

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.VINOD CHANDRAN

MONDAY, THE 29TH DAY OF JUNE 2015/8TH ASHADHA, 1937

WP(C).No. 1893 of 2010 (J)

PETITIONER(S):

1. **B.SOMACHOODAN,**
KIZHAKKINKARA VEEDU, BHARATHIPURAM P.O.,
ANCHAL (VIA), KOLLAM DISTRICT.
2. **SANDHYA SOMAN,**
D/O.SOMACHOODAN, OF DO. DO.

BY ADV. SRI.B.KRISHNA MANI

RESPONDENT(S):

1. **THE STATE OF KERALA,**
REPRESENTED BY CHIEF SECRETARY,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
2. **THE REGISTRAR,**
KERALA NURSING COUNCIL, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
3. **THE MANAGING DIRECTOR,**
JOSCO-MULTI SPECIALITY HOSPITAL PVT. LTD., EDAPPAN,
NOORANADU, MAVELIKKARA.
4. **THE PRINCIPAL,**
JOSCO-SCHOOL OF TRAINING, EDAPPAN, PANDALAM,
PATHANAMTHITTA DISTRICT.

R1 BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.MANOJ P. KUNJACHAN
R3 BY ADVS. SRI.R.BINDU (SASTHAMANGALAM)
SRI.PRASANTH M.P

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD
ON 29-06-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED
THE FOLLOWING:

sts

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

- P1 COPY OF THE AGREEMENT DATED NIL**
- P2 COPY OF THE REGISTERED LETTER DATED 13/12/2008 TO THE 3RD RESPONDENT**
- P3 COPY OF THE POSTAL COVER**
- P4 COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION DATED 12/12/08 ISSUED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT**
- P5 COPY OF THE POSTAL COVER DATED 15/12/2008**
- P6 COPY OF THE REPLY DATED 19/12/2008**
- P7 COPY OF THE APPLICATION DATED NIL SUBMITTED BY 2ND PETITIONER BEFORE THE CHIEF MINISTER**
- P8 COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION DATED 03/4/2009 ALONG WITH REPLY ADDRESSED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT**
- P9 COPY OF THE LAWYER'S NOTICE DATED 16/11/2009**
- P10 COPY OF THE REPLY DATED 28/11/2009**
- P11 COPY OF THE PROSPECTUS**

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS:

- R3(A) COPY OF THE AGREEMENT**

/TRUE COPY/

P.A.TO JUDGE

sts

K. VINOD CHANDRAN, J.

=====

W.P.(C) No.1893 of 2010 - J

=====

Dated this the 29th day of June, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The writ petition was filed for return of the original certificate entrusted with the 3rd respondent and for refund of Rs.10,000/- being caution deposit paid by the 2nd petitioner on her admission to the 3rd respondent college. When the matter came up for consideration, there is no representation for the petitioner. The learned counsel for the respondent submits that the original documents have been returned and the matter has been settled between the parties.

Hence, the writ petition would stand dismissed.

Sd/-

**K. VINOD CHANDRAN,
JUDGE**

SB

// true copy //

P.A to Judge.