

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI

TUESDAY, THE 11TH DAY OF AUGUST 2015/20TH SRAVANA, 1937

WP(C) .No. 24361 of 2015 (U)

PETITIONER(S) :

SURESH P.S.,
PULIMOOTTIL HOUSE, MUDAKKOLLY P.O.,
SULTHAN BATHERY,
WAYANAD.

BY ADV. SRI.ANEESH JOSEPH.

RESPONDENT(S) :

1. SULTHAN BATHERY GRAMA PANCHAYAT,
SULTHAN BATHERY P.O., WAYANAD DISTRICT-673 592,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.
2. DISTRICT MEDICAL OFFICER,
MANANTHAVADY, WAYANAD-670 645.
3. SANIL M.M.,
MALIEKKAL HOUSE, MANICHIRA, POOMALA P.O.,
SULTHAN BATHERY, PIN-673 592.
4. DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF PANCHAYATS,
KALPETTA P.O., WAYANAD DISTRICT, PIN-673 121.
5. DISTRICT COLLECTOR
KALPETTA, WAYANAD DISTRICT, PIN-673 121.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT.K.A.SANJEETHA.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
11-08-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

rvs.

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S) ' EXHIBITS :

EXHIBIT P1- PHOTOSTAT COPY OF THE COMPLAINT FILED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE
THE 4TH DY. DIRECTOR OF PANCHAYATS DATED 9-5-2015.

EXHIBIT P2- PHOTOSTAT COPY OF THE COMPLAINT FILED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE
THE 5TH RESPONDENT, DISTRICT COLLECTOR DATED 9-5-2015.

RESPONDENT(S) ' EXHIBITS :

NIL.

/TRUE COPY/

P.A.TO JUDGE

RVS.

A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI, J.

W.P.(C)No.24361 of 2015

Dated this the 11th day of August, 2015.

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner is aggrieved by the running of pig slaughtering house by the 3rd respondent within the local limits of respondent panchayat and the non consideration of his Ext.P1 complaint submitted by him to the 4th and 5th respondents.

2. The petitioner is resident of Sulthan Bathery grama panchayat. The 3rd respondent has established a pig slaughtering house in the said locality, which causes hardship to the petitioner and other neighbouring residents. The petitioner had filed Exts.P1 and P2 complaints before the 4th and 5th respondents pointing out the nuisance caused by the pig slaughtering house, but the respondents are not taking any action on the complaints.

3. I have heard the learned Government Pleader and the learned counsel for the respondents.

4. As the learned counsel for the petitioner confined his arguments to the limited prayer for a direction to the 5th respondent to consider Exts.P1 and P2 complaints, this writ petition can be disposed of without issuing notice to respondent nos.1 and 3.

Therefore, the writ petition is disposed of directing the 5th respondent to consider and pass orders on Ext.P2, within 1 month from the date of receipt of copy of this judgment, after affording the petitioner and respondents 1 and 3 an opportunity of being heard.

Sd/-
A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI,
Judge.

ami/

//True copy//

P.A. to Judge