

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE ANTONY DOMINIC
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALEXANDER THOMAS

WEDNESDAY, THE 25TH DAY OF NOVEMBER 2015/4TH AGRAHAYANA, 1937

RP.No. 1132 of 2015 IN RCRcv.111/2012
AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN RCRcv.111/2012 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA DATED 22-01-2015

REVIEW PETITIONERS/ADDITIONAL RESPONDENTS 2 TO 7:

1. DHANALAKSHMI.P, RAJ NIVAS, THUVAKKOD PO
CHEMANCHERI (VIA), KOZHIKODE-673 304.
2. RANJITH .K.B., RAJ NIVAS, THUVAKKOD PO
CHEMANCHERI (VIA), KOZHIKODE 673 304.
3. SHAJITH .K.B, RAJ NIVAS, THUVAKKOD PO
CHEMANCHERI (VIA), KOZHIKODE 673 304.
4. VRINDHA SREEJITH, SOUBHAGYAM, UNITED RESIDENCE COLONY
ST. VINCENT COLONY, KOZHIKODE-673 006.
5. KARTHIKA SREEJITH (MINOR), SOUBHAGYAM,
UNITED RESIDENCE COLONY, ST. VINCENT COLONY, KOZHIKOE 673 006.
REPRESENTED BY HER NEXT FRIEND AND GUARDIAN,
VRINDHA SREEJITH (4TH PETITIONER)
6. NAVNEETH SREEJITH (MINOR), SOUBHAGYAM,
UNITED RESIDENCE COLONY
ST.VINCENT COLONY, KOZHIKODE 673 006.
REPRESENTED BY HER NEXT FRIEND AND GUARDIAN,
VRINDHA SREEJITH (4TH PETITIONER)

BY ADVS.SRI.VINOD SINGH CHERIYAN
SRI.R.SUDHISH
SMT.M.MANJU

RESPONDENTS:

1. SHEENATH.A., W/O SASIKUMAR RAJ
46 YEARS, NOW RESIDING AT K.S.RESIDENCY, AZHAKENDRA LANE
KALOOR, KOCHI 682 017.
2. ATHIRA S. RAJ, D/O SASIKUMAR RAJ
AGED 18 YEARS, NOW RESIDING AT K.S.RESIDENCY, AZHAKENDRA LANE,
KALOOR, KOCHI-682 017
3. RAHUL.S RAJ, S/O SASIKUMAR RAJ
25 YEARS, NOW RESIDING AT K.S.RESIDENCY, AZHAKENDRA LANE
KALOOR, KOCHI 682 017

R BY SRI.NIRMAL. S

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 25-11-2015 ALONG
WITH R.P.NOS.1133 & 1134/2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE
FOLLOWING:

ANTONY DOMINIC & ALEXANDER THOMAS, JJ.

**R.P.No.1132 of 2015 in R.C.R.No.111 of 2012
R.P.No.1133 of 2015 in R.C.R.No.8 of 2012 &
R.P.No.1134 of 2015 in R.C.R.No.9 of 2012**

Dated this the 25th day of November, 2015

ORDER

Antony Dominic, J.

The only ground raised in these review petitions is that the fixation of fair rent at the rate of 5/- per square feet is exorbitant. In our view, even if this contention is accepted at its face value, that does not make out a case of error apparent on the face of record entitling this court to entertain a review petition.

We do not find any scope for interference. Review petitions are accordingly dismissed.

**ANTONY DOMINIC
JUDGE**

**ALEXANDER THOMAS
JUDGE**

jes