

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.T.RAVIKUMAR

TUESDAY, THE 13TH DAY OF JANUARY 2015/23RD POUSHA, 1936

RP.No. 1036 of 2014 () IN WP(C).16879/2012

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 16879/2012 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA
DATED 30-07-2014

REVIEW PETITIONER(S)/1ST RESPONDENT:

THE VALLIKUNNAN INDUSTRIAL CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETY LTD
NO.S IND(A)56,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY
VALLIKUNNAM P.O., MAVELIKKARA, ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT
PIN-690 501.

BY ADV. SRI.R.GOPAN

RESPONDENT(S)/PETITIONER & RESPONDENTS 1&2:

1. B LEELA BAI AMMA
W/O.K.VASUDEVAN PILLAI, REVATHI
KOYPPALLIL HOUSE VAYANAKOM, NJAKKANAL P.O, OACHIRA
KOLLAM.
2. THE DEPUTY REGISTRAR
DISTRICT INDUSTRIAL CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETY
ALAPPUZHA 688 001
3. THE GENERAL MANAGER
INDUSTRIES AND COMMERCE CENTRE, ALAPPUZHA-688 001.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.N.SURESH
R1 BY SRI.T.R.HARIKUMAR

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 13-01-2015,
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

C.T. RAVIKUMAR, J.

=====

**R.P.No.1036 OF 2014 IN
W.P.(C).No.16879 OF 2012
&
C.M.A.No.417 OF 2014**

=====

Dated this the 13th day of January 2014

ORDER

C.M.A.No.417 of 2014

This is an application seeking condonation of delay of 107 days in filing the review petition. A perusal of the affidavit accompanying the application would reveal that no reason whatsoever has been stated for condoning the delay. What has been stated in the affidavit is that on receipt of copy of the judgment in the captioned writ petition, it was communicated to the deponent-petitioner by the counsel and he was under the impression that he could calculate the amount of leave surrender due to the first respondent. There cannot be any doubt with respect to the position that the party seeking condonation of delay has to explain the delay. I have already taken

note of the reason assigned by the petitioner which cannot be said to be a sustainable one. That apart, the contention of the petitioner is that the amount payable to the writ petitioner towards the Earn Leave surrender was already paid and the said fact did not find any place in the affidavit and no document whatsoever has been produced to substantiate the said contention. In such circumstances, I find no reason to condone the delay. Resultantly, this application is dismissed.

R.P.No.1036 OF 2014

In view of the order in C.M.A.No.417 of 2014, this review petition is dismissed.

**Sd/-
C.T. RAVIKUMAR
(JUDGE)**

spc/

C.T. RAVIKUMAR, J.

JUDGMENT

R.P.1036/14.

4

September, 2010