

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.K.ABDUL REHIM
&
THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE MARY JOSEPH

FRIDAY, THE 13TH DAY OF NOVEMBER 2015/22ND KARTHIKA, 1937

WP(Crl.).No. 434 of 2015 (S)

PETITIONER(S) :

SAFIYA P.Y AGED 53 YEARS
W/O.SIDHI C.A., CHATHAMKOTIL HOUSE, WADAKANCHERY PO
THRISSUR-680 582.

BY ADV. SRI.P.K.NIJOY

RESPONDENT(S) :

1. STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT HOME DEPARTMENT
SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

2. THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

3. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE
THRISSUR.

4. THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE
WADAKKANCHERY, THRISSUR.

5. THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE
CHERPU, THRISSUR.

6. LIBU KOTTAPADIKKAL
C/O.KASIM, VALIYAKATH, HEALTH CENTRE VIA OORAKAM
THRISSUR. NOW RESIDING AT ORKID APARTMENTS
SREEKRISHNA COLLEGE ROAD, KOVAIPUTHUR, COIMBATORE
TAMILNADU.

7. NASEEMA V.K.
W/O.LIBU KOTTAPADIKKAL, VALIYAKATH
HEALTH CENTRE VIA OORAKAM
THRISSUR. NOW RESIDING AT ORKID APARTMENTS
SREEKRISHNA COLLEGE ROAD, KOVAIPUTHUR, COIMBATORE
TAMILNADU

GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.EGGY N.ELIAS.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CRIMINAL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
13-11-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

WP(Cr1.).No. 434 of 2015 (S)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S) ' EXHIBITS

EXT.P1 : TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE OF MARRIAGE DT 16-9-2014.

/TRUE COPY/

P.S. TO JUDGE.

s1.

C.K.Abdul Rehim & Mary Joseph, JJ.

=====

W.P.(Crl.)No.434 of 2015

=====

Dated this the 13th day of November, 2015.

JUDGMENT

Abdul Rehim, J.

1. The above case is instituted seeking a writ of Habeas Corpus raising allegation that the petitioner's daughter is under illegal confinement of respondents 6 and 7. Eventhough this court was not inclined to admit the writ petition based on the arguments advanced, notice on admission was issued to the respondents 6 and 7 through speed post. The Registry had endorsed that the notice sent to the respondents 6 and 7 were returned unserved stating that the address is insufficient.
2. Today when the case is taken up for consideration, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the address of the respondents 6 and 7 already furnished, is the only address known to the petitioner. He seeks permission to withdraw the writ petition with liberty to move a

fresh petition, if circumstances warrants, on furnishing the exact address of respondents 6 and 7.

3. Permission is granted. The writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn, subject to liberty reserved as mentioned above.

C.K.Abdul Rehim, Judge.

Mary Joseph, Judge.

sl.