

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON

FRIDAY, THE 16TH DAY OF JANUARY 2015/26TH POUSHA, 1936

WP(C).No. 1506 of 2015 (K)

PETITIONER:

**KRISHNADEEPTHI.P.S.,
D/O.SHEENA SURESH, PANAKKAL HOUSE,
NATTIKA (P.O), THRISSUR DISTRICT.**

BY ADV. SMT.K.V.BHADRA KUMARI

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
GENERAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**
- 2. DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTIONS,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**
- 3. GENERAL CONVENOR,
KERALA STATE SCHOOLS KALOTHSAVAM 2014-'15,
STATE LEVEL COMPETITIONS, KOZHIKODE.**
- 4. CHAIRMAN, APPEAL COMMITTEE,
OFFICE OF DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION,
THRISSUR 3.**

BY SENIOR GOVT. PLEADER SRI.MUHAMMED SHAFI.M

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 16-01-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

mbr/

WP(C).No. 1506 of 2015 (K)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS:

**EXHIBIT P1: TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE ISSUED IN FAVOUR OF THE
PETITIONER IN STATE KERALOLSAVAM 2014.**

EXHIBIT P2: TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER PASSED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT.

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

/TRUE COPY/

P.A. TO JUDGE

mbr/

P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON, J.

=====

W.P.(C). No. 1506 of 2015

Dated this the 16th day of January, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioner participated in the event 'Mohiniyattom' in the District Level School Kalolsavam and could secure only the third place. The appeal was rejected by the Appeal Committee as per Ext.P2 order allegedly without considering the contentions raised and hence the writ petition. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the 1st prize was awarded to the concerned team on the basis of predetermined arrangements and that the dance teacher of the said team had entered into the stage when the said team was performing, thus giving signal to judges.

2. The learned Government Pleader submits on instructions that, no such event had occurred and no such ground was raised by the petitioner in the grounds of appeal. That apart, the video was seen by the appeal committee and the case projected by the petitioner was found as having no merit at all. The only ground raised is that, she had performed in a good manner and that she had obtained a chance to perform in the state level competition last year. It is also submitted that the 1st prize winner got 241 marks; whereas the petitioner could secure only 229 marks. Thus, there is a difference of 12 marks.

3. After going through the pleadings and proceedings and the submissions of 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.**

kp/-