

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.VINOD CHANDRAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 11TH DAY OF MARCH 2015/20TH PHALGUNA, 1936

WP(C).No. 2230 of 2004 (M)

PETITIONER(S):

**K.P.VARGHESE, KOLENCHERY HOUSE,
NJARAKKAL P.O., ERNAKULAM.**

**BY ADVS.SRI.P.RAMAKRISHNAN
SRI.A.X.VARGHESE**

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. THE KERALA HEADLOAD WORKERS WELFARE
BOARD, VYPEEN COMMITTEE, NAYARAMBALAM
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN.**
- 2. THE CHAIRMAN, KERALA HEADLOAD WORKERS
WELFARE BOARD, VYPEEN COMMITTEE, NAYARAMBALAM.**
- 3. THE POOL LEADER, POOL NO.4,
KERALA HEADLOAD WORKERS WELFARE BOARD
VYPEEN COMMITTEE, NAYARAMBALAM.**

**R,R1 & R2 BY ADV. SRI.A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PANICKER, SC,KHLWWB
R,R1,2 & 3 BY ADV. SRI.BABU KARUKAPPADATH, SC,KHLWWB
R,R1 TO R3 BY ADV. SRI.RENIL ANTO KANDAMKULATHY,SC,KHLWWB
R,R1 & 2 BY ADV. SRI.KOSHY GEORGE, SC, KHLWWB
R1&2 BY ADV. SRI.AJITH PRAKASH, SC, KHLWWB**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD
ON 11-03-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

APPENDIX

PETITIONERS EXHIBITS:

- EXT.P1 COPY OF NOTICE DATED 24.2.03 ISSUED BY THE 2ND
RESPONDENT.
- EXT.P2 COPY OF THE REPLY DATED 28.2.03 SUBMITTED BY THE
PETITIONER BEFORE THE 2ND RESPONDENT.
- EXT.P3 COPY OF COMPLAINT FILED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE
2ND RESPONDENT.
- EXT.P4 COPY OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE 1ST
RESPONDENT HELD ON 16.07.03.
- EXT.P5 COPY OF ORDER DATED 7.11.03 ISSUED BY THE 2ND
RESPONDENT.

RESPONDENTS EXHIBITS: **NIL**

// TRUE COPY //

PA to Judge

SB

K. VINOD CHANDRAN, J.

=====

W.P.(C) No.2230 of 2004 - M

=====

Dated this the 11th day of March, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner admittedly is a registered employer under the Kerala Head Load Workers Act, 1978. The dispute arose between the petitioner and the employees of Pool No.4, represented by the 3rd respondent herein, when insistence was made on engaging the head load workers for every work connected with the establishment, even with respect to small articles, which the petitioner's employees could effectively carry out. The writ petition itself was filed in the year 2004. As of now, there is no dispute and there is no purpose in considering the writ petition.

The writ petition is closed, leaving open the contentions of the petitioner. No costs.

Sd/-

**K. VINOD CHANDRAN,
JUDGE**

SB

// true copy //

P.A to Judge