IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PIUS C.KURIAKOSE

TUESDAY, THE 30TH SEPTEMBER 2008 / 8TH ASWINA 1930

RP.No. 949 of 2008() -----(IN C.R.P. NO.1572/1995)

REVIEW PETITIONER(S): 3RD RESPONDENT

K. CHANDRASEKHARAN NAIR, S/O. SANKARA PILLAI, VETTENTHIYIL PUTHEN VEEDU, THAMARAKUDY, KOTTARAKKARA.

BY ADV. SRI.C.S.MANILAL

 $RESPONDENT(S): RESPONDENTS \ 1, 2, 5 \ AND \ THE \ REV. \ PETITIONER$

- 1. SURENDRA PILLAI, KOOPARAKIZHAKKETHU VEEDU, KALAYAPURAM, MYLOM, KOTTARAKKARA.
- 2. RADHAKRISHNA PILLAI, SANKARAMANGALATHU VEEDU, THAMARAKUDY, KOTTARAKKARA.
- 3. TALUK LAND BOARD, KOTTARAKKARA.
- 4. THE STATE OF KERALA, REP. BY THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
- 5. TAHSILDAR, KOTTARAKKARA.

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 30/09/2008, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

PIUS.C.KURIAKOSE,J.

C.M.APPLN.830/2008 & R.P. NO.949/2008 IN C.R.P.No. 1572/1995

Dated this the 30th day of September, 2008

ORDER

I do not find any valid grounds made out by the petitioner

for condoning the inordinate delay, which has been caused in the

matter of filing the review petition. Moreover, it is brought to my

notice by Sri.K.K.John that R.P. No.947/2008 filed by the third

respondent in C.R.P. No.48/1997, a case which was disposed of

along with C.R.P. NO.1572/1995, the present case was

dismissed. A copy of the order in the R.P. No.947/2008 is

placed before me. The impugned common order has thus

attained finality, having been reiterated twice by this court. I do

not find any infirmity about my order warranting invocation of the

jurisdiction for review.

The I.A. as well as R.P. fails and they will stand dismissed.

(PIUS.C.KURIAKOSE, JUDGE)

dpk