

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI

TUESDAY, THE 10TH DAY OF MARCH 2015/19TH PHALGUNA, 1936

WP(C).NO. 7499 OF 2015 (J)

PETITIONER(S):

**P.A. ABRAHAM, AGED 51 YEARS,
MANAGING PARTNER, M/S. PRIYANKA MOTORS,
MAKKAMKUNNU, PATHANAMTHITTA-689 645.**

**BY ADVS.SRI.ANIL D. NAIR,
SRI.R.SREEJITH,
SMT.C.S.SULEKHA BEEVI,
SMT.ROSIE ATHULYA JOSEPH,
SMT.MANEESHA KUMAR.**

RESPONDENT(S):

**SECRETARY,
PATHANAMTHITTA MUNICIPALITY,
PATHANAMTHITTA-689 640.**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 10-03-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

rs.

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:-

EXHIBIT P1: TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION DATED 20.02.2015 FOR RENEWAL OF LICENSE SEND BY REGISTERED POST TO RESPONDENT BY THE PETITIONER.

EXHIBIT P1(A): THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF P1.

EXHIBIT P2: TRUE COPY OF THE REQUEST DATED 23.02.2015 SEND BY REGISTERED POST TO RESPONDENT ALONG WITH P1 BY THE PETITIONER.

EXHIBIT P2(A): THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF P2.

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS:- NIL.

//TRUE COPY//

PA. TO JUDGE

rs.

A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI, J.

W.P.(C) No. 7499 of 2015

Dated this the 10th day of March, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The limited prayer in this writ petition is for a consideration of the petitioner's application for renewal of the licence.

2. According to the petitioner, he is conducting an automobile business from 2001 onwards in the shop rooms taken on lease situated within the local limits of the respondent municipality. The petitioner alleges that the licence, which was issued by the respondent municipality, was renewed from time to time; and the petitioner has sent an application for renewal of licence after remitting necessary fee. However, the respondent has neither renewed the licence nor informed the petitioner the reasons for not renewing the licence.

3. Today, when the matter came up for hearing, the learned counsel for the petitioner confined his

..2..

argument to the limited prayer for a direction to the respondent municipality to consider Ext.P1 application within a time frame after affording the petitioner an opportunity of being heard.

4. Considering the nature of the submission, this Court is of the view that the writ petition can be disposed of even without issuing notice to the respondent municipality.

Therefore, the writ petition is disposed of directing the respondent municipality to consider and pass appropriate orders on Ext.P1 after affording the petitioner an opportunity of being heard within a period of 15 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment. To facilitate an early action, it shall be open to the petitioner to produce a copy of this judgment along with a copy of the writ petition before the respondent municipality at the earliest.

Sd/-

A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI
JUDGE

bka/-