

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.VINOD CHANDRAN

MONDAY, THE 15TH DAY OF JUNE 2015/25TH JYAISHTA, 1937

WP(C).No.11117 of 2015 (L)

PETITIONER:

**SASI,S/O.SHAMBHU EMBRANTHIRI,AGED 45 YEARS,
RESIDING AT PERANA BADAGAMANA,
PORATHISSERY DESAM,PORATHISSERY VILLAGE,
THRISSUR DISTRICT.**

**BY ADVS.SMT.P.DEEPTHI
SRI.SABU JOHN**

RESPONDENT'S:

- 1. KERALA STATE,REP. BY THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR,
CIVIL STATION,IYYANTHOLE,THRISSUR DISTRICT-680 683.**
- 2. THE ADDITIONAL TAHSILDAR,
MUKUNDAPURAM TALUK,THRISSUR DISTRICT-680 683.**
- 3. THE VILLAGE OFFICER,
IRINJALAKKUDA VILLAGE,IRINJALAKKUDA,
THRISSUR DISTRICT-680 683.**
- 4. MARY @ KOCHUMARY,AGED 73 YEARS,
D/O.ACHANGADAN THOMAS,W/O.THOMMAN VARGHESE,
RESIDING AT PARACKAL HOUSE,AVITTATHUR P.O,
KADUPPASSERY VILLAGE,MUKUNDAPURAM TALUK,
THRISSUR DISTRICT,PIN-680683.**

R1 TO R3 BY GOVT. PLEADER SRI.P.K.SOYUZ.

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 15-06-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

pk

WP(C).No.11117 of 2015 (L)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

**EXT.P1 - TRUE COPY OF THE SALE DEED BEARING NO.2791/2014 DT.26/11/2014
OF IRINJALAKKUDA SRO.**

**EXT.P2 - TRUE COPY OF THE PARTITION DEED BEARING NO.1383/1979 DT. OF
IRINJALAKKUDA SRO.**

EXT.P3 - TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION FOR MUTATION DATED 30/12/2014.

EXT.P4 - TRUE COPY OF THE TRUE STATEMENT DATED 30/12/2014.

**EXT.P5 - TRUE COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT FILED BEFORE THE 3RD RESPONDENT
DATED 30/12/2014.**

**EXT.P6 - TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER OF THE 3RD RESPONDENT
NO.B-5-10111/2014 DT.04.03.2015.**

**EXT.P7 - TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PORTION OF THE DATA BANK
REGISTER.**

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS:

NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.S. TO JUDGE

pk

K. VINOD CHANDRAN, J.

W.P.(C) No. 11117 of 2015 (L)

Dated this the 15th day of June, 2015

J U D G M E N T

As early as on 6.4.2015, when the matter came up for admission, the petitioner sought for time to correct the cause title in respect of R1 and also to challenge the order passed by the District Collector as referred to in Ext.P6, that too after impleading the District Collector in the party array. Nothing has been done till date.

In such circumstance, the writ petition would stand closed, however, leaving open the remedy of the petitioner against the order of the District Collector.

Sd/-
K.VINOD CHANDRAN,
JUDGE