

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.RAVINDRAN
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL K.NARENDRAN**

TUESDAY, THE 22ND DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2015/31ST BHADRA, 1937

RP.No. 610 of 2015 () IN Ex.FA.49/2014

**-----
AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN Ex.FA 49/2014 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA DATED
19-02-2015**

REVIEW PETITIONERS/APPELLANTS:

-
- 1. SINIMOLE CHIRAYATH (MINOR), AGED 17 YEARS
D/O.VARGHESE, CHIRAYATH THRISSURKKARAN HOUSE
THALORE DESOM, THRIKKUR VILLAGE
MUKUNDAPURAM TALUK.(MENTALLY RETARDED)
REPRESENTED BY NEXT FRIEND AND SISTER, KUNJUMOLE, AGED 24,
D/O.VARGHESE, CHIRAYATH, THRISSURKKARAN HOUSE
THALORE DESOM, THRIKKUR VILLAGE, MUKUNDAPURAM TALUK.**
 - 2. KUNJUMOLE, AGED 24 YEARS
D/O.VARGHESE, CHIRAYATH THRISSURKKARAN HOUSE
THALORE DESOM, THRIKKUR VILLAGE, MUKUNDAPURAM TALK.**

**BY ADVS.SRI.V.M.KURIAN
SRI.MATHEW B. KURIAN
SRI.K.T.THOMAS**

RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS:

-
- 1. THE MANAGER,
PUNJAB NATIONAL BANK, PUDUKKAD BRANCH, THRISSUR
PIN-680 301.**
 - 2. VARGHESE,
CHIRAYATH, CHIRAYATH THRISSURKKARAN HOUSE
THALORE DESOM, THRIKKUR VILLAGE, MUKUNDAPURAM TALUK
PIN-680 306.**
 - 3. SHYNI,
W/O.VARGHESE, CHIRAYATH, THRISSURKKARAN HOUSE
THALORE DESOM, THRIKKUR VILLAGE, MUKUNDAPURAM TALUK
PIN-680 306.**

R1 BY SRI.SANTHEEP ANKARATH, SC, PUNJAB NATIONAL BANK

**THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 22-09-2015, THE
COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:**

VPV

P.N.RAVINDRAN & ANIL K. NARENDRA, JJ.
=====

R.P.No.610 of 2015
in
EX.F.A.No.49 of 2014
=====

Dated this the 22nd day of September, 2015

ORDER

P.N.Ravindran, J.

The prayer in this application is to review and recall the judgment delivered by us on 19.2.2015 dismissing Ex.F.A.No.49 of 2014. The grounds raised have been elaborately considered by us in the judgment delivered on 19.2.2015. After hearing learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and on going through the impugned judgment, more particularly, the findings and observations in paragraph 12 thereof, we are not satisfied that the petitioners have made out a case for review. What the petitioners seek under the guise of a review is really a re-hearing which is impermissible. Everyone of the contentions now put forward were considered and rejected by the impugned judgment. We therefore find no good grounds to entertain the review petition. It fails and is accordingly dismissed *in limine*.

Sd/-
P.N.RAVINDRAN
JUDGE

Sd/-
ANIL K. NARENDRA
JUDGE

/true copy/

P.A. To Judge