

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM**

**PRESENT:**

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON**

**THURSDAY, THE 15TH DAY OF JANUARY 2015/25TH POUSHA, 1936**

**WP(C).No. 1364 of 2015 (U)**  
-----

**PETITIONER:**  
-----

**M.LAKSHMI, AGED 15 YEARS  
D/O.JALAJA, (MINOR), REPRESENTED BY HER MOTHER JALAJA  
WIFE OF SASIDHARAN, AGED 42 YEARS, (RESIDING AT PUTHEN VEEDU  
P.O.POOKKOTTUR-676517, ERNAD, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT).**

**BY ADVS.SRI.V.A.MUHAMMED  
SRI.M.SAJJAD**

**RESPONDENTS:**  
-----

- 1. THE STATE OF KERALA,  
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT  
GENERAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695001.**
- 2. THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTIONS,  
JAGATHY, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695014.**
- 3. THE GENERAL CONVENER,  
SCHOOL KALOLSAVAM,  
THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION,  
MALAPPURAM REVENUE DISTRICT-676505.**

**BY SENIOR GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.MUHAMMED SHAFI.M.**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION  
ON 15-01-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE  
FOLLOWING:**

**PJ**

**APPENDIX**

**PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS**  
-----

**EXT.P1            TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE OF MERIT DATED 5.1.2012**  
**EXT.P1(A)       TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE OF MERIT DATED 28.11.2013**  
**EXT.P1(B)       TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE OF MERIT DATED 9.1.2014**  
**EXT.P1(C)       TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE OF MERIT DATED 7.11.2014**  
**EXT.P1(D)       TRUE COPY OF THE NEWS PAPER REPORT CHANDRIKA DAILY DATED**  
**4TH JANUARY 2012**  
**EXT.P2           TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER DATED 20.12.2014**  
**EXT.P3           TRUE COPY OF THE ITEM WISE PARTICIPANTS DETAILS DATED**  
**08.01.2015.**

**RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS**  
-----

**NIL.**

**/ TRUE COPY /**

**P.S. TO JUDGE**

**PJ**

**P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON, J.**

-----  
**W.P.(C) No.1364 of 2015**  
-----

**Dated this the 15<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2015**

**JUDGMENT**

The petitioner was a participant in the District School Youth Festival in the event 'Mohiniyattam' and was awarded only 15<sup>th</sup> position. The petitioner preferred an appeal, but the same was rejected. It is stated that the video clipping was not viewed by the appeal committee. Hence the writ petition.

2. The learned Government Pleader submits on instructions that, the 1<sup>st</sup> prize winner got 253 marks and that the petitioner got only 219 marks. 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