that continuous communications took place between the school and the first respondent from the date of the petitioner's appointment in the year 2013 till the year 2019.

7. The letter dated 23.03.2018 shows that the first respondent sought additional information which appears to be relevant for consideration of the approval. A reply was submitted by the school through its letter dated



W.P.(MD).No.11044 of 2019

24.08.2018, which also referred to the earlier correspondence exchanged between the parties.

8. Despite this, the first respondent once again raised certain queries, including requests for the Building Stability Certificate, Sanitary Certificate, School Recognition Certificate, and other information.

9. In my view, the approach of the first respondent is not proper. He ought to have passed final orders either accepting or rejecting the approval. However, the impugned proceedings dated 22.02.2019 shows that the first respondent is merely attempting to further delay the process. The petitioner has already completed 12 years of service. Any further delay in consideration is unwarranted and improper on the part of the first respondent. However, final decision to be taken by the first respondent herein.

10. Taking all these facts into consideration, I am of the view that the first respondent has not taken a conscious decision on merits and in accordance with law. Therefore, the impugned proceedings passed by the first respondent in Na.Ka.No.402/A2/2019, dated 01.02.2019, are hereby set aside. The first respondent is directed to consider the petitioner's case and pass



W.P.(MD).No.11044 of 2019

appropriate orders on merits and in accordance with law, based on the available

WEB COPY

records, without seeking any further documents or unnecessary clarifications,

within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

11. With these observations and directions, this Writ Petition is **Allowed**. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition stands closed.


30.07.2025

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

KSA

To

1. The District Educational Officer,
Tuticorin.
2. The Block Educational Officer,
Karunkulam,
Tuticorin District.
3. The Correspondent,
T.N.D.T.A. Middle School,
Alwarkarkulam,
Tuticorin District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD).No.11044 of 2019

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

KSA

Order made in
W.P.(MD).No.11044 of 2019

30.07.2025