

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V.CHITAMBARESH

WEDNESDAY, THE 18TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2015/29TH MAGHA, 1936

WP(C).No. 2215 of 2015 (B)

PETITIONER(S):

**SHEEJA T.P. AGED 37 YEARS
W/O.K.S. CHANDRAN, SHAJI BHAVAN, PIRAPPANCODU P.O.
VENJARAMOODU, PIN-695 607**

**BY ADVS.SRI.VENJARAMOODU M.ZIYAD
SRI.SANU.S.PANICKER**

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. ADDITIONAL DISTRICT MAGISTRATE
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM 695 001.**
- 2. ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
LINE CONSTRUCTION SUB DIVISION, VENJARAMOODU P.O.
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DISTRICT, PIN-695001**
- 3. ANIL KUMAR, VILAYIL VEEDU,
VELAVOOR, PIRAPPANCODE P.O., THIRUVANANTHAPURAM 695 607**
- 4. MUNEERUDHEEN
VILAYIL VEEDU, VELAVOOR, PIRAPPANCODU P.O.
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM 695607.**

**R2 BY ADV. SRI.SAJEEVKUMAR K.GOPAL,SC,KSEB
R4 BY ADV. SRI.SAJU.S.A
R3 BY ADV. SRI.P.K.MUHAMMED
R3 BY ADV. SRI.M.ABDUL RASHEED
R BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.GIKKU JACOB**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 18-02-2015,
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**

Imp

WP(C).No. 2215 of 2015 (B)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

EXT.P1. TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 31.12.2014 PASSED BY THE ADDITIONAL DISTRICT MAGISTRATE.

EXT.P2. TRUE COPY OF THE OBJECTION DATED 19.01.2015 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT.

EXT.P3. TRUE COPY OF THE SKETCH PREPARED BY THE PETITIONER WITH THE HELP OF SURVEYOR.

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS

ANNEXURE R2(a). TRUE COPY OF THE SKETCH SHOWING THE PROPOSAL I AND II.

ANNEXURE R4(a) . TRUE COPY OF DISABILITY CERTIFICATE DATED 12.08.2011 ISSUED BY MEDICAL BOARD GENERAL HOSPITAL THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE

Imp

V.CHITAMBARESH, J.

W.P.(C) No.2215 of 2015

Dated this the 18th day of February, 2015

JUDGMENT

I do not find any illegality in Exhibit P1 order passed by the first respondent in terms of Section 16 of the Indian Telegraph Act. The first respondent has preferred the second proposal suggested by the second respondent to the first proposal submitted. The electricity supply line will be drawn along a broader pathway in the second proposal where as the pathway suggested in the first proposal is too narrow.

2. It is also reported that the petitioner owns only three cents of property in the area and the majority of extent is held by her father. The father of the petitioner was very much served with the notice as he is an adult member residing in the house. The Government Pleader points out that the petitioner stays elsewhere and that she has also not turned up to object to the route before the first respondent.

3. All the necessary inputs had been considered by the first respondent in passing Exhibit P1 order. The same does not warrant interference in exercise of the jurisdiction of this court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

The writ petition is dismissed. No costs.

Sd/-
V.CHITAMBARESH, JUDGE

Imp

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE

