

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON

MONDAY, THE 12TH DAY OF JANUARY 2015/22ND POUSHA, 1936

WP(C).No. 79 of 2015 (H)

PETITIONER:

**T.S.ARJUN, AGED 17 YEARS,
REPRESENTED BY HIS GUARDIAN T.N.SAJEEVAN,
THAREPADATH HOUSE, PALLURUTHY, KOCHI-682006.**

**BY ADVS.DR.K.P.SATHEESAN (SR.)
SRI.M.R.JAYAPRASAD
SRI.P.MOHANDAS (ERNAKULAM)
SRI.ANOOP.V.NAIR
SRI.S.VIBHEESHANAN
SRI.N.MANU THAMPI**

RESPONDENTS:

- 1. STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY,
GENERAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 001.**
- 2. THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTIONS,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 033.**
- 3. THE GENERAL CONVENER,
KERALA STATE SCHOOL KALOLSAVAM 2014-2015
KOZHIKODE-673 001.**
- 4. THE CHAIRMAN,
DISTRICT LEVEL APPELLATE COMMITTEE,
KERALA KALOLSAVAM, ERNAKULAM REVENUE DISTRICT,
ERNAKULAM, KAKKANAD, KOCHI-682 030.**

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER, SRI. JOSEPH GEORGE

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
12-01-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**

WP(C).No. 79 of 2015 (H)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS

- EXT.P1 : COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE OF PETITIONER IN KERALA
SCHOOL KALOLSAVAM 2014-2015 IN VRINDAVADYAM IN
MATTANCHERRY EDUCATIONAL SUB DISTRICT.**
- EXT.P2 : COPY OF THE ORDER NO.F1/18209/2014(92)DATED 19-12-2014
ISSUED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT.**

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS : NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE

DST

P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON, J.

W.P.(C) No.79 of 2015

Dated this the 12th day of January, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioner's team participated in 'Vrindavadyam' in the District Level Competition. The grievance of the petitioner is that, because of the fault in the sound system, the performance of the petitioner's team could not be evaluated properly. As a result, the petitioner's team could not get the first prize. The appeal filed by the petitioner was rejected and the video clipping was not viewed by the appeal committee. Hence the writ petition.

2. The learned Government Pleader submits on instructions that, the allegation is wrong. The 1st prize winner got 253 marks and that of petitioners' team got only 246 marks. It is submitted that the Appeal committee has viewed the video clipping of the event and that the judges of the judging committee had evaluated the event in a uniform manner.

3. After going through the pleadings and proceedings and the submissions made by the learned Government Pleader, this Court finds that the petitioner has not established any tenable ground to call for interference. Accordingly, interference is declined and the writ petition is dismissed.

**P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON,
JUDGE**