

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU

FRIDAY, THE 27TH DAY OF NOVEMBER 2015/6TH AGRAHAYANA, 1937

Con.Case(C).No. 922 of 2015 (S) IN WP(C).137/2015

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 137/2015 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA,
DATED 04-02-2015

PETITIONER/PETITIONER IN WPC: -

E.K.ABDUL KHADER, AGED 56 YEARS,
S/O. E.A.KOCHUNNI,
ERUPPAKKOTTIL HOUSE,
PERINGALA.P.O., ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.

BY ADVS.SRI.SAJEEV KUMAR K.GOPAL
SRI.R.HARISHANKAR

RESPONDENT/2ND RESPONDENT IN WPC: -

K.K.SUBRAHMANIAN,
THE SECRETARY,
(AGE AND FATHER'S NAME NOT KNOWN TO THE PETITIONER),
KUNNATHUNADU GRAMA PANCHAYAT,
KUMARAPURAM.P.O., ERNAKULAM-683565.

BY ADV.SRI.S.M.PRASANTH

THIS CONTEMPT OF COURT CASE (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY
HEARD ON 27-11-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S ANNEXURES :

ANNEXURE 1 : TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN WP(C) No. 137 OF 2015 (N) DATED 04.02.2015 OF THIS HON'BLE COURT.

ANNEXURE 2 : COPY OF THE LETTER SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE RESPONDENT PRODUCING ANNEXURE 1 JUDGMENT.

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS :

EXHIBIT R1(a) : TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE ISSUED FROM THE KUNNATHUNADU PANCHAYATH DATED 08.09.2015.

EXHIBIT R1(b) : TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE ISSUED TO SRI. P.N. MOHANAN, GAMA INDUSTRIES DATED 21.03.2015.

// TRUE COPY //

P.A. TO JUDGE

DMR/-

DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, J.

Cont. Case (C) No. 922 of 2015

Dated this the 27th day of November, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioner initially approached this Court contending that the respondent Panchayat has been insisting on the petitioner to have a licence though it has allowed many other people to function without licence. Through judgment dated 04.02.2015, this Court directed the respondent Grama Panchayat to consider petitioner's Exhibit P9 representation, which the petitioner had submitted to the respondent earlier.

2. In the course of time, complaining that Annexure-1 judgment has not been complied with, the petitioner has filed the present Contempt Case.

3. Indeed, though it cannot be called an undertaking on the part of the respondent, in the counter affidavit, nevertheless, the respondent has stated that it has been taking all diligent steps to ensure that no person carries on business in the vicinity without any valid licence.

Trusting the efficacy of the respondent officials and hoping that they will enforce the law in letter and spirit, this Court closes the Contempt Case as having not survived for further consideration.

**DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU
JUDGE**

DMR/-