

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM
PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.ASHOK BHUSHAN
&
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.M.SHAFFIQUE

MONDAY, THE 1ST DAY OF JUNE 2015/11TH JYAISHTA, 1937

RP.No. 400 of 2015 () IN WA.1205/2014

AGAINST THE ORDER/JUDGMENT IN WA 1205/2014 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA
DATED 13-10-2014

REVIEW PETITIONER(S):

M/S. K. RAVINDRAN,
GOVERNMENT CONTRACTOR, 28/309A, 'NATH'
THONDAYAD - KOTTOLI ROAD, CHEVARAMBALAM P.O.
CALICUT - 673 017
REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGIND PARTNER
V.RAJEENDRANATH.

BY ADVS.SRI.BABU KARUKAPADATH
SMT.M.A.VAHEEDA BABU
SRI.K.A.NOUSHAD
SRI.P.U.VINOD KUMAR
SRI.KANDAMPULLY RAHUL
SRI.MITHUN BABY JOHN
SRI.J.RAMKUMAR

RESPONDENT(S):

1. MEMBER SECRETARY,
KERALA STATE RURAL ROADS DEVELOPMENT, T.C.28/885
CSI BUILDING, PULIMOODU JUNCTION, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER ,
THE CHIEF TECHNICAL OFFICER
KERALA STATE RUARAL ROADS DEVELOPMENT, T.C.28/885
CSI BUILDING, PULIMOODU JUNCTION, THIRUVANANTHAPRUAM.

3. THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
PROGRAM IMPLEMANTATION UNIT
WAYANAD DISTRICT PANCHAYATH, NORTH KALPETTA P.O.
WAYANAD DISTRICT. .

4. THE PROJECT DIRECTOR,
DISTRICT POVERTY ALLEVIATION UNIT
WAYANAND DISTRICT PANCHAYATH, KALPETTA NORTH P.O.
WAYANAD.

BY SR.GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.P.I.DAVIS

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
01-06-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

**ASHOK BHUSHAN, CJ
&
A.M.SHAFFIQUE, J**

**R.P.No.400 of 2015
IN
W.A.No.1205 of 2014**

Dated this the 1st June, 2015

O R D E R

Shaffique, J.

This Review Petition is filed seeking to review the judgment dated 13.10.2014 in W.A.No.1205 of 2014. It is pointed out by learned counsel for the review petitioner that the only review sought for is to modify the judgment to the extent that liability to pay interest at 10% on the balance amount Uhas been deleted. The Writ Appeal was filed against the judgment of the learned Single Judge. It was the contention of the learned Government Pleader that the direction issued by the learned Single Judge directing payment of the amount with interest was unreasonable.

2. Having gone through the entire factual circumstances, we had deleted the liability to pay interest at 10% on the balance amount. It was found that non payment was on account of a genuine dispute between the parties and there was no reason to direct payment of interest on the balance amount payable.

3. Having regard to the fact that we had considered the matter on merits and taken a decision, no ground is made out as far as the direction to delete the interest portion is concerned. Accordingly, we do not find any reason to review the judgment. The Review Petition is dismissed.

**ASHOK BHUSHAN
CHIEF JUSTICE**

**A.M.SHAFFIQUE
JUDGE**

vgs2/6/15