

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL THOMAS

WEDNESDAY, THE 8TH DAY OF JULY 2015/17TH ASHADHA, 1937

WP(C) .No. 27126 of 2014 (M)

PETITIONER(S) :

C.GIRI, AGED 66 YEARS,
S/O.CHAKRAPANI PISHARODI, "ADHARSH", MANAPPULLIKAVU
KIZHAKE YAKKARA, PALAKKAD DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.T.V.JAYAKUMAR NAMBOODIRI

RESPONDENT(S) :

1. STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY
REVENUE (DEVASWOM) DEPARTMENT
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695001.

2. MALABAR DEVASWOM BOARD,
REPRESENTED BY COMMISSIONER,
MALABAR DEVASWOM BOARD
KOZHIKODE-673006.

*Addl.R3. EXECUTIVE OFFICER
SREE MANAPPULLIKKAVU BHAGAVATHI DEVASWOM,
YAKKARA, PALAKKAD - 678 013.

*Addl.R4. TRUSTEE BOARD OF SREE MANAPPULLIKKAVU
BHAGAVATHI DEVASWOM
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN,
MANAPPULLIKAVU TEMPLE
YAKKARA, PALAKKAD - 678 013.

*(ADDL.R3 AND R4 ARE IMPEADED AS PER ORDER DATED 30.10.2014
IN IA 14836/14.)

**Addl.R5. A.MOHANDAS, AGED 64 YEARS,
S/O.K.PARAMESWARAN NAIR, PLOT NO.52,
DEVI NAGAR, NURANI POST, PALAKKAD - 678 004.

WP (C) 27126/14

**Addl.R6. BALU KENATH, AGED 41 YEARS,
S/O.LATE RAMACHANDRAN, 25/317, KRISHNA,
NEAR FIRE STATION, PALAKKAD - 678 001.

** (ADDL.R5 AND R6 ARE IMPEADED AS PER ORDER DATED 17.12.2014
IN IA 17254/14).

***Addl.R7. VELA COMMITTEE OF SREE MANAPULLY
BHAGAVATHY DEVASWOM
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, EAST YAKKARA
PALAKKAD - 678 013.

***ADDL R7 IMPEADED *SUO MOTU* AS PER ORDER DATED 21.05.2015.

R1 BY A.RENJITH, GOVERNMENT PLEADER
R2 BY SRI.PARTHASARATHY.B, SC, MALABAR DEVASWOM BOARD
ADDL.R3 BY ADV. SRI.V.V.SURENDRAN
ADDL.R3 BY ADV. SRI.P.A.HARISH
ADDL.R4 BY ADV. SRI.N.M.MADHU
ADDL.R4 BY ADV. SMT.C.S.RAJANI
ADDL.R5 & R6 BY ADV. SRI.KALEESWARAM RAJ

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD
ON 08-07-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN &
SUNIL THOMAS, JJ.

.....
WP(C) No.27126 of 2014
.....

Dated this the 8th day of July, 2015.

J U D G M E N T

Thottathil B.Radhakrishnan, J.

Process not filed for service of notice on the additional seventh respondent. The petitioner does not appear to be interested in prosecuting the matter. He has not instructed his counsel as well. Hence, this writ petition is dismissed for non-prosecution.

(THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN, JUDGE)

(SUNIL THOMAS, JUDGE)

js