

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU

MONDAY, THE 17TH DAY OF MARCH 2014/26TH PHALGUNA, 1935

WP(C).No. 34985 of 2014 (W)

PETITIONER:

P.BHASKARAN, AGED 67 YEARS,
S/O.PAPPU, THUNDIL VEEDU, MUTHUKULAM P.O.,
MUTHUKULAM.

BY ADV. SRI.V.ANIL (K/1480/98)

RESPONDENTS:-

1. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR,
CIVIL STATION, ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT, ALAPPUZHA - 688 001.
2. THE SECRETARY,
ALAPPUZHA MUNICIPALITY, MUNICIPAL OFFICE, ALAPPUZHA - 688 001.

R2 BY ADV. SRI.AZAD BABU, SC, ALAPPUZHA MUNICIPALITY
R BY SRI. GOPAKUMAR G, GOVERNMENT PLEADER

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
17-03-2014, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

: 2 :

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS :

EXHIBIT P1. TRUE COPY OF THE REQUEST DATED 14.05.2014 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE 2ND RESPONDENT.

EXHIBIT P2. TRUE COPY OF THE COMPLAINT SUBMITTED BEFORE RESPONDENT NO.1 DATED 15.05.2014.

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS:

EXT.R2(a): TRUE COPY OF DISTRIBUTION REGISTER MAINTAINED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT.

EXT.R2(b): TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED BY THE REGISTRAR OF BIRTH & DEATH TO SHRI. RAJENDRAN.

/True Copy/

P.A to Judge.

DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, J.

W.P. (C) No. 34985 of 2014 (W)

Dated this the 17th day of March, 2015.

JUDGMENT

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned counsel for the second respondent, apart from perusing the record.

2. Briefly stated, the petitioner is said to have submitted an application before the second respondent on 10.01.2014 for the birth certificate of his grand son. When no certificate was issued by the second respondent, the petitioner submitted Ext.P1 request on 14.05.2014. Eventually, the petitioner seems to have complained to the first respondent on 15.05.2014 against the inaction of the second respondent. Finally, he has approached this Court.

3. The learned Standing Counsel for the second respondent submits that the application submitted by the petitioner is not in proper format; if the petitioner submits an application in terms of the statutory requirements, it will be

considered by the second respondent.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner, on her part, has agreed to the proposal and stated the petitioner's willingness to file appropriate application so that it can be processed by the second respondent.

5. In the facts and circumstances, having regard to the respective submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent, this Court, without adverting to the merits of the matter, disposes of the writ petition leaving it open for the petitioner to file a proper application in statutory terms before the second respondent seeking the birth certificate of his grand son; the second respondent, on receipt of the said application, shall process it and pass appropriate orders thereon expeditiously.

sd/- DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, JUDGE.

