

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE ANTONY DOMINIC

&

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE P.V.ASHA

TUESDAY, THE 8TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2015/17TH AGRAHAYANA, 1937

WA.No. 2565 of 2015 () IN WP(C).36747/2010

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 36747/2010 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA
DATED 22/09/2015

APPELLANT/PETITIONER IN THE WRIT PETITION:

K.G.MANOJKUMAR
S/O.K.T.GOPALAN, KOKKATTU HOUSE, PULLADU P.O.
THIRUVALLA (TECHNICIAN GRADE II
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, ATTINGAL.

BY ADV. SRI.S.SUBHASH CHAND

RESPONDENT(S)/RESPONDENTS IN THE WRIT PETITION::

1. INSTITUTE OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT
PRAJOE TOWERS, VAZHUTHACAUD
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM 14, REPRESENTED BY ITS DIRECTOR.

2. THE DIRECTOR
INSTITUTE OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT
PRAJOE TOWERS, VAZHUTHACAUD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM 14.

R BY SRI.V.A.MOHAMMED, SC, IHRD

THIS WRIT APPEAL HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
08-12-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

ANTONY DOMINIC & P.V ASHA, JJ.

W.A No.2565 of 2015

Dated this the 8th day of December, 2015

JUDGMENT

Antony Dominic, J.

Heard the learned counsel for the appellant and the learned Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents. The appellant filed the Writ Petition, essentially claiming retrospectivity to his promotion to the post of Technician Grade II, in the 10% quota from the post of Workshop Assistant. According to the appellant, vacancies were available from 2002 and he got qualified on 25.08.2005, but was promoted by Ext.P9 order only with effect from 01.09.2007. In these circumstances, he represented for promotion with effect from the date on which he became qualified. When that representation was not responded to, the Writ Petition was filed and the learned Single Judge having negatived the claim, this appeal is filed.

2. On hearing the parties, we notice that the claim made by the appellant in his representation, evidenced by Ext.P11

submitted to the 2nd respondent, is still remaining unattended. Therefore, it is only appropriate that the 2nd respondent considers the said claim.

Accordingly, we dispose of this appeal, directing the 2nd respondent to consider and pass orders on Ext.P11 - the representation made by the appellant claiming retrospectivity to his promotion, untrammelled by the observations made by the learned Single Judge in the impugned judgment.

With this observation, the Writ Appeal is disposed of

Sd/-
ANTONY DOMINIC
Judge

Sd/-
P.VASHA
Judge

rtr/

/true copy/

P.S to Judge