

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL K.NARENDRA

TUESDAY, THE 2ND DAY OF JUNE 2015/12TH JYAISHTA, 1937

WP(C).No. 35560 of 2009 (L)

PETITIONER(S):

1. K.H.ABDUL RAHIMAN, S/O.K.K.HAMSA,
KAYAMKULAM HOUSE, KURICHIMALA, PO.KALLEKAD
PALAKKAD.
2. M.A.RAZAK, 5/486, ALAKKAL PARAMBIL,
PO PRAGIRI, PALAKKAD-19.
3. A.HAMSA, S/O.ABDU, UPASANA NAGAR,
PO PRAGIRI, PALAKKAD-19.
4. ALI ASKAR P.K., PARACKAL HOUSE,
VADAKKANTHARA PO, PALAKKAD-12.

BY ADV. SRI.P.RAMAKRISHNAN

RESPONDENT(S):

1. THE KERALA HEADLOAD WORKERS WELFARE FUND
BOARD, PALAKKAD LOCAL COMMITTEE, 1ST FLOOR
MUNICIPAL BUILDING, BIG BAZAR, PALAKKAD-14
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN.
2. THE CHAIRMAN, KERALA HEADLOAD WORKERS
WELFARE FUND BOARD, P.B.NO.2017, S.R.M.ROAD
ERNAKULAM, KOCHI-18.

BY ADV. SRI.KOSHY GEORGE, SC, KHWWB
BY ADV. SRI.AJITH PRAKASH, SC, KHWWB

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 02-06-2015, THE
COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**

WP(C) NO.35560/2009

APPENDIX

PETITIONERS' EXHIBITS:

- P1 : COPY OF ORDER DATED 15.11.2007 OF THE 1ST RESPONDENT**
P2 : COPY OF JUDGMENT DATED 07.01.2008 IN WP(C) NO.639/2008

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS:

- ANNEXURE A : COPY OF ORDER DATED 19.03.2008 BY 2ND RESPONDENT**

//TRUE COPY//

P.A.TO JUDGE

JV

ANIL K. NARENDRAN, J.

W.P.(C) No.35560 of 2009

Dated this the 2nd day of June, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioners were headload workers of Pool No.4 of Palakkad local committee. They had sought transfer to other Pools under the 1st respondent in view of paucity of work in Pool No.4. They have approached this Court in this writ petition seeking a writ of mandamus or other appropriate writ or order commanding the 1st respondent to transfer workers of Pool No.4 to other Pools where there are vacancies and sufficient work and for consequential reliefs.

2. A statement has been filed on behalf of the respondents alongwith which Annexure-A order passed by the 2nd respondent dated 19.03.2008 has been produced. As per Annexure-A order the request made by the petitioners has already been rejected.

3. Today, when the case was taken up for final hearing, the learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that since rejection of their request in Ext.P1 order passed by the 1st respondent has been confirmed by the 2nd respondent in

Annexure-A order, this writ petition may be closed without prejudice to the right of the petitioners to challenge Annexure-A order.

4. I have also heard the learned Standing Counsel for the respondents.

Considering the fact that the request made by the petitioners has already been rejected by Annexure-A order dated 19.03.2008 of the 2nd respondent, this writ petition is closed without prejudice to the right of the petitioners to challenge Annexure-A order dated 19.03.2008 of the 2nd respondent, if so advised.

JV

sd/-
ANIL K. NARENDRAN,
JUDGE