

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON

WEDNESDAY, THE 7TH DAY OF JANUARY 2015/17TH POUSHA, 1936

WP(C).No. 34901 of 2014 (K)

PETITIONER(S) :

ANEETTA JILSON,
(MINOR) AGED 15 YEARS,
REPRESENTED BY MOTHER SHINY JILSON, W/O. K.V.JILSON,
KUNNATHUPARAMBIL HOUSE, VENNUR,
ANNAMANADA P.O.,
THRISSUR DISTRICT, PIN-680741.

BY ADVS.SRI.V.S.CHANDRASEKHARAN
SMT.LEKSHMI SWAMINATHAN
SRI.M.V.DAS.

RESPONDENT(S) :

1. THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION,
DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL EDUCATION,
THRISSUR, PIN - 680 020.
2. THE APPEAL COMMITTEE OF SCHOOL KALOISAVAM,
(THRISSUR REVENUE DISTRICT),
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN
THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION,
DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL EDUCATION,
THRISSUR, PIN - 680 020.

BY SENIOR GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI. JOSEPH GEROGE.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 07-01-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

RVS.

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S) ' EXHIBITS :

EXHIBIT P1- COPY OF THE APPEAL PREFERRED BY THE PETITIONER ON
04-12-2014 BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT.

EXHIBIT P2- COPY OF THE ORDER NO. E5/1095 DATED 08-12-2014
PASSED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT.

EXHIBIT P3(A) - COPY OF THE REPORT ON THE ISSUE WHICH CAME IN
MADHYAMAM DAILY DATED 05-12-2014.

EXHIBIT P3(B) - COPY OF THE REPORT THAT APPEARED IN DEEPIKA DAILY
DATED 05-12-2014.

RESPONDENT(S) ' EXHIBITS :

NIL.

/TRUE COPY/

P.A.TO JUDGE

RVS.

P.R. RAMACHANDRA MENON, J.

.....
W.P.(C)No.34901 OF 2014
.....

Dated this the 7th January, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner was a participant in the event- ***Kathaprasangam*** in the Thrissur Revenue District Level School Kalolsavam, 2014. Even though she performed well, she could not secure first prize, as a result of which, she is not in a position to participate in the State Level competition. The case of the petitioner is that, though an appeal was filed, the same was not properly entertained, leading to Ext.P2 order of the appeal Committee, whereby the appeal was rejected , which in turn is sought to be intercepted. It is stated that while the event was going on, judges of the event/item went outside the venue to attend mobile phone calls and further that performance of the participants was assessed not independently, but by consultation with each other. There is also a case for the petitioner that the appeal was heard only by one member of the appeal Committee.

2. Heard the learned Government Pleader as well, who submits on instruction that the allegation with regard to use of mobile phones is baseless, since it was strictly prohibited in the concerned premises. It is also added that there was a

difference of '19' marks between the petitioner (221 marks) and the first prize winner (240 marks). It is added that the appeal was heard by the committee consisting of 'three members', eventhough the order was issued by the Chairman of the Committee, on behalf of all concerned.

This Court does not find any tenable ground to call for interference. The writ petition is dismissed.

P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON
JUDGE

/k