

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.VINOD CHANDRAN

MONDAY, THE 22ND DAY OF JUNE 2015/1ST ASHADHA, 1937

WP(C).No. 15174 of 2015 (V)

PETITIONER:

**SMEERAJ B.S., S/O.LATE BABU,
AGED 31 YEARS, CONTRACTOR,
KALLUVILA VEEDU, PATTUVILAKOM,
KATTAYIKONAM PO, KAZHAKKOOTTAM,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695584.**

**BY ADVS.SRI.BABU JOSEPH KURUVATHAZHA
SRI.P.T.ABHILASH**

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. KERALA TOURISM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED,
MASCOT SQUARE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695033,
REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR.**
- 2. CHAIRMAN, KERALA TOURISM DEVELOPMENT
CORPORATION LIMITED, MASCOT SQUARE,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695033.**
- 3. CHIEF ENGINEER,
KERALA TOURISM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED,
MASCOT SQUARE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695033.**

BY ADV. SRI.THOMAS MATHEW NELLIMOOTTIL, SC

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 22-06-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

mbr/

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS:

- P1: TRUE COPY OF THE SELECTION NOTICE DATED 06.02.2014 ISSUED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT.
- P2: TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 05.04.2014 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE RESPONDENTS.
- P3: TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 10.09.2014 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE RESPONDENTS.
- P4: TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 20.01.2015 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE RESPONDENTS.

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS: **NIL.**

//TRUE COPY//

P.S. TO JUDGE

mbr/

K. VINOD CHANDRAN, J.

=====

W.P.(C) No.15174 of 2015 - V

=====

Dated this the 22nd day of June, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner has filed the above writ petition contending that the petitioner had executed certain work for the 1st respondent and the 1st respondent is refraining from making payments.

2. The learned Counsel appearing for the 1st respondent relying on the statement contends that, the entire submission of the petitioner before this Court is false since the work has not been carried on at all. In such circumstance and considering the disputes raised on facts, it may not be proper for this Court to invoke the extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

The writ petition would stand closed however leaving open the remedies of either parties before the other forums.

Sd/-

**K. VINOD CHANDRAN,
JUDGE**

SB

// true copy //

P.A to Judge.