

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V.CHITAMBARESH

TUESDAY, THE 26TH DAY OF MAY 2015/5TH JYAISHTA, 1937

WP(C).No. 15475 of 2015 (H)

PETITIONER:

**NIZA V. A,
RESIDING AT ALAPPAT HOUSE,
WEST OF VELIYATHUNAD P.O.
ALANGAD, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT**

**BY ADVS.SRI.A.JAYASANKAR
SRI.C.V.MANUVILSAN
SRI.MANU GOVIND**

RESPONDENTS:

- 1. THE KERALA STATE ROAD TRANSPORT CORPORATION
TRANSPORT BHAVAN, FORT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695023
REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR.**
- 2. THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (ADMIN.)
KSRTC, TRANSPORT BHAVAN, FORT
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695023.**
- 3. THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (VIGILANCE)
KSRTC, TRANSPORT BHAVAN, FORT
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695023.**

BY SRI.M.GOPIKRISHNAN NAMBIAR, SC, KSRTC

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 26-05-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

DCS

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT P1: A TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE TRANSFER ORDER DATED 24.1.2015.

EXHIBIT P2: CHARGE MEMO N.VLC1/023807/14 DATED 31.1.2015.

EXHIBIT P3: A TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE COVERING LETTER DATED 25.8.2014.

EXHIBIT P4: A TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE COMPLAINT DATED 22.8.2014.

EXHIBIT P5: A TRUE COPY OF THE COMPLAINT DATED 21.8.2014 FROM RANIMOL.

EXHIBIT P6: COMPLAINT DATED 21.5.2014 FROM KSTW UNION (INTUC)

EXHIBIT P7: COMPLAINT DATED 30.5.2014 FROM SHAMON, UNIT SECRETARY KSTWU (INTUC).

EXHIBIT P8: TRUE COPY OF THE COVERING LETTER NO.OAD/2014 DATED 24.11.2014 PREPARED BY THE AUDIT OFFICER ALONG WITH ENQUIRY REPORT DATED 20.11.2014.

EXHIBIT P9: PETITIONERS RESPONSE DATED 3.2.2015 TO THE CHARGE MEMO.

EXHIBIT P10: PETITIONERS ADDITIONAL RESPONSE DATED 28.3.2015 TO THE CHARGE MEMO

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS:-NIL

/TRUE COPY/

P.A. TO JUDGE

DCS

V. CHITAMBARESH, J

W.P.(C). NO. 15475 OF 2015

Dated this the 26th day of May, 2015

JUDGMENT

The disciplinary proceedings initiated against the petitioner are impugned. The same is proceeded with on the basis of a non-existent complaint according to the petitioner. The petitioner points out that signature of the complainant was fabricated by another which led to this situation.

2. The petitioner has preferred Ext. P10 representation to the third respondent in this regard. I direct the third respondent to consider Ext. P10 representation with notice to the petitioner. The alleged complainant shall also be put on notice and heard. The final orders shall be passed within a period of two months from today.

The writ petition is disposed of.

**V. CHITAMBARESH
JUDGE**

DCS