

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON

TUESDAY, THE 3RD DAY OF FEBRUARY 2015/14TH MAGHA, 1936

RP.No. 76 of 2015 ()

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN WP(C).NO.21257/2014 DATED 24/11/2014.

.....

REVIEW PETITIONER/PETITIONER:

**SUSHEELA NARAYANAN,
W/O.P. NARAYANAN, AGED 58 YEARS,
"KRISHNA KRIPA", NORTH MANAKKAD,
P.O. KARIVELLUR, KANNUR- 670 521.**

BY ADV. SRI.MAHESH V RAMAKRISHNAN.

RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS:

- 1. THE KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, VYDYUTHI BHAVAN,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM -695 001.**
- 2. THE DEPUTY CHIEF ENGINEER,
K.S.E.B. ELECTRICAL CIRCLE,
SREEKANTAPURAM, KANNUR- 670 631.**
- 3. THE ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
K.S.E.B. ELECTRICAL DIVISION, VELLUR,
KANNUR -670 307.**
- 4. THE ASSISTANT ENGINEER,
K.S.E.B. ELECTRICAL SECTION, KARIVELLUR,
KANNUR- 670 521.**

BY ADV. SRI.SAJEEVKUMAR K.GOPAL, SC.

**THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 03-02-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE
FOLLOWING:**

rs.

RP.No. 76 of 2015

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S ANNEXURES:-

**ANNEXURE A1 COPY OF THE REPLY AFFIDAVIT DATED 21/11/2014 IN
WP(C).NO.21257/2014.**

RESPONDENT'S ANNEXURES:- NIL.

//TRUE COPY//

P.A TO JUDGE

rs.

P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON, J.

=====

R.P. No. 76 of 2015

in

W.P.(C). No. 21257 of 2014

Dated this the 3rd day of February, 2015

ORDER

The main ground raised in the Review Petition is that, the writ petition came to be dismissed for want of reply affidavit and that, non filing of reply affidavit on time was due to some unforeseen circumstances.

2. After hearing the petitioner and also going through the pleadings and proceedings, this Court finds that the dismissal of the writ petition was not for want of filing reply affidavit alone, but due to various facts and circumstances as pointed out from the part of the concerned respondent, which version as appearing in paragraphs 3, 6 and 7 of their counter affidavit has been extracted in paragraph '3' of the judgment.

3. This Court does not find any 'error apparent on the face of record' to call for interference, more so, in view of the law declared by the Apex Court on many an occasion including the one in **Meera Bhanja v. Nirmala Kumari Choudhary** (AIR

1995 SC 455), holding that the scope and power of review shall not be mis-construed as a substitute for appeal.

The review petition is dismissed accordingly.

**P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON,
JUDGE.**

kp/-