

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU

WEDNESDAY, THE 7TH DAY OF JANUARY 2015/17TH POUSHA, 1936

RP.No. 1034 of 2014 () IN WP(C).29350/2014

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 29350/2014 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA
DATED 17-11-2014

REVIEW PETITIONER(S)/3RD RESPONDENT:

CORPORATE MANAGER
M.E.S.SCHOOLS, M.E.S OFFICE, BANK ROAD, CALICUT-673001.

BY ADVS.SRI.BABU KARUKAPADATH
SMT.M.A.VAHEEDA BABU
SRI.K.A.NOUSHAD
SRI.KANDAMPULLY RAHUL
SRI.MITHUN BABY JOHN
SRI.J.RAMKUMAR

RESPONDENT(S)/PETITIONER AND R1,2 AND 4.:

1. SAJIMON A.M.
DRAWING TEACHER (HS), M.E.S.HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL
MANNARKKAD, MANNARKKAD COLLEGE P.O.
PALAKKAD DISTRICT-678583 RESIDING AT ANAKKALLAN HOUSE
PALLIKUNNU P.O., MANNARKKAD COLLEGE VIA
PALAKKAD DISTRICT.
2. THE STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL EDUCATION
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695001.
3. DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL OFFICER
MANNARKKAD, PALAKKAD DISTRICT, PIN-678582.
4. HEADMISTRESS
M.E.S.HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL, MANNARKKAD
MANNARKKAD COLLEGE P.O., PIN-678583
PALAKKAD DISTRICT.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.V.VIJULAL
BY SMT.M.R.SREELATHA

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
07-01-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

v dv

DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, J.
=====

Review Petition No.1034 of 2014 in
W.P.(C) No.29350 of 2014
=====

Dated this the 07th day of January, 2015

ORDER

In the review petition it is brought to the notice that in the direction portion of the judgment in W.P.(C) No.29350 of 2014 dated 20.12.2014, the 3rd respondent Manager is directed to forward the petitioner's leave application to the '5th respondent' instead of '2nd respondent'.

2. Further the petitioner has sought re-incorporation of direction found in earlier judgment which was recalled by this Court, to the effect that the 2nd respondent, in turn, shall forward the application to the 1st respondent Government, which is required to take appropriate action thereon. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, there are the errors apparent on the face of the record which require to be corrected.

3. I see substance in the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner. Accordingly, the review petition is allowed modifying the last paragraph of the judgment dated 20.12.2014 to the following effect: “applying the ratio laid down in Ext.P7 judgment, as has been affirmed in Ext.P8 judgment, this Court allows the present review petition with direction to the 3rd respondent Manager to forward the petitioner's leave application to the 2nd respondent forthwith with his recommendations in one week. On the receipt of the leave application from the 3rd respondent Manager, the 2nd respondent, in turn, shall forward it to the 1st respondent, which is required to pass appropriate orders thereon, as expeditiously as possible, at any rate within a period of one month from the date of receipt of the application as well as recommendation from the 2nd respondent.”

4. It is further made clear that wherever in the judgment on the review reference is made to 5th respondent, it shall be treated as reference to the 2nd respondent.

In the facts and circumstances, the Registry is directed to issue a corrected judgment as has been indicated above.

Sd/-
DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, JUDGE

vdv //True copy// P.A to Judge