
(2025) 02 KL CK 1255
In the High Court Of Kerala
Case No : Writ Petition (C) No.5377 Of 2025

Unnikuttan

APPELLANT

Vs

State Police Chief

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 10-02-2025

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2025) 02 KL CK 1255

Hon'ble Judges : C.S.Dias, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : P.T.Sheejish, Shibin K F, Seby Joseph, Aneena Roy, Joseph Francis, Indu Menon M., S.Rajan, Vidya Kuriakose

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

C.S.Dias, J

1. The writ petition is filed, inter alia, to direct the 3rd respondent not to harass the petitioner and his men from participating in the temple festival of Vettikali Bagavathi Kshethram temple on 10.02.2025.

2. The petitioner is the President of the temple Agosha Committee of the above temple. There were certain disputes between the petitioner's Committee and the respondents 4 to 6, which were settled in mediation as per Ext.P1 judgment. The petitioner has made all the arrangements to participate in the festival, which is scheduled today. The respondents 4 to 6 have turned inimical towards the petitioner and the Committee members. They have made an oral complaint to the 3rd respondent, to prevent the petitioner from participating in the festival. Consequently, the 3rd respondent is unnecessarily harassing the petitioner and the Committee members. He is insisting the petitioner and the Committee members not to participate in the temple festival. The action of the 3rd respondent is high handed. Hence, the writ petition.

3. Heard; the learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned Government Pleader and the learned counsel appearing for the respondents 4 to 6.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that, despite Ext.P1 judgment, the respondents 4 to 6 are not taking steps to obtain the statutory licenses and permits to conduct the temple festival.

5. The learned Government Pleader submitted that, the respondents 4 to 6 have complained to him that the petitioner is collecting money in violation of Ext.P1 judgment. Neither the petitioner nor the respondents 4 to 6 have the statutory permissions and licenses to conduct the temple festival.

6. The learned counsel for the respondents 4 to 6 submitted that the party respondents have received all the statutory permissions to conduct the festival.

5. On a consideration of the facts and the materials on record, I am of the view that the dispute between the petitioner and respondents 4 to 6 is civil in nature. If either of the party has a grievance that the other party is not performing their part, the remedy of the aggrieved party is to execute the decree. It is not for this Court to direct the 3rd respondent to resolve the disputes between the parties. Nonetheless, it is made clear that the 3rd respondent shall ensure that law and order is maintained in the locality, without interfering in the civil disputes between the parties.

The writ petition is ordered accordingly.