

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.VINOD CHANDRAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 27TH DAY OF MAY 2015/6TH JYAISHTA, 1937

WP(C).No. 13895 of 2015 (J)

PETITIONER:

**M/S.INDUS IND BANK LTD,
HAVING ITS REGIONAL OFFICE AT 'RAMA BHAVAN',
PARUTHELI PALAM, TOLL JUNCTION, EDAPPALLY,
KOCHI - 682024, REP BY ITS DEPUTY MANAGER(LEGAL)
AJAY.M.**

**BY ADVS.SRI.G.HARIHARAN
SRI.PRAVEEN.H.**

RESPONDENT(S)

- 1. RANGE FOREST OFFICER,
OFFICE OF THE RANGE FOREST OFFICER,
KANTHALLOOR RANGE, KOVILKADAVU,
SAHAYAGIRI P.O, IDUKKI DISTRICT, PIN - 685620.**
- 2. THE AUTHORIZED OFFICER AND
THE DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER,
SANDAL FOREST DIVISION MARAYOOR,
IDUKKI DISTRICT, PIN - 685620.**
- 3. RAMALA MUHAMMED, W/O.MUHAMMED,
AZHUTHANIKKATTU HOUSE, KOVILKADAVU,
MARAYOOR, IDUKKI DISTRICT, PIN - 685620.**

R1 & R2 BY SRI.M.A.THOMAS KUTTY, SPL. GOVT. PLEADER(FOREST)

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 27-05-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

mbr/

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS:

- P1:- TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT MADE IN WPC NO 18725/2014
DATED 24/7/2014.
- P2:- TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION DATED 17/7/2014 FILED UNDER SECTION
61A OF THE FOREST ACT BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE
2ND RESPONDENT.
- P3:- TRUE COPY OF THE POSTAL ACKNOWLEDGEMENT RECEIVED FROM THE
2ND RESPONDENT ON 4/9/2014.
- P4:- TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER MADE IN IA NO 805/2014 IN WPC NO 18725/2014
DATED 11/2/2015.
- P5:- TRUE COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION DATED 7/3/2015 SENT BY THE
2ND RESPONDENT.

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS:

- EXT. R1(A) : TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO.A1-710/14 DATED 19.6.2014 OF THE
DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER, MARAYOOR SANDAL DIVISION.

/TRUE COPY/

P.A. TO JUDGE

mbr/

K. VINOD CHANDRAN, J.

W.P(C). No.13895 of 2015

Dated this the 27th day of May, 2015.

JUDGMENT

The petitioner seeks interim custody of a vehicle, which is said to have been seized in respect of an allegation of commission of offence under the Forest Act.

2. The learned Special Government Pleader (Forest) appear and submits that the vehicle was confiscated by order dated 19.06.2014. The petitioner however contends that in fact an earlier writ petition has resulted in Ext.P1 directing consideration of appropriate application for interim custody, if one is made. It is to be noticed that even before Ext.P1 judgment was passed, the confiscation order is said to have been passed. The compliance of Ext.P1 judgment has also been effected by Ext.P5.

3. The petitioner contends that the petitioner has not been communicated with the order of 09.07.2014. In fact, even in

Ext.P5 the said order is referred to and the petitioner could make an application for getting certified copy of the said order.

The writ petition is dismissed with liberty reserved to the petitioner to challenge the orders passed.

Sd/-
K. VINOD CHANDRAN,
JUDGE

sp