

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.RAVINDRAN

THURSDAY, THE 15TH DAY OF OCTOBER 2015/23RD ASWINA, 1937

RP.No. 271 of 2010 () IN WP(C).27910/2008

AGAINST THE ORDER/JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 27910/2008 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA
DATED 03-12-2009
REVIEW PETITIONER(S)/RESPONDENTS 1 TO 4:

1. K.S.E.BOARD
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, VYDYUTHI BHAVAN, PATTOM
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
2. THE CHIEF ENGINEER(HRM), KERALA STATE
ELECTRICITY BOARD, VYDYUTHI BHAVAN, PATTOM
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
3. FINANCIAL ADVISOR AND CHIEF ACCOUNTS
OFFICER, KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD, VYDYUTHI
BHAVAN, PATTOM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
4. EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, KERALA STATE
ELECTRICITY BOARD, ELECTRICAL SECTION, VADAKARA.

SRI.PULIKOOL ABUBACKER, SC, KSEB

RESPONDENT(S)/PETITIONER:

P.K.CHATHU
ELECTRICAL SECTION, VADAKARA, RESIDING AT PATTIYATTU
POIL, MEMUNDA.P.O, VADAKARA
KOZHIKODE.

R BY SRI.P.M.PAREETH

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 15-10-
2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

P.N. Ravindran, J.

R.P.No.271 of 2010

in

W.P.(C) No.27910 of 2008

Dated this the 15th October, 2015

ORDER

The prayer in this review petition is to review and recall the judgment delivered by me on 3.12.2010 in W.P.(C)No.27910 of 2008. The review petitioners are the respondents in the writ petition and the sole respondent in the review petition is the petitioner therein.

2. The issue that arose before me in the writ petition was whether paragraph 11 of Ext.P2 order issued by the Kerala State Electricity Board protects only the pension component or whether it protects the dearness relief on pension. Interpreting paragraph 11 of Ext.P2, I held that paragraph 11 of Ext.P2 protects the pension that the writ petitioner was drawing prior to Ext.P2 and the dearness relief component as well. A review is sought on the ground that the dearness relief component which the petitioner has claimed, was in excess of his eligibility. That was not an issue which arose before me or which was decided by me. The only question which I have decided is whether paragraph 11 of

Ext.P2 protects only the pension component or the dearness relief component as well. If, as contended by the review petitioners, the writ petitioner has made an erroneous claim regarding the amount payable by way of dearness relief, that is a matter in respect of which the Board can take appropriate action having regard to the rate of dearness relief payable to the writ petitioner.

With the above observation, the review petition is dismissed.

(P.N. Ravindran, Judge.)

kav/