

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.VINOD CHANDRAN

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

WP(C).No. 24917 of 2011 (L)

PETITIONERS:

1. **AJITHA K., AGED 37 YEARS,
W/O.C.S.MURALIKRISHNA, 'KRISHNA DHANAM', MAMMIYOOR
GURUVAYUR.**
2. **GEETHA V.T., AGED 42 YEARS,
W/O.T.K.SURESH BABU, MUNGOTTU POYIL HOUSE
MUTHUVANNACHA, KUTTIYADI.**
3. **HARIDASAN V., AGED 43 YEARS,
S/O.SANKARAN NAIR V., VADAKKOOTTU HOUSE, THIRUVENKIDAM
GURUVAYUR**

**BY ADVS.SRI.SAJEEV KUMAR K.GOPAL
SMT.AMBIKA RADHAKRISHNAN**

RESPONDENTS:

1. **THE GURUVAYUR DEVASWOM MANAGING COMMITTEE
GURUVAYUR DEVASWOM , GURUVAYUR-680 101
REPRESENTED BY ITS ADMINISTRATOR.**
2. **THE ADMINISTRATOR,
GURUVAYUR DEVASWOM, GURUVAYUR-680 101**
3. **THE COMMISSIONER,
GURUVAYUR DEVASWOM, GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 001.**

**BY SRI.K.JAJU BABU,SC,GURUVAYUR DEVASWOM
BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT. A. LOWSY
BY ADV. SRI.V.KRISHNA MENON**

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

APPENDIX

PETITIONERS' EXHIBITS :-

- EXT.P1 - COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION VIDE NO.R1-720/2000 ISSUED BY
THE 2ND RESPONDENT DATED 27.10.2000.
- EXT.P2 - COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION VIDE NO.R1-8670/1999 ISSUED BY
THE 2ND RESPONDENT DATED 16.02.2001.
- EXT.P3 - COPY OF THE APPLICATION DATED 12.03.2001 SUBMITTED BY
3RD PETITIONER PURSUANT TO EXHIBIT P2.
- EXT.P4 - COPY OF THE DECISION OF THE 1ST RESPONDENT AT ITS
MEETING HELD ON 25.11.2010 IN RESOLUTION NO.69.
- EXT.P5 - COPY OF THE

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS:- NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE

sp

K. VINOD CHANDRAN, J.

W.P(C). No.24917 of 2011

Dated this the 15th day of October, 2015.

JUDGMENT

The above writ petition is filed for a direction to complete the selection process initiated as per Exts.P1 and P2 dated **27.10.2000** and **16.02.2001** respectively. The petitioners are said to be aggrieved by Ext.P4, which is a decision to regularise certain persons taken in the year 2010. The petitioners contend that their cause of action arose only on Ext.P4 decision being taken. However, notification being of the year 2000 and 2001, if they had a claim to be appointed or atleast to be considered under the said notification, writ petition should have been filed within a reasonable time. The present writ petition, claiming appointment under a notification on 2000 and 2001, cannot be entertained.

The writ petition would stand dismissed. No costs.

Sd/-

**K. VINOD CHANDRAN,
JUDGE**

//True Copy//

P.A. to Judge.

sp/16/10/15