

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. 1047 of 2015 (E)

PETITIONER :

**ANAGHA, AGED 52 YEARS
D/O. K.R.KRISHNAKUMAR (MINOR)
REPRESENTED BY HER FATHER K.R.KRISHNAKUMARI
S/O. RAMAN NABHOODHIRI,
AGED 52 YEARS, PATHIRIKUNNATH MANA
"SREEVALSAM", P.O.MUNDAKOTTUKURISSI, SHORANUR
PIN-679 122.**

BY ADV. SRI.K.RAVI (PARIYARATH)

RESPONDENT(S) :

- 1. THE STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT
GENERAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 001.**
- 2. THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTIONS
JAGATHY, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 014.**
- 3. THE GENERAL CONVENER OF REVENUE DISTRICT KALOLSAVAM
PALAKKAD, (DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION, CIVIL STATION
PALAKKAD, PALAKKAD DISTRICT-678 001.**
- 4. THE CHAIRMAN
APPELLATE AUTHORITY OF REVENUE DISTRICT KALOLSAVAM
PALAKKAD. (DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION
CIVIL STATION, PALAKKAD), PALAKKAD DISTRICT-678 001.**

R1 TO R4 BY SR. GOVT. PLEADER SRI. JOSEPH GEORGE

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

Mn

...2/-

WP(C).No. 1047 of 2015 (E)

APPENDIX

PETITIONERS' EXHIBITS :

**EXT. P1 : COPY OF THE ORDER PASSED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT ON THE
 APPEAL PREFERRED AT THE INSTANCE OF THE PETITIONER
 DTD.26.12.2014.**

**EXT. P2 : COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGES OF THE KERALA SCHOOL
 KALOLSAVAM MANNUAL DATED NIL.**

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS : NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE

Mn

P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON, J.

W.P.(C) No.1047 of 2015

Dated this the 13th day of January, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioner was a participant in the item 'Poetry (General Poetry-HSS [Sanskrit]) in the Revenue District Kalolsavam held at Palakkad. The petitioner's contention is that, she performed well, but was awarded only the 4th place, mainly because of the reason that 'power failure' happened during her performance. 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 261 marks (91,90,80), whereas petitioner got only 226 marks (74,76,76) and the difference of marks is '35'. 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**

sp