

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON

FRIDAY, THE 10TH DAY OF APRIL 2015/20TH CHAITHRA, 1937

WP(C).No. 12049 of 2015 (E)

PETITIONER(S):

**SOBHA, AGED 50 YEARS,
D/O.SANKUNNI, MANKUZHI HOUSE,
IRINGAPRAM P.O., IRINGAPRAM - 680 103,
THRISSUR DISTRICT.**

**BY ADVS.SRI.S.SANAL KUMAR
SMT.BHAVANA VELAYUDHAN
SMT.T.J.SEEMA**

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. THE DEPUTY INSPECTOR GENERAL OF
REGISTRATION (LICENSING), OFFICE OF THE
DEPUTY INSPECTOR GENERAL OF REGISTRATION,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 023.**
- 2. THE DISTRICT REGISTRAR (GENERAL),
THRISSUR - 680 020.**
- 3. THE SUB REGISTRAR,
KUNNAMKULAM - 680 503.**

BY SENIOR GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.JOSEPH GEORGE

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
10-04-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**

msv/

WP(C).No. 12049 of 2015 (E)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS:

**EXT.P1: TRUE COPY OF THE EXPLANATION SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER
BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT DTD.5.12.2014.**

**EXT.P2: TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO.L1.17925/2014 DATED 20.3.2015 ISSUED BY
THE 1ST RESPONDENT.**

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS:

NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.S.TO JUDGE

MsV/

P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON, J.

=====

W.P.(C). No. 12049 of 2015

Dated this the 10th day of April, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioner has approached this Court with the following prayers:

“i. Issue a writ of certiorari or any other appropriate writ, order or direction quashing Ext.P2 order.

ii. Issue such other writ, order or direction which this Honourable Court deems fit in the nature and circumstances of the case.”

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the Ext.P2 is under challenge whereby the licence of the petitioner as a 'Scribe' stands suspended as per order dated 20.3.2015. According to the petitioner no misconduct/irregularity has been committed by petitioner. The explanation submitted by the petitioner vide Ext.P1 has not been properly considered while passing Ext.P2, submits the learned counsel.

2. Heard the learned Government Pleader as well.

3. After hearing both the sides, this Court finds that the petitioner is having an effective alternative remedy by way of appeal before the competent authority against Ext.P2. In the

said circumstance, the petitioner is relegated to move the appellate authority. With out prejudice to the rights and liberties of the petitioner to move the appellate authority as above, interference is declined and the writ petition is dismissed.

So as to enable the petitioner to pursue such exercise, further proceedings pursuant to Ext.P2 shall be kept in abeyance for a period of two weeks.

**P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON,
JUDGE.**

kp/-