IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.VINOD CHANDRAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 1ST DAY OF JULY 2015/10TH ASHADHA, 1937

W.P.(C).No.18627 of 2010 (C)

PETITIONER(S):-

JALESH KUMAR, S/O.PEETHAMBARAN VAIDYAN,
MANAYILAZHIKATH, PORUKKARA, EDAPPALIKOTTA PO.,
KOLLAM.

BY ADVS.SRI.C.M.MOHAMMED IQUABAL
SRI.S.SHAJI.

RESPONDENT(S):-

---

1. KERALA MINERALS AND METALS LTD.,
SANKARAMANGALAM, CHAVARA, KOLLAM,
REPRESENTED BY, ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR.

2. THE MANAGING DIRECTOR,
KERALA MINERALS AND METALS LTD.,
SANKARAMANGALAM, CHAVARA, KOLLAM.

3. THE ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEER,
KERALA STATE POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD,
DISTRICT OFFICE, KRISHNALEELA TOWERS, KADAPPAKKADA PO.,
KOLLAM - 691 008.

R1 & 2 BY ADVS.SRI.B.S.KRISHNAN [SENIOR ADVOCATE]
SRI.K.ANAND [SENIOR ADVOCATE]
SMT.LATHA KRISHNAN
R3 BY STANDING COUNSEL SRI.M.AJAY.
R3 BY ADV. SMT.K.K.THULASY BHAI,SC,POLLUTION C.BOARD.
R3 BY ADV. SRI.M.K.CHANDRAMOHAN DAS,SC,POLL.C.BOARD
R3 BY ADV. SRI.M.R.ARUNKUMAR, SC, POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 01-07-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:-

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS:-

EXHIBIT P1: TRUE COPY OF THE TEST RESULT OF WATER SAMPLE OF THE LOCAL WELL DATED 16.9.2008.

EXHIBIT P2 TRUE COPY OF THE COMPLAINT SUBMITTED BY THE PURASAMATHI HEADED BY THE PETITIONER DATED 22.09.2008.

EXHIBIT P3 TRUE COPY OF THE PLP.NO.47/2008 FILED BEFORE THE TALUK LEGAL SERVICE AUTHORITY, KARUNAGAPPALLY DATED 03.10.08.

EXHIBIT P4 TRUE COPY OF THE REPORT DATED 22.07.09 OF THE 3RD RESPONDENT.

EXHIBIT P5 TRUE COPY OF THE DIRECTION ISSUED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT TO THE SECOND RESPONDENT DATED 22.07.09.

EXHIBIT P6 TRUE COPY OF THE DECISION DATED 5.3.2010 IN PLP.NO.47/2008 ON THE FILE OF THE TALUK LEGAL SERVICE AUTHORITY.

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS:-
--- NIL

vku/- [true copy]

K. Vinod Chandran, J

W.P.(C).No.18627 of 2010-C

Dated this the 01st day of July, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioner, a resident of Sankaramangalam at Chavara, was aggrieved with the activities of the 1st respondent-Company. The petitioner had moved an application before the 3rd respondent, in which Exhibit P5 directions were said to have been issued. The writ petition is of the year 2010. If the 1st respondent has not complied with Exhibit P5 and the same is not modified and if the petitioner has any surviving grievance, the petitioner can approach the appropriate authority. With that liberty, the writ petition would stand closed. No costs.

Sd/-
K.Vinod Chandran
Judge.

vku/-

[true copy]