

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.K.ABDUL REHIM

WEDNESDAY, THE 1ST DAY OF APRIL 2015/11TH CHAITHRA, 1937

RPNo. 326 of 2009 (C)

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN OP No.20817/2002 DATED 19-10-2004

REVIEW PETITIONER/PETITIONRS 1 AND 4:

- 1. PANNIYANKARA SERVICE CO-OP.BANK LTD.NO.2964-
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, P.O.KALLAI,
KOZHIKODE.**
- 2. CALICUT NORTH SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE BANK
LTD. NO.LL 37, REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
P.O.KARUVASSERY, KOZHIKODE.**

BY ADV. SRI.M.SASINDRAN

RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS/PETITIONERS 2 AND 3:

- 1. JT.REGISTRAR (GENERAL),CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES,
KOZHIKODE.**
- 2. THE REGISTRAR, CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**
- 3. STATE OF KERALA- REPRESENTED BY ITS
SECRETARY, CO-OPERATIVE DEPARTMENT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**
- 4. JACOB K.BABU, CHIEF PROMOTER,
CALICUT CITY SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE BANK, KOZHIKODE.**
- 5. CALICUT CITY SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE (ADDL)
BANK LTD. NO.D 2777 REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
P.O.PUTHIYARA, KOZHIKODE.**

RP.No. 326 of 2009 (C)

**6. CALICUT TOWN SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE BANK
LTD. NO.D 2665- REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
JAWAHAR BUILDING, K.P.K.MENON ROAD, CALICUT-1.**

**7. VENGERI SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE BANK LTD.,
NO.2714, REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, P.O.VENGERI
KOZHIKODE-10.**

**R1 TO R3 BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.SOJAN JAMES
R5 BY SRI.P.P.JACOB**

**THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 01-04-2015, THE COURT ON THE
SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:**

MJL

C.K. ABDUL REHIM, J.

R.P.No.326 of 2009

IN

O.P.No.20817 of 2002

Dated this the 1st day of April, 2015

ORDER

This review petition was filed as early as in the year 2009. Despite notice ordered by this court against the 4th respondent, as early as on 06/10/2009, service against the said respondent remains not complete. Notice sent from this court to the 4th respondent was returned with an endorsement as 'no such addressee'. When the matter was posted before this court on 06/03/2015, learned counsel for the petitioners sought for a week's time to cure the defect. But, endorsement of the Registry would indicate that no steps were taken for curing the defect and to complete service on the 4th respondent.

Under the above mentioned circumstances the review petition is hereby dismissed for non prosecution.

**Sd/-C.K. ABDUL REHIM
JUDGE**