

(2020) 11 KL CK 0158

In the High Court Of Kerala

Case No : Writ Petition (Civil) No. 24858 Of 2020 (F)

S. Vishnuvardhan And Anr

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Kerala And Ors

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 26-11-2020

Acts Referred:

Constitution Of India, 1950 — Article 14

Citation : (2020) 11 KL CK 0158

Hon'ble Judges : N. Nagaresh, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : K. Siju, S. Abhilash, S. Rekha Kumari, S. Seetha, Anjana Kannath, Titus Mani Vettom, V. Manu

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

1. The writ petition has been filed by the petitioners seeking to declare that adopting different criteria for computing seats for SC/ST reservation and

EWS reservation are arbitrary and violative of Article 14 of the Constitution.

2. The petitioners applied for KEAM-2020 Examination for admission to Kerala Engineering, Architecture and Medical Courses. Their grievance, in a

nutshell, is that the State is adopting different standards in computing the number of seats allocable under 10% reservation for Scheduled Castes and

Scheduled Tribes, and 10% reservation under Economically Weaker Sections quota.

3. When the writ petition came up for hearing today, learned Government Pleader representing respondents 1 to 5 submitted that during the last year,

quota for Economically Weaker Sections was sanctioned at the last minute and the Government had to allocate all those seats as sanctioned to the

EWS quota, since those seats were sanctioned as supernumerary seats for the

purpose of newly introduced EWS quota, which was newly introduced.

4. Learned Government Pleader submits that during this year, 10% seats allocated to SC/ST and 10% seats allocated to EWS, are equal in number

and there is no arbitrariness or discrimination shown in the matter.

5. Learned Standing Counsel for the 6th respondent would submit that the newly sanctioned seats under EWS quota will form part of the total number

of seats and therefore while calculating the number of seats for SC/ST and EWS, there will not be any arbitrariness or discrimination.

6. As the grievance raised by the petitioners stands answered satisfactorily by the learned Government Pleader and Standing Counsel for the 6th

respondent, no further orders are required in this writ petition.

Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of recording the submissions made by the learned Government Pleader and the learned Standing Counsel for

the 6th respondent.