



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM**

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE GOPINATH P.**

**&**

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JOHNSON JOHN**

**FRIDAY, THE 17<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF APRIL 2026 / 27TH CHAITHRA, 1948**

**WA NO. 923 OF 2026**

**AGAINST THE ORDER DATED IN WP(C) NO.8498 OF 2026 OF HIGH COURT  
OF KERALA**

**APPELLANTS/PETITIONERS:**

- 1 NEONOVA MUNNAR LLP, CHITHIRAPURAM P.O. ANCHAL,  
IDUKKI REPRESENTED BY IT'S DESIGNATED PARTNERS  
PRAVEEN MOHAN, AGED 43, S/O. P.G. MOHANAN,  
PULICKAMARIL HOUSE, THOKKUPARA P.O. THOKKUPARA,  
PIN - 685565**
- 2 P.C.JAYAN, AGED 56 YEARS  
S/O. CHAKRAPANI, DESIGNATED PARTNERS  
NEONOVA MUNNAR LLP, CHITHIRAPURAM P.O. ANCHAL,  
IDUKKI RESIDING AT PATTANANIYIL HOUSE, SENGULAM  
P.O. MUTHUVAANKUDY, PIN - 685565**

**BY ADV SMT.NISHA GEORGE**

**RESPONDENT(S)/RESPONDENTS:**

- 1 STATE OF KERALA  
REPRESENTED BY IT'S SECRETARY,  
DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM, GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695001**



2026:KER:33010

- 2 KERALA ADVENTURE TOURISM PROMOTION SOCIETY  
REPRESENTED BY CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER,  
VAZHUTHACAUD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695014
- 3 DISTRICT DISASTER MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY  
IDUKKI, CIVIL STATION, PAINAVU P.O. KAYILIMALA  
REPRESENTED BY IT'S CHAIRPERSON, PIN - 685603
- 4 DISTRICT COLLECTOR/CHAIRPERSON  
DISTRICT DISASTER MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY,  
IDUKKI, CIVIL STATION, PAINAVU P.O.  
KAYILIMALA, PIN - 685603
- 5 TAHSILDAR  
OFFICE OF THE TAHASILDAR, TALUK OFFICE,  
DEVIKULAM, PIN - 685613
- 6 VILLAGE OFFICER  
OFFICE OF THE VILLAGE OFFICER, KUNJITHANNY,  
ANACHAL, IDUKKI DISTRICT, KERALA, PIN - 685565
- 7 PALLIVASAL GRAMA PANCHAYAT  
SANGULAM POWER HOUSE MAIN ROAD, DEVIKULAM P.O.,  
IDUKKI DISTRICT REPRESENTED BY IT'S SECRETARY,  
PIN - 685565
- 8 SECRETARY, PALLIVASAL GRAMA PANCHAYAT  
SANGULAM POWER HOUSE MAIN ROAD, DEVIKULAM P.O.,  
IDUKKI DISTRICT, PIN - 685565

BY ADVS.SRI.K.M FAISAL- GP  
SMT.SREELAKSHMI SABU -SC

THIS WRIT APPEAL HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON  
17.04.2026, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

**GOPINATH P. & JOHNSON JOHN, JJ**

-----  
**W.A.No.923 of 2026**  
-----

Dated this the 17<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2026

**JUDGMENT****Gopinath P., J.**

The appellants are the writ petitioners in WP(C) No.8498 of 2026. This writ appeal has been filed challenging the interim order dated 10.04.2026, through which and for the reasons stated therein, the learned Single Judge refused interim relief. WP(C) No.8498 of 2026 has been filed challenging Ext. P8 communication issued by the Deputy Collector on behalf of the District Collector, Idukki, in his capacity as the Chairperson of the District Disaster Management Authority, as also Ext. P16 communication issued by the District Collector, Idukki (the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent) as the Chairperson of the District Disaster Management Authority prohibiting the use of a glass bridge constructed and operated by the petitioners at Anachal, Munnar for tourism-related activities. A reading of Ext. P16 communication would show that the District Collector, Idukki, as the Chairperson of the District Disaster Management Authority, has directed the petitioners to stop the use of the glass bridge, exercising his jurisdiction under the provisions of the Disaster



2026:KER:33010

Management Act, 2005. A reading of Ext. P16 also indicates that, according to the District Collector, the glass bridge was constructed without permission from the Kerala Adventure Tourism Promotion Society, the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent herein. The learned Single Judge, by the impugned order dated 10.04.2026, refused to grant an interim order staying Ext.P16, taking the view that since the matter involves the safety of the public, the question of granting an interim order staying the operation of Ext.P16 does not arise for consideration.

2. When the matter is taken up for consideration today, it is the submission of the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the appellants that after Ext.P16 was issued, by a subsequent communication dated 30.12.2025 (Ext.P24), a study was directed to be conducted regarding the safety of the glass bridge and that such study has been conducted through the National Institute of Technology, Calicut. It is also submitted that, taking into consideration the report of the National Institute of Technology, Calicut, the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent herein has issued a communication bearing No.KATPS/70/2020 dated 16.04.2026, finding that the glass bridge constructed by the petitioners is safe for use and can be opened to the public. This communication is not on record in this writ appeal. However, a copy of the said communication has been handed over to us across the bar by the learned Senior Counsel



appearing for the appellants.

4. The learned Standing Counsel appearing for respondents 7 & 8 (Pallivasal Grama Panchayat) would submit that no permission had been taken from respondents 7 & 8 for the construction of the glass bridge. It is submitted that the matter has to be ultimately decided by the District Collector as Ext.P16 is an order issued by the District Collector, Idukki, in his capacity as the Chairperson of the District Disaster Management Authority constituted under the provisions of the Disaster Management Act, 2005.

5. The learned Government Pleader would also submit that the matter has to be decided by the District Collector.

6. Having heard the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the appellants, the learned Government Pleader appearing for respondents 1 to 6 and the learned Standing Counsel appearing for respondents 7 & 8 and in the facts and circumstances noticed above, we are of the opinion that the learned Single Judge was right in refusing the interim relief staying the operation of Ext.P16 as any permission to use the glass bridge would involve issues of public safety. However, we think that in the light of the subsequent developments, including the communication dated 16.04.2026 issued by the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent, it is only proper that the matter be considered by the 4<sup>th</sup>



respondent, taking note of the subsequent developments and after affording an opportunity of hearing to the appellants as also to respondents 2 & 8.

Accordingly, this writ appeal will stand disposed of directing that the matter be considered by the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent, also taking note of the communication dated 16.04.2026 issued by the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent and after affording an opportunity of hearing to the appellants as also to respondents 2 & 8. The 4<sup>th</sup> respondent shall endeavour to pass fresh orders in the matter as directed above, as expeditiously as possible and at any rate, within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this judgment.

Sd/-

**GOPINATH P.  
JUDGE**

Sd/-

**JOHNSON JOHN  
JUDGE**