

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.VINOD CHANDRAN

TUESDAY, THE 29TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2015/7TH ASWINA, 1937

WP(C).No. 29452 of 2015 (F)

PETITIONER(S):

**I. NAVAZ, AGED 34 YEARS
SON OF ISMAYIL, LOWER GRADE ARABIC TEACHER
BJSM MADATHIL HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL,
THAZHAVA, KARUNAGAPPALLY, KOLLAM DIST.**

**BY ADVS.SRI.V.A.MUHAMMED
SRI.M.SAJJAD**

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. THE STATE OF KERALA, REP. BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVT.
GENERAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT,
SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 001.**
- 2. THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTIONS
JAGATHY, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 014.**
- 3. THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION
THEVALLY, KOLLAM DIST. 690 009.**
- 4. THE DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL OFFICER,
KOLLAM DIST. 690 001.**
- 5. THE MANAGER,
BJSM MADATHIL HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL
THAZHAVA, KARUNAGAPPALLY
KOLLAM DIST. 690 544.**

R BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT. M.J. RAJASREE

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 29-09-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

APPENDIX

PETITIONERS EXHIBITS:

- EXT.P1 COPY OF THE APPOINTMENT ORDER DATED 2.6.08 OF THE PETITIONER.
- EXT.P2 COPY OF THE ORDER NO.B2/4494/08 OF THE DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL OFFICER DATED 25.09.08
- EXT.P3 COPY OF THE APPOINTMENT ORDER DATED 1.6.09 OF THE PETITIONER.
- EXT.P4 COPY OF THE STAFF FIXATION ORDER DATED 31.08.10 OF THE 4TH RESPONDENT.
- EXT.P5 COPY OF THE ORDER NO.ET(1) 35921/2013/DPI DATED 2.7.13 OF THE 2ND RESPONDENT.
- EXT.P6 COPY OF THE REVISION PETITION FILED BEFORE THE GOVT. DATED 2.2.14 WITHOUT EXHIBITS.
- EXT.P6(A) COPY OF THE REMINDER OF THE PETITIONER DATED 8.8.15.

RESPONDENTS EXHIBITS: **NIL**

// TRUE COPY //

PA TO JUDGE.

SB

K. VINOD CHANDRAN, J.

=====

W.P.(C) No.29452 of 2015 - F

=====

Dated this the 29th day of September, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner is aggrieved with the non-consideration of Exts.P6 and P6(a) revisions filed before the 1st respondent. The revisions are filed on 02.02.2014 and 08.08.2015 respectively.

2. In such circumstance, the 1st respondent definitely will have to look at the revisions filed before it and consider the same in accordance with law, after affording an opportunity of hearing, at any rate within a period of three months from the date of hearing. It is made clear that this Court has not made any observations on merits, which the 1st respondent will consider, in accordance with law.

The writ petition is disposed of.

**K. VINOD CHANDRAN,
JUDGE**

SB

// true copy //
P.A to Judge.