

(2010) 11 KL CK 0333

In the High Court Of Kerala

Case No : RP. No. 925 of 2010 in Writ Petition (C) No. 15014 of 2009

V. S. Radhakrishnan, Senior Process and Others

APPELLANT

Vs

Fertilizers And Chemicals Travancore, General Manager
(Human Resource) and Assistant Manager (Production)

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 23-11-2010

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2010) 11 KL CK 0333

Hon'ble Judges : T.R. Ramachandran Nair, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : M.R. Venugopal, for the Appellant; No Appearance, for the Respondent

Judgement

T.R. Ramachandran Nair, J. 1. The Petitioners in the Writ Petition have filed this Review Petition by producing Annexure I which is a reply given by the Management to the Petitioners in W.P.(C) No. 19774/2006. The contention of the learned Counsel for the Petitioners is that the Management has considered in Annexure I that the Petitioners therein had been given stagnation promotion to E2 Grade in Sub Layer with retrospective effect from 19.9.2003. It is also seen stated that they were granted E3 Grade with effect from 19.9.2006 as part of the grievance redressal.

2. While considering the pleas raised by the Petitioner, in paragraph No. 7 of the judgment this Court noted that the proceedings granting benefits to the Petitioners in the earlier Writ Petition are not available in the pleadings. The learned Counsel for the review Petitioners explained that the Petitioners were not in possession of Annexure I at the time of hearing of the Writ Petition and therefore they could not produce it. It is submitted that the same clinches the issue and accordingly it is prayed that the judgment may be reviewed and the Respondents may be directed to grant the benefits, to the review Petitioners.

3. Heard the learned Counsel for the Management, who submitted that the circumstances wherein the said benefits were granted to the Petitioners in the

other Writ Petition was as part of the grievance redressal and therefore the Petitioners herein cannot rely upon the same. It is also submitted that representations have been received from the Petitioners as directed in the judgment and final replies have been given on 30.10.2010.

4. In that view of the matter, as the directions in the judgment have been complied with, there is no purpose in entertaining the Review Petition. There is no apparent error also. Leaving open the remedy of the Petitioners to challenge the orders in appropriate Writ Petition, the Review Petition is dismissed. It is open to the Petitioners to rely upon Annexure I, if they deem fit. The copy of the proceedings dated 30.10.2010 will be issued to the Petitioners without any delay if not already communicated.