

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU

WEDNESDAY, THE 4TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2015/15TH MAGHA, 1936

WP(C).No. 137 of 2015 (N)

PETITIONER:

E.K.ABDUL KHADER AGED 56 YEARS
S/O. E.A.KOCHUNNI, ERUPPAKKOTTIL HOUSE, PERINGALA.P.O.
ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.

BY ADVS.SRI.SAJEEV KUMAR K.GOPAL
SRI.R.HARISHANKAR

RESPONDENTS:

1. THE KUNNATHUNADU GRAMA PANCHAYAT
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, KUMARAPURAM.P.O.
ERNAKULAM-683565.
2. THE SECRETARY,
KUNNATHUNADU GRAMA PANCHAYAT, KUMARAPURAM.P.O.
ERNAKULAM-683565.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 04-02-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

- P1. TRUE COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION VIDE NO. A2-9125/2013 ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT DATED 25-3-2014 WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATION.
- P2. TRUE COPY OF THE LICENSE BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT VIDE NO. 457/14-15 DATED 30-7-2014 WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATION.
- P3. TRUE COPY OF THE OWNERSHIP CERTIFICATE ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT DATED 23-11-12.
- P4. TRUE COPY OF THE CONSENT NO. PCB/EKM/DO2/1C-F/291/2014 ISSUED BY THE POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD, DATED 30-5-2014.
- P5. TRUE COPY OF THE NO OBJECTION CERTIFICATE ISSUED BY THE ASSISTANT DIVISIONAL OFFICER, FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICES ERNAKULAM DATED 21-5-2014.
- P6. TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE ISSUED BY THE DISTRICT MEDICAL OFFICER OF HEALTH DATED 5-7-2014.
- P7. TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER UNDER THE RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT DATED 19-11-14 WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATION.
- P8. TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY ISSUED BY THE INFORMATION OFFICER TO THE PETITIONER DATED 15-12-14 WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATION.
- P9. TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE 2ND RESPONDENT DATED 29-12-14.

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS: NIL

/TRUE COPY/

P.A. TO JUDGE

SJ

DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, J.

= = = = =

W.P.(C) No.137 of 2015

= = = = =

Dated this the 4th day of February, 2015

JUDGMENT

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader for the respondents, apart from perusing the record. Since the issue lies in a narrow compass, this Court proposes to dispose of the writ petition at the admission stage itself.

2. Briefly stated, the petitioner, who runs a work shop, has a grievance that though the respondent Panchayat has insisted on his having requisite permissions/licences, it has ignored the other work shops in the vicinity, most of which do not have, according to the petitioner, any such licenses. In that regard the petitioner is said to have made Ext.P9 representation before the 2nd respondent. Complaining of delay in its consideration by the 2nd respondent, the petitioner has filed the present writ petition.

3. Despite service of notice to respondents 1 and 2, I do not see any representation on their behalf. At any rate, it will meet the ends of justice, if the writ petition is disposed of with a

direction to the 2nd respondent to consider Ext.P9 representation of the petitioner expeditiously.

In the facts and circumstances, having regard to the respective submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned Government Pleader, without adverting to the merits of the matter, this Court disposes of the present writ petition with a direction to the 2nd respondent to consider Ext.P9 representation, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, at any rate, within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, JUDGE

sj