

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM**

**PRESENT:**

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.RAVINDRAN**

**TUESDAY, THE 22ND DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2015/31ST BHADRA, 1937**

**RPNo. 110 of 2014 ()**  
-----

**(AGAINST THE ORDER IN AR.NO. 21/2013 DATED 21-10-2013)**  
-----

**PETITIONER :**  
-----

**K.VIJAYAKUMAR,  
IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT, ROTARY CLUB OF KARETTE,  
KARETTE, TRIVANDRUM-695 606.**

**BY ADV. SRI.ABDUL JALEEL.A**

**RESPONDENT(S):**  
-----

- 1. P.G.MURALEEDHARAN,  
DISTRICT GOVERNOR, RID 3211, DISTRICT SECRETARIAT,  
GURUMANDIRAM, SASTHAMANGALAM, TRIVANDRUM-695 010.**
- 2. MR.JATINDER SINGH,  
MANAGER, CLUB AND DISTRICT SUPPORT SECTION,  
ROTARY INTERNATIONAL SOUTH ASIA OFFICE, THAPAR HOUSE,  
JANPATH, NEW DELHI-110 001.**
- 3. MR.C.LUKE,  
CHIRAKKADAVIL, PUTHENANGADY,  
KOTTAYAM-686 001.**

**R1 & R3 BY SRI.V.ABRAHAM MARKOS  
R2 BY SRI.DEEPU THANKAN**

**THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD  
ON 24-03-2014, THE COURT ON 22-09-2015 PASSED THE  
FOLLOWING:**

**sts**

**P.N.RAVINDRAN, J.**

-----  
**R.P.No.110 of 2014**  
**in**  
**Arb. Request No.21 of 2013**  
-----

**Dated this the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of September, 2015.**

**ORDER**

The prayer in this review petition is to review and recall the judgment delivered by me on 21.10.2013 dismissing Arbitration Request No.21 of 2013. The main ground raised in the review petition is that the second respondent herein had put forward a diametrically opposite contention in the suit instituted by another rotarian in relation to an election dispute before the High Court of Delhi on the original side and that in that case the contention of the second respondent was that an election dispute is also covered by Article 24 of the byelaws of Rotary International. Reliance is placed on Annexure 16 judgment delivered by a learned single Judge of the Delhi High Court in support of the said contention. Referring to Annexure 18 order it is contended that an appeal therefrom filed by the plaintiff in the suit was dismissed by a Division Bench of the Delhi High Court and referring to Annexure 19 order it is contended that the Special Leave Petition filed therefrom by the plaintiff in the suit was dismissed by the Honourable the Supreme Court of India.

2. Shorn of details, the main ground raised in the instant review petition is that even election petitions fall within the purview of Article 24 of the byelaws of Rotary International. The reasons which persuaded me to hold that Article 24 does not apply to

election disputes and that in the matter of election disputes Article 10.0701 and related articles alone apply have been set out in detail in the impugned order. The question raised before me was neither raised nor considered by the Delhi High Court or the Apex Court. Infact, a reading of Annexure 16 judgment delivered by the learned single Judge of the Delhi High Court on the original side discloses that the plaintiff was also agreeable to have the dispute resolved by Arbitration. The question whether in view of Article 10.070.01 and related articles, Article 24 can apply to election disputes did not arise for consideration before the Delhi High Court or the Apex Court.

I therefore find no good grounds to review and recall the impugned order. The review petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

Sd/-  
**P.N.RAVINDRAN**  
**JUDGE**

AV