

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON

WEDNESDAY, THE 14TH DAY OF JANUARY 2015/24TH POUSHA, 1936

WP(C).No. 1088 of 2015 (I)

PETITIONER:

**JINTO P.MATHEW, (MINOR),
REPRESENTED BY NEXT FRIEND
AND GUARDIAN(MOTHER) ELSAMMA MATHEW,
AGED 53 YEARS, W/O.MATHEW P.M.,
PARIYARATH HOUSE, PALAMBRA P.O.,
PALKKUNNU, KANJIRAPPILLY, PN - 686 518,
KOTTAYAM DISTRICT.**

BY ADV. SMT.P.KPRIYA

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. THE GENERAL CONVENOR,
KOTTAYAM DISTRICT KALOLSAVAM 2014 - 2015,
KOTTAYAM DISTRICT.**
- 2. THE CONVENOR,
PROGRAMME COMMITTEE,
KOTTAYAM DISTRICT KALOLSAVAM 2014 - 2015,
ST.MARY'S BOYS H.S.S.KURAVILANGAD,
KOTTAYAM DISTRICT.**
- 3. THE GENERAL CONVENOR,
(DEPUTY DIRECTOR EDUCATION KOTTAYAM)
KOTTAYAM DISTRICT KALOLSAVAM - 2014 - 2015.**
- 4. THE CHAIRMAN, APPEAL COMMITTEE,
KOTTAYAM REVENUE DISTRICT KALOLSAVAM - 2014 - 2015,
KOTTAYAM DISTRICT.**

BY SENIOR GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.K.C.VINCENT

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 14-01-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

mbr/

WP(C).No. 1088 of 2015 (I)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS:

EXT.P-1: THE TRUE COPY OF THE RESULT PUBLISHED FOR MIMICRY (BOYS).

**EXT.P-2: THE TRUE COPY OF ORDER ISSUED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT TO
 THE PETITIONER.**

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS: - NIL

/TRUE COPY/

P.S. TO JUDGE

mbr/

P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON J.

~~~~~

W.P.(C) No. 1088 of 2015

~~~~~

Dated, this the 14th day of January, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioner was a participant in the 'Mimicry (Boys)' competition held recently in the Kottayam Revenue District Level Youth festival. Despite the best performance stated as put in by him, he was not selected to perform at State level. Appeal filed against the decision came to be rejected as borne by Ext. P2, which made the petitioner to approach this Court by filing the present writ petition.

2. Heard the learned Government Pleader as well, who submits that there is a substantial margin of '17 marks' between the petitioner and the first prize winner. The merit of the case was evaluated by the appellate committee, after viewing the video recording. The Judges who valued the performance had awarded marks almost in a uniform manner. It is pointed out that the marks awarded to first prize winner by the first, second and third Judges were 85, 82, and 80 marks respectively; whereas the marks awarded to the petitioner are 80, 75 and 75. No Judge has awarded marks over and above the marks given to the first prize winner. Moreover, the Judges were

W.P.(C) No. 1088 of 2014

: 2 :

experts in the filed and they are renowned mimicry artists.

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)**

kmd