

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON

TUESDAY, THE 13TH DAY OF JANUARY 2015/23RD POUSHA, 1936

WP(C).No. 902 of 2015 (K)

PETITIONER:

**HARITHA D, AGED 18 YEARS,
D/O.G.HIRAN, DEVANKANAM, VALUMMEL ROAD,
THRIPUNITHURA.P.O, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.**

BY ADV. SRI.AJITH KRISHNAN

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY
SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
GENERAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT,
SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695001.**
- 2. THE DIRECTOR,
HIGHER SECONDARY EDUCATION,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**
- 3. THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION,
O/O. THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR, CIVIL STATION,
KAKKANADU, ERNAKULAM-31.**
- 4. THE GENERAL CONVENOR,
55TH KERALA SCHOOL KALOLSAVAM 2014-15,
KOZHIKODE-01.**

BY SENIOR GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.K.C.VINCENT

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 13-01-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

mbr/

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS:

**EXT.P1 : TRUE COPY OF THE PROGRAMME SCHEDULE FOR THE ERNAKULAM
REVENUE DISTRICT DATED KALOLSAVAM.**

**EXT.P2 : TRUE COPY OF THE RESULTS OF MIMICRY PROGRAMME FOR HIGH
SCHOOL BOYS APPEARED AS NEWS ITEM IN MALAYALAMA
MANORAMA DATED 3/12/2014.**

**EXT.P3 : TRUE COPY OF THE APPEAL SUBMITTED BEFORE THE
3RD RESPONDENT.**

**EXT.P4 : TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 19/12/2014 ISSUED BY THE
3RD RESPONDENT.**

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS:

- NIL

/TRUE COPY/

P.A. TO JUDGE

mbr/

P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON, J.

W.P(C). No. 902 of 2015

Dated this the 13th day of January, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner was a participant in the 'Mimicry' competition held at the Revenue District School Kalolsavam, Ernakulam 2014-15. According to the petitioner, though she performed well, after evaluation she was awarded only the 2nd place. The petitioner contends that during her performance, there was a pandemonium, because of dispute between the organizers and some students, with regard to the confusion in the results of the earlier item. The grievance of the petitioner is that, though she had preferred an appeal, the same was rejected by the 3rd respondent, as borne by Ext.P4, which in turn is under challenge in this writ petition.

2. The learned Government Pleader submits, on instructions that, the 'Stage Manger' has not reported any such disturbance. It is also pointed out that, the 1st price winner obtained 233 marks, while the petitioner obtained only 216 marks and as such, there is a substantial margin of 17 marks.

3. Considering the facts and circumstances, this Court finds that there is no tenable ground. Interference is declined and the writ petition is dismissed.

Sd/-

P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON, JUDGE.

Pn