



W.P.(C) No.46045 of 2024

2025:KER:54

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C. JAYACHANDRAN

FRIDAY, THE 3<sup>RD</sup> DAY OF JANUARY 2025 / 13TH POUSHA, 1946

WP(C) NO. 46045 OF 2024

PETITIONER:

ANANYA P  
AGED 16 YEARS  
3/1769, PURATHIL HOUSE, KUZHIKKANDYPARAMBU,  
KACHERI, KOZHIKODE. REPRESENTED BY HER MOTHER,  
SHOBITHA K.P, AGED 38 YEARS, C/O. RAJEESH P,  
3/1769, PURATHIL HOUSE, KUZHIKKANDYPARAMBU,  
KACHERI, KOZHIKODE., PIN - 673011

BY ADV ARYA B.

RESPONDENTS:

- 1 DIRECTOR OF GENERAL EDUCATION  
O/O THE DIRECTOR OF GENERAL EDUCATION, JAGATHY,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695014
- 2 KALOISAVAM COMMITTEE CONVENER,  
ADDITIONAL DIRECTOR OF GENERAL EDUCATION, O/O  
THE ADDITIONAL DIRECTOR OF GENERAL EDUCATION,  
JAGATHY, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695014
- 3 DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL OFFICER,  
O/O THE DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL OFFICER, EAST  
NADAKKAVE, TAZHEKKOD, KOZHIKODE, PIN - 673004
- 4 CHAIRMAN APPEAL COMMITTEE,  
DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION, O/O THE DEPUTY



W.P.(C) No.46045 of 2024

2025:KER:54

2

DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION. DISTRICT TOURISM,  
MANANCHIRA RD, NEAR THE SECRETARY, MANANCHIRA,  
KOZHIKODE, PIN - 673001

ADV.E.G.GORDEN - GOVERNMENT PLEADER

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR  
ADMISSION ON 03.01.2025, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED  
THE FOLLOWING:



W.P.(C) No.46045 of 2024

2025:KER:54

3

**C.JAYACHANDRAN, J.**

=====

**W.P.(C.) No.46045 of 2024**

=====

**Dated this the 03<sup>rd</sup> day of January, 2025**

**JUDGMENT**

The petitioner was a contestant in “group dance” event, but she could secure only the 3<sup>rd</sup> prize, with A-Grade.

2. The allegation raised is that the back curtain swayed in the wind during the event, which affected the performance of the whole team, including the petitioner. The stage was mismanaged, according to the petitioner. After the performance by the petitioner’s team, the back curtain was corrected by the stage manager and the other participants could reap the advantage of the same. These aspects were not considered by the appellate authority, is the grievance espoused. These submissions were seriously opposed by the learned Government Pleader.



3. Having heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader, this Court finds little merit in the instant writ petition.

4. Primarily, the specific allegation with respect to the curtain does not find a place in Ext.P1 appeal preferred by the petitioner. It only speaks of the instability of the stage and the insufficiency of the size of the stage. That apart, this Court notice that, Ext.P2 would indicate that the appeal committee has heard the petitioner in person, besides perusing and analyzing the video, the score sheet and the report of the stage manager, to arrive at a conclusion that the evaluation was not affected by any of the factors, as alleged in the appeal. Ext.P2 order also finds that there is a difference of 8 marks between the petitioner and the 1<sup>st</sup> rank holder. This Court cannot find any tangible reason to interfere with the factual findings of the appellate authority. Nor is such an exercise expected of this Court in exercise of



W.P.(C) No.46045 of 2024

2025:KER:54

5

its powers under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Accordingly, this writ petition fails and the same stands dismissed.

Sd/-

**C.JAYACHANDRAN,**

**JUDGE**

SMF



W.P.(C) No.46045 of 2024

2025:KER:54

6

**APPENDIX OF WP(C) 46045/2024**

**PETITIONER EXHIBITS**

<b>Exhibit P1</b>	<b>TRUE COPY OF THE APPEAL FORM SUBMITTED BEFORE THE 4TH RESPONDENT BY THE PETITIONER DATED 22.11.2024.</b>
<b>Exhibit P2</b>	<b>TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DISMISSING THE PETITIONER'S APPEAL DATED 07.12.2024 BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT.</b>