

Thomas vs Mukundan

Thomas vs Mukundan

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1441337

Court : Kerala

Decided On : Feb-01-2022

Judge : Honourable Mr. Justice P.B.Suresh Kumar, Honourable Mrs. Justice C.S. Sudha

Appeal No. : WA/62/2022

Appellant : Thomas

Respondent : Mukundan

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.B.SURESH KUMAR & THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE C.S. SUDHA TUESDAY, THE 1ST DAY OF FEBRUARY 2022 / 12TH MAGHA, 1943 WA NO. 62 OF 2022 AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 26012/2021 DATED 17.12.2021 OF HIGH COURT OF KERALA APPELLANT/4TH RESPONDENT: THOMAS AGED 53 YEARS S/O. PAILY, PALACHUVADU HOUSE, PANNIKUZHY KARA, PUTHENCROZE P. O., ERNAKULAM DISTRICT - 682308. SUNIL KUMAR A.G JOHN VIPIN RESPONDENTS/PETITIONER/RESPONDENTS 1 TO 3 AND 5:

1 MUKUNDAN AGED 57 YEARS S/O. LATE NARAYANAN, VILLAMPURATHU HOUSE, PANNIKUZHY KARA, PUTHENCROZE VILLAGE, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT, PIN - 682308. 2 STATE OF KERALA REPRESENTED BY THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT, CIVIL STATION, KAKKANAD P. O., ERNAKULAM - 682030. 3 THE TAHSILDAR KUNNATHUNADU TALUK, TALUK OFFICE, MINI CIVIL STATION, PERUMBAVOOR P. O., ERNAKULAM - 683542. 4 THE VILLAGE OFFICER PUTHENCROZE VILLAGE OFFICE, PUTHENCROZE P. O., 5 CIRCLE INSPECTOR OF POLICE PUTHENCROZE POLICE STATION, PUTHENCROZE P. O.,

Writ Appeal No.62 of 2022 2 M.K.DILEEPAN DEEPAK T.NEDUNGADAN S.KARTHIK MENON REKHA.C.NAIR THIS WRIT APPEAL HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 01.02.2022, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING: Writ Appeal No.62 of 2022 3 P.B.SURESH KUMAR & C.S.SUDHA, JJ. Writ Appeal No.62 of 2022 Dated this the 1st day of February, 2022

JUDGMENT

P.B.Suresh Kumar, J.

The learned counsel for the appellant submits that orders have been passed by the competent authority on Ext.P6 application preferred by the first respondent as directed in the impugned judgment and the appellant has been served with the said order. The learned counsel also submits that the order is in favour of the appellant. The learned Government Pleader also confirms the said fact.

2. The learned counsel for the first respondent submits that the order referred to above is yet to be served on his client.

3. In the light of the submissions aforesaid, in so far as

the order in the impugned judgment directing the parties to maintain Writ Appeal No.62 of 2022 4 status quo as regards the property is no longer in existence, it is

unnecessary to consider the correctness of the said order. The writ appeal is accordingly closed. If the order passed on Ext.P6 application is not served on the first respondent, the competent authority is directed to serve a copy of the same to the first respondent forthwith. P.B.SURESH KUMAR, JUDGE. C.S.SUDHA, JUDGE. YKB

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