

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.VINOD CHANDRAN

THURSDAY, THE 15TH DAY OF JANUARY 2015/25TH POUSHA, 1936

RP.No. 24 of 2015 ()

(AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN WP(C).NO. 15550/2014 DATED 20-06-2014)

REVIEW PETITIONER/PETITIONER:

**M/S.MULTIMAX ENGINEERING WORKS PVT. LTD.,
A-6, INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, PARTAPUR,
MEERUT, UTTAR PRADESH, 250 103
REPRESENTED BY ITS ACCOUNT EXECUTIVE SHASHIKANT.**

BY ADV. SRI.C.K.SREEJITH

RESPONDENT(S)/RESPONDENTS:

- 1. THE INTELLIGENCE INSPECTOR, SQUAD NO.1,
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTING ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER,
COMMERCIAL TAXES, KOZHIKODE-6.**
- 2. THE INTELLIGENCE OFFICER, SQUAD NO.1,
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTING ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER,
COMMERCIAL TAXES, KOZHIKODE-6.**
- 3. THE INSPECTING ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER,
COMMERCIAL TAX CHECK POST, WALAYAR-678 624.**
- 4. M/S.BHARAT PETROLEUM CORPORATION LIMITED,
POST BAG NO.2, AMBALAMUGAL,
ERNAKULAM DISTRICT-682 302.**

**R1 TO R3 BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.R.RANJITH
R4 BY ADV. SRI.K.I.MAYANKUTTY MATHER
SRI.R.JAIKRISHNA
SRI.M.GOPIKRISHNAN NAMBIAR**

**THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 15-01-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE
FOLLOWING:**

sts

K. VINOD CHANDRAN, J

R.P No.24 of 2015

in

W.P(C) No.1550 of 2014

Dated this the 15th day of January, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The review petitioner is aggrieved with the reservation in the judgment sought to be reviewed that adjudication shall be proceeded with, after installation of the products, which was permitted to be released from the check post, on execution of simple bond without sureties. The petitioner's contention now, is that the installation has to be carried out by the BPCL itself. The delay caused would prejudice them, insofar as the contract amounts to the extent of the security deposit demanded is not being released, for reason of the BPCL also having executed an undertaking.

2. However, specifically this Court had directed that the adjudication will be proceeded with after verifying the installation and it was only in such

circumstance, the goods were released without payment of any amount as security deposit. In such circumstance, this Court does not find any reason to review this judgment.

Review petition is dismissed.

Sd/-
(K. VINOD CHANDRAN, JUDGE)

jma //true copy//

P.A to Judge