

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. 757 of 2015 (R) IN O.P (FC) No.265/2015

**AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN O.P (FC) No.265/2015 OF HIGH COURT OF KERALA
DATED 12-08-2015**

REVIEW PETITIONER(S)/RESPONDENT:

**SNEHA JOSE, AGED 30 YEARS,
D/O. JOSE KURIAN, VEMPENY HOUSE, VETTIMUKAL P.O.,
ETTUMANOOR , KOTTAYAM - 686 631.**

BY ADV. SRI. M.K.CHANDRA MOHANDAS

RESPONDENT(S)/RESPONDENTS 1 TO 2:

**1. JIJU LUKOSE, AGED 31 YEARS,
S/O. LUKOSE GEORGE,
NOW RESIDING AT: 1300 W300 WORCESTER ROAD,
FRAMINGHAM, MA 01702, BOSTON, USA.**

HAVING NATIVE ADDRESS:

**PLATHOTTAM HOUSE, ATHIRAMPUZHA P.O.,
KOTTAYAM - 686 562 (REPRESENTED BY HIS FATHER AND POWER OF
ATTORNEY HOLDER GEORGE LUKOSE, THE 2ND RESPONDENT HEREIN).**

**2. GEORGE LUKOSE, AGED 65 YEARS,
S/O.LATE MR.GEORGE, PLATHOTTAM HOUSE,
ATHIRAMPUZHA P.O., KOTTAYAM - 686 562.**

**BY ADVS. SRI. DIPU.R
SRI. G. KRISHNAKUMAR**

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

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

**R.P. No. 757 of 2015
in
OP(FC) No.265of 2015**

Dated this the 8th day of October, 2015

ORDER

K. RAMAKRISHNAN, J.

Respondent in the main petition is the review petitioner herein. It is alleged in the review petition that on account of the order passed by this court, serious hardship has been passed to the review petitioner and there is no bona fides on the part of the original petitioners - the respondents herein in seeking the reliefs but it is only to harass the petitioner that such an application has been filed .

2. Further it is difficult to comply with the directions in the order as well. They have no objection in allowing the grandparents to come and meet the child from her house. As her parents are aged and ailing, it is not possible for her

to go the Family Court and produce the child as directed.

3. Further it is also to be noted that several petitioners have been filed making false allegations and since the order has not been complied with, contempt petition has also been filed. So the petitioner prays for review the order making modifications in the order as requested in the review petition.

4. Heard counsel for the petitioner Sri. Chandra Mohandas and counsel for the respondent Sri. G. Krishnakumar.

5. Counsel for the petitioner reiterated the allegations and contentions raised in the review petition. Counsel for the respondents submitted that all these aspects were considered when the order has been passed by this court and there is no error apparent on the face of the record calling for interference of this court to review the

order.

6. While disposing the petition this court had considered all the contentions that had been raised by this review petitioner in the review petition. Further considering the strained relationship between the parties, the prayer in the petition to permit the visitorial right of the paternal grandparents in the house of the petitioner also is not favourable or proper as it may lead to other complications as well. So considering these aspects only this court has directed the child to be produce before the Family Court so as to facilitate visitorial right and interaction with the grandchild by the paternal grandparents. Further the apprehension of the petitioner has been taken note of by this court while granting such a relief in the main petition itself namely interacting with the child over phone and it is specifically mentioned in the order itself that can be done

only in such a way as not to cause any harassment to the mother, the petitioner.

7. So under the circumstances there is nothing to be reviewed and there is no error apparent on the face of the record so as to interfere with the order passed by this court. So there is no merit in the petition and the petition is dismissed.

Sd/-
C.K. ABDUL REHIM
JUDGE

Sd/-
K. RAMAKRISHNAN
JUDGE