

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. CHITAMBARESH

THURSDAY, THE 17TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2015/26TH BHADRA, 1937

RP.No. 783 of 2015 () IN WP(C).11741/2015

WP(C) 11741/2015 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA DATED 05-06-2015

REVIEW PETITIONERS/RESPONDENTS 3, 4, 5 & 6 IN THE WRIT PETITION:

1. RADHAKRISHNAN NAIR, AGED 72,
S/O. P.K. RAGHAVAN PILLAI,
SREE BHAVAN, PERUMPAZHUTHOOR,
PERUMPAZHUTHOOR P.O.,
NEYYATTINKARA 695 121.
2. SYAMALA, W/O. RADHAKRISHNAN NAIR,
SREE BHAVAN, PERUMPAZHUTHOOR,
PERUMPAZHUTHOOR P.O.,
NEYYATTINKARA 695 121.
3. MADHUSOODHANAN NAIR, S/O. LATE VELAPPAN NAIR,
VASANTHA VILASOM, PERUMPAZHUTHOOR,
PERUMPAZHUTHOOR P.O., NEYYATTINKARA 695 121.
4. HEMALATHA, W/O. MADHUSOODHANAN NAIR,
VASANTHA VILASOM, PERUMPAZHUTHOOR,
PERUMPAZHUTHOOR P.O., NEYYATTINKARA 695 121.

BY ADVS. SRI. R. T. PRADEEP
SMT. M. BINDUDAS

RESPONDENTS/PETITIONER & RESPONDENTS 1, 2 & 7 IN THE WRIT PETITION.

1. V. GOPINATHAN NAIR, AGED 75 YEARS,
S/O. VALAYUDHAN PILLAI, SHEEJA BHAVAN,
PERUMPAZHUTHOOR P.O., NEYYATTINKARA TALUK.
2. KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY
VYDYUTHI BHAVAN, PATTOM,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM 69+5 001.
3. ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD,
NEYYATTINKARA - 695 121.
4. STATE OF KERALA REPRESENTED BY
GOVERNMENT PLEADER,
HIGH COURT OF KERALA, ERNAKULAM 682 031.

BY SENIOR GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT. ANITHA RAVINDRAN
R BY SRI. G. SUDHEER
R BY SRI. SAJEEVKUMAR K. GOPAL, SC, KSEB

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 17-09-2015, THE
COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

RP NO. 783/2015

APPENDIX

- ANNEXURE I : TRUE COPY OF THE WRITTEN OBJECTION OF THIRD
RESPONDENT IN WP(C) ACCOMPANIED WITH TAX RECEIPT
AND SKETCH.
- ANNEXURE II : TRUE COPY OF THE RE-SURVEY PLAN IN SY. NO. 243/24 AND
243/30.
- ANNEXURE III : TRUE COPY OF THE DOCKET OF WRIT PETITION SERVED ON
PARTY RESPONDENTS IN WP(C).

/TRUE COPY/

P.A. TO JUDGE.

V. CHITAMBARESH, J

R.P. No. 783 OF 2015
IN
WP(C) NO. 11741 OF 2015

Dated this the 17th day of September, 2015

ORDER

It is clarified that the objections of the review petitioners also will be considered by the Additional District Magistrate. The question whether the road in question is a public road or a private lane is left open. I make it clear that I have not pronounced on the merits of the claim of either parties.

The Review Petition is disposed of.

V. CHITAMBARESH
JUDGE

ncd