

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V.CHITAMBARESH

TUESDAY, THE 15TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2015/24TH BHADRA, 1937

WP(C).No. 24236 of 2015 (D)

PETITIONER(S)/PETITIONER:

1. ANOOP G.P., AGED 23 YEARS
S/O.SASIDHARAN, GOVINDAPURATH HOUSE, ARAKKINAR.P.O
KOZHIKODE DISTRICT.
2. SIRAJUDDEEN, AGED 40 YEARS
S/O.SAIDALAVI, PALLITHODY, CHAKKIRIKKAD HOUSE
ARAKKINAR.P.O, KOZHIKODE DISTRICT.
3. DIBEESH, AGED 30 YEARS
S/O.BALAN, THACHAT HOUSE, ARAKKINAR.P.O
KOZHIKODE DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.S.K.SAJU

RESPONDENT(S)/RESPONDENTS:

1. THE CORPORATION OF KOZHIKODE,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, KOZHIKODE-673001.
2. VILLAGE OFFICER,
BEYPORE VILLAGE, BEYPORE.P.O, KOZHIKODE-673015.
3. THE THAHSILDAR,
KOZHIKODE, CIVIL STATION.P.O, KOZHIKODE-673020.
4. MUHAMMED NAZAR.K,
S/O.ABDURAHIMAN, DARUL NAJATH HOUSE
PUTHURPALLIKKAL.P.O, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT, PIN-673636.

R4 BY ADV. SRI.T.K.VENUGOPALAN
R2 AND R3 BY ADV.ANITHA RAVINDRAN, GOVERNMENT PLEADER
R1 BY SRI.K.D.BABU,STANDING COUNSEL,KOZHIKODE
CORPORATION

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD
ON 15-09-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S) ' EXHIBITS

P1 TRUE COPY OF THE NOTE AND PROCEEDINGS DATED 29.05.2015
SUBMITTED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT

P2 TRUE COPY OF THE STOP MEMO DATED 28.05.2015 ISSUED BY
THE 2ND RESPONDENT TO THE 4TH RESPONDENT

P3 TRUE COPY OF THE COMPLAINT DATED 10.07.2015 SUBMITTED
BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT.

RESPONDENT(S) ' EXHIBITS

V.CHITAMBARESH, J.

W.P(C)NO. 24236 OF 2015

Dated this the 15th day of September, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioners assert that the 4th respondent is proceeding with the construction despite Ext.P2 stop memo. It is also the case of the petitioners that the ongoing construction is unauthorised.

2. The petitioners have in this regard submitted Ext.P3 complaint to the first respondent. I direct the first respondent to consider Ext.P3 complaint with notice to the petitioners and the 4th respondent. The needful shall be done within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

3. It is made clear that I have not pronounced on the merits of the contentions urged by the petitioners and the 4th respondent in the writ petition.

The writ petition is disposed of accordingly.

V.CHITAMBARESH, JUDGE

sks