

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN
&

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.HARILAL

FRIDAY, THE 20TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2015/1ST PHALGUNA, 1936

RP.No. 323 of 2014 () IN WA.2679/2009

AGAINST THE ORDER/JUDGMENT IN WA 2679/2009 of HIGH COURT OF
KERALA DATED 19-01-2011

REVIEW PETITIONER(S)/1ST RESPONDENT:

P.SATHEESHKUMAR
DRAWING TEACHER, PALORA HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL
ULLIYERI, KOZHIKODE DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.R.K.MURALEEDHARAN

RESPONDENT(S)/APPELLANTS 1 TO 5 & 2ND RESPONDENT:

1. THE STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
GENERAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695001.
2. THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695001.
3. THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION,
KOZHIKODE-673001.
4. THE DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL OFFICER,
VADAKARA, KOZHIKODE DISTRICT, PIN-673101.
5. THE DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL OFFICER,
THAMARASSERY, KOZHIKODE DISTRICT-673 503.
6. THE MANAGER,
PALORA HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL, ULLIYERI
KOZHIKODE DISTRICT-673 323.

R1-R5 BY ADV.T.RAMAPRASAD UNNI, SR.GOVERNMENT PLEADER
R6 BY ADV. DR.GEORGE ABRAHAM
R BY SRI.M.A.THOMAS KUTTY

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
20-02-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

RP 323/14

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS

ANNEXURE-A1 : COPY OF ORDER PASSED BY R1 DATED 01.04.2014.

//TRUE COPY//

PA TO JUDGE.

j9

THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN &
K.HARILAL, JJ.

.....
R.P.No.323 of 2014 in W.A.No.2679 of 2009
and
C.M.Appl.No.119 of 2014 in R.P.No.323 of 2014
.....
Dated this the 20th day of February, 2015.

O R D E R

Thottathil B.Radhakrishnan, J.

This application for review of judgment in a writ appeal is filed with an application seeking condonation of delay of 1134 days in its institution. What is sought to be reviewed is a judgment issued in a writ appeal filed by State of Kerala and others. That arose from a writ petition instituted by the review petitioner. Manager of the school, where the review petitioner was working, was a respondent in that writ petition and, therefore, a respondent in the writ appeal. The judgment in the writ appeal was sought to be reviewed, at the instance of the Manager. That review petition– R.P.No.705 of 2012– was dismissed on 10.08.2012.

The learned counsel for the review petitioner points out that the decision taken by the Government following the judgment is not

in conformity with the directions contained therein and if the Government had given effect to the directions of the judgment, the review petitioner would have been satisfied. This is a complaint about an event relating to the enforcement of the judgment sought to be reviewed. That, in our view, is not a ground to entertain the application for review, though the petitioner may have legal right to sue for other reliefs, in accordance with law, in appropriate jurisdiction. Without prejudice to that, the C.M.Application and the review petition are dismissed.

(THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN, JUDGE)

(K.HARILAL, JUDGE)

js