

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE B.SUDHEENDRA KUMAR

THURSDAY, THE 1ST DAY OF OCTOBER 2015/9TH ASWINA, 1937

RPFC.No. 167 of 2015 ()

MC 167/2013 of FAMILY COURT, KALPETTA

REVISION PETITIONER/RESPONDENT:

KUNHIMOIDEEN KUTTY, AGED 42 YEARS
S/O.MUHAMMED KUNHI HAJI, RESIDING AT ASYA MANZIL
PADNA VILLAGE, PADNA P.O., HOSDURG TALUK
KASARAGOD DISTRICT.

BY ADVS.SRI.JAWAHAR JOSE
SMT.CISSY MATHEWS
SRI.ARUN AJAY SHANKAR

RESPONDENTS/PETITIONERS:

-
1. SABEENA A.M, AGED 32 YEARS
D/O.SULAIMAN.S., RESIDING AT BAITHAL AFSA, PAYYANKI
CHERUVATHUR VILLAGE, HOSDURG TALUK, KAITHAKAD P.O.
KASARAGOD DISTRICT. PIN - 671 313.
 2. AYISH, AGED 15 YEARS
D/O.SABEENA A.M., RESIDING AT BAITHAL AFSA, PAYYANKI
CHERUVATHUR VILLAGE, HOSDURG TALUK, KAITHAKAD P.O.
KASARAGOD DISTRICT. PIN -671 313.
 3. SANA, AGED 13 YEARS, D/O.SABEENA A.M.,
RESIDING AT BAITHAL AFSA, PAYYANKI, CHERUVATHUR VILLAGE,
HOSDURG TALUK, KAITHAKAD P.O.,KASARAGOD DISTRICT. PIN -671 313.
 4. SINAN MOIDEEN, AGED 9 YEARS
D/O.SABEENA A.M., RESIDING AT BAITHAL AFSA, PAYYANKI
CHERUVATHUR VILLAGE, HOSDURG TALUK, KAITHAKAD P.O.
KASARAGOD DISTRICT. PIN -671 313.
 5. THE STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT OF KERALA, ERNAKULAM.PIN - 682 031.

(THE RESPONDENTS 2 TO 4 ARE MINORS AND THEY ARE REPRESENTED BY THEIR
GUARDIAN (MOTHER) WHO IS THE RESPONDENT HEREIN).

R1 -R4 BY ADV. SRI.T.K.VIPINDAS
R1-R4 BY ADV. SRI.MOHAMMED HUSSAIN K.M.
R5 BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, SHRI.V.S.SREEJITH

THIS REV.PETITION(FAMILY COURT) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 01-10-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

B.SUDHEENDRA KUMAR, J.

R.P.(F.C.) No.167 of 2015

Dated this the 1st day of October 2015

ORDER

When this matter has been taken up for hearing, the learned counsel for the revision petitioner, Shri.Jawahar Jose, has submitted that the matter has been settled between the parties and the parties are presently living together and in the said circumstances, he has prayed for closing the revision petition. Suffice it to say that having gone through the relevant inputs, I do not find any reason to hold that the order impugned is not legal, proper and correct, warranting interference by this Court.

In the result, this revision petition stands dismissed as not pressed.

I make it clear that this order will not preclude both the parties from approaching the court below for modification, if any, of the order impugned in accordance with law.

Sd// B.SUDHEENDRA KUMAR, JUDGE.

dl

/ True copy /

PA to Judge