

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE ANTONY DOMINIC
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALEXANDER THOMAS**

THURSDAY, THE 12TH DAY OF MARCH 2015/21ST PHALGUNA, 1936

RP.No. 257 of 2015 () IN RCRcv..250/2014

**AGAINST THE ORDER/JUDGMENT IN RCRcv. 250/2014 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA
DATED 28-01-2015**

REVIEW PETITIONER(S)/RESPONDENT:

**SARASA SHANMUGHAN AGED 73 YEARS
W/O. LATE POOKAT SHANMUGHAN, 4/479-C, A.G.ROAD
KATCHER, KOZHIKODE-673001.**

BY ADV. SRI.E.NARAYANAN

RESPONDENT(S)/PETITIONER:

**P.R.K.DAMODARAN
S/O. KESAVAN KUTTY, MANOHARA TIMBER WORKS, 19/626
EAST ROAD, PANTHALAYANI, KOTHAMANGALAM,
KOYILANDY-673305.**

BY SRI.NIRMAL. S

**THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 12-03-2015,
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:**

ANTONY DOMINIC & ALEXANDER THOMAS, JJ.

=====

R.P.No.257 OF 2015

IN

R.C.R.No.250 OF 2014

=====

Dated this the 12th day of March, 2015

O R D E R

Antony Dominic, J.

The respondent landlord in RCR No.250/14 has filed this petition seeking review of the order dismissing the RCR filed by the tenant, but giving him one year time to surrender vacant possession. According to the counsel, despite confirming the finding of *bona fide* need, since the petitioner is prevented from occupying the room for another one year, the petitioner is entitled to be adequately compensated. Therefore, she says that the order needs review.

2. We are not inclined to agree. First of all, this was not a claim which was urged when the revision was heard. Secondly, even during the extended time, the landlady can at best claim only continued payment of rent, which is now payable and nothing more. Therefore, we do not find any error in the order.

Review petition is dismissed.

**ANTONY DOMINIC
JUDGE**

**ALEXANDER THOMAS
JUDGE**