

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. 1000 of 2013 () IN WP(C).3412/2013

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 3412/2013 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA

REVIEW PETITIONER/4TH RESPONDENT:

PORATHOOR PAUL AGED 65 YEARS
S/O.IYPPUNNY, MAZHUVANCHERY DESOM, KAIPARAMBU P.O
THRISSUR

BY ADV. SRI.C.PRABIN BENNY

RESPONDENTS/PETITIONER 1ST,2ND & 3RD RESPONDENT:

1. K.V.SAKTHIDHARAN
S/O.VELAPPAN, KOTILAPPURATH VEEDU
MAZHUVANCHERRY DESOM, KAIPARAMBU P.O
THRISSUR DISTRICT - 680 501

2. KAIPARAMBU GRAMA PANCHAYATH
KAIPARAMBU GRAMA PANCHAYATH OFFICE, MUNDUR P.O
THRISSUR, REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY- 680 024

3. THE AGRICULTURAL OFFICER,
KRISHI BHAVAN, KAIPARAMBU, MUNDUR P.O
THRISSUR - 680 024

4. HEALTH OFFICER,
MUNDUR P.O, THRISSUR DISTRICT - 680 024

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.A.MOHAMMED SAVAD
BY SRI.P.VIJAYA BHANU (SR.)

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
11-08-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

T.R.RAMACHANDRAN NAIR,J.

**R.P.No.1000 of 2013 in
W.P.(C)No.3412 of 2013**

Dated this the 11th day of August,2015

JUDGMENT

The review petitioner has come up with a prayer to review the observations in paragraph 5 of the judgment . He was the fourth respondent in the writ petition. It is highlighted in the review petition that O.S.No.4568/2012 pending before the Munsiff's Court, Thrissur where a decree for permanent prohibitory injunction restraining the writ petitioner and his men as well as Panchayath is pending and Annexure 3 is the copy of the plaint. It is submitted that the said aspect could not be brought to the notice of this Court, but it is also maintained that pendency of the same was within the knowledge of the other parties before this Court.

2. Going by the judgment of this Court, it can be seen that there was no appearance for the first respondent Panchayath or the review petitioner herein. In paragraph 5 of the judgment, the only

direction is to take follow up action to implement Ext.P2 order if there is no other legal impediment by way of any order from any civil court or Tribunal for Local Self Government Institutions or from this Court.

3. As far as the state of affairs after the judgment of this Court, the learned counsel on both sides submitted that they are not well aware of the same.

4. It is seen that the review petitioner has filed a civil suit seeking appropriate remedies. The observation in the judgment will not prejudice the right of the review petitioner to seek appropriate relief from the Civil Court.

With the above observation, the review petition is disposed of.

T.R.RAMACHANDRAN NAIR
JUDGE