

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.VINOD CHANDRAN

THURSDAY, THE 12TH DAY OF MARCH 2015/21ST PHALGUNA, 1936

WP(C).No. 10631 of 2005 (N)

PETITIONER(S):

1. P.K.KHALID,
REG.NO.12A/167, POOL NO.12 A, RESIDING AT
RUPPAKKAL HOUSE, PIRAYANI P.O., PALAKKAD-678 019.
2. M.ABDUL KHADER, S/O.MOHAMMED KASIM,
20/241, PUDUPALLI STREET, KUNDUKAD,
PALAKKAD DIST.
3. S.ALI AKBAR, S/O. SAIDALI,
24/210, PUDUPALLI STREET, P.O. NURANI,
PALAKKAD.
4. N.K.ABDUL HAMEED,
2/36, ILLATHU PARAMBU, P.O. PIRAYINI,
PALAKKAD DIST.
5. P.H.ASHRAF,
MYTHRI NAGAR, PIRAYANI P.O., PALAKKAD DIST.
6. S.KAJA HUSSAIN,
1/9, KUMARASWAMY COLONY, KALPATHY P.O.,
PALAKKAD.

**BY SRI.K.RAMAKUMAR, SENIOR ADVOCATE
ADV. SRI.T.RAMPRASAD UNNI**

RESPONDENT(S):

**THE CHAIRMAN K.H.W.F. BOARD,
KERALA HEADLOAD WORKERS WELFARE BOARD,
PALAKKAD LOCAL COMMITTEE, 1ST FLOOR,
MUNICIPAL BUILDING, BIG BAZAR, PALAKKAD-678 014.**

BY ADV. SRI.A.N.RAJAN BABU, SC

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON
12-03-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**

msv/

WP(C).No. 10631 of 2005 (N)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS:

EXT.P1: TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DTD.25.9.1999 ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT BOARD.

EXT.P2: TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DTD.16.12.2004 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONERS BEFORE THE BOARD.

EXT.P3: TRUE COPY OF GOVT. ORDER NO.G.O.(RT) NO.2728/07/LBR DTD.6.9.2007 ISSUED BY THE GOVT. OF KERALA.

EXT.P4: TRUE COPY OF COMMUNICATION DTD.8.1.2008 ISSUED BY R1.

EXT.P5: TRUE COPY OF A SET OF SALARY SLIP OF VARIOUS POOLS.

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS:

NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.S.TO JUDGE

Msv**/**

K. VINOD CHANDRAN, J

W.P(C) No. 10631 of 2005

Dated this the 12th day of March, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The petitioners, by the above writ petition, sought re-allotment of work to the various pools. There are different “Pool” of workers, in a notified area under the Headload Workers Act. The petitioners sought to, ventilate the grievance in a situation where the workers in a particular “Pool” does not get enough work for subsistence, while the other “Pools” have sufficient or more than the normal share of work. The dispute arose since each Pool formed under the Board is assigned, a specific jurisdictional area giving rise to such disparity.

2. In any event, writ petition is one which is filed as early as in 2005. It is not clear whether the grievance survives as of now. If at all any of the

grievance survives, the petitioners could agitate the same before the original authority afresh. All contentions of the petitioners would be left open. Writ petition would stand closed.

Sd/-

(K. VINOD CHANDRAN, JUDGE)

jma

//true copy//

P.A to Judge