

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE B.SUDHEENDRA KUMAR

FRIDAY, THE 9TH DAY OF OCTOBER 2015/17TH ASWINA, 1937

Crl.Rev.Pet.No. 1278 of 2015 ()

**AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN CRMP 579/2015 of ENQUIRY COMMR.&
SPL.JUDGE, THRISSUR DATED 24-04-2015**

REVISION PETITIONER(S)/PETITIONER:-:

**P.R.SURESH
S/O.RAMAN, PUTHUKULANGARA HOUSE, P.O.VELUR
THRISSUR DISTRICT, PIN - 680 601.**

BY ADV. SRI.DINESH MATHEW J.MURICKEN

RESPONDENT(S)/RESPONDENTS:-:

- 1. STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED THROUGH THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT OF KERALA, ERNAKULAM.**
- 2. SECRETARY
CORPORATION OF THRISSUR, THRISSUR, PIN - 680 001.**
- 3. RAJAN PALLAN
MAYOR, CORPORATION OF THRISSUR, THRISSUR
PIN - 680 001.**
- 4. M.P.PAUL
FORMER MAYOR, CORPORATION OF THRISSUR, THRISSUR
PIN - 680 001.**

R1 BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR R.GITHESH

**THIS CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON
09-10-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:**

avk

B.SUDHEENDRA KUMAR,J.

=====

Cr.R.P.No.1278 of 2015

=====

Dated this the 9th day of October, 2015

JUDGMENT

The revision petitioner is the petitioner in CrI.M.P.579/2015 on the files of the Court of the Enquiry Commisioner & Special Judge, Thrissur.

2. The revision petitioner filed a complaint before the court below alleging offences under sections 7 and 13 (1) (d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act,1988.

3. The petitioner alleged in the complaint that the street vendors were evicted by the Thrissur Corporation without identifying the persons who were entitled to be rehabilitated. They did not chalk out any concrete scheme for their eviction and rehabilitation. There was no proper allotment of the evicted property also. The said property was allotted to the persons without observing any norms. The complainant had raised allegations of illegal gratification, misconduct etc. against the second respondent herein, who is the Secretary of the

Corporation of Cochin. It is alleged that after evicting the street vendors, the sites had been given to some persons under the banner of Co-operative Societies, who are benamies of the respondent. The respondent had obtained pecuniary advantage in connection with the above.

4. The court below observed that there was only vague and general allegation against the respondent without making any particular allegation. No specific instance of corruption has been alleged in the complaint. In the said circumstances, the court below correctly found that there was no need to commence any enquiry on the basis of such vague and general allegations. For the said reason, the court below rejected the complaint. No circumstance has been brought to my notice by the learned counsel for the revision petitioner to indicate that the order impugned is not legal, proper or correct.

5. Having gone through the relevant inputs, I am satisfied that the order impugned does not suffer from any illegality, impropriety or incorrectness warranting

interference by this Court.

In the result, this revision petition stands dismissed.

**Sd/-
B.SUDHEENDRA KUMAR
JUDGE**

//TRUE COPY//

PA TO JUDGE

avk