

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE T.R.RAMACHANDRAN NAIR

TUESDAY, THE 11TH DAY OF AUGUST 2015/20TH SRAVANA, 1937

RP.No. 76 of 2013 (A) IN WP(C).25607/2012

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 25607/2012 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA
DATED 26-11-2012

REVIEW PETITIONER/RESPONDENTS 2 & 3:

1. M/S. KERALA FINANCIAL CORPORATION
REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR, VELLAYAMBALAM
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN-695 001.

2. THE CHIEF MANAGER
KERALA FINANCIAL CORPORATION, VELLAYAMBALAM
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN-695 001.

BY ADV. SRI.MILLU DANDAPANI

RESPONDENTS/PETITIONERS 1 & 2 AND RESPONDENTS 1, 4 AND 5 :

1. M/S. PALANATTIL CONSTRUCTION COMPANY
ENGINEERS AND CONTRACTORS, REVIEW BUILDING
KURUSADI JN., NALANCHIRA, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR, P.P.PAULOSE.

2. P.P.PAULOSE, AGED 62 YEARS
S/O.UTHUP PAILEY, MANAGING DIRECTOR
M/S.PALANATTIL CONSTRUCTION COMPANY
ENGINEERS AND CONTRACTORS, REVIEW BUILDING
KURUSADI JN., NALANCHIRA, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

3. STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY ITS FINANCE SECRETARY
GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
PIN-695001.

4. THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT, SOUTH CIRCLE
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN-695001.

5. THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT, ALAPPUZHA DIVISION-688 001.

R1 BY ADV. SRI.M.RAMASWAMY PILLAI

R1 BY ADV. SMT.PREETHY R. NAIR

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.A.MOHAMMED SAVED

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
11-08-2015 ALONG WITH COC NO.151/2013, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY
PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

T.R.RAMACHANDRAN NAIR,J.

**R.P.No.76 of 2013 &
Cont. Case (Civil) No.151 OF 2013**

Dated this the 11th day of August, 2015

ORDER

The review petition is filed by the respondents 2 and 3 in the writ petition and the petitioner has come up with the contempt case alleging disobedience of the orders passed by this court. By the judgment under review this Court after recording the submission directed the second respondent to take steps to return the original of the power of attorney (Ext.P7) within a period of two weeks.

2. In the review petition, it is pointed out that two more loans are remaining to be closed and therefore the writ petitioners cannot get release of the power of attorney and that the above facts could not be brought to the notice of this Court.

3. Heard both sides.

The learned counsel for the writ petitioners submits that let the review petitioners have not informed the petitioners about the

liabilities, if any. It is submitted that the stand taken by the review petitioners is not correct. Of course, the contention raised is that the liabilities are not which are to be satisfied by the first respondent in the review petition. Evidently, this Court has not considered anything with regard to the further liability if any of the petitioners. The learned counsel for the review petitioners explained the reasons for withholding the power of attorney. Therefore, it is upto the review petitioners to inform the petitioners of any amount remaining unpaid in any loan transaction and thereafter it is upto to the parties to work out their remedies in the matter. Accordingly, the review petition is disposed of and the contempt case is closed.

T.R.RAMACHANDRAN NAIR
JUDGE

SV.