

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU

MONDAY, THE 16TH DAY OF NOVEMBER 2015/25TH KARTHIKA, 1937

WP(C).No. 12059 of 2015 (F)

PETITIONER : -

VMUTHUSWAMY, S/O. VALAIDAS,
HOUSE.NO.1/1638, BEHIND KOKERS THEATRE,
FORT KOCHI 682 001.

BY ADVS.SRI.DIPU.R
SRI.SANAL P.RAJ
SMT.DHANYABABU
SMT.P.A.PRIYA

RESPONDENTS : -

1. STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF CO-OPERATION, GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM 695 001.
2. REGISTRAR OF CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES,
KERALA, OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES,
STATUE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM 695001.
3. THE ASSISTANT REGISTRAR OF CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES (GENERAL),
FORT KOCHI 682 001.
4. THE MATTANCHERRY SC/ST CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETY,
NO.R.131, MATTANCHERRY, KOCHI-682 002,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.

R4 BY ADV.SRI.K.JANARDHANA SHENOY
R4 BY ADV.SRI.R.ROHITH
R1-R3 BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI. G. GOPAKUMAR

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON
16-11-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

WP(C).No. 12059 of 2015 (F)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS : -

EXHIBIT P1 : TRUE COPY OF TYHE LETTER NO.M/294/K.DIS DATED 21.07.2012.

EXHIBIT P2 : TRUE COPY OF THE CORONARY ANGIOGRAM REPORT OF THE
PETITIONER DATED 1.10.2014 ISSUED FROM AMRITA INSTITUTE OF
MEDICAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH CENTRE.

EXHIBIT P3 : TRUE COPY OF THE PETITIONER'S LETTER DATED 14.1.2015.

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS : - NIL.

// TRUE COPY //

P.A. TO JUDGE

DMR/-

DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, J.

W.P.(c) No. 12059 of 2015

Dated this the 16th day of November, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioner and his wife having deposited certain amounts in 2002, later renewed the deposits on their maturity. Thus, the matured deposits were required to be paid by the fourth respondent in 2012. Despite all their efforts, the petitioner and his wife could not get the amounts repaid to them. Aggrieved, the petitioner has filed the present writ petition, representing the cause of his wife as well.

2. In response to the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned counsel for the fourth respondent has submitted that the fourth respondent could not repay the amounts given its precarious financial position. He has, however, submitted that the fourth respondent is willing to repay the deposits to the petitioner and his wife within two months.

Recording the submission of the learned counsel for the fourth respondent, this Court disposes of the writ petition with a direction to the fourth respondent to repay the amounts due

to the petitioner and his wife, as has been undertaken by it through its learned counsel before the Court.

**DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU
JUDGE**

DMR/-