

**Shyam S Menon vs Aravindakumar**

**Shyam S Menon vs Aravindakumar**

**SooperKanoon Citation :** [sooperkanoon.com/1443364](https://sooperkanoon.com/1443364)

**Court :** Kerala

**Decided On :** Mar-10-2022

**Judge :** Honourable Mr.Justice V.G.Arun

**Appeal No. :** RP/62/2022

**Appellant :** Shyam S Menon

**Respondent :** Aravindakumar

**Judgement :**

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V.G.ARUN THURSDAY,  
THE 10TH DAY OF MARCH 2022 / 19TH PHALGUNA, 1943 RP NO. 62  
OF 2022 OP(C) 1951/2020 OF HIGH COURT OF KERALA REVIEW  
PETITIONER/S:

1 SHYAM S MENON AGED 55 YEARS S/O. LATE KRISHNA MENON,  
DARPAN, R. MADHAVAN NAIR ROAD PALLIMUKKU, ERNAKULAM -  
682016., REPRESENTED THROUGH THE POWER OF ATTORNEY  
HOLDER, MRS. SUBHA GOKUL MENON, AGED 53 YEAR, D/O. LATE  
KRISHNA MENON, DARPAN, R. MADHAVAN NAIR ROAD,  
PALLIMUKKU, ERNAKULAM - 682 016. 2 SUBHA GOKUL MENON

AGED 53 YEARS, D/O. LATE KRISHNA MENON, DARPAN, R. MADHAVAN NAIR ROAD, PALLIMUKKU, ERNAKULAM - 682 016. 3 SIVA GOPALAKRISHNAN AGED 50 YEARS, S/O. LATE KRISHNA MENON, DARPAN, R. MADHAVAN NAIR ROAD PALLIMUKKU, ERNAKULAM - 682016., REPRESENTED THROUGH THE POWER OF ATTORNEY HOLDER, MRS. SUBHA GOKUL MENON, AGED 53 YEAR, D/O. LATE KRISHNA MENON, DARPAN, R. MADHAVAN NAIR ROAD, PALLIMUKKU, ERNAKULAM - 682 016. BY ADVS. P.G.SURESH ASWATHY KRISHNAN

RESPONDENT/S: 1 ARAVINDAKUMAR AGED 71 YEARS S/O. GOVINDALU, RESIDING AT DOOR NO.39/4844, M. G. ROAD, RAVIPURAM, KOCHI - 682 016. 2 P. B. GOPALAKRISHNAN AGED 63 YEARS S/O. RAGHAVAN PILLAI, PUKALAKATTU ETTUKETIL HOUSE, P. O. PALAROVATTOM, ERNAKULAM, PIN - 682 025. 3 BHIMA JEWELS JOSE JUNCTION, MG ROAD, ERNAKULAM, REPRESENTED THROUGH ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR, PIN - 682 011. THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 10.03.2022, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING: -2-

## **ORDER**

Dated this the 10th day of March, 2022 Having heard the learned Counsel on either side, I am unable to find any error apparent on the face of the judgment, requiring invocation of the power of review. Needless to say, my findings are confined to the question of maintainability, based on appraisal of the factual and legal findings rendered by the executing court. If questions other than those relating to maintainability are to be canvassed, it is for the parties to agitate them before the executing court. The review petition is dismissed accordingly. Sd/- V.G.ARUN JUDGE ScI/10.03.2022 -3- APPENDIX OF RP 62/2022 PETITIONER ANNEXURES Annexure A1 THE CERTIFIED COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN OP(C) NO.1951/2020 DATED 20.10.2021.