

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI

FRIDAY, THE 13TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2015/24TH MAGHA, 1936

WP(C).No.4650 of 2015 (E)

PETITIONER:

**MOSQUE LANE RESIDENT'S ASSOCIATION,
KESAVADASAPURAM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 004,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.**

**BY ADVS.SRI.K.B.PRADEEP
SRI.ASHOK SURESH**

RESPONDENTS:

- 1. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,
OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR,
KUDAPPANAKUNNU.P.O-695 001.**
- 2. THE CORPORATION OF THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,
OFFICE OF THE THIRUVANANTHAPURAM CORPORATION,
MUSEUM P.O., THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 001,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.**
- 3. THE DEPUTY TAHSILDAR (LA),
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 001.**

**R1 & R3 BY GOVT. PLEADER SMT.C.K.SHERIN.
R2 BY SRI.P.K.MANOJKUMAR, SC, TVPM CORPORATION**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 13-02-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

pk

WP(C).No.4650 of 2015 (E)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

EXT.P1:TRUE COPY OF THE DECISION TAKEN ON 21.11.2012.

EXT.P2:TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DTD.1.7.2014 IN WPC NO.6007/2014.

EXT.P3:TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DTD.5.12.2014.

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS:

NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.S. TO JUDGE

pk

A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI, J.

W.P.(C) No. 4650 of 2015

Dated this the 13th day of February, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner, who is a registered association of the residents of the Mosque Lane, Kesavadasapuram, Thiruvananthapuram, has approached this Court alleging that though the respondent Government approved the proposal of widening of the road, no action was taken in the matter.

2. The petitioner points out that after repeated requests, budgetary allocations are made for acquisition. However, as the acquisition proceedings moved in a snail pace, directions were sought to expedite the land acquisition proceedings before the end of the financial year. The Government undertook before this Court to complete the land acquisition proceedings within a time frame and the local authority promised this Court not to divert the allotted funds. Due to non-compliance of the above undertakings, after the expiry of the time limits, the petitioner approached this Court with contempt case, in which this Court extended the time

limit for a further period of year, which also expired long back; according to the petitioner. The petitioner points out that at the instigation of two residents, the 3rd respondent then decided to reduce the width of the proposed road by one meter from seven meters, which was originally fixed after detailed technical study. According to the petitioner, the reduction proposed would deny the very purpose of widening. Pending a writ petition filed by the petitioner, the corporation decided to go back to the original proposal for having 7 meter width for the road; it is alleged. It is with this background, the petitioner has come up before this Court.

As the limited prayer in this writ petition is only for a direction to expedite further action pursuant to Exts.P1 and P3, this writ petition is disposed of directing respondents 1 and 3 to take follow-up action to implement Exts.P1 and P3 without any delay, at any rate, within a period of five months.

Sd/-
A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI
JUDGE

bka/-