

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.K.ABDUL REHIM
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.RAMAKRISHNAN**

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

R.P. No. 750 of 2015 (R) IN O.P (FC) No.318/2015

**AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN O.P (FC) No. 318/2015 OF HIGH COURT OF KERALA
DATED 29-07-2015**

REVIEW PETITIONER(S)/RESPONDENT :

**DEEPTI RAJAN,
PRAKASH MANDIRAM, VENKULAM P.O., EDAVA,
NOW RESIDING AT BLOCK NO.09-94-166,
BISHAN STREET-12, SINGAPORE - 570 101,
REPRESENTED BY POWER OF ATTORNEY HOLDER,
SINDHU PRAKASH, VISAKH, T.C.5/2550-1,
GOLF LINKS ROAD, KOWDIYAR, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 001.**

**BY ADVS. SRI. C.RAJENDRAN
SRI. K.R.RANJITH**

RESPONDENT(S)/PETITIONER :

**RAJ SEKHAR.R, AGED 52 YEARS,
LEKSHMI, VIKAS NAGAR, PATTATHANAM P.O.,
KOLLAM DISTRICT.**

BY SRI. S.SHYAM

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

R.P. No. 750 of 2015 (R) IN O.P (FC) No.318/2015

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

ANNEXURE-A1: A TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE VAKALATH DATED 24.07.2015.

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS - NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE

WW

**C.K. ABDUL REHIM, J.
&
K. RAMAKRISHNAN, J.**

**R.P. No. 750 of 2015
in
OP(FC) No.318 of 2015**

Dated this the 8th day of October, 2015

ORDER

K. RAMAKRISHNAN, J.

This petition is filed by the respondent in the original petition seeking review of the judgment. It is alleged in the petition that though the counsel for the review petitioner filed vakalath it was returned for defect and though it was rectified and represented, it was not noted in the cause list. So his name was not shown. That was the reason why he could not appear. Hence this petition.

2. Respondent appeared and submitted that they have no objection in making necessary modification in the judgment.

3. The only grievance of the petitioner is that the petition was disposed of as though the respondent has not

appeared in spite of service of notice. Considering the circumstances we feel that in paragraph 3 of the judgment a clarification can be given stating that respondent appeared and opposed the application. Since the order passed by this court need not be reviewed as it does not cause any prejudice to the respondent also. So with the above modification the application will stand allowed to the extent mentioned above.

Sd/-
C.K. ABDUL REHIM
JUDGE

Sd/-
K. RAMAKRISHNAN
JUDGE