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. 14787 of 2015 (W)

PETITIONER :

AYISHA BEEVI,
UMMAITHANAKAM, EEZHUVATHURUTHY AMSOM,
ERIKKAMANNA DESOM, PONNANI P.O.

BY ADV. SRI.T.G.RAJENDRAN

RESPONDENT(S):

1. **MUNICIPAL SECRETARY,**
   PONNANI MUNICIPALITY, PONNANI SOUTH P.O.-679 586.

2. **STATE OF KERALA,**
   REP. BY CHIEF SECRETARY, SECRETARIAT,
   THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 001.

3. **THE ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEER,**
   KERALA STATE POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD,
   DISTRICT OFFICE, MALAPPURAM - 676 505.

R1 BY ADV.SRI.S.SUJIN
R2 BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT.K.A.SANJEETHA
R3 BY SRI. M.AJAY, SC, KERALA STATE POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

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. 14787 of 2015 (W)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

P1 - COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION SENT BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT DATED 18.5.2015

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS: NIL

/TRUE COPY/

P.A.TO JUDGE

sts

A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI, J.

W.P.(C) No. 14787 of 2015

Dated this the 21st day of May, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The grievance of the petitioner is that the 1st respondent, who is duty bound to take immediate action on Ext.P1 representation, is keeping mum on the same.

2. The petitioner is a resident of Ponnani Municipality, who is residing near a public road. According to the petitioner, the 1st respondent has permitted a fish market to be located in the public road, just opposite to her residence. According to her, this was originally located on the side of NH 17 at Ponnani. Her grievance is that though Ext.P1 representation was submitted before the respondent panchayath ventilating her grievance, no action has been taken.

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned Standing Counsel for the respondent municipality, the learned Government Pleader and the learned Standing Counsel for the Kerala State Pollution

Control Board.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner confined her argument to the limited prayer for a direction to the 1st respondent to consider and pass appropriate orders on Ext.P1 representation within a time frame.

In the light of the submission, this writ petition is disposed of directing the 1st respondent to consider and pass appropriate orders on Ext.P1 representation 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 1st respondent at the earliest.

Sd/-
A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI
JUDGE

bka/-