

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR

FRIDAY, THE 20TH DAY OF MARCH 2015/29TH PHALGUNA, 1936

WP(C).No. 34200 of 2014 (Y)

PETITIONER(S) :

**SUNEER.N.A, AGED 49 YEARS,
S/O.ABDUL KHADER, NADUVILAPARAMBIL, PALAPPRASSERY,
CHENGAMANAD VILLAGE, ALUVA TALUK,
ERNAKULAM DISTRICT-683 578.**

BY ADV. SRI.UNNIKRISHNAN.S.

RESPONDENT(S) :

- 1. STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
GOVERNMENT OF KERALA, SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 001.**
- 2. DIRECTOR OF INDUSTRIES AND COMMERCE,
GOVERNMENT OF KERALA, SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 001.**
- 3. DISTRICT COLLECTOR,
DISTRICT COLLECTORATE, CIVIL STATION, KAKKANAD,
ERNAKULAM-682 030.**
- 4. DEPUTY TAHSILDAR,
REVENUE RECOVERY, ALUVA-683 101.**
- 5. VILLAGE OFFICER,
VILLAGE OFFICE, CHENGAMANAD-683 578.**
- 6. GENERAL MANAGER,
DISTRICT INDUSTRIES CENTRE, SIDCO BUILDING,
GANDHI NAGAR, KADAVANTHRA, ERNAKULAM-682 020.**
- 7. TALUK INDUSTRIAL OFFICER,
NORTH PARAVOOR-683 513.**

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.SHYSON.P.MANGUZHA

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 20-03-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

Msd.

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

**EXHIBIT-P1: TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE REPRESENTATION SUBMITTED
BEFORE THE 6TH RESPONDENT DATED 03.06.2014.**

**EXHIBIT-P2: TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE REPLY ISSUED BY
THE 6TH RESPONDENT DATED 19.07.2014.**

**EXHIBIT-P3: TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE REPRESENTATION SUBMITTED
BEFORE THE DATED 30.07.2014.**

**EXHIBIT-P4: TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED BY
THE 1ST RESPONDENT TO THE 2ND RESPONDENT
DATED 02.09.2014.**

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS

NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A.TO JUDGE.

Msd.

A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR, J.

.....
W.P.(C).No.34200 of 2014
.....

Dated this the 20th day of March, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner, who has approached this Court challenging the revenue recovery proceedings initiated against him by the respondents, is a person who had approached this Court on an earlier occasion seeking identical reliefs as also the benefit of one time settlement from the 1st respondent. In the counter affidavit filed on behalf of the 6th respondent in the present writ petition, it is stated that, against earlier revenue recovery proceedings, the petitioner had filed a writ petition which was disposed with a direction to the petitioner to remit Rs.2 lakhs, and the 1st respondent was directed to consider the application for one time settlement scheme. It is pointed out that the petitioner did not remit any amount as directed by this Court, and hence, the benefit of one time settlement was not extended to the petitioner. Under the said circumstances, the present writ petition which, once again, seeks substantially the same relief, as was earlier sought for, cannot be maintained at the instance of the petitioner.

Resultantly, the writ petition fails and is accordingly dismissed.

**A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR
JUDGE**

