

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU

THURSDAY, THE 2ND DAY OF JULY 2015/11TH ASHADHA, 1937

RP.No. 543 of 2015 () IN WP(C).12384/2015

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT DATED 17-04-2015 IN WP(C) 12384/2015 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA

REVIEW PETITIONER/PETITIONER IN W.P.(C):

JAFFER P.,
PATTUPURA HOUSE, OTTATHARA,
KODUR P.O., MALAPPURAM DISTRICT.

BY ADVS.SRI.SAJEEV KUMAR K.GOPAL
SRI.R.HARISHANKAR

RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS IN W.P.(C):

1. THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY,
MALAPPURAM, PIN - 676 505,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.
2. THE SECRETARY,
REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY,
MALAPPURAM - 676 505.

R BY SRI. K.C. VINCENT, GOVERNMENT PLEADER

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
02-07-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, J.

R.P. No. 543 of 2015
in
W.P.(C). No. 12384 of 2015

Dated this the 2nd day of July, 2015.

ORDER

The petitioner filed the present review petition contending that though Ext.P3 is actually an application for renewal of the permit, it was mentioned in the judgment dated 17.04.2015 as an application for replacement. The petitioner seeks correction of the said alleged mistake. Further, it is the grievance of the petitioner that the second limb of the prayer for the grant and issuance of the temporary permit has not been ordered.

2. Today, when the matter is taken up for consideration, I find in the record the originally signed copy of the judgment, which, in fact, contained the correct description of Ext.P3 and also a direction in terms of the second limb of the prayer. It is evident that the registry, perhaps, erroneously issued a certified copy of the draft judgment.

3. When the learned counsel for the petitioner has seen the original copy of the judgment, which is part of the record, he has stated that he is very much aware of the fact that this Court, at the time of dictating the judgment in the open court, has specifically granted the second limb of the relief as well.

4. Under these facts and circumstances, I do not find any need for reviewing the judgment dated 17.04.2015. This Court, however, directs the registry to issue a certified copy of the original judgment, without committing any further mistake in that regard.

With the above observation, this review petition stands closed.

sd/- DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, JUDGE.

rv