IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BECHU KURIAN THOMAS

FRIDAY, THE 13TH DAY OF NOVEMBER 2026 / 22ND KARTHIKA, 1948

WP(C) NO. 13910 OF 2023

PETITIONER:

BIJULAL VISWANATHAN,
S/O.VISWANATHAN, AGED 58 YEARS,
BAIJU NIVAS,
RAMANKARY (PO), MAMPUZHAKKARI,
ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT, 689595

REPRESENTED BY HIS SON AND POWER OF ATTORNEY HOLDER SHRI. ABHILAL B.,
S/O.BIJULAL VISWANATHAN, AGED 24 YEARS,
RESIDING AT BAIJU NIVAS,
RAMANKARY (PO),
ALAPPUZHA DST., PIN - 689595

BY ADVS.
SRI.MILLU DANDAPANI
SHRI.THOMAS C.ABRAHAM
SHRI.RONIT ZACHARIAH

RESPONDENTS:

1 **STATE OF KERALA,**
REPRESENTED BY PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAL,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695001

2 THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR,
1ST FLOOR, COLLECTORATE, CIVIL STATION,
ALAPPUZHA, PIN - 688001

3 THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER,
(SUB COLLECTOR) REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICE,
OPP: DISTRICT COURT COMPLEX, SH40,
THODANKULANGARA, ALAPPUZHA, PIN - 688013

4 THE ADDITIONAL TAHSILDAR,
TALUK OFFICE, KUTTANAD,
ALAPPUZHA, PIN - 688561

5 THE VILLAGE OFFICER,
RAMANKARY VILLAGE, RAMANKARY,
ALAPPUZHA, PIN - 689595

6 THE LOCAL LEVEL MONITORING COMMITTEE (LLMC),
REPRESENTED BY ITS CONVENOR,
AGRICULTURAL OFFICER, KRISHI BHAVAN,
RAMANKARY,
ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT, PIN - 689595

7 ANILKUMAR M.S,
AGED 52 YEARS,
AMRUTHAM,
VAZHAPPALLY PO, CHANAGANASSERY,
KOTTYAM DISTRICT, PIN - 686103

BY ADVS.
SRI.ABDUL NISHAD P., GOVT. PLEADER
SRI.LINDONS C.DAVIS
SMT.E.U.DHANYA
SMT.N.S.SHAMILA
SMT.CHINJU P. JOYIES

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 14.10.2026, ALONG WITH WP(C)No.27500/2024, THE COURT ON 13.11.2026 DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BECHU KURIAN THOMAS

FRIDAY, THE 13TH DAY OF NOVEMBER 2026 / 22ND KARTHIKA, 1948

WP(C) NO. 27500 OF 2024

PETITIONER:

ADV.ANILKUMAR M.S,
AGED 55 YEARS, S/O K.G.MAHUSOODHANAN,
'AMRUTHAM',
VAZHAPPALLY.P.O, CHANGANASSERY,
KOTTAYAM DT., PIN - 686103

BY ADVS.
SRI.LINDONS C.DAVIS
SMT.E.U.DHANYA
SMT.N.S.SHAMILA
SMT.CHINJU P. JOYIES

RESPONDENTS:

1 **STATE OF KERALA,**
REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695001

2 **DISTRICT COLLECTOR,**
COLLECTORATE,
ALAPPUZHA, PIN - 688001

3 REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER,
(SUB COLLECTOR) REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICE,
ALAPPUZHA, PIN - 688001

4 LOCAL LEVEL MONITORING COMMITTEE,
REPRESENTED BY ITS CONVENER,
AGRICULTURAL OFFICER, KRISHI BHAVAN,
RAMANKARRY,
ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT, PIN - 689595

5 AGRICULTURAL OFFICER,
KRISHI BHAVAN, RAMANKARRY,
ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT, PIN - 689595

6 VILLAGE OFFICER,
VILLAGE OFFICE, RAMANKARRY
ALAPPUZHA DT., PIN - 689595

7 BIJULAL,
S/O.VISWANATHAN,
BYJU NIVAS,
RAMANKARRY.P.O, MAMPUZHAKKARI,
ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT – 689595,

REPRESENTED BY HIS SON AND POWER OF ATTORNEY
HOLDER SHRI.ABHILAL.B,
S/O.BIJULAL VISWANATHAN, AGED 24 YEARS,
RESIDING AT BAIJU NIVAS,
RAMANKARY (P.O),
ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT, PIN-689585

BY SRI.ABDUL NISHAD P., GOVT. PLEADER
ADV SRI.MILLU DANDAPANI

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 14.10.2026, ALONG WITH WP(C)No.13910/2023, THE COURT ON 13.11.2026 DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

BECHU KURIAN THOMAS, J.

W.P.(C) Nos.13910 of 2023
&
27500 of 2024

Dated this the 13th day of November, 2026

JUDGMENT

The petitioner in W.P.(C) No.13910 of 2023 challenges Ext.P10 order issued by the Government directing the petitioner to restore a paddy land back to its earlier condition. W.P.(C) No.27500 of 2024 is filed by the seventh respondent in W.P.(C) No.13910 of 2023, seeking a direction to restore the paddy land, by implementing the order impugned in the latter writ petition.

2. Since the reliefs sought for in the above referred two writ petitions are interconnected, they are considered and disposed of by this judgment. For the purpose of easier comprehension, W.P.(C) No.13910 of 2023 is treated as the leading case and the parties are referred to as they are in the said writ petition.

3. The petitioner is the owner of a large extent of land in Re-

survey No.269/1 of Block No.24 of Ramankary Village, Alappuzha District. Alleging that an area, 16 metres wide and 60 metres long, out of an extent of 67.45 Ares of property, was being attempted to be converted, a stop memo was issued by the Village Officer. In the meantime, pursuant to a complaint by the seventh respondent, the Revenue Divisional Officer issued a notice dated 28.05.2012 to the petitioner, directing him to restore the paddy land illegally reclaimed to avoid prosecution proceedings. While so, by Ext.P2, the Village Officer reported that a portion of the property had been converted around 10 years ago and that it contained banana plants and coconut saplings.

4. In the meantime, the Additional Tahsildar - the fourth respondent, submitted a report dated 19.05.2015, stating that an extent of 0.15 Ares was found to have been converted years ago wherein 3 coconut trees, 6 coconut saplings and 4 mango trees aged around five years, apart from 18 banana plants and 50 tapioca plants with another two year old tree were found to be standing in the property. It was also reported that though the said property is shown as a paddy land in the basic tax register, the direction to restore it was

not adhered to. The report also mentioned that, in the property adjacent to the converted land, the petitioner had constructed a house and his mother is also residing there. Later, the District Collector by order dated 10.02.2016, refused to order restoration of the paddy land.

5. While so, the seventh respondent challenged the order of the District Collector, in a revision petition under the Kerala Paddy Land and Wetland Act, 2008 (for short 'the Act') before the State Government. Thereafter, he filed W.P.(C) No.38482 of 2018, before this Court and a direction was issued to dispose of the revision petition. Pursuant to the said direction, the Government considered the issue and by an order dated 28.02.2020, concluded that the subject property was part of the 'Thenamkap Eastern Padasekharam' and included in the data bank. It was also concluded that the petitioner had unauthorisedly tried to convert the property by filling it up with gravel. The petitioner challenged the said order of the Government in W.P.(C) No.14500 of 2020. By judgment dated 27.07.2020, a learned single Judge of this Court set aside the order of the Government and directed reconsideration. Consequent to the above direction, the Government, by Ext.P10 order dated 11.02.2022, considered the

reports of various officers and directed that the extent of 12 Ares situated in Re-survey No.269/1 had been converted after 2008, and even noted that the petitioner had accepted subsidy for paddy cultivation after 2008 and further that the property is still suitable for paddy cultivation and had even been under cultivation after the coming into force of the Act.

6. According to the petitioner, the impugned order is perverse and was issued ignoring the report of the Village Officer stating that the property was reclaimed ten years prior to 2011 and also that a property being cultivated with banana plants and coconut trees, cannot be regarded as a paddy land under any circumstances, nor does it come within the purview of the definition of the word ‘paddy land’ under the Act.

7. A counter affidavit has been filed by the seventh respondent stating that the writ petitioner has an extent of 1.59 Acres of paddy land in Re-survey No.269/1 of Ramankary Village, which is part of a Padasekharam, while the seventh respondent has an ancestral paddy land having an extent of 2.77 Acres in Survey No.268/2 of the same Village. According to the seventh respondent, his property as well as

that of the writ petitioner are lying adjacent to each other and due to the unauthorised reclamation of paddy land by the petitioner, paddy cultivation in his property has been adversely affected and hence the original position has to be restored to enable paddy cultivation. It is further stated that he had filed a complaint against unauthorised conversion of paddy land by the petitioner and even though a hearing note was submitted, it was realised, much later, that the District Collector had passed an order in favour of the writ petitioner, misreading the report of the Additional Tahsildar and without bearing in mind that the said report mentioned that the trees planted in the property were having only an age of around five years, which obviously indicated conversion after 2008.

8. The seventh respondent has further pointed out, by producing Ext.R7(c), a copy of the letter of the Agricultural Officer, Ramankary that petitioner had obtained a compensation for loss of paddy cultivation in the year 2010-11 and further that, the petitioner had made an application on 06.01.2009, as per Ext.R7(d), claiming amounts from the Government for cultivation of paddy land for the year 2008-09 and therefore the claim of the writ petitioner that the property

was converted prior to 2008 is incorrect. It is also stated that when petitioner's mother had attempted reclamation of the paddy land, a stop memo dated 06.03.2008 was served on her and thereafter, reclamation was being attempted in a phased manner. Petitioner asserts that if the report and satellite pictures from the Kerala State Remote Sensing and Environment Centre were called for, it would clearly indicate the status of land even after the commencement of the Act and the declaration by the District Collector that the land was converted before commencement of the Act was without any authority. According to the seventh respondent, the property in question is part of a Padasekharam - a collective paddy land, which is unique to Kuttanad, as the water is to be maintained in a uniform level.

9. A statement has been filed on behalf of the first respondent stating that the impugned order as well as other orders i.e., Ext.P5 and Ext.P8 are legally in order, as they were issued after affording an opportunity of hearing to all parties concerned and after examining the facts and reports filed in the case.

10. In this context, it is essential to reiterate that W.P.(C) No.27500 of 2024 is filed by the seventh respondent in W.P.(C)

No.13910 of 2023, seeking a direction to restore the paddy land, allegedly reclaimed by the petitioner.

11. Sri.Millu Dandapani, the learned counsel for the petitioner, contended that the proceedings initiated by the respondents under Section 13 of the Act having been dropped by the District Collector, the impugned order of the Government is perverse. The learned counsel further contended that, as evident from the report of the Village Officer in the year 2011, the property had been converted more than 10 years ago and therefore it is a property that should not have been included in the data bank nor can it be regarded as a paddy land. The learned counsel further submitted that in the impugned order, all the earlier reports were ignored and there was never any consideration of the suitability of the property for paddy cultivation as held in **Muraleedharan Nair R. v. Revenue Divisional Officer** [2023 (4) KHC 524]. The learned counsel asserted that when reclamation was carried out prior to 2008, the property could not have been included in the data bank nor could any proceedings having been initiated under Section 13 of the Act.

12. Sri. Lindons C. Davis, the learned counsel for the seventh

respondent, on the other hand, contended that the petitioner's property, which is the subject matter of alleged conversion, is adjacent to the seventh respondent's paddy land and is part of a Padeshekaram. Conversion of petitioner's paddy land results in destruction of the paddy land of the seventh respondent and the same cannot be permitted. According to him, in the year 2008, when the petitioner's mother made an attempt to convert the property, a stop memo was issued, but subsequently, the Village Officer had, without any reason or any basis, submitted a report stating that the property was converted 10 years ago. No material was available with the Village Officer to arrive at such a conclusion and the District Collector, without considering the specific contentions raised by the petitioner in W.P.(C) No.27500 of 2024, issued Ext.P5 order, which was interfered with by the Government in Ext.P8 order. Subsequently pursuant to the direction of this Court, the matter was reconsidered and the Government came to the conclusion that the petitioner had unauthorisedly converted his property. It was also argued that, in the year 2009-10, the petitioner had collected amounts from the Government for cultivation of paddy on land which was left fallow. He

had even obtained compensation for loss of paddy cultivation in the year 2008-09, which was processed after the Agricultural Officer verified the claim. Thereafter, the compensation was decided and was even disbursed. The petitioner cannot then turn around and contend that paddy cultivation has not been carried out.

13. Sri. Abdul Nishad P., the learned Senior Government Pleader submitted that the impugned order has been issued after considering all the reports and therefore the same does not warrant any interference.

14. At the outset of the discussion itself, it needs to be noted that, the impugned order was issued after considering the reports and also after granting an opportunity of hearing and hence there is no violation of the statutory prescriptions or the principles of natural justice, while arriving at the impugned order.

15. In Ext.P9 judgment [W.P.(C) No.14500 of 2020], this Court interfered with the earlier order of the Government setting aside the District Collector's order and directing restoration of the paddy land. However, while directing reconsideration by the Government, this Court observed that the report of the Convenor of the Local Level

Monitoring Committee should be called for and orders in the revision petition should be passed after considering whether the property in question would fulfill the definition of paddy land and also whether the property is suitable and fit for paddy cultivation as on 12.08.2008.

16. The term “paddy land” is defined in Section 2(xii) of the Act as all types of land situated in the State where paddy is cultivated at least once in a year or suitable for paddy cultivation but uncultivated and left fallow, and includes its allied constructions like bunds, drainage channels, ponds and canals. A perusal of the above definition indicates that even though a paddy land is left fallow, the same is not a reason to treat it as a converted land. Thus, even a land that left fallow, would still fall within the definition of paddy land. Hence the only question is whether the property was converted prior to 2008.

17. True that the Village Officer had submitted a report on 11.10.2011, stating that the property had been converted 10 years ago. However the said report is not based on any material. On the contrary, a stop memo is seen to have been issued on 20.05.2008 to Smt.Madhavi Amma Chellamma (the mother of the petitioner) by the Village Officer, directing her to stop the attempts for converting the

property. Subsequently, after 3 years, the Village Officer submitted a report, stating that as he could find coconut saplings and few banana plants in the property, it could be concluded that conversion had taken place around ten years ago. On the basis of the above report, the District Collector concluded that the reclamation activity took place prior to the coming into force of the Act. The said conclusion however, did not find favour with the Government and the order of the District Collector was set aside after concluding that the land is a part of a Padasekharam and is also included in the data bank. Though the District Collector had even referred to the report of the Additional Tahsildar dated 19.05.2015, as rightly pointed out by the learned counsel for the seventh respondent, he had failed to comprehend the scope of the said report, as it was specifically mentioned therein that the trees were having only an age of around 5 years, which does not take it beyond 2008.

18. Further, the report of the Agricultural Officer referred to in the impugned order, reveals that, on the one side of petitioner's property there is a paddy field which was cultivated till the year 2010, while the MC road runs through the front portion and on two other

sides, there are houses constructed apart from a thodu running through the said property. Though the paddy land has been lying fallow for years, the reports indicate that adjacent to petitioner's property, there is a paddy field on one side, which was cultivated till 2010. The impugned order also came to the finding that the property in question is part of a Padasekharam and in 2011, when there was an attempt to dump ordinary earth into the paddy land, a stop memo was issued and proceeding under Section 13 of the Act was initiated. Moreover, the property was included in the data bank as a paddy land and merely because the property was left fallow, the same cannot be a reason to regard the property as a converted land. It is also noted that though stop memos were issued against reclamation of paddy land in the year 2008, 2010 and 2012, the petitioner refused to abide by the stop memos and instead, defied the same.

19. In this context, it is necessary to mention that Ext.R7(c) indicates that petitioner's mother had obtained compensation for loss of paddy cultivation in the year 2010-11, while Ext.R7(d) revealed that the petitioner had made an application on 06.01.2009, claiming amounts from the Government for cultivation of paddy land for the year

2008-09. After receiving benefits from the Government in the year 2008 for paddy cultivation, it cannot be concluded that the property was converted prior to 2008. The Government found that the Agricultural Officer had not referred to any of these aspects in his report and thus concluded that the petitioner had unauthorisedly converted the paddy land.

20. As noted earlier, the impugned order reveals that the petitioner's property touches a Padasekharam on one side. If illegal reclamation is permitted, that too carried out after coming into force of the Act, it would destroy the surrounding paddy lands as well. The seventh respondent’s paddy land is also adjacent to that of the petitioner's property. Illegal reclamation of paddy land will have drastic consequences and will prejudice various farmers, who depend on paddy cultivation alone.

21. Removal of 12 Ares of property of the petitioner from the data bank by the LLMC after obtaining notice of hearing of the revision petition was obviously an attempt to defeat the revision petition itself. None of the details of the particular property was verified to conclude that it could be excluded from the data bank. The LLMC had not even

verified the status of the land as of 2008 for arriving at such a conclusion. No materials were available nor is it evident from Ext.P9 for indulging in such an exercise, at such haste and that too without any material in their possession. The conclusion in Ext.P10 that the exclusion of 12 Ares in Re-survey No.269/1 by the LLMC is not legally sustainable, also does not call for any interference.

22. This Court cannot ignore that the Act was introduced as a measure of agrarian reform, to conserve the paddy lands in the State and to restrict the conversion or reclamation thereof, in order to promote growth in the agricultural sector and to sustain the ecological system, in the State of Kerala. It was identified that even though Kuttanad in Alappuzha District and Palakkad and such other paddy fields of Kerala remained the granaries of the State, the situation had changed for the last few decades. With an alarming decline in the area under rice cultivation mainly due to conversion of the paddy lands, the State of Kerala has to import more than eighty percent of its rice requirements from other States. Therefore, the State felt that the paddy fields, throughout Kerala, are facing severe threats as they are being converted to cash crop plantations and are filled for new

constructions. It was also realised that the paddy field conversion had led to enormous ecological degradation in the watershed region, reduction in humus formation, intensification of soil erosion, affected the fertility of soil, reduction in water level in wells, ponds etc. causing innumerable ecological imbalances and it was thereupon that the new legislation was thought of in order to conserve and regulate the reclamation and conversion of paddy lands, and wetlands in Kerala. The agrarian reform envisioned by the State Legislature by introducing the Act of 2008, is on the basis of an agricultural policy which is intended to advance the object of protecting the paddy fields from being converted and utilized for other purposes, thus reducing the paddy cultivation and affecting the interests of the State and the citizens of the State at large. These avowed objectives of the Statute cannot be ignored. Reference to the decision in **Sabeena E. K. and Others v. District Collector Ernakulam and Others** [2022 (2) KLT 551] and **Hema Anil v. State of Kerala** [2023 (6) KLT 44] would be appropriate in this context.

23. Considering the scope of interference under Article 226 of the Constitution of India also, this Court is of the view that the order

impugned in W.P.(C) No.13910 of 2023 does not warrant any interference. As noted earlier, there is no violation of the principles of natural justice and the statuary prescriptions have also not been violated. There is no patent error or illegality that goes to the root of the decision warranting an interference by this Court. In this context, the observation of the Supreme Court in **Sarvepalli Ramaiah and Others v. The District Collector, Chittoor District and Others [(2019) 4 SCC 500]** is relevant and they are extracted below:

> "43. Judicial review under Article 226 is directed, not against the decision, but the decision making process. Of course, a patent illegality and/or error apparent on the face of the decision, which goes to the root of the decision, may vitiate the decision making process. In this case there is no such patent illegality or apparent error. In exercise of power under Article 226, the Court does not sit in appeal over the decision impugned, nor does it adjudicate hotly disputed questions of fact."

24. The decision of the Government was based on materials and it is not for this Court exercising the power of judicial review to reanalyse the evidence of material on record and adjudicate the questions of fact.

In the result, the following conclusions are arrived at:

(I) W.P.(C) No.13910 of 2023 is dismissed.

(ii) W.P.(C) No.27500 of 2024 is allowed and respondents 2 to 6 therein are directed to take immediate steps to restore the paddy lands reclaimed by the seventh respondent in that writ petition by implementing Ext.P10 order dated 11.02.2022.

Sd/-

BECHU KURIAN THOMAS
JUDGE

vps

APPENDIX OF WP(C) NO. 13910 OF 2023

PETITIONER'S/S' EXHIBITS

Exhibit P1	**A TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED NIL SUBMITTED BEFORE THE 2ND RESPONDENT DISTRICT COLLECTOR IS PRODUCED HEREWITH AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT P-1**
Exhibit P2	**A TRUE COPY OF THE SAID REPORT DATED 11/10/2011 IS PRODUCED HEREWITH AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT-P2**
Exhibit P3	**A TRUE COPY OF THE SAID REPORT DATED 10.01.2013 IS PRODUCED HEREWITH AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT P-3**
Exhibit P4	**A TRUE COPY OF THE REPORT DATED 19.05.2015 OF THE 4TH RESPONDENT IS PRODUCED HEREWITH AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT P-4.**
Exhibit P5	**A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER PASSED BY THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR DATED 10.02.2016 IS PRODUCED HEREWITH AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT P-5.**
Exhibit P6	**A TRUE COPY OF THE DECISION OF 6TH RESPONDENT DATED 11/2/2020 IS PRODUCED HEREWITH AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT-P6.**
Exhibit P7	**A TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 27/11/2018 IN W.P.(C) NO: 38482 OF 2018 IS PRODUCED HEREWITH AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT-P7.**
Exhibit P8	**A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER AS GO NO: 277 OF 2020 DATED 28/2/2020 IS PRODUCED HEREWITH AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT-P8**
Exhibit P9	**THE TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 27TH JULY 2020 PASSED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT IN WP(C) 14500 OF 2020 IS PRODUCED HEREWITH AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT P9.**
Exhibit P10	**THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER PASSED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT DATED 11.02.2022 IS PRODUCED HEREWITH AND MARKED AS EXHIBIT P10.**

RESPONDENT'S/S' EXHIBITS

Exhibit R7(a)	**A COPY OF THE LETTER OF AGRICULTURE OFFICER DATED 10.02.2016 SHOWING THAT SURVEY NO.269/1 OF RAMANKARY IS INCLUDED IN DATA BANK REGISTER.**
Exhibit R7(b)	**TRUE COPY OF THE MEMO DATED 28.05.2012 ISSUED BY THE RDO.**
Exhibit R7(c)	**A COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 26.09.2012 OF AGRICULTURE OFFICER, RAMANKARY.**
Exhibit R7(d)	**A COPY OF THE APPLICATION OF THE PETITIONER FOR PADDY LAND CULTIVATION.**
Exhibit R7(e)	**A COPY OF THE REVISION PETITION DATED 10.11.2018 SUBMITTED BY THE 7TH RESPONDENT BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT.**

APPENDIX OF WP(C) NO. 27500 OF 2024

PETITIONER'S/S' EXHIBITS

Exhibit P1	**A COPY OF THE LETTER OF AGRICULTURE OFFICER DATED 10.02.2016 SHOWING THAT SURVEY NO.269/1 OF RAMANKARY IS INCLUDED IN DATA BANK REGISTER**
Exhibit P2	**TRUE COPY OF THE MEMO DATED 28.5.2012 ISSUED BY THE RDO**
Exhibit P3	**A COPY OF THE ORDER NO.C10-26487/15 DATED 10.02.2016 OF DISTRICT COLLECTOR; ALAPUZHA**
Exhibit P4	**A COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 19.09.2018 FROM COLLECTORATE; ALAPUZHA**
Exhibit P5	**A COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 26.09.2012 OF AGRICULTURE OFFICER; RAMANKARY**
Exhibit P6	**A COPY OF THE APPLICATION OF THE 7TH RESPONDENT FOR FALLOW LAND CULTIVATION**
Exhibit P7	**A COPY OF THE REVISION PETITION DATED 10.11.2018 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT**
Exhibit P8	**A TRUE COPY OF THE G.O(RT)NO.277/2020/AGRI. DATED 28.02.2020**
Exhibit P9	**A COPY OF THE DECISION OF THE LLMC DATED 11.02.2020**
Exhibit P10	**TRUE COPY OF THE G.O(RT)NO.110/2022/AGRI. DATED 11.02.2022**

RESPONDENT'S/S' EXHIBITS

Exhibit R7(A)	**THE TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 27TH JULY 2020 PASSED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT IN WP(C) 14500 OF 2020**
Exhibit R7(B)	**THE TRUE COPY OF THE PHOTOGRAPHS SHOWING THE NATURE OF THE LAND DATED NIL**
Exhibit R7(C)	**THE RELEVANT PAGE OF THE PASSPORT OF THE PETITIONER DURING THE PERIOD FROM 21.08.2009 TO 22.09.2009**