

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE THE AG.CHIEF JUSTICE MR.ASHOK BHUSHAN
&

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.M.SHAFFIQUE

TUESDAY, THE 3RD DAY OF MARCH 2015/12TH PHALGUNA, 1936

WP(C).No. 6604 of 2015 (A)

PETITIONER(S) :-

P.ABDUL AZEEZ,
POOLAKKODAN HOUSE, RANDATHANI, MALAPPURAM -676 510.

BY ADV. SRI.GEORGE POONTHOTTAM

RESPONDENT(S) :-

1. THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE
PALAKKAD NORTH POLICE STATION, PALAKKAD - 678 001.
2. RAFEEQ
S/O.LATE YUSUF, PODIPPARA, KALLEKKAD P.O.
PALAKKAD DISTRICT - 678 015.

R1 BY STATE ATTORNEY SRI.P.VIJAYARAGHAVAN

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 03-03-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

jvt

WP(C).No. 6604 of 2015 (A)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S) ' EXHIBITS :-

EXT.P-1: TRUE COPY OF THE ALLOTMENT CERTIFICATE DATED 18.2.2013 ALONG
WITH THE SCHEDULE OF THE LAND WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATION.

EXT.P-2: TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE DATED 12.4.2012 WITH ENGLISH
TRANSLATION.

EXT.P-3: TRUE COPY OF THE COMPLAINT PREFERRED BEFORE THE SUB INSPECTOR
OF POLICE, DATED 18.2.2015.

RESPONDENT(S) ' EXHIBITS :- NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE

**ASHOK BHUSHAN, Ag. C.J &
A.M. SHAFFIQUE, J.**

W.P.(C) No.6604 of 2015

Dated this the 3rd day of March 2015

J U D G M E N T

Ashok Bhushan, Ag.CJ

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned State Attorney.

2. No notice is required to be issued to the first respondent in view of the order being passed in the writ petition.

3. By this writ petition, the petitioner has prayed for a mandamus directing the first respondent to give adequate protection to the person and property of the petitioner and ensure that the work conducted on the land of the petitioner is not obstructed by the 2nd respondent.

4. Petitioner's case in the writ petition is that he is proceeding to fence his property extending more than 7 Acres. The petitioner has also submitted a complaint dated 18.2.2015, Ext.P3, to the Sub Inspector of Police.

5. Learned State Attorney after obtaining instructions would submit that after receiving the complaint, the 2nd respondent was called and he is warned not to interfere in the

-: 2 :-

petitioner's work. It is submitted that in any event, the first respondent receives any further complaint, appropriate action will be taken.

In view of the aforesaid submission, we dispose of the writ petition giving liberty to the petitioner to submit appropriate complaint as and when obstruction is created by the 2nd respondent.

Sd/-
ASHOK BHUSHAN
Ag. CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-
A.M. SHAFFIQUE
JUDGE