

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI

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

WP(C).No. 18238 of 2015 (D)

PETITIONER :

**HASEEM MUHAMMED.S,
KALLUVILA VEEDU, ELAMUDAKKAL P.O,
ANCHAL - 691 306.**

BY ADV. SRI.GEORGE POONTHOTTAM

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. THE CHANCELLOR, KERALA UNIVERSITY,
RAJ BHAVAN, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.PIN-695 002**
- 2. THE UNIVERSITY OF KERALA,
PALAYAM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR. PIN-695 002**
- 3. THE VICE CHANCELLOR,
UNIVERSITY OF KERALA, PALAYAM,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM. PIN-695 004**
- 4. J.S. AKHIL,
II SEMESTER B.A. MALAYALAM, MASS COMMUNICATION,
ST.XAVIERS COLLEGE, THUMBA.PIN-695 006**

R1 TO R3 BY SRI.BECHU KURIAN THOMAS, SC, UNIVERSITY OF KERALA

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

sts

WP(C).No. 18238 of 2015 (D)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

P1 - TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION DATED 14.03.2014

P2 - TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION DATED 05.04.2014

**P3 - TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 27.05.2015 PREFERRED
BEFORE THE CHANCELLOR BY THE PETITIONER.**

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS: **NIL**

/TRUE COPY/

P.S.TO JUDGE

sts

A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI, J

WPC No.18238 of 2015

Dated this the 18th day of June, 2015

JUDGMENT

The main prayer in this writ petition is for a direction declaring that the 4th respondent has ceased to be a member of the Syndicate of the second respondent University from 30.3.2015.

2. According to the petitioner, the 4th respondent being member of the senate of the respondent University was elected to the Syndicate by virtue of Section 21(b)(ii) of the Kerala University Act. The petitioner alleges that the term of the 4th respondent as a member of the Senate and as a corollary thereof as a member of the Syndicate expired on 30.3.2015. According to the petitioner, the 4th respondent continues to avail of and exercise all the benefits and privileges available to a member of the Syndicate even after 30.3.2015. Though Ext.P3 has been preferred before the first respondent, no action has been taken till date. It is with this background, the petitioner

has come up before this Court.

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned standing counsel for the respondents. The learned counsel for the respondents confined his argument to the limited prayer for a direction to dispose of Ext.P3 within a time frame. Therefore, this Court is of the view that the writ petition can be disposed of without issuing notice to the respondents.

4. Allegedly the petitioner has submitted Ext.P3 representation before the first respondent Chancellor and the same is pending.

As the ultimate authority to take a decision on Ext.P3 is the first respondent, this writ petition is disposed of directing the office of the first respondent to process Ext.P3 and place before the first respondent at the earliest, so that the first respondent would be able to take a final decision on the same within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

To facilitate an early action, it shall be open to the petitioner to produce a copy of this judgment, a copy of

the writ petition as well as a copy of Ext.P3 representation
in the office of the first respondent.

sd/- A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI
JUDGE

CSS/

true copy

P.S.TO JUDGE