

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.M.SHAFIQUE
&
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.HARILAL

TUESDAY, THE 7TH DAY OF APRIL 2015/17TH CHAITHRA, 1937

RP.No. 310 of 2013

AS 739/1995, DATED 14/09/2012

REVIEW PETITIONER(S)/APPELLANTS:

1. K.RUDRANI, AGED 67 YEARS,
KANNANKARA P.O, CHELANNUR VIA, KOZHIKODE.
2. VILASINI, AGED 66 YEARS,
KANNANKARA P.O, CHELANNUR VIA, KOZHIKODE.
3. NALINI, AGED 60 YEARS,
KANNANKARA P.O, CHELANNUR VIA, KOZHIKODE.
4. PUSHPA, AGED 54 YEARS,
KANNANKARA P.O, CHELANNUR VIA, KOZHIKODE.
5. PREMA, AGED 52 YEARS,
KANNANKARA P.O, CHELANNUR VIA, KOZHIKODE.
6. PAVITHRAN, AGED 48 YEARS,
KANNANKARA P.O, CHELANNUR VIA, KOZHIKODE.
7. GEETHA, AGED 46 YEARS,
KANNANKARA P.O, CHELANNUR VIA, KOZHIKODE.
8. SHAJI, AGED 41 YEARS,
KANNANKARA P.O, CHELANNUR VIA, KOZHIKODE.

BY ADVS.SRI.V.V.SURENDRAN
SRI.P.A.HARISH

RESPONDENT(S)/RESPONDENTS:

1. PRADEEP KUMAR (DIED)

PJ

....2/-

RPNo. 310 of 2013

2. VIJAMANI (INSAME)
REPRESENTED NEXT FRIEND R6, KAKKUR AMSOM
NADUVALLUR DESOM, KOZHIKODE 673 614.
 3. SANTHOSH KUMAR
KAKKUR AMSOM, NADUVALLUR DESOM, KOZHIKODE 673 614.
 4. GIRIJA,
KAKKUR AMSOM, NADUVALLUR DESOM, KOZHIKODE 673 614.
 5. USHA
D/O.JANAKI AMMA, KAKKUR AMSOM, NADUVALLUR DESOM
KOZHIKODE 673 614.
 6. SMT.LEELAVATHY
W/O.PRADEEPKUMAR, MADATHIL HOUSE, POST KAKKUR
VIA NANMINDA, KOZHIKODE 673 613.
- R3,R4 & 6 BY ADVS. SRI.K.M.FIROZ
SMT.M.SHAJNA
SRI.S.KANNAN
SRI.P.S.RAMALINGAM
BY SRI.GEEN T.MATHEW
BY SRI.O.RAMACHANDRAN NAMBIAR

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 07-04-2015, THE
COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

PJ

A.M.SHAFIQUE, J & K.HARILAL, J

*** * * * ***

R.P.No.310 of 2013 in A.S.No.739 of 1995

Dated this the 7th day of April 2015

J U D G M E N T

Shaffique,J

This review petition is filed by the appellants seeking to review the judgment dated 14/09/2012 in A.S.No.739 of 1995. In the grounds raised, the review petitioner submits that the property obtained by Janaki Amma as per Ext.A1 partition deed had been sold by her to the 1st petitioner and she had obtained the sale consideration for acquiring house property for the residence. Further, it is stated that there is error apparent on the face of the record.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the review petitioner.

3. On a perusal of the judgment, we are of the view that the entire issue projected by the appellants had been considered in detail. The grounds raised in the review petition therefore does not warrant review of the judgment

as there is no error apparent on the face of the judgment.
Under such circumstances, there is no basis to consider this
review petition on merits and hence the same is dismissed.

(SD/-)

(A.M.SHAFIQUE, JUDGE)

(SD/-)

(K.HARILAL, JUDGE)

jsr

