

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAJI P.CHALY

FRIDAY, THE 18TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2015/27TH AGRAHAYANA, 1937

RP.No. 1186 of 2015 (K) IN WP(C).16308/2013

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 16308/2013 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA
DATED 13-11-2015

REVIEW PETITIONER/5TH RESPONDENT:

SAROJINI AMMA, AGED 68 YEARS
W/O.LATE NARAYANAN, MANARVILAYIL HOUSE
ERUMAKUZHI MURI, PALAMEL VILLAGE, MAVELIKKARA TALUK.

BY ADV. SRI.G.UNNIKRISHNAN

RESPONDENT/PETITIONER/RESPONDENTS 1 TO 4 & 6 TO 11:

1. VIJAYANPILLAI, AGED 45 YEARS
S/O.LATE RAGHAVAN PILLAI
THADATHIL VADAKKEKKARA VEEDU, ERUMAKUZHI MURI
PANAYIL.P.O., NOORANAD, PALAMEL
PIN-690 504.
2. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR
ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT - 688 001.
3. THE TAHSILDAR
MAVELIKKARA TALUK, ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT. 690 001.
4. THE VILLAGE OFFICER
PALMEL VILLAGE, MAVELIKKARA TALUK
ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT.690 001.
5. SOMAN NAIR
PUTHENVEETIL KAZHAKKETHIL, ERUMAKUZHI MURI
PANAYIL.P.O., NOORANAD, PALAMEL
PIN-690 504.
6. VIJAYAMMA
THADATHIL VEEDU, ERUMAKUZHI MURI, PANAYIL.P.O.
NOORANAD, PALAMEL, PIN-690 504.

7. SARASWATHYAMMA
THADATHIL VEEDU, ERUMAKUZHI MURI, PANAYIL.P.O.
NOORANAD, PALAMEL, PIN-690 504.
8. GOPALAKRISHNA PILLAI
THADATHIL VEEDU, ERUMAKUZHI MURI, PANAYIL.P.O.
NOORANAD, PALAMEL, PIN-690 504.
9. AMBILY
KRISHNAVILASAM, ERUMAKUZHI MURI, PANAYIL.P.O.
NOORANAD, PALAMEL, PIN-690 504.
10. KRISHNAN NAIR
KRISHNAVILASAM, ERUMAKUZHI MURI, PANAYIL.P.O.
NOORANAD, PALAMEL, PIN-690 504.
11. THE SECRETARY
PALAMEL GRAMA PANCHAYATH, NOORANAD.P.O.
ALAPPUZHA-690 504.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.K.C. VINCENT
BY SRI.S.SHANAVAS KHAN
BY SRI.UNNIKRISHNAN.V.ALAPATT

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 18-12-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

smv

SHAJI P. CHALY, J.

Review Petition No.1186 of 2015

in

W.P.(C) No.16308 of 2013

Dated this the 18th day of December, 2015

ORDER

The Writ Petition was disposed of by judgment dated 13.11.2015 by which the 1st respondent therein was directed to take action pursuant to Ext.P4, taking into account Ext.P3 series of orders in accordance with law and within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of a copy of the judgment.

2. Now a review petition is filed by the 5th respondent seeking to review the judgment on the ground that the 5th respondent has already filed an objection before the 2nd respondent and unless and until a direction is issued by this Court, the objection filed by him will be overlooked by the 2nd respondent.

3. In fact, in the judgment it is categorically stated that the 2nd respondent shall dispose of Ext.P4 in accordance with law and therefore, obviously the 2nd

respondent is expected to issue a notice to the party respondents. Any how the period granted by this Court to consider Ext.P4 is over. The learned counsel for the 1st respondent, on the other hand submits that the attempt of the review petitioner is to protract the proceedings and therefore, there shall be a peremptory direction to the 2nd respondent to complete the proceedings at the earliest point of time since the matter is pending before the 2nd respondent for long. I do not think that there is any substance in the review petition, since the review petitioner has failed to point out any error apparent on the face of the record. But at the same time I make it clear that the 2nd respondent will provide an opportunity of being heard to the review petitioner on the basis of the objection filed by the review petitioner. Any how the whole exercise shall be completed within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order after hearing all concerned.

Review petition is dismissed with the above observations.

Sd/-
SHAJI P. CHALY
JUDGE

//true copy//

smv
18.12.2015

P.A. To Judge