

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.VINOD CHANDRAN

TUESDAY, THE 21ST DAY OF JULY 2015/30TH ASHADHA, 1937

WP(C).No. 544 of 2010 (P)

PETITIONER :

**INDIRA BAI AMMA, AGED 69,
W/O.PARAMESWARAN PILLAI, SRUTHI, ERAMATHOOR P.O.
MANNAR, KURATHISSERI VILLAGE, CHENGANNOOR TALUK
ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT.**

BY ADV. SRI.G.BENO

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. CHENGANNOOR TALUK LEGAL SERVICES
AUTHORITY REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN
CHENGANNOOR TALUK LEGAL SERVICES AUTHORITY
OFFICE OF THE SUB COURT, CHENGANNOOR
ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT.**
- 2. THE TAHSILDAR, CHENGANNOOR TALUK,
ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT.**
- 3. THE VILLAGE OFFICER, KURATTISSERI
VILLAGE, MANNAR, CHENGANNOOR TALUK
ALAPPUZHA.**
- 4. NIZAR, AGED 29, S/O.MAJEED KUTTY,
WARRIETHU THEKKATHIL VEEDU, ERAMATHOOR MURI
KURATTISSERI VILLAGE, CHENGANNOOR TALUK, ALAPPUZHA.**

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI. S. JAMAL.

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD
ON 21-07-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED
THE FOLLOWING:**

bp

WP(C).No. 544 of 2010 (P)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S

- P1: COPY OF THE TITLE DEED OF THE PETITIONER.
- P2: COPY OF THE TITLE DEED OF THE R4
- P3: COPY OF THE PLP NO. 896 OF 2008
- P4: ORIGINAL PHOTOGRAPHS OF TH DISPUTED PROPERTY.
- P5: COPY OF THE NOTICE IN EXHIBIT P3.
- P6: COPY OF THE OBJECTION FILED BY THE R5 IN EXT P3.

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS : NIL.

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE

bp

K. VINOD CHANDRAN, J

W.P(C) No. 544 of 2010

Dated this the 21st day of July, 2015

J U D G M E N T

When the matter was called there was no appearance for the petitioner. Ext.P3 is an order of the Taluk Legal Service Committee. Ext.P3 relates to a property of which the title is with the petitioner. The petitioner was not issued with notice, is the contention. The petitioner's husband who was the 4th respondent in Ext.P3 in PLP NO.896/2008 had specifically filed an objection with respect to the consideration of the case by the Legal Service Authority. A reading of the impugned order would indicate that rival contentions were looked into and an order was passed directing eviction of the 4th respondent from the property. However, the 4th respondent has not made any challenge to the impugned order. The petitioner herein need not be concerned with the order since it is not passed against her. In such circumstance, writ petition would stand dismissed.

Sd/-

(K. VINOD CHANDRAN, JUDGE)

jma

//true copy//

P.A to Judge