



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISANKAR V. MENON

THURSDAY, THE 27TH DAY OF MARCH 2025 / 6TH CHAITHRA, 1947

WP(C) NO. 23467 OF 2019

PETITIONER:

RAMESH
AGED 50 YEARS, S/O.SANKARANARAYANAN,
KALATHINGAL VEEDU, P.O.KOLAKKAT CHALIL,
VALLIKUNNU VILLAGE, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT.

BY ADVS.
SRI.R.SUDHISH
SMT.M.MANJU

RESPONDENTS:

- 1 STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY, HOME DEPARTMENT,
SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695001.
- 2 DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE (CRIME),
POLICE HEAD QUARTERS, VAZHUTHACAUD,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695010.
- 3 INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE
(ADMINISTRATION), POLICE HEAD QUARTERS,
VAZHUTHACAUD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695010.
- 4 CITY POLICE COMMISSIONER,
KOZHIKODE CITY, KOZHIKODE-673001.
- 5 VIDHULA,
AGED 41 YEARS, D/O.BHASKARAN NAIR,
SAROVARAM HOUSE, POST KARIYATHANKAVU,
SIVAPURAM VILLAGE, THAMARASSERY TALUK,
KOZHIKODE-673612.



BY ADVS.
SRI.HARISH VASUDEVAN
SRI.RAJAN VISHNURAJ (K/653/2010)
SRI.E.G.GORDEN, SR.GP.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 27.03.2025, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:



JUDGMENT

The petitioner is the husband of the 5th respondent herein. The petitioner has stated that, while they were residing together in the N.G.O. quarters in Kozhikode district, substantial amounts in the form of cash as well as certain documents were in the cupboard in the quarters, and the 5th respondent herein, without notice to the petitioner, locked the quarters, and subsequently the cash was stolen. The petitioner admits that the so-called valuable documents have been subsequently returned. In such circumstances, the petitioner submitted Exts.P1 to P4 before respondents 1 to 4, complaining about the alleged excesses carried out by the 5th respondent herein.

2. I have heard Smt.M.Manju, the learned counsel for the petitioner, Sri.E.G.Gorden, the learned Senior Government Pleader for respondents 1 to 4 and Sri.Harish Vasudevan, the learned counsel for the 5th respondent.

3. True, the learned counsel Sri.Harish, on behalf of the 5th respondent, contends that the petitioner has not made out any locus standi for filing the captioned writ petition, without availing



the remedy available in accordance with law.

4. However, I find that the complaint raised by the petitioner is pointed out before respondents 2 to 4 by filing applications at Exts.P1 to P4. In such circumstances, I am of the opinion that, without entering into the maintainability or otherwise of Exts.P1 to P4, this writ petition can be disposed of, by directing respondents 2 to 4 to take a decision on Exts.P1 to P4 as expeditiously as possible, if not already decided, after granting the 5th respondent herein also an opportunity of being heard in the matter. I make it clear that, any among the respondents 2 to 4 would be entitled to act on the basis of Exts.P1 to P4.

5. I further make it clear that, I have not considered the question as regards the maintainability of Exts.P1 to P4 in this writ petition.

This writ petition is disposed of as above.

Sd/-

HARISANKAR V. MENON
JUDGE

anm



APPENDIX OF WP(C) 23467/2019

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT P1 COPY OF THE COMPLAINT SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE SECRETARY, HOME DEPARTMENT DATED 13.6.2019.

EXHIBIT P2 COPY OF THE COMPLAINT SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE 2ND RESPONDENT DATED 13.6.2019.

EXHIBIT P3 COPY OF THE COMPLAINT SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE 3RD RESPONDENT DATED 13.6.2019.

EXHIBIT P4 COPY OF THE COMPLAINT SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE 4TH RESPONDENT DATED 13.6.2019.