

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU

THURSDAY, THE 15TH DAY OF OCTOBER 2015/23RD ASWINA, 1937

WP(C).No. 20988 of 2012 (W)

PETITIONER:

SUJATHA R.S.,
D/O SURENDRAN NAIR, SUSAN COTTAGE, KALADY,
KARAMANA (PO), THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 025.

BY ADV. SRI.C.E.UNNIKRISHNAN

RESPONDENT(S):

1. REGISTRAR OF CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 001.
2. THE CO-OPERATIVE SERVICE EXAMINATION BOARD,
KERALA STATE CO-OPERATIVE BANK BUILDING,
OVER BRIDGE JUNCTION,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 001,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.
3. THE TRIVANDRUM CO-OPERATIVE URBAN BANK LTD.,
P.B.NO.115, M.G.ROAD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 001.

R3 BY ADV. SRI.GEORGE POONTHOTTAM
R2 BY ADV. SRI.ANIL THOMAS, SC
R2 BY ADV. SMT.RASHMI. K.V., SC
R BY SRI. G. GOPAKUMAR, GOVERNMENT PLEADER

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON
15-10-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, J.

W.P.(C). No. 20988 of 2012 (W)

Dated this the 15th day of October, 2015.

JUDGMENT

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned counsel for the third respondent, apart from perusing the record.

2. In 2012, the second respondent, on behalf of the third respondent, issued Ext.P5 notification for filling up the post of General Manager in the third respondent Bank.

3. Questioning Ext.P5 notification on various grounds, the petitioner has approached this Court. Initially, this Court, through interim order dated 11.09.2012, has observed that the recruitment process undertaken by the second respondent shall be subject to the result of the writ petition.

4. At any rate, for various reasons, the second respondent could not proceed further with Ext.P5 notification.

5. Now, when the matter is taken up for hearing, the learned counsel for the third respondent has represented that in view of the long lapse of time, the Bank does not want to proceed further with

Ext.P5 notification. He has further submitted that the Bank wishes to issue a fresh notification in accordance with law.

6. In reply, the learned counsel has submitted that if that is the case, the writ petition does not survive and that the right of the petitioner may be left open with regard to the fresh notification.

In the facts and circumstances, this Court closes the writ petition as having not survived for further consideration. It is, therefore, observed that a fresh notification may provide a fresh cause of action, if any, to the petitioner. No order as to costs.

sd/- DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, JUDGE.

rv