

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. 1573 of 2015 (V)

PETITIONER(S):

**PRANAV P.K., AGED 17 YEARS
S/O.NARAYANAN, REPRESENTED BY HIS FATHER GUARDIAN,
P.K.NARAYANAN, S/O.NEELAKANDAN, PANNIYAMKUNNATH HOUSE,
KAVANOOR, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT.**

**BY ADVS.SRI.BABU S. NAIR
SMT.SMITHA BABU**

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. THE GENERAL CONVENER,
KERALA SCHOOL KALOLSAVAM,
THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT,
DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL EDUCATION,
THIRUVANNATHAPURAM,PIN-695 001.**
- 2. THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTIONS,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN-695 001.**
- 3. THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION,
MALAPPURAM, PIN-676 505.**

BY SENIOR GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.JOSEPH GEORGE

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

msv/

WP(C).No. 1573 of 2015 (V)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

**EXHIBIT P1(a) TO P1(j):TRUE COPIES OF THE CERTIFICATES OBTAINED BY THE
PETITIONER IN THE MALAPPURAM REVENUE DISTRICT
LEVEL KALOLSAVAM DATED 12.01.2011, 05.01.2012,
06.12.2012, 09.01.2014.**

**EXHIBIT P2(a)TO P2(f):TRUE COPIES OF THE CERTIFICATES OBTAINED BY THE
PETITIONER IN THE STATE LEVEL COMPETITIONS
DATED 22.01.2012, 20.01.2013 AND 25.01.2014.**

**EXHIBIT P3; TRUE COPY OF THE NEWSPAPER REPORT APPEARED IN MALAYALA
MANORAMA DAILY DATED 18.1.2013.**

**EXHIBIT P4: TRUE COPY OF THE COMPLAINT GIVEN BY THE PETITIONER TO THE
3RD RESPONDENT.**

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS:

NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.S.TO JUDGE

Msv**/**

P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON, J.

=====

W.P.(C). No. 1573 of 2015

Dated this the 16th day of January, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioner participated in the event 'Bhrathanatyam' in the District Level School Kalolsavam and secured first place with A Grade. He was also to participate in the event 'Keralanadanam', but denied the opportunity alleging that he reported only belatedly. Ext.P4 compliant preferred in this regard was not considered properly and hence the writ petition.

2. Heard the learned Government Pleader as well.

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. No lapse on the part of the respondents is established. Accordingly, interference is declined and the writ petition is dismissed.

**P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON,
JUDGE.**