

Rahul Krishnan vs the Electrical Inspector

Rahul Krishnan vs the Electrical Inspector

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1321456

Court : Kerala

Decided On : Apr-09-2024

Judge : Honourable Mr. Justice Gopinath P.

Appeal No. : RP/431/2024

Appellant : Rahul Krishnan

Respondent : The Electrical Inspector

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE GOPINATH P.
TUESDAY, THE 9TH DAY OF APRIL 2024 / 20TH CHAITHRA, 1946 RP
NO. 431 OF 2024 AGAINST THE JUDGMENT DATED IN WP(C)
NO.27392 OF 2015 OF HIGH COURT OF KERALA REVIEW
PETITIONER/PETITIONER: RAHUL KRISHNAN, AGED 43 YEARS S/O.
T.N.RADHAKRISHNA PILLAI, SWAGATH ORGANIC FARM TRADING,
EDAPPON, NOORANAD, IRANIKKUZHI PO, CHENGANNUR,
ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT, PIN - BY ADVS. G.HARIHARAN PRAVEEN.H.
K.S.SMITHA B.R.SINDU V.R.SANJEEV KUMAR V.ROHITH AFNA V.P.
RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS:

1 THE ELECTRICAL INSPECTOR ELECTRICAL INSPECTORATE
DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ELECTRICAL
INSPECTOR, THIRUMALA DEVASWOM BOARD BUILDINGS 2 THE
ASSISTANT ENGINEER, LINE MAINTENANCE SECTION, EDAPPON,
PATTOOR PO, ALAPPUZHA, PIN - 689501 3 THE DEPUTY CHIEF
ENGINEER, TRANSMISSION CIRCLE, 4 THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
TRANSMISSION DIVISION, MAVELIKKARA., ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT,
PIN - 690101 5 THE ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
TRANSMISSION SUB DIVISION, EDAPPON, ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT,
PIN - 689501

OTHER PRESENT: SRI.BINOY DAVIS (GP) SRI B PREMOD, SC KSEB
THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
09.04.2024, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

GOPINATH P., J.

----- R.P.No.431 of 2024 in W.P(C).No.27392
of 2015 ----- Dated this the 9th day of April, 2024

ORDER

The contention of the petitioner in the review petition appears to be that, if the existing towers supporting the tower line passing over the cattle shed of the petitioner is supported by another tower by maintaining the distance specified in the technical specification for steel pole structure installations in India, the sagging of the tower lines between the existing tower lines can be avoided and the aerial distance can be maintained. This contention, in my view, does not constitute a ground for review. The Review Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. Sd/-
GOPINATH P, JUDGE Sbnal/ APPENDIX OF RP 431/2024 PETITIONER
ANNEXURES Annexure I A TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER DATED
10.09.2015 MADE IN W.P.(C).NO.27392/2015 Annexure II A TRUE COPY OF
THE RELEVANT EXTRACT OF THE REGULATION 63 OF THE CEA

MEASURES RELATING TO SAFETY AND ELECTRIC SUPPLY REGULATIONS, 2010 Annexure III . A TRUE COPY OF THE PHOTOGRAPH OF THE AERIAL VIEW OF THE TOWER LINE AS WELL AS THE CATTLE SHED ERECTED IN THE PETITIONER'S PROPERTY Annexure IV A TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE DATED 29.02.2024 ISSUED BY THE 5TH RESPONDENT ADDRESSED TO THE PETITIONER

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