

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.SURENDRA MOHAN

FRIDAY, THE 30TH APRIL 2010 / 10TH VAISAKHA 1932

WP(C).No. 13936 of 2010(N)

PETITIONER:

DR.SINDHU SREEDHARAN,
W/O.R.AZAD BABU, D.D.WEST WINDS,
LISIE HOSPITAL ROAD, ERNAKULAM NORTH P.O.,
KOCHI-682 018.

BY ADVS. SRI.T.R.RAVI,
SRI.JAWAHAR JOSE.

RESPONDENTS:

1. STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY
THE SECRETARY TO HEALTH DEPARTMENT,
SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
2. DIRECTOR OF HEALTH SERVICES,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
3. DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL EDUCATION,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
4. THE DISTRICT MEDICAL OFFICER (HEALTH),
ERNAKULAM.
5. THE COMMISSIONER FOR ENTRANCE
EXAMINATIONS, HOUSING BOARD BUILDINGS,
SANTHI NAGAR, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 001.

R1 TO R5 BY GOVT. PLEADER SRI. V. MANU.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 30/04/2010, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

prv.

K.SURENDRA MOHAN, J.

W.P.(C) No.13936 of 2010

Dated this the 30th day of April, 2010

JUDGMENT

The petitioner is working as an Assistant Surgeon under the State Health Services. According to her, she has actual rural service of 11 years 5 months and 23 days. However, while preparing the seniority list for admission to Post Graduate Medical (Degree/Diploma) Courses in the Medical Colleges in Kerala for the year 2010, she has been given the benefit of only 7 years 11 months and 14 days of her rural service. Consequently, the rank of the petitioner in the seniority list has come down to 159 instead of 42, to which rank she is legitimately entitled to. The petitioner apprehends that due to the above mistake, she may lose her chance of getting admission to her Post Graduate Medical course.

2. The petitioner has set out her grievances in detail, in Ext.P6 appeal, which is pending before the second respondent. In view of the fact that Ext.P6 is pending consideration of the second respondent, I do not propose

to consider the merits of the contentions raised in this Writ Petition. Since the process of selection of candidates from Ext.P8 list is already in progress, it is necessary that Ext.P6 is disposed of without further delay.

3. In the above circumstances, this writ petition is disposed of directing the second respondent to consider the appeal of the petitioner evidenced herein by Ext.P6 in accordance with law, and to pass appropriate orders thereon as expeditiously as possible and at any rate before the second round of consideration of the candidates who are ranked in the seniority list, evidenced by Ext.P8. The petitioner shall produce a copy of the Writ Petition as well as a copy of this judgment before the second respondent for prompt compliance with the above direction.

**K.SURENDRA MOHAN,
JUDGE**

css/