

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE T.R.RAMACHANDRAN NAIR

THURSDAY, THE 15TH OCTOBER 2009 / 23RD ASWINA 1931

WP(C).No. 28312 of 2009(H)

PETITIONER:

LASITHA.K., D/O.NANU, AGED 44 YEARS,
CRAFT TEACHER, ONIYAN HIGH SCHOOL,
(UP SECTION), KOTIYERI, PARAL P.O.,
KANNUR DISTRICT.

BY MR.CIBI THOMAS, ADVOCATE.

RESPONDENTS:

1. THE MANAGER, ONIYAN HIGH SCHOOL,
KOTIYERI, PARAL P.O., KANNUR DISTRICT.
2. THE DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL OFFICER,
THALASSERY, KANNUR DISTRICT.
3. THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTIONS,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
4. STATE OF KERALA, REP. BY SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY MR. T.T. MUHAMOOD, SR. GOVERNMENT PLEADER.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 15/10/2009, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

T.R. RAMACHANDRAN NAIR, J.

W.P.(C) No.28312 OF 2009

Dated this the 15th day of October, 2009.

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner is working as Craft Teacher in the UP Section of Oniyan High School. She was appointed in a part time post. The Manager, on 01.06.1989, submitted an application for conversion of the post into a full time post. The same was rejected by the 2nd respondent-District Educational Officer. The appeal was rejected by the 3rd respondent by Exhibit P1 dated 27.11.1990.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that challenging Exhibit P1, the petitioner filed a revision petition before the Government on 23.03.1991 as per Exhibit P2. Exhibit P3 is said to be the reminder sent by the petitioner.

3. Learned Government Pleader on getting instructions submitted that Exhibits P2 and P3 are not pending before the Government and could not be traced out also. Even going by the averments in the writ petition, Exhibit P2 is dated 23.03.1991

and Exhibit P3 is dated 14.11.1994. The petitioner has approached this Court after 18 years from the date of Exhibit P2 and 15 years from the date of Exhibit P3.

In that view of the matter, I find no reason to entertain the writ petition. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner may be allowed a fresh opportunity to file a revision petition. The said request also cannot be accepted because of the long delay in the matter. It is upto the petitioner to seek appropriate remedies in the matter and dismissal of the writ petition will be without prejudice to the said course.

This writ petition is dismissed.

T.R. RAMACHANDRAN NAIR
JUDGE

smp