

Fathima Beevi Vs. K.S.E.B

Fathima Beevi Vs. K.S.E.B

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1017855

Court : Kerala

Decided On : Jul-31-2013

Judge : Honourable Mr.Justice Thomas P.Joseph

Appellant : Fathima Beevi

Respondent : K.S.E.B

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM PRESENT: THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE THOMAS P.JOSEPH WEDNESDAY, THE 31ST DAY OF JULY 2013 9TH SRAVANA, 1935 RFA.No. 606 of 2004 () ----- THE ORDER/JUDGMENT IN OS 131/1993 of SUB COURT, MAVELIKKARA DATED 20 12-2002 APPELLANTS/PLAINTIFFS 1 TO 3.5 AND 7.----- 1. FATHIMA BEEVI, W/O.LATE ALIYARUKUNJU, R/A. PARAYANVILLA PUTHEN VEEDU, VENGAL, MINAGAPPALLY SASTHAMKOTTA TALUK (DIED) 2. TAHA KUNJU, PARAYAN VILLA PUTHEN VEEDU, MINAGAPPALLY VILLAGE, SASTHAMCOTTA.

3. SAUDA BEEVI, PARAYANVILLA PUTHEN VEEDU, MINAGAPPALLY VILLAGE, SASTHAMCOTTA.

4. SHAHIDA BEEVI, PARAYANVILLA PUTHEN VEEDU, MINAGAPPALLY VILLAGE, SASTHAMKOTTA.

5. LILA BEEVI, PARAYANVILA PUTHEN VEEDU, MINAGAPPALLY VILLAGE, SASTHAMCOTTA. BY ADVS.SRI.K.K.CHANDRAN PILLAI SRI.SUDHEESH.A. RESPONDENT(S)/DEFENDANTS 1 3 TO 5 AND PLAINTIFFS 4 AND 6.----- 1. KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD, REP. BY ITS SECRETARY, VAIDYUTHI BHAVAN, PATTOM THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. REMA, UNDATHU MADATHIL, KEEZHCHERIMEL MURI, CHENGANNUR.

3. JYOTHI LAKSHMI, UNDATHU MADATHIL, KEEZHCHERIMEL MURI, CHENGANNUR.

4. RAJALAKSHMI, UNDATHU MADATHIL, KEEZHCHERIMEL MURI, CHENGANNUR.

5. MOHAMMED SHAFI, PARAYANVILLA PUTHEN VEEDU, MINAGAPPALLY VILLAGE, SASTHAMKOTTA.

6. MOHAMMED QUASHSI, PARAYANVILLA PUTHEN VEEDU, MINAGAPPALLY VILLAGE, SASTHAMKOTTA. ADV. SRI. P SANTHALINGAM FOR R1 THIS REGULAR FIRST APPEAL HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 31.07-2013, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING: THOMAS P.JOSEPH, J.

===== R.F.A.No.606 of 2004
===== Dated this the 31st day of July, 2013

JUDGMENT

The defect in the appeal is not cured. Steps are not taken to issue notice to the respondents 2 to 4.

2. This appeal was preferred on 15.05.2004. In spite of granting sufficient opportunity the appellants have not cured the defect.

3. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that in spite of giving intimation to the appellants vide two letters, the appellants have not responded.

4. It is clear that the appellants are not interested in prosecuting the appeal. Hence the appeal is dismissed for non prosecution. No cost. All pending interlocutory applications will stand dismissed. Sd/- THOMAS P.JOSEPH, JUDGE Sbna True
Copy P.A to Judge

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com