

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.VINOD CHANDRAN

THURSDAY, THE 18TH DAY OF JUNE 2015/28TH JYAISHTA, 1937

WP(C).No.17320 of 2015 (L)

PETITIONER:

**LINY STANLY,MANNADIYIL,PALLIPPAD P.O.,HARIPAD,
ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT-690 512.**

**BY ADVS.SRI.GEORGE VARGHESE (PERUMPALLIKUTTIYIL)
SRI.A.R.DILEEP
SRI.MANU SEBASTIAN
SMT.PARVATHY NAIR**

RESPONDENT'S:

- 1. STATE OF KERALA,REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETATRY TO
GOVERNMENT IN THE DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT,THIRUVANANTHPAURAM-695 001.**
- 2. THE DISTRICT CLLECTOR,COLLECTORATE,ALAPPUZHA-688 001.**
- 3. THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER,
REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICE,CHENGANNUR-689 121.**
- 4. THE TAHSILDAR,TALUK OFFICE,KARITHIKAPPALLY-690 514.**
- 5. THE VILLAGE OFFICER,VILLAGE OFFICE,PALLIPAD-690 512.**

BY SENIORGOVT. PLEADER SRI.BIJU MEENATTOOR.

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 18-06-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

pk

WP(C).No.17320 of 2015 (L)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

EXT.P1.A TRUE COPY OF THE DEED NO.1812/2013 OF CHEPPAD SRO.

EXT.P2.A TRUE COPY OF THE STOP MEMO DATED 26/9/2014.

**EXT.P3.A TRUE COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION MADE BY SARAMMA DANIEL TO
DISTRICT COLLECTOR.**

**EXT.P4.A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 23/4/2014 PASSED BY THE 2ND
RESPONDENT IN PROCEEDINGS NO.C8-27838/2014.**

**EXT.P5.A TRUE COPY OF THE MEMORANDUM OF REVISION FILED BY THE
PETITIONER (WITHOUT ANNEXURES) BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT.**

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS:

NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.S. TO JUDGE

pk

K. VINOD CHANDRAN, J.

W.P.(C) No. 17320 of 2015 (L)

Dated this the 18th day of June, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The grievance of the petitioner is that the revision filed against Ext.P4 order of the District Collector, under the Kerala Conservation of Paddy Land and Wet Land Act, 2008, is not disposed of and in the meanwhile the order is sought to be enforced. The petitioner prays that status quo may be directed till the revision is considered on merits.

2. Considering the confined prayer made, there shall be a status quo till the revision is disposed of, specifically observing that the petitioner also shall not interfere further with the nature and lie of the property till the revision is disposed of. The 1st respondent shall dispose of the revision as expeditiously as possible.

Writ Petition is disposed of.

Sd/-
K.VINOD CHANDRAN,
JUDGE