

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.M.SHAFFIQUE

TUESDAY, THE 24TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2015/5TH PHALGUNA, 1936

RP.No. 169 of 2015 (T) IN WP(C).25760/2014

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 25760/2014 of HIGH COURT OF
KERALA

REVIEW PETITIONER(S)/PETITIONER:

SRI. SANJAY SUBRAO NIKAM
M/S.ADITYA JEWELLERY WORKS, SANJAY NIVAS, IV/422
PALLITHAZHAM, MULANTHURUTHY.

BY ADVS.SRI.ANIL D. NAIR
SRI.R.SREEJITH
SMT.C.S.SULEKHA BEEVI
SMT. SOUMYA PRAKASH C.S.

RESPONDENT(S)/RESPONDENT:

1. THE INTELLIGENCE OFFICER
COMMERCIAL TAXES, SQUAD NO. IV,
ERNAKULAM - 682 030.

2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
COMMERCIAL TAXES, ERNAKULAM - 682 031.

BY SPL. GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT. SOBHA ANNAMMA EAPEN

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD
ON 24-02-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE
FOLLOWING:

A.M. SHAFFIQUE, J.

.....
R.P. No. 169 of 2015
in
W.P. (C) No. 25760 of 2014
.....

Dated : 24 - 02 - 2015

ORDER

In view of the dismissal of C.M. Application No. 63/2015,
this Review Petition is dismissed.

**Sd/- A.M. SHAFFIQUE
(Judge)**

ani/

/truecopy/

P.S. to Judge

A.M. SHAFFIQUE, J.

.....
C.M. Application No. 63 of 2015
in
W.P.C. No. 25760 of 2014 (T)
.....

Dated : 24 - 02 - 2015

ORDER

This is an application to condone the delay of 94 days in filing the Review Petition. The Application is opposed by the learned Spl. Government Pleader appearing for the respondents.

The only reason stated is that the petitioner made earnest efforts to furnish immovable property as security. Since the same has already been attached, the petitioner was unable to provide such security. I do not think there is any good ground for condoning the delay. Accordingly this application is dismissed.

**A.M. SHAFFIQUE
(Judge)**

ani/