

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL K.NARENDRA

THURSDAY, THE 10TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2015/19TH AGRAHAYANA, 1937

WP(C).No. 18792 of 2011 (Y)

PETITIONER(S):

**RUGMINI, W/O. GURUSWAMY,
MAMPALLAM, MUTHALAMADA, CHITTUR TALUK
PALAKKAD DISTRICT.**

BY ADV. SRI.RAJESH SIVARAMANKUTTY

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY, REVENUE DEPARTMENT
GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**
- 2. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR,
PALAKKAD DISTRICT - 678 001.**
- 3. THE ADDITIONAL TAHSILDAR,
CHITTUR TALUK, PALAKKAD DISTRICT - 678101.**
- 4. THE VILLAGE OFFICER,
MUTHALAMADA NO. II VILLAGE, MUTHALAMADA, CHITTUR TALUK
PALAKKAD, DISTRICT -678 101.**

R BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.K.K.SAIDALAVI

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 10-12-2015,
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**

avk

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS

- EXT.P1 : TRUE COPY OF THE SALE OTICE DATED 29.6.2011 ISSUED
BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT
- EXT.P2 : TRUE COPY OF THE POSSESSION CERTIFICATE DATED
8.6.2010 ISSUED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT
- EXT.P3 : TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 14.6.2011
SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE 3RD
RESPONDENT
- EXT.P4 : TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY NO.F2(1) - 15113/87 DATED
29.6.2011 ISSUED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT
- EXT.P5 : TRUE COPY OF REPLY DATED 30.6.2011 SUBMITTED BY
THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE 3RD RESPONDENT

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS

NIL

//TRUE COPY//

PA TO JUDGE

avk

ANIL K.NARENDRA, J

W.P.(C.)No.18792 Of 2011

DATED THIS THE 10th DAY OF DECEMBER, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioner has filed this writ petition seeking a writ of certiorari to quash Ext.P1 notice issued by the 3rd respondent and seeking a writ of mandamus commanding the 3rd respondent to consider and pass appropriate orders on Ext.P5 representation.

2. Today, when the case was taken up for final hearing, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that, challenging the proceedings in C.C.No.1356/1973 on the file of the Taluk Land Board, Chittoor, the petitioner and her children had approached this Court in C.R.P.No.499 of 2010. By order dated 27.5.2014, this Court allowed the said C.R.P. in part holding that the direction to the revision petitioners and the 5th respondent in that C.R.P to surrender 2.84 acres of land in lieu of 2.84 acres of land which was excluded on the application of the fifth respondent in the C.R.P is illegal and unsustainable. In such circumstances, the petitioner does not want to prosecute this writ petition further.

3. Accordingly this writ petition is closed recording the aforesaid submission made by the learned counsel for the writ petitioner.

**Sd/-
ANIL K.NARENDRAN
JUDGE**

//TRUE COPY//

PA TO JUDGE

avk