IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE ANTONY DOMINIC
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAJI P.CHALY

FRIDAY, THE 5TH DAY OF JUNE 2015/15TH JYAISHTA, 1937

W.A.No. 1133 of 2015 IN WP(C).14190/2015

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN W.P.(C) 14190/2015 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA DATED 12-05-2015

APPELLANT:

P G PRAVEENA, AGED 28 YEARS, WIFE OF VIJAYASANKAR
LOWER PRIMARY SCHOOL ASSISTANT, S.C.S. HIGH SCHOOL
VALAMANGALAM P.O. THURAVUR, ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT.

BY ADVS.SRI.V.A.MUHAMMED
SRI.V.RAJASEKHARAN NAIR

RESPONDENTS:

1. THE STATE OF KERALA REPRESENTED BY ITS
SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
GENERAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT,
SECRETARIATE,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM 695 001.

2. THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTIONS
JAGATHY, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 014

3. THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION
ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT 688 001

4. THE DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL OFFICER
CHERTHALA, ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT 688 524

5. THE MANAGER
S.C.S. HIGH SCHOOL, VALAMANGALAM
P.O. THURAVUR, ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT

6. SMT.T.NISHAMOLE
UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL ASSISTANT
S.C.S. HIGH SCHOOL, VALAMANGALAM
P.O.THURAVUR, ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT.

R BY SR. GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.M.A.FAYAZ

THIS WRIT APPEAL HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 05-06-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

ANTONY DOMINIC & SHAJI P.CHALY, JJ.

- -

Writ Appeal No.1133 of 2015

- -

Dated this the 5th day of June, 2015

JUDGMENT

Antony Dominic, J.

The appellant filed Writ Petition No.14190/15 seeking to quash Exts.P3 and P4 orders and in the alternative for an early disposal of Ext.P5 by the first respondent. By the judgment under appeal, the learned Single Judge directed the first respondent to dispose of Ext.P5. In this appeal, the claim made by the appellant is that the learned Single Judge ought to have directed that Exts.P3 and P4 should be kept in abeyance in the meanwhile.

2. The issue raised in the writ petition was relating to the validity of Exts.P3 and P4. If these orders are directed to be kept in abeyance as sought for, that would virtually amount to allowing the writ petition which could not have been done by the learned Single Judge at the time of considering Ext.P5.

We therefore, do not find any reason to interfere with the judgment under appeal. Writ appeal is dismissed accordingly.

Sd/-
ANTONY DOMINIC
JUDGE

Sd/-
SHAJI P. CHALY
JUDGE

jes