

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE ANTONY DOMINIC
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAJI P.CHALY

THURSDAY, THE 8TH DAY OF OCTOBER 2015/16TH ASWINA, 1937

RPNo. 749 of 2015 IN WA.123/2015

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN WA 123/2015 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA DATED 18-08-2015

REVIEW PETITIONERS/RESPONDENTS 1-4 IN W.A.:

1. VIJAYAKSHMI A. AGED 41 YEARS, THEKKE VENGARA, THIRUVALLAM P.O.
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695027.
2. ANOOP M. AGED 31 YEARS
MANU VIHAR, CC-56/1662, THEVARA SOUTH, KOCHI-13.
3. GIGIMOL ANTONY AGED 39 YEARS
KALLUMADICKAL (H), PEROOR P.O., ETTUMANOOR
KOTTAYAM-686637.
4. MANJU PRABHA K. AGED 36 YEARS, CHUNDAKKATTIL HOUSE,
ATHIRAMPUZHA P.O., KOTTAYAM-686 562.

BY ADV. SRI.S.PRASANTH (AYYAPPANKAVU)

RESPONDENTS/APPELLANT & RESPONDENTS 5-8 IN W.A.:

1. AKASH.A, KAILATHUPURAYIDATHIL, PERUMBAIKKAD P.O.
KOTTAYAM DISTRICT.
2. THE MAHATMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY, REPRESENTED BY THE REGISTRAR
PRIYADARSHINI HILLS P.O, KOTTAYAM-686 560.
3. THE SYNDICATE , REPRESENTED BY THE VICE CHANCELLOR
MAHATMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY, PRIYADARSHINI HILLS P.O.
KOTTAYAM-686 560.
4. STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
HIGHER EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT
THIRUVANATHAPURAM-695 001.
5. THE CHANCELLOR, MAHATMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY, KOTTAYAM-686 560.

R BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.SHYSON P MANGUZHA
R BY SRI.P.C.SASIDHARAN
R BY SRI.VARUGHESE M.EASO, SC, M.G.UNIVERSITY
R BY SMT.M.U.VIJAYALAKSHMI

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 08-10-2015, THE
COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

ANTONY DOMINIC & SHAJI P. CHALY, JJ.

**R.P. No.749 of 2015 in
W.A.No.123 of 2015**

Dated this the 8th day of October, 2015

ORDER

Antony Dominic, J.

This review petition is filed seeking to review the judgment in W.A.123/2015 in which the petitioners were respondents 1 to 4. The two contentions raised before us are that the petitioners who filed the writ petitions, claiming appointment against substantial vacancies which were in existence and that they had filed the writ petitions before the expiry of the ranked list. It is also contended that this court rendered judgment relying on the judgment in Suresh v. M.G.University [2009 (1) KLT 950] which according to the counsel is clearly distinguishable on facts and therefore should not have been relied on.

2. Having heard counsel for the petitioners, we are not inclined to entertain this review petition. The grounds relied on by the learned counsel do not disclose any error apparent on the face of the judgment, which alone will entitle this court to entertain a petition seeking the review of the judgment. We are not satisfied that the petitioner has made out a case for review of the judgment.

Review petition fails and it is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/-
**ANTONY DOMINIC
JUDGE**

Sd/-
**SHAJI P. CHALY
JUDGE**

jes