

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.VINOD CHANDRAN

FRIDAY, THE 10TH DAY OF JULY 2015/19TH ASHADHA, 1937

WP(C).No. 19720 of 2015 (L)

PETITIONER(S):

**OMEGAA ENTERPRISES,
NO.1/323, SARASWATHY NAGAR, NEELANGARAI
CHENAI - 600 041. (HAVING OLD ADDRESS AT 3A
THRID FLOOR, JAMAL MASILA ILLAM, 162,
RANGARAJAPURAM MAIN ROAD, KODAMBAKKOM, CHENNAI - 24)
REPRESENTED BY ITS PROPRIETRIX, MANOVIDHYA.**

**BY ADVS.SRI.DIPU.R
SRI.P.S.SAJEEV (CHIRAYIL)
SRI.SANAL P.RAJ
SRI.K.S.BAIJU**

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. UNION OF INDIA,
REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY,
MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY, UDYOG BHAVAN,
NEW DELHI - 110107.**
- 2. DIRECTOR GENRAL OF FOREIGN TRADE,
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY, UDYOG BHAVAN,
NEW DELHI - 110 107.**
- 3. SECRETARY,
MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT, FOREST AND CLIMATE CHANGE, O-4
MALABAR GARDEN (RAJOURI GARDEN)
NEAR METRO PILLAR NO. 196, NEW DELHI - 110 001.**
- 4. CUSTOMS SUPERINTENDENT
AIR CARGO WING, COCHIN INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LTD,
AIRPORT P.O., NEDUMBASSERY, COCHIN - 683 113.**

**R1-R3 BY ADV. SRI.N.NAGARESH, ASSISTANT SOLICITOR GENERAL
R4 BY ADV. SRI.TOJAN J.VATHIKULAM,SC,**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 10-07-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

K. VINOD CHANDRAN, J

W.P(C) Nos.19720 of 2015

Dated this the 10th day of July, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner seeks export of shark fins through the 4th respondent. However, the learned Standing Counsel for the 3rd respondent would point out that an application was filed as W.P(C) No.12311 of 2015 before the High Court of Judicature at Madras, by an association of exporters in which the petitioner was shown as one of the members, however, with a different address, and represented by a different person. The prayer for stay of notification, is pending before that court. While so, the petitioner through a different person, represented; by the proprietrix viz. Manovidhya, has filed the above writ petition. This Court is not inclined to pass any orders in the said writ petition and was even inclined to impose exemplary cost. However, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he himself was not aware of that

fact and seeks withdrawal of this writ petition.

Writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

Sd/-

(K. VINOD CHANDRAN, JUDGE)

jma

//true copy//

P.A to Judge