

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.SIRI JAGAN

FRIDAY, THE 31ST JULY 2009 / 9TH SRAVANA 1931

RP.No. 734 of 2009(I)

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT/ORDER IN WPC.19823/2007 Dated 30/06/2009
.....

REVIEW PETITIONER(S) : 3RD RESPONDENT

THE PRINCIPAL,
PARASSINILKADAVU AYURVEDA MEDICAL COLLEGE,
PARASSINILKADAVU, KANNUR.

BY ADV. SRI.B.S.SWATHY KUMAR

RESPONDENT(S) : PETITIONER & RESPONDENTS 1 & 2

-
1. AMRUTHA VENUGOPAL, D/O. VENUGOPAL,
21/819, 'UDAYAM' PAI ROAD, PERUMBADAPPU,
PALLURUTHY POST, KOCHI-6.
 2. THE DIRECTOR,
AYURVEDA MEDICAL EDUCATION DEPT., DIRECTORATE OF
AYURVEDA MEDICAL EDUCATION, AROGYA BHAVAN,
M.G.ROAD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
 3. STATE OF KERALA, REP. BY
ITS SECRETARY, HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE
DEPARTMENT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

ADV. SHRI.P.V.KUNHIKRISHNAN FOR R1
G.P. SHRI.DILIP MOHAN

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 31/07/2009, A/W. W.P.(C).No. 19823/2007
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

S.SIRI JAGAN, J.

=====

R.P.No.734/2009 &
W.P.(C).No.19832/2007

=====

Dated this the 31st day of July, 2009

J U D G M E N T

The 3rd respondent in the writ petition has filed this review petition seeking review of my judgment dated 30.6.2009 in the writ petition. The contention is that in the judgment I had directed that the admission given to the petitioner in the writ petition pursuant to the interim order, would be treated as regular and the respondents shall permit the petitioner to complete the course as if she was validly admitted. The contentions raised by the petitioner in the review petition is that the petitioner in the writ petition has never turned up for admission pursuant to the interim order and the course is also over. Therefore, there is no point in directing that the petitioner be allowed to complete the course as if she was validly admitted.

The petitioner in the writ petition does not dispute the fact that she did not join the course as permitted by the interim order. It is also not disputed that the course itself is over. That being so, there is no point in directing that the admission of the petitioner be treated as regular and allowing the petitioner to complete the course as if she was validly admitted. Accordingly, I recall the judgment dated 30.6.2009 and dismiss the writ petition as infructuous.

sdk+

///True copy///

Sd/-
S.SIRI JAGAN, JUDGE

P.A. to Judge

