

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN
&
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.HARILAL**

MONDAY, THE 30TH DAY OF MARCH 2015/9TH CHAITHRA, 1937

WA.No. 686 of 2015 () IN WP(C).30031/2014

**AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 30031/2014 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA DATED
12-11-2014**

APPELLANT(S)/PETITIONER:

**ABDUL MAJEED P.M., AGED 65 YEARS,
S/O.MOOSA MUSLIAR, POKKAKKILLATH HOUSE,
ISLAND AVENUE,
POONKUNNAM, THRISSUR.**

**BY ADVS.SRI.RENJITH THAMPAN (SR.)
SMT.P.R.REENA**

RESPONDENT(S)/RESPONDENTS:

- 1. INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LIMITED,
REPRESENTED BY SENIOR AREA MANAGER,
INDANE AREA OFFICE, KOCHI - 682 036.**
- 2. THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
139, . SOUTHERN REGIONAL OFFICE,
INDIAN OIL CORPORATION, 39, NUNGAPAKKAM,
CHENNAI, TAMIL NADU - 600 034.**
- 3. V.C RAMESAN,
S/O.CHATHAN, VANGANASSERY HOUSE,
PULIKKATTIMADAM ROAD,
IRINJALAKUDA.**

R1 & R2 BY SRI.M.GOPIKRISHNAN NAMBIAR, SC.

**THIS WRIT APPEAL HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 30-03-2015, THE
COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**

P.T.O.

**THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN
&
K.HARILAL, JJ.**

W.A.No.686 of 2015

Dated this the 30th day of March, 2015

JUDGMENT

Thottathil B.Radhakrishnan, J.

We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the appellant, who is the writ petitioner.

2. The 3rd respondent is a licensee of the Indian Oil Corporation. According to the petitioner/appellant, he entered into certain transactions with the 3rd respondent in relation to the conduct of 'Indane distributorship'. There appears to be certain civil litigations between the parties. The learned single Judge did not find way to interfere with the I.O.C's decision on a complaint made by the petitioner. It was noted that the matter being one relating to the internal management of the affairs of I.O.C., the Court cannot interfere at the instance of the petitioner. The apprehension of the petitioner that the observations in the impugned proceedings may impair proper adjudication of the

suits pending in the civil court has also been addressed by the learned single Judge, by issuing clarification through the judgment as regards the quality of adjudication in the civil courts. We do not find any reason to interfere with the decision of the learned single Judge through this intra-court appeal. The appeal, therefore, fails.

In the result, this writ appeal is dismissed *in limine*.

Sd/-

**THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN
JUDGE**

Sd/-

**K.HARILAL
JUDGE**

//true copy//

P.S. to Judge

St/-