

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON

WEDNESDAY, THE 8TH DAY OF APRIL 2015/18TH CHAITHRA, 1937

WP(C) .No. 23908 of 2014 (K)

PETITIONER(S) :

M/S. JAYALAKSHMI
ERNAKULAM, REPRESENTED BY N NARAYANA KAMATH
SON OF NARASIMHA KAMATH, XL/7171, T.DROAD
ERNAKULAM

BY ADVS.SMT.K.P.SANTHI
SRI.RILGIN V.GEORGE

RESPONDENT(S) :

1. STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
REVENUE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM 695 001
2. THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER,FORTKOCHI 682 001
3. THE TAHSILDAR,
KANAYANNUR 682 011
4. THE VILLAGE OFFICER
NADAMA VILLAGE 682 306

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.M.MOHAMMED SHAFI

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON
08-04-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

WP(C) .No. 23908 of 2014 (K)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S) ' EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT P1: TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION DATED 1-1-2014 SUBMITTED TO
RESPONDENTS 2 TO 4

EXHIBIT P2: TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGE OF THE DRAFT DATA BANK

EXHIBIT P3: TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE ISSUED BY THE PRINCIPAL
AGRICULTURAL OFFICER, ERNAKULAM

EXHIBIT P4: TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE DATED 25-1-2014 ISSUED BY
THE MARADU MUNICIPALITY

RESPONDENT(S) ' EXHIBITS

NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A TO JUDGE

v dv

P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON, J.
=====

W.P.(C) No.23908 of 2014
=====

Dated this the 8th day of April, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioner has approached this Court with the following prayers:

“1. Issue a writ of mandamus or such other writ, direction or order compelling the respondents 2 to 4 to consider Exhibit P1 application in the light of Exhibits P2 to P4, affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner within a time frame to be fixed by this Honourable Court and to reclassify the status of the land as dry land and issue tax receipt accordingly.

2. Issue such other writ, direction or order as is deemed just and necessary in the facts, features and circumstances of the case. ”

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the only prayer is to cause Ext.P1 to be considered and disposed of within a reasonable time.

3. Heard the learned Government Pleader as well, who submits that by virtue of the law declared by Apex Court as per the decision reported in **Revenue Divisional Officer v. Jalaja Dileep** (2015(1) KLT 984) (SC), the classification cannot be changed in the the BTR. However, if a proper application is filed under Clause 6(2) of the KLU Order, it will be considered and

appropriate orders will be passed within reasonable time.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that Ext.P1 may be considered and dealt with accordingly.

5. In the said circumstance, the writ petition is disposed of, directing the 2nd respondent to consider and pass appropriate orders on Ext.P2 in accordance with law, with reference to Clause 6(2) of the KLU Order, after calling for a report from the 4th respondent with regard to the nature of the land in question and after hearing, in the light of the law declared by the Apex Court as per the decision cited supra. This shall be done at the earliest, at any rate, within 'two months' from the date of receipt of a copy of the judgment. The petitioner shall produce a copy of the judgment along with a copy of the writ petition before the 2nd respondent for further steps.

Sd/-

P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON, JUDGE

vdv