

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON

TUESDAY, THE 24TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2015/5TH PHALGUNA, 1936

RPNo. 884 of 2014 ()

(AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN WP(C).NO. 24279/2012 DATED 01-08-2014)

REVIEW PETITIONER/RESPONDENT NO.1 :

**THE KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM -693 004**

BY ADV. SRI.P.C.SASIDHARAN, SC, KPSC

RESPONDENT(S)/PETITIONER AND 2ND RESPONDENT :

- 1. SHEBIN, S/O.ABDUL SALIM.A,
PARAKATHERI PUTHENVEEDU,
IDICHAKKAPLAMOODU, PARASSALA P.O.,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM -695 502**
- 2. THE KERALA WATER AUTHORITY,
REPRESENTED BY THE MANAGING DIRECTOR, JALABHAVAN,
VELLAYAMBALAM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM -695 033**

**R1 BY ADV.SRI.C.UNNIKRISHNAN (KOLLAM)
R2 BY SRI.JOSEPH JOHN, SC, KERALA WATER AUTHORITY**

**THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 24-02-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE
FOLLOWING:**

sts

P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON, J.

R.P. No.884 of 2014

In

W.P.(C) No.24279 of 2012

Dated this the 24th day of February, 2015

O R D E R

Heard the Review Petition in detail.

2. After going through the pleadings and proceedings and also the verdict passed by this Court, it is seen that there is absolutely no error apparent on the face of the record. The remedy of the petitioner, if any, is by way of appeal, if aggrieved. It has been made clear by the Apex Court on many an occasion, that the scope/power of review is not to be misconstrued or misunderstood as a substitute for appeal. This Court finds support from the decision reported in **Smt. Meera Bhanja V. Smt. Nirmala Kumari Choudhury**) AIR 1995 SC 455.

The review petition is dismissed accordingly.

**P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON,
JUDGE**