

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.S.SATHEESACHANDRAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 16TH DAY OF JANUARY 2013/26TH POUSHA 1934

CRP.No. 1883 of 1991 (B)

AGAINST THE ORDER IN OS.131/1979 of MUNSIF COURT, MUVATTUPUZHA
DATED 03-01-1991

REVISION PETITIONER(S):

DAMODARAN DAMODARAN NAMBOODIRI,
KOTTACKAL ILLOM, VARAPPETTYKKARA,
VARAPPETTYKKARA VILLAGE.

BY ADV. SRI.M.C.NAMBIAR

RESPONDENT(S):

1. DAMODARAN PARAMESWARAN NAMBOODIRI,
RESIDING AT KALAPPURACKAL,
VARAPPETTYKKARA, VARAPPETTYKKARA VILLAGE.
2. UMADEVI ANTHARJANAM,
VARAPPETTYKKARA, VARAPPETTYKKARA VILLAGE.
3. DAMODARAN NARAYANAN NAMBOODIRI,
VARAPPETTYKKARA, VARAPPETTYKKARA VILLAGE.

BY ADVS. SRI.K.N.NARAYANA PILLAI
SRI.DINESH R.SHENOY

THIS CIVIL REVISION PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON
16-01-2013, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

stu

S.S.SATHEESACHANDRAN, J.

=====

C.M.A.No.541/2012

M.J.C.No.542/2012

in

R.P.No.49/2008

in

C.R.P.No.1883 OF 1991

=====

Dated this the 16th day of January, 2013

ORDER

Review Petition was filed by one of the plaintiffs in a Suit for Redemption. That petition had been dismissed for non-taking of steps within time. Now the present petition is filed to restore the review petition to file after condoning the delay of 1110 days. In fact, the review petition had been filed with a petition to condone delay of 36 days. Orders passed by the court in the review petition would indicate that review happened to be dismissed for non-prosecution at a stage when delay in filing this petition also remained to be considered.

I do not find any merit in the petition also for restoring the review petition as no satisfactory reason has been stated for condoning the inordinate delay. The M.J.C and petition to condone delay are dismissed.

**S.S.SATHEESACHANDRAN,
JUDGE.**

stu