

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.HARILAL

WEDNESDAY, THE 9TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2015/18TH AGRAHAYANA, 1937

WP(C).No. 35280 of 2015 (H)

PETITIONER(S):

**K.V.LAKSHMANAN, AGED 48 YEARS,
S/O.KARIYAMBU, WORKING AS EMPANELLED CONDUCTOR, KSRTC,
PAYYANUR AND RESIDING AT KANATHUMVATHUKKAL,
ALAMTHATTA, VALIYAPOYIL P.O., CHERUVATHUR (VIA),
KASARGOD - 671 313.**

**BY ADVS.SRI.N.UNNIKRISHNAN
SRI.PAULACHAN IYPE**

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT,
TRANSPORT (A) DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 001.**
- 2. KERALA STATE ROAD TRANSPORT CORPORATION,
TRANSPORT BHAVAN, FORT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 023,
REPRESENTED BY THE CHAIRMAN & MANAGING DIRECTOR.**

**R1 BY SENIOR GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT.K.A.SANJEETHA
R2 BY ADV. SRI.M.GOPIKRISHNAN NAMBIAR, SC**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
09-12-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**

msv/

WP(C).No. 35280 of 2015 (H)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

EXT.P1: A COPY OF CASH RECEIPT NO.024951 DATED 18.10.1999.

EXT.P2: A COPY OF CASH RECEIPT NO.53928 DATED 24.08.2006, 18.10.1999.

EXT.P3: A TRUE COPY OF STATEMENT OF ATTENDANCE DETAILS DATED 03.08.2015.

**EXT.P4: A TRUE COPY OF G.O.(MS)/78/2011/TRAN DATED 21.12.2011 ISSUED BY THE
1ST RESPONDENT.**

EXT.P5: A TRUE COPY OF REPRESENTATION DATED 16.11.2015.

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS:

NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A.TO JUDGE.

Msv/

K.HARILAL, J.

W.P.(C) No.35280 of 2015

Dated this the 9th day of December, 2015.

JUDGMENT

The petitioner is working as provisional Conductor from 18.10.1999 as evident from Exts.P1 to P3. According to the petitioner, he has more than ten years of service and the same is evident from Ext.P3. As per Ext.P4 Government Order, he is entitled for regularisation in service. So also, the ratio decided by this Court in Suresh Kumar v. State of Kerala [2012 (3) KLT 258] also applies to the case of the petitioner. But, the benefit under Ext.P4 has been denied to the petitioner wrongly. Under this circumstance, the petitioner filed Ext.P5 representation before the 2nd respondent. The grievance of the petitioner is that Ext.P5 has not been considered so far, despite the long lapse of time.

2. Heard the The learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel for the

respondent Corporation.

3. Having regard to the fact that Ext.P5 representation has not been considered so far, this writ petition is disposed of directing the 2nd respondent to consider and pass orders on Ext.P5 representation, after affording an opportunity of being heard to the petitioner, at the earliest, at any rate, within two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

This writ petition is disposed of accordingly.

Sd/-
K. HARILAL, JUDGE

okb.