

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.ASHOK BHUSHAN
&
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.M.SHAFFIQUE

SATURDAY, THE 21ST DAY OF NOVEMBER 2015/30TH KARTHIKA, 1937

WP(C) .No. 35226 of 2015 (C)

PETITIONER(S) :

1. K.J.REGHU, AGED 56 YEARS
S/O.JANARAJAN, PLOT NO.16, PANCHAVADY COLONY
AMBELIPADAM ROAD, VYTTILA, KOCHI- 682 019.
2. E.P.SUNITHA, AGED 54 YEARS
W/O.K.J.REGHU, PLOT NO.16, PANCHAVADY COLONY
AMBELIPADAM ROAD, VYTTILA, KOCHI- 682 019.

BY ADVS.SRI.PRAVEEN K. JOY
SRI.T.A.JOY

RESPONDENT(S) :

1. STATE OF KERALA,
REP.BY SECRETARY, HOME DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT
TRIVANDRUM- 695 001.
2. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
THRISSUR- 680001.
3. THE CIRCLE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
KUNNUMKULAM POLICE STATION
THRISSUR DISTRICT- 680 523.
4. BINNI VARGHESE, AGED 35 YEARS
S/O.MADHURAMCHERIL JACOB, KANIYAMBAL DESOM
KUNNAMKULAM VILLAGE, TALAPPILLY TALUK- 680 523.

BY Sr.GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.P.I.DAVIS

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
21-11-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S) ' EXHIBITS

EXT P1- THE TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 18/12/12 IN OS
706/07 OF SUB COURT, THRISSUR.

EXT P2- THE TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE ORDER DATED 12/02/15 IN IA 5055/13
IN OS 706/07 OF SUB COURT, THRISSUR.

EXT P3- THE TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 21/08/14 IN OP(DRT)
77/14 OF THIS HONOURABLE COURT.

EXT P4- THE TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE FINAL ORDER DATED 30/03/2015 IN SA
95/08 OF DEBTS RECOVERY TRIBUNAL, ERNAKULAM.

EXT P5- THE TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE COMPLAINT BEFORE THE 2ND
RESPONDENT.

RESPONDENT(S) ' EXHIBITS

NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A.TO JUDGE

ami/

**ASHOK BHUSHAN, C.J. &
A.M.SHAFFIQUE, J.**

W.P.(C)No.35226 of 2015

Dated this the 21st day of November, 2015.

J U D G M E N T

ASHOK BHUSHAN, C.J.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned Senior Government Pleader in the matter.

2. Notice to the 4th respondent was dispensed with, in view of the judgment to be passed. The petitioners' case in the writ petition is that they had purchased a property in which the 4th respondent is residing as on date. The suit as well as the review filed by the 4th respondent were dismissed. The petitioners' case is that at the instance of the 4th respondent, the police is unnecessarily putting pressure on the petitioners to enter into settlement with the 4th respondent, which according to the petitioners, is a harassment by the police.

3. The learned Senior Government Pleader on instruction would submit that the petitioners, after receiving

an information that the son of the 4th respondent has a leg injury, he is not being allowed to take medical help and due to the pressure put up by the petitioner, the police has called the petitioner and then they went there to enquire. It is submitted that there is no harassment by the police as alleged by the petitioners. The police has also directed the petitioners not to adopt any pressure tactics. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners shall only take steps in accordance with law for eviction of the 4th respondent. Recording the submissions made at the bar, we close the writ petition, since we do not find any harassment by police as alleged by the petitioners.

Sd/-
ASHOK BHUSHAN,
CHIEF JUSTICE.

Sd/-
A.M.SHAFFIQUE,
JUDGE.

ami/

//True copy//

P.A. to Judge