

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BABU MATHEW P.JOSEPH

FRIDAY, THE 16TH DAY OF JANUARY 2015/26TH POUSHA, 1936

RP.No. 1018 of 2014 () IN Tr.P(C).395/2014

AGAINST THE ORDER/JUDGMENT IN Tr.P(C) 395/2014 of HIGH COURT
OF KERALA DATED 19.09.2014

REVIEW PETITIONER(S) : /PETITIONER

GEORGE KURIAN ARIKODY
FLAT NO.A(iii)-MMC 12/183 H, KAVUMPADY ROAD
MARADY VILLAGE
IN FRONT OF NIRMALA JUNIOR SCHOOL, MUVATTUPUZHA POST
ERNAKULAM DISTRICT - 686 661

BY ADV. GEORGE KURIAN ARIKODY (PARTY IN PERSON)

RESPONDENT (S) : /RESPONDENT

GEORDY JOSEPH PITTAPPILLY
PITTAPPILLY HOUSE
IN FRONT OF NIRMALA JUNIOR SCHOOL, KAVUMPADY ROAD,
MARADY VILLAGE,
MUVATTUPUZHA POST, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT - 686 661.

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
16-01-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

RP1018/14

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS

ANNEXURE A1 : COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN TRPC 395/14 IN RCP
04/2011.

ANNEXURE A2 : COPY OF THE IA NO.2023/2014 IN TRPC 395/2014
ON THE DE JURE RIGHT OF THE REVIEW PETITIONER / TENANT.

//TRUE COPY//

PA TO JUDGE.

j9

THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN &
BABU MATHEW P. JOSEPH, JJ.

.....
R.P.No.1018 of 2014

in

Tr.P(C) No.395 of 2014
.....

Dated this the 16th day of January, 2015.

O R D E R

Thottathil B.Radhakrishnan, J.

- 1.We have heard the party-in-person. He seeks review of the judgment dated 19.09.2014 in Tr.P(C) No.395 of 2014.

- 2.Petitioner insisted that he had not got an equal treatment in terms of Article 14 of the Constitution of India and that there are statements in the judgment which are false. He has gone to the extent of saying that certain sentences therein were not actually dictated in court, though the judgment was pronounced in open court. We see that the Tr.P(C) was decided on 19.09.2014 after hearing the party-in-person, and therefore, in his presence. The directions issued after holding that there was no ground to transfer RCP No.4 of 2011 on the file of the Rent Control Court, Perumbavoor were even to ensure that the petitioner, who is now before us, would get a proper trial, in terms of the directions

contained in the order of remit made in the appellate judgment in RCA No.16 of 2008.

3. Having perused the judgment sought to be reviewed and having heard the party-in-person, we do not see any ground for review of the judgment having been made out. This application for review, hence, fails.

In the result, this review petition is dismissed.

(THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN, JUDGE)

(BABU MATHEW P. JOSEPH, JUDGE)

jg