

Dr. Anilkumar vs Kerala State Human Rights Commission

Dr. Anilkumar vs Kerala State Human Rights Commission

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1359588

Court : Kerala

Decided On : Jan-31-2023

Judge : Honourable the Chief Justice Mr.S.Manikumar,Honourable Mr.Justice Murali Purushothaman

Appeal No. : WP(C)/2012/2018

Appellant : Dr. Anilkumar

Respondent : Kerala State Human Rights Commission

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.S.MANIKUMAR & THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE MURALI PURUSHOTHAMAN TUESDAY, THE 31ST DAY OF JANUARY 2023 / 11TH MAGHA, 1944 PETITIONER DR. ANILKUMAR, AGED 44 YEARS S/O. AMBI PANICKER, KESAVABHAVAN, VENNIYOOR,NELLIVILA PO.,THIRUVANANTHAPURAM PIN-695523 BY ADVS.SRI.S.SAJU SMT.NEELANJANA NAIR RESPONDENTS: 1 KERALA STATE HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION M.P.APPAN ROAD, VAZHUTHACAUD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM PIN-695014 REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR 2 DORATHI SUMAM W/O. SOMAN, CHEENIVILA

VEEDU,TOWER JUNCTION, VENGODU PO., PARIYARAM,
NEDUMANGAD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

3 THE ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER WATER AUTHORITY,
NEDUMANGADU PIN-695541 THIRUVANANTHAPRAM BY
ADVS.SRI.GOPAKUMAR R.THALIYAL SRI.RAHUL RAJ P.M.JOHN,
SC, KWA THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR
ADMISSION ON 31.01.2023, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY
DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING: :: 2 ::

JUDGMENT

Dated this the 31st day of January, 2023 S.MANIKUMAR, C.J. This writ petition is filed seeking the following reliefs: a) issue writ or directions in the nature of or similar to writ of certiorari to quash Ext.P2 order dated 4.1.2018 issued by the 1st respondent, Human Rights Commission and declaring it as illegal, unreasonable and unconstitutional.

b) issue writ or directions in the nature of or similar to writ of mandamus or order to declare that the 1 st respondent has no power to entertain a complaint that prima facie establishes a violation of Section 16(b) & 17 of the Protection of Human Rights Act 1993 and set aside all further proceedings pursuant to Ext.P1 complaint.

2. On this day, when the matter came up for hearing,

Mr.Saju S Nair, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that respondent No.2 is no longer residing in the premises in question. It is further submitted that the writ petition has now become infructuous. In view of the above, writ petition is dismissed as infructuous. S.MANIKUMAR CHIEF JUSTICE MURALI PURUSHOTHAMAN JUDGE jes

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