

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON

FRIDAY, THE 9TH DAY OF JANUARY 2015/19TH POUSHA, 1936

WP(C).No. 17 of 2015 (B)

PETITIONER(S):

**ANAMIKA RAVI, AGED 14 (MINOR)
D/O.LEKHA, THATTAYATH BALA NIVAS, CHUTTUPADUKARA
PONEKKARA, KOCHI - 24,
REPRESENTED BY HER MOTHER AND LAWFUL GUARIDAN
MRS.LEKHA, W/O.RAVI, AGED 43 YEARS, THATTAYATH BALA NIVAS
CHUTTUPADUKARA, PONEKKARA, KOCHI - 24.**

BY ADV. SRI.MANU ROY

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONA, GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695001.**
- 2. THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION
ERNAKULAM DISTRICT-680030.**

BY SENIOR GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.JOSEPH GEORGE

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 09-01-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

PJ

WP(C).No. 17 of 2015 (B)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT P1: TRUE COPY OF G.O. DATED 18/10/12.

EXHIBIT P2: TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 19/12/2014.

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS

NIL.

/ TRUE COPY /

P.S. TO JUDGE

PJ

P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON, J.

W.P(C). No. 17 of 2015

Dated this the 9th day of January, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The grievance of the petitioner is mainly with regard to the rejection of the appeal preferred against the decision of the 'judging committee' in respect of 'Bharathanatyam' preformed by the petitioner in the 'Ernakulam District School Youth Festival'. The petitioner preferred an appeal as per Ext.P2. The petitioner complains that the carpet on the stage was not properly spread and certain portions were projecting upwards due to the unscientific laying. Hence she lost her steps and rhythm and slipped. She was awarded only the 3rd position for the said reason. The petitioner requested the appeal committee to view the video to see how the carpet was laid and how the petitioner lost her foot steps and also to enquire with the 'Stage Manager'. The case is that, without seeing the video, the appeal committee dismissed the appeal.

2. Heard the learned Government Pleader as well, who submits on instruction and also with reference to the materials on record, that there is absolutely no merit of bonafides in the

writ petition and no defect has been brought to the notice of the 'Stage Manager' and no such event has been reported by the 'Stage Manager' as well. The learned Government Pleader also points out that, there is substantial difference between the marks obtained by the petitioner and the first prize winner, to an extent of 10.

3. After hearing both the sides, this Court finds that, it is not a fit case to call for interference invoking the discretionary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

The writ petition stands dismissed accordingly.

Sd/-

P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON, JUDGE.