

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI

THURSDAY, THE 21ST DAY OF MAY 2015/31ST VAISAKHA, 1937

WP(C).No. 13890 of 2015 (I)

PETITIONER :

**P.L.RAFY,
PERINCHERRI HOUSE, KURIACHIRA,
THRISSUR.**

BY ADV. SRI.DINESH MATHEW J.MURICKEN

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. THRISSUR CORPORATION,
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY, THRISSUR, THRISSUR P.O.,
PIN-680 001.**
- 2. THRISSUR CORPORATION COUNCIL,
REP. BY ITS MAYOR, THRISSUR CORPORATION, THRISSUR P.O.,
PIN-680 001.**
- 3. THE SECRETARY,
THRISSUR CORPORATION, THRISSUR P.O, PIN-680 001.**
- 4. HEALTH OFFICER, THRISSUR CORPORATION,
SAKTHAN THAMPURAM MARKET CIRCLE,THRISSUR,
PIN-680 001.**
- 5. C.V.JOSE,S/O.VAREETH,
CHITTALAPPILLY MISSION QUARTERS,
THRISSUR P.O, PIN-680 001.**

**R1 TO R4 BY ADV. SRI.K.P.VIJAYAN,SC, THRISSUR CORPORATION
SRI.V.N.HARIDAS**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 21-05-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

sts

WP(C).No. 13890 of 2015 (I)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

**EXT P1 : TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE ISSUED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT TO
 THE PETITIONER DATED 30-3-2015.**

**EXT P2 : TRUE COPY OF THE APPEAL SUBMITTED BEFORE THE 2ND
 RESPONDENT BY THE PETITIONER DATED 27-4-2015.**

**EXT P3 : TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER SEND BY THE POLLUTION CONTROL
 BOARD TO THE 3RD RESPONDENT DATED 8-1-2015.**

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS: NIL

/TRUE COPY/

P.A.TO JUDGE

sts

A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI, J.

W.P.(C) No. 13890 of 2015

Dated this the 21st day of May, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The grievance projected in this writ petition is that Ext.P2 appeal filed by the petitioner against Ext.P1 notice, has not been considered by the respondent corporation.

2. The petitioner alleges that as per Resolution No.71 dated 30.04.2015, Ext.P1 notice was issued by the Health Officer of the respondent corporation proposing the cancellation of licence issued in the name of the petitioner for selling chemicals, which are raw materials for making soaps and other washing materials. According to the petitioner, he was not given a copy of Ext.P1 resolution. Having every right to challenge Ext.P1 order, the petitioner has approached the respondent corporation with Ext.P2 appeal, which, according to the petitioner, is still pending without any decision being taken.

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel for the

respondent corporation.

4. When the matter came up for admission, the learned counsel for the petitioner confined his argument to the limited prayer for a direction to the respondent corporation to consider and pass appropriate orders in Ext.P2 appeal within a time frame.

Considering the nature of the submission, this writ petition is disposed of directing the 2nd respondent to consider and pass appropriate orders on Ext.P2 appeal after affording the petitioner and the affected parties, if any, an opportunity of being heard, within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

To facilitate an early action, the petitioner shall be at liberty to produce a copy of this judgment as well as a copy of this writ petition before the 2nd respondent at the earliest.

Sd/-
A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI
JUDGE

bka/-