

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.T.RAVIKUMAR

TUESDAY, THE 10TH DAY OF MARCH 2015/19TH PHALGUNA, 1936

UNNUMBERED R.P(F.C) of 2015
ZRPFC No. 591 of 2015 ()

(AGAINST THE ORDER IN CMP.NO.591/2014 IN MC 204/2013 of FAMILY
COURT,TRIVANDRUM DATED 23-01-2015)

REVISION PETITIONER/RESPONDENT:

SURESH KUMAR B, AGED 46 YEARS,
S/O.BHASKARAN NADAR, TC 18/824
SHANKAR BHAVAN, KONGALAM JUNCTION, ARAMADA PO,
THIRUMALA VILLAGE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN 695 032.

BY ADVS.SRI.K.K.BALAKRISHNAN (KODIYURA)
SRI.K.K.ALI
SRI.K.R.AVINASH (KUNNATH)

RESPONDENTS/PETITIONERS:

-
1. SHEEJA V., D/O.VASANTHA, AGED 33 YEARS,
PEZHUNINNAVILA VEEDU, VANDITHADAM, KALIYUR, VELLAYANI PO,
KALLIYUR VILLAGE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN 695 028.
 2. ASWATHY SURESH, D/O.SHEEJA V, AGED 9 YEARS,
PEZHUNINNAVILA VEEDU, VANDITHADAM, KALIYUR, VELLAYANI PO,
KALLIYUR VILLAGE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN 695 028.
 3. ASWANY SURESH, D/O.SHEEJA V, AGED 1 YEAR,
PEZHUNINNAVILA VEEDU, VANDITHADAM, KALIYUR, VELLAYANI PO,
KALLIYUR VILLAGE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN 695 028.

(2nd AND 3rd RESPONDENTS ARE MINORS AND REPRESENTED BY
MOTHER 1st RESPONDENT)

THIS UNNUMBERED RPFC HAVING BEN FINALLY HEARD ON 10-03-2015,
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

C.T.RAVIKUMAR, J.

Unnumbered R.P.(FC) of 2015
(ZRPFC No.591 of 2015)

Dated 10th March, 2015

ORDER

This unnumbered revision petition is taken up for consideration today at the instance of the learned counsel for the revision petitioner pursuant to a defect noted by the Registry. The Registry noted that a revision petition would not lie against the order in CMP.No.591 of 2014 in M.C.No.204 of 2013, the order against which this revision is sought to be registered, in the light of the provisions under Section 19(4) of the Family Court Act. Evidently, it is an interlocutory order. Obviously, the said defect is noted in the light of a decision of this Court dated 27.6.2014 in R.P.(F.C) No.96 of 2014, as well. When this matter is taken up for consideration the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that in the light of the provisions under Section 19(4) of the Family Court Act and also in the light of the aforementioned decision this revision petition would not lie against the said order and the same may be ordered to be returned. In the circumstances, the objection raised by the Registry is upheld and the Registry is directed to return the file to the petitioner.

Sd/-
C.T.RAVIKUMAR
Judge

TKS