

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU

TUESDAY, THE 15TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2015/24TH AGRAHAYANA, 1937

WP(C).No. 37902 of 2015 (K)  
-----

PETITIONER:  
-----

R.MOHANDAS, S/O. RAGHAVAN,  
SUPERINTENDENT (RETD) COIRFED, ALAPPUZHA,  
RESIDING AT VALIAVEETIL HOUSE, ALAPPAT,  
KARUNAGAPPALLY, KOLLAM.

BY ADV. SRI.P.N.MOHANAN

RESPONDENT:  
-----

DIRECTOR OF COIR DEVELOPMENT,  
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTORATE OF COIR DEVELOPMENT,  
COIR BHAVAN, NADAVANAM - 695 033,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

R BY SRI. JOBY CYRIAC  
SRI. JOSEPH GEORGE, SR. GOVERNMENT PLEADER

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON  
15-12-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE  
FOLLOWING:

WP(C).No. 37902 of 2015 (K)

: 2 :

**APPENDIX**

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

- EXT.P1 : TRUE COPY OF THE AWARD DATED 22.02.2012 IN ARC NO.110/2008.
- EXT.P2 : TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 18.06.2015 IN W.P.(C) NO.25848/2012.
- EXT.P3 & P3(a) : TRUE COPY OF THE PETITION DATED 16.11.2015 WITH THE ACKNOWLEDGMENT DUE FROM THE POSTAL DEPARTMENT.

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS: NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE

DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, J.

-----  
W.P. (C) No. 37902 of 2015 (K)  
-----

Dated this the 15<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2015.

### JUDGMENT

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

2. The petitioner, having obtained an award, seeks to execute it through the process of a Civil Court. Since the statute demands that he should obtain a certificate from the respondent, the petitioner is said to have submitted Ext.P3 application. Apprehending that the respondent may not consider the petitioner's application on time, he has approached this Court.

3. I have no doubt that the respondent is not conscious of his responsibilities. I am sure that he will pass appropriate orders and, if the petitioner meets all the legal requirements, he may also give the certificate sought by the petitioner.

I am of the opinion that the writ petition is premature, for there is no express rejection on the part of the respondent. At any rate, as it has become liturgical litigation, this Court disposes of the

writ petition with a direction to the respondent to consider the petitioner's Ext.P3 representation and pass appropriate orders, as expeditiously as possible, at any rate, within one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

sd/- DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, JUDGE.

rv