

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

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

TUESDAY, THE 3RD DAY OF NOVEMBER 2015/12TH KARTHIKA, 1937

RP.No. 886 of 2015 () IN Mat.Appeal.318/2014

**-----
AGAINST THE JUDGMENT DATED 10-08-2015 IN Mat.Appeal 318/2014
of HIGH COURT OF KERALA**

REVIEW PETITIONER/RESPONDENT:

**-----
NIYAS,
S/O.ABDUL KHARIM,
NIYAS MANZIL, CHAVARA BRIDGE PO
KOLLAM DISTRICT 691 583.**

BY ADV. SRI.V.PHILIP MATHEW

RESPONDENT/APPELLANT:

**-----
SHAHITHA
D/O.ABDUL LATHEEF,
SHAHITHA MANZIL, M.S.NAGAR-56
KALLUMTHAZHAM, KOLLAM DISTRICT 691 004.**

BY SRI.C.RAJENDRAN

**THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 03-11-2015
ALONG WITH RP No.971/2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE
FOLLOWING:**

AMG

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

R.P. No. 886 OF 2015
IN
Mat. Appeal No. 318 OF 2014
&
R.P. No. 971 OF 2015
IN
Mat. Appeal No. 897 OF 2014

DATED THIS THE 3rd DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2015.

ORDER

K. Ramakrishnan, J:

Both these review petitions have been filed against the common judgment passed by this court in MA Nos.897/2014 & 318/2014 respectively. The grievance of the petitioner was that by mistake this court has mentioned in the judgment that the children will have to be produced before the Family Court, Kasaragod instead of Family Court, Kollam. Further he is finding it difficult to pay Rs.2,500/- towards the expenses directed to be paid for travel expenses of the children to the Family Court, Kollam, and these conditions will have to be reviewed.

2. Heard the counsel for the review petitioners, Sri. V. Philip Mathews and Sri. C. Rajendran, counsel appearing for the respondents.

3. On going through the common judgment of this court, it is clear that the name of the court mentioned as Family Court, Kasaragod is a mistake for Family Court, Kollam. So this will have to be corrected. So the court mentioned in the last paragraph of the judgment in page 6 has to be corrected as Family Court, Kollam.

4. As regards the other contention is concerned we do not find any reason to interfere with the order passed by this court directing the father of the children to meet the expenses for taking the children from Kasaragod to Kollam to meet his visitorial right. This was considered by this court considering the fact that the children were now in the relatives house along with the mother in Kasaragod and they will have to be brought from Kasaragod to Kollam and they are small children they will have to be accompanied by the mother. She will have to incur huge amount for this

purpose. There is no necessity to interfere with the order of direction to pay expenses for bringing the children as claimed by the review petitioner.

With the above modification of the impugned judgment, the Review Petitions are disposed of.

Sd/-

C.K. ABDUL REHIM, JUDGE.

Sd/-

K. RAMAKRISHNAN, JUDGE.

AMG

True copy

P.A. to Judge