

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.VINOD CHANDRAN

FRIDAY, THE 26TH DAY OF JUNE 2015/5TH ASHADHA, 1937

WP(C).No. 19324 of 2015 (M)

PETITIONER:

**ANILKUMAR S., "SREELAKAM, T.C.6/35(1),
SNRRA-164, PRASANTH NAGAR, ULLOOR,
MEDICAL COLLEGE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**

**BY ADVS.SRI.M.R.ANANDAKUTTAN
SMT.M.A.ZOHRA
SRI.MAHESH ANANDAKUTTAN
SMT.SOUMYA ISAAC**

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. DISTRICT COLLECTOR, COLLECTORATE,
CIVIL STATION, KUDAPPANAKKUNNU,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695005.**
- 2. DEPUTY COLLECTOR, COLLECTORATE,
CIVIL STATION, KUDAPPANAKKUNNU,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695005.**
- 3. ARYA, T.C. 6/35, PNRA-71-C, PRASANTH NAGAR,
AAKKULAM WARD, CHERUVAKKAL VILLAGE,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695011.**
- 4. SHERIN, T.C. 6/35, PNRA-17-C, PRASANTH NAGAR,
AAKKULAM WARD, CHERUVAKKAL VILLAGE,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695011.**
- 5. STATION HOUSE OFFICER,
MEDICAL COLLEGE POLICE STATION,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695011.**

R1, R2 & R5 BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.S.JAMAL

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 26-06-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

mbr/

WP(C).No. 19324 of 2015 (M)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS:

EXHIBIT P1- TRUE COPY OF THE F.I.R. 7 F.I. STATEMENT DATED 25-6-2014 IN CRIME NO. 1162/2014 DATED 26-06-2014.

EXHIBIT P2- TRUE COPY OF THE REFER REPORT IN CRIME NO. 1162/14.

EXHIBIT P3- TRUE COPY OF THE PLAINT AS O.S. 71/15 OF THE SUBORDINATE JUDGE'S COURT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

EXHIBIT P4- TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 3-5-2015 ISSUED ON BEHALF OF THE 1ST RESPONDENT BY 2ND RESPONDENT.

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS: **NIL.**

//TRUE COPY//

P.S. TO JUDGE

mbr/

K. VINOD CHANDRAN, J

W.P(C) No.19324 of 2015

Dated this the 26th day of June, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner is aggrieved with Ext.P4 order. The petitioner and the respondents 3 and 4 are neighbours. Admittedly, there are litigations pending between the petitioner and the respondents 3 and 4; both civil proceedings and criminal proceedings. The petitioner is aggrieved with the fact that by Ext.P4 the respondents 3 and 4 are using their influence over a Government Official and has obtained an order of police protection. Ext.P4 is only a consideration of an application filed by the respondents 3 and 4 and the order is only to afford necessary protection if they raise any apprehension of danger to their life and limb. The petitioner cannot have a case that no police protection should be given to the respondents 3 and 4, merely because there are some litigations pending between himself and respondents 3 and 4.

2. The petitioner's counsel though present in the morning, when the matter was passed over, none was present when it was called twice later on.

In such circumstance, the writ petition is found to be not maintainable and the same is dismissed in limine

Sd/-

(K. VINOD CHANDRAN, JUDGE)

jma

//true copy/

P.A to Judge