

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM**

**PRESENT:**

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU**

**TUESDAY, THE 6TH DAY OF JANUARY 2015/16TH POUSHA, 1936**

**WP(C).No.32725 of 2014 (M)**  
-----

**PETITIONER:**  
-----

**B.REGHUKUMAR,GOVERNMENT CONTRACTOR,  
SREE VISHAKHAM,VP-1-1492 (PTR-53),  
PALLIMUKKU,PEYAD P.O.,THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**

**BY ADV. SRI.AJITH KRISHNAN**

**RESPONDENTS:**  
-----

- 1. THE THIRUVANANTHAPURAM CORPORATION,  
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,PALAYAM,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 033.**
- 2. THE CORPORATION ENGINEER,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM CORPORATION,  
PALAYAM,THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 033.**

**BY SRI.P.K.MANOJKUMAR,SC,TVPM CORPORATION**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION  
ON 06-01-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE  
FOLLOWING:**

**pk**

WP(C).No.32725 of 2014 (M)  
-----

**APPENDIX**

**PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:**  
-----

**EXT.P1:TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGES OF THE AGREEMENT NO.416/12-13 DATED 15/2/2013 EXECUTED BETWEEN THE PETITIONER WITH 2ND RESPONDENT.**

**EXT.P2:TRUE COPY OF LETTER ZR4/FE2/GA7/105981/2014 DATED 26.9.2014 ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT.**

**EXT.P3:TRUE COPY OF THE SELECTION NOTICE VIDE PROJECT NO.957/14 DATED 18/11/2013 ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT TO THE PETITIONER FOR THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF RS.14,28,000/-.**

**EXT.P4:TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 21/9/2014 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER.**

**RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS:**  
-----

**NIL**

**//TRUE COPY//**

**P.S. TO JUDGE**

**pk**

**DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, J.**

-----  
**W.P.(c) No. 32725 of 2014**  
-----

Dated this the 06<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2015

JUDGMENT

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel for the respondents, apart from perusing the record. Since the issue lies in a narrow compass, this Court proposes to dispose of the writ petition at the admission stage itself.

2. Briefly stated, the petitioner, a Government Contractor, is said to have executed three works for the first respondent Corporation. Having completed the work, when the petitioner submitted bills, it appears that part of the amount due to the petitioner has been paid. There afterwards, the petitioner is said to have submitted a representation on 21.09.2014 seeking the payment of the balance amount due to the petitioner. Questioning the inaction of the respondents in considering his representation, the petitioner has approached this Court.

3. In the facts and circumstances, having regard to the respective submissions of the learned counsel for the

petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel for the respondents, this Court, without adverting to the merits of the matter, disposes of the present writ petition with a direction to the respondents to consider Exhibit P4 representation of the petitioner in accordance with law, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, and pass appropriate orders thereon, as expeditiously as possible, at any rate, within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

With the above observation, this writ petition is disposed of.

**DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU**  
**JUDGE**

DMR/-