

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. 1717 of 2015 (L)

PETITIONER(S):

1. **ABHIRAMI T.T.,
S.V.V. HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL, PALEMADU,
MALAPPURAM DISTRICT, MINOR, REPRESENTED BY
MOTHER SMT.USHAKUMARI P.S., THILLAIKATHU,
KARUNECI, EDAKKARA P.O., 679 331.**
2. **SREERAG P.S.,
S.V.V. HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL, PALEMADU,
MALAPPURAM DISTRICT, MINOR, REPRESENTED BY
FATHER SRI.SANTHOSH KUMAR, POOLAKKAL HOUSE,
ARNADAMPADAM, P.O. PALEMADU - 679 331.**

BY ADV. SRI.V. RAJENDRAN

RESPONDENT(S):

1. **THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION,
MALAPPURAM - 676 505.**
2. **DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 001.**
3. **GENERAL CONVENOR, STATE SCHOOL YOUTH
FESTIVAL COMMITTEE, B.E.M. HIGHER SECONDARY
COMPOUND, CALICUT - 673 001.**

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. 1717 of 2015 (L)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS:

EXT.P1: TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DTD.NIL ISSUED TO THE 1ST PETITIONER.

EXT.P2: TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DTD.9.1.2015 ISSUED TO THE 2ND PETITIONER.

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS:

NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.S.TO JUDGE

Msv/

P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON J.

~~~~~

W.P.(C) No. 1717 of 2015

~~~~~

Dated, this the 16th day of January, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioners were participants in 'Chavittunadakam' competition held recently in the Malappuram Revenue District School Kalolsavam. According to the petitioners, though the petitioners' teams performed well, after evaluation, the 1st petitioner's team was awarded only the 3rd prize with A Grade, while the 2nd petitioner's team was awarded the 2nd prize with A Grade, which according to the petitioners is not correct. Appeals were preferred, contending that the Judges were biased; but they were dismissed, as borne by Exts. P1 and P2, which in turn are under challenge in this writ petition.

2. Heard the learned Government Pleader as well, who submits that there is absolutely no pith or substance in the averments raised in the writ petition. It is stated that the Judges who evaluated performance were experts in the field.

3. Considering the facts and circumstances, this Court finds that there is no tenable ground. But for the vague allegation, no material is produced to substantiate the contentions. Interference is declined and the writ petition is dismissed.

Sd/-

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

kmd