

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.MUHAMED MUSTAQUE

FRIDAY, THE 18TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2015/27TH AGRAHAYANA, 1937

WP(C).No. 38219 of 2015 (B)

PETITIONER(S):

**ANEESH P A, AGED 26 YEARS,
S/O.ASHARAF, PUTHANPARAMBIL HOUSE, MALIPURAM,
VYPIN VALAPPU, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.**

**BY ADVS.SRI.HARISH R. MENON
SRI.K.T.SHYAMKUMAR**

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. GREATER COCHIN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
KADAVANTHRA, ERNAKULAM,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY. 682 017.**
- 2. R.LALU, FATHER'S NAME NOT KNOWN,
SECRETARY, GCDA, KADAVANTHRA
ERNAKULAM 682 017.**
- 3. SHABEER,
PROPRIETOR, E4 EVENTZ, XI/148F,
NEREVEETIL BUILDING, VAZHAKKALA, THRIKKAKARA P.O,
KOCHI 682 021.**

**R1 BY SRI.C.A.MAJEED, SC
R3 BY ADV. SRI.K.R.VINOD**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 18-12-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

PJ

WP(C).No. 38219 of 2015 (B)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT P1. COPY OF THE APPLICATION DATED 12.10.15 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE RESPONDENT SEEKING PERMISSION TO CONDUCT THE EXHIBITION FOR THE YEAR 2015-2016.

EXHIBIT P2. COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 13.11.15 ISSUED BY THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, ERNAKULAM.

EXHIBIT P3. COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 2.12.15 ISSUED BY THE OFFICE OF THE LOCAL SELF GOVERNMENT, DEPARTMENT THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

EXHIBIT P4. COPY OF THE BROUCHER FOR THE EXHIBITION.

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS

NIL.

/ TRUE COPY /

P.S. TO JUDGE

PJ

A.MUHAMED MUSTAQUE, J.

=====

W.P(C)No.38219 of 2015

=====

Dated this the 18th day of December, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioner approaches this Court alleging that the 1st respondent failed to provide space for running exhibition as envisaged in Ext.P1.

2. The learned counsel for the GCDA submits that though the petitioner has filed application, he did not remit the requisite fee and therefore, allotment was made to party respondents. Counsel for the party respondents submits that they have already paid the entire amount and taken possession and erected all infrastructures for the purpose of exhibition.

3. In that view of the matter, this Court cannot interfere in this matter as the priority is based on the payment of ground rent.

In view of the above, writ petition is dismissed.

Sd/-

A.MUHAMED MUSTAQUE,
JUDGE