

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR

THURSDAY, THE 28TH DAY OF MAY 2015/7TH JYAISHTA, 1937

CON.CASE(C) .NO. 436 OF 2015 (S) IN WP(C) .28722/2014

AGAINST THE ORDER/JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 28722/2014 OF HIGH COURT OF
KERALA DATED 31-10-2014

PETITIONER(S) :

MUJEEB RAHMAN C.P. AGED 42 YEARS
S/O. UNNI MOYI, CHEEDIPOTTA, P.O.CHERUVAYOOR
VAZHAKKAD VILLAGE, KONDOTTY TALUK
MALAPPURAM DISTRICT-673 645.

BY ADV. SRI.K.SHIBILI NAHA

NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE 2ND RESPONDENT(S) :

MR. RAVEENDRAN, SECRETARY, VAZHAKKAD GRAMA PANCHAYAT
VAZHAKKAD P.O.
MALAPPURAM DISTRICT-673 645. (AGE AND FATHER'S NAME
NOT KNOWN TO THE PETITIONER)

R1 BY ADV. SRI.SAJU J.VALLYARA

THIS CONTEMPT OF COURT CASE (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR
ADMISSION ON 28-05-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

CON.CASE(C) .NO. 436 OF 2015 (S) IN WP(C) .28722/2014

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S ANNEXURES:

ANNEXURE 1:TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN W.P.(C) .NO.28722/2014 DATED
31.10.2014

ANNEXURE-II:TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 24.12.2014 PASSED BY THE
RESPONDENT

RESPONDENTS' ANNEXURES: NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P A TO JUDGE

A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR, J.

.....

Con. Case (Civil) No.436 of 2015

in

W.P.(C).No.28722 of 2014

.....

Dated this the 28th day of May, 2015

J U D G M E N T

It is submitted by the learned counsel for the respondent that in compliance with the directions of this Court, Annexure-II order was passed, and therefore, the direction of this Court in the judgment dated 31.10.2014 has been complied with. Counsel for the petitioner would vehemently dispute the said submission and contend that Annexure-II order does not reflect a consideration of the relevant facts material to the decision that was directed to be taken by this Court. On a consideration of rival submissions and on a perusal of Annexure-II order of the respondent Panchayath, I find that the respondent Panchayath has passed Annexure -II order, after a verification as directed by this Court in the judgment dated 31.10.2014. If the petitioner is of the view that the order passed is erroneous in law, then it is for the petitioner to impugn the same through appropriate proceedings. With the passing of Annexure-II order, I am of the view that the respondent Panchayath has complied with the direction issued by this court inasmuch as the judgment only directed the Panchayath to consider the matter and to take a decision within a period of one month from the date of

receipt of a copy of the judgment. Taking note of Annexure-II order passed by the Panchayath, therefore, this Contempt of Court Case is closed.

A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR
JUDGE

mns