

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU

WEDNESDAY, THE 4TH DAY OF MARCH 2015/13TH PHALGUNA, 1936

WP(C).No. 24432 of 2014 (D)

PETITIONER : -

LOVELY SHIBU, AGED 40 YEARS,
W/O.SHIBU, PARATHOOR VEEDU,
MARAVOOR, KOLLAM DISTRICT.

BY ADV.SRI.S.MOHAMMED AL RAFI

RESPONDENTS:-

1. DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF PANCHAYATH,
KOLLAM - 691 001.
2. EAST KALLADA GRAMA PANCHAYATH,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
KALLADA P.O., KOLLAM - 691 502.
3. SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
EAST KALLADA POLICE STATION,
KOLLAM - 691 502.

R2 BY ADV.SRI.T.K.ANANDA KRISHNAN, SC

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
04-03-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

DMR/-

DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, J.

W.P.(c) No. 24432 of 2014

Dated this the 04th day of March, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioner has a grievance that the respondent Grama Panchayat has not considered its Exhibit P4 application for licence to have Hollow Cement Brick Industry established.

2. The learned counsel for the Grama Panchayat has submitted that Exhibit P4 licence was meant for the year 2013-2014, which already came to an end; accordingly, he has contended that the writ petition has become infructuous.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner, however, has submitted that Exhibit P4 was submitted only on 16.09.2014 and that it is meant for the year 2014-2015. Meeting the specific objection on the part of the learned counsel for the Grama Panchayat that their application itself mentions the year 2013-2014, the learned counsel for the petitioner

submitted that it is a typographical error.

4. I am afraid the approach of the petitioner seems to be rather cavalier. Assuming it to be a typographical error, one were to assure thus, it is the bounden duty of the petitioner to have filed a duly corrected application reflecting the correct period. In the absence of any such remedial measure having been taken by the petitioner, this Court is not prepared to entertain the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner that Exhibit P4 application is meant for 2014-2015. It is nevertheless made clear that the petitioner can submit a fresh application for 2014-2015, or for any other future period.

With the above observation, the writ petition stands dismissed as infructuous.

**DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU
JUDGE**

DMR/-