

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.VINOD CHANDRAN

FRIDAY, THE 29TH DAY OF MAY 2015/8TH JYAISHTA, 1937

WP(C).No. 14977 of 2015 (V)

PETITIONER(S) :

N.V.SADANANDAN @ K.PURAM SADANANDAN,
SRUTHILAYAM , K PURAM P.O.,
MALAPPURAM - 676 307.

BY ADV. SRI.N.J.JOHNSON.

RESPONDENT(S) :

1. STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY CHIEF SECRETARY, SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM 695001
2. P.N.PREMACHANDRAN,
SOIL SURVEY, SOIL CONSERVATION DIRECTOR,
CENTRAL PLAZA,
VAZHUTHACADU, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 014.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT. C.K.SHERIN.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 29-05-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

rvs.

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S) ' EXHIBITS :

EXT. P1:- TRUE COPY OF THE COMPLAINT DTD 30/3/2015

EXT. P2:- TRUE COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION RECEIVED BY THE
PETITIONER FROM THE VIGILANCE COURT.

EXT. P3:- TRUE COPY OF NEWS ITEM APPEAREDIN MATHRUBHOOMI DAILY DTD
19/5/2015.

EXT. P4:- TRUE COY OF THE REQUEST ADDRESSED TO THE IST RESPONDENT
DTD 8/5/2015.

RESPONDENT(S) ' EXHIBITS :

NIL.

/TRUE COPY/

P.A.TO JUDGE

RVS.

K. VINOD CHANDRAN, J.

W.P(C). No.14977 of 2015

Dated this the 29th day of May, 2015.

JUDGMENT

The petitioner claims to be a social worker and a resident of Malappuram District and seeks expeditious consideration of the Vigilance case pending before the Vigilance Court, Trivandrum numbered as Crl.M.P. No.443 of 2015. The case is said to be posted on 06.06.2015. The complaint, as is revealed from the writ petition, is said to have been filed on 17.04.2015 and the same is said to have been posted before the Vigilance Court on 18.05.2015 and now to 06.06.2015. The petitioner is the person, who has filed the complaint before the Vigilance Court and he has also been directed to appear before the Court on 06.06.2015.

2. It will not be proper for this Court to direct expeditious consideration especially since it is for the Vigilance Court to look into the complaint and decide on the further course of action. The

petitioner's contention is that the 2nd respondent will be retiring on 31.05.2015 and hence expeditious consideration is warranted. The petitioner was aware of the date of retirement of the 2nd respondent and the complaint filed on 17.04.2015 is with respect to various incidents starting from 11.08.2009 and thereafter. The petitioner filed the complaint itself only two months prior to the retirement of the 2nd respondent. The Vigilance Tribunal would have to look into the pendency of the cases and the complaints pending before it and decide on the course of action, for which there cannot be any positive direction issued to the Vigilance Court as of now by this Court. This Court is of the opinion that no valid cause for the issuance of a direction in the subject complaint exists on the facts revealed.

The writ petition would stand dismissed, without any expression on the merits of the matter.

Sd/-

**K. VINOD CHANDRAN,
JUDGE**

sp