



2023/KER/50412

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIJU ABRAHAM

WEDNESDAY, THE 23<sup>RD</sup> DAY OF AUGUST 2023 / 1ST BHADRA, 1945

WP(C) NO. 7059 OF 2020

**PETITIONER:**

N.ANIL KUMARAGED 53 YEARSWORKING AS RANGE FOREST OFFICER, KASARGODE 671 121 S/O. N. SAHADEVAN, DEVA HOUSE, EAST KATHIROOR P.O, THALASSERY 670 642

BY ADVS.K.P.PRADEEPSMT.T.THASMI

**RESPONDENTS:**

- 1 UNION OF INDIAREPRESENTED BY SECRETARY, MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT FOREST AND CLIMATE CHANGE, C.G.O COMPLEX, LODHI ROAD, PARYAVARAN BHAVAN, NEW DELHI 110 003
- 2 THE STATE OF KERALA, REPREENTED BY THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, FOREST AND WILDLIFE DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM 695 001.
- 3 THE PRINCIPAL CHIEF CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS ANDHEAD OF FORESTS FORCES, VZHUTHACAD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM 695 014
- 4 THE CHIEF CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS, NORTHERN CIRCLE, KOZHICODE, HEADQUARTERS AT KANNUR, KANOTHUMCHAL, THANA P.O, KANNUR 670 012
- 5 DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER, KASARGOD DIVISION, OFFICE OF THE DFO, KASARGOD 676 001

BY ADV SRI.P.VIJAYAKUMAR

**OTHER PRESENT:**

SPL.GP - T.P.SAJAN

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 23.08.2023, ALONG WITH WP(C).7107/2020, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



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

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE VIJU ABRAHAM**

**WEDNESDAY, THE 23<sup>RD</sup> DAY OF AUGUST 2023 / 1ST BHADRA, 1945**

**WP(C) NO. 7107 OF 2020**

**PETITIONER:**

ANGELS NAIRAGED 53 YEARS GEN, SECRETARY, ANIMAL  
LEGAL FORCE INTEGRATION, KAPPILLIL PULLUVAZHY  
P.O. PERUMBAVOOR, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT 683 541.

BY ADV ANGELS NAIR(Party-In-Person)

**RESPONDENT:**

- 1 THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, FOREST AND WILDLIFE  
DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
- 2 PRINCIPAL CHIEF CONSERVATOR OF FOREST AND HEAD OF  
FOREST FORCE HEADQUARTERS, VAZHUTHAKKAD,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM 695 014.
- 3 CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMISSION, DEPUTY INSPECTOR  
(GENERAL OF FORESTS (CENTRAL)-1, MINISTRE OF  
ENVIRONMENT, FOREST AND CLIMATE CHANGE, REGIONAL  
OFFICE (SOUTHERN ZONE), KENDRIYA SADAN, IVTH  
FLOOR E AND F WINGS, 17TH MANIN ROAD, IIND BLOCK  
KORAMANGALA BANGALORE 560034.
- 4 UNION OF INDIA , REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY,  
MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT, FOREST AND CLIMATE  
CHANGE, C.G.O. COMPLEX, LODHI ROAD, PARYAVARAN  
BHAWAN, NEW DELHI 110 003.

BY ADVS.SHRI.P.VIJAYAKUMAR, ASG OF INDIA MANU S.,  
ASG OF INDIA

SPECIAL GP - T.P.SAJAN

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD  
ON 23.08.2023, ALONG WITH WP(C).7059/2020, THE COURT ON THE  
SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



**VIJU ABRAHAM, J**

-----  
**W.P. (C) .Nos.7107 & 7059 of 2020**  
-----

**Dated this the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of August, 2023**

**JUDGMENT**

WP(C) No.7107 of 2020

The above writ petition is filed essentially aggrieved by the issuance of Ext.P1 report by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of India dated 25.9.2019, issued in compliance of the judgment in WP(C) No.1645 of 2019. Petitioner has also sought for other consequential reliefs.

2. Petitioner claims to be General Secretary of an NGO, Animal Legal Force Integration. Petitioner submits that Ext.P1 report produced by the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent as per the directions issued by this Court in Ext.P2 judgment, is not in accordance with the directions contained therein. The essential complaint raised by the petitioner is that permission was granted for using forest land for the purpose of shooting a Malayalam movie



in the Parthakochi, Karudukka Reserve Forest under Kasargode Range Forest. Permission in this regard was given by the Divisional forest Officer as per Exts.P3 and P4. Petitioner contend that going by Ext.P5 guidelines any such diversion of forest land for non-forest purposes is punishable. Petitioner also relies on Ext.P6 statement filed by the Central Government in WP(C) No.1645 of 2019 and contend that any change in the land used without prior permission of the Central Government shall amount to the violation of Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980. This Court in Ext.P2 judgment directed the Central Government to carryout necessary enquiry in the matter and to take appropriate action in accordance with law and also to rectify the damages without affecting the ecosystem and the natural attire of the forest. It is in obedience to Ext.P2 judgment that Ext.P1 report has been submitted by the committee constituted by the Central Government, Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change and in the operative portion of the report, it is



specifically stated that the movie company erred in dumping soil on the road when no such permission existed and the field staff of the concerned Range Office can be faulted for not preventing dumping of soil and for not taking action by way of booking a case, seizure of vehicle and arresting of the persons involved and also for not maintaining proper records on the movement of men and material. It is also stated that the DFO can also be faulted for not exercising due diligence by way of not mentioning extent of area for film shooting, the quantity of soil that can be transported, etc., and also by not monitoring from his level, once the permission was granted. It was also ordered that the State Government shall initiate appropriate proceedings as per the service Rules applicable. There was a further direction that the soil now been dumped on the road inside the forest should be removed by the forest department and the cost incurred can be recovered from the movie company. Petitioner submits that the said recommendations in Ext.P1 is



not complied and further that no positive action has been taken.

3. Respondent No.3 has filed counter affidavit stating that it is in compliance of the direction in Ext.P2 that a committee was constituted to conduct an enquiry into the matter and the said committee conducted enquiry and thereafter submitted Ext.P1 report and series of directions were also issued as per Ext.P1. It is submitted that the committee has found that there is no permanent diversion of forest land and there is no major damages to the forest area in question. Going by Ext.R3(a) guidelines which does not involve breaking or clearing of forest land or portion thereof, or assigning by way of lease or otherwise to firm, person or organization using such forest land temporarily and does not create any right on such forest land of such firm, person or organization will not require prior approval of Central Government under the Forest Conservation Act. It is also submitted that as per Ext.R3(b) necessary communication was issued to the State



Government to initiate action against the erring officials and to submit an action taken report before to the ministry and consequent to the same, Ext.R3(c) communication was sent directing to remove two small mounds of soil deposited and to recover amount incurred for the work from the film company with a direction to forfeit the security deposit. In addition to these directions, show cause notices were issued to then Divisional Forest Officer, Sri. Rajeevan M, Sri.Anilkumar N, Range Forest Officer, Kasargod and Sri.M.Gopalan, Section Forest Officer for submitting explanation for the dereliction of their duties. It was informed that steps have already been initiated to revise the Government order vide G.O(MS) No.37/2013/F&WLD dated 30.3.2013 which permits film shooting by incorporating necessary directions given in the enquiry report of Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate change and that the Principal Chief Conservator of Forests (Wildlife) & Chief Wildlife Warden has informed the Chief Conservator of Forest, Kannur to



initiate necessary consequential action pursuant to the directions in Ext.P1 report.

4. A counter affidavit has been filed by the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent, wherein it is specifically stated the action has been taken pursuant to Ext.P2 judgment and that prima facie there are violations which are to be dealt with under the Forest Act and other local laws and the same has been mentioned in the enquiry report and since there is no diversion of forest land for non forest purposes, no violation is made out under the Forest Conservation Act 1980.

5. A counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent also, wherein it is contended that commercial film shooting was undertaken after obtaining permission in this regard and that the action of the Divisional Forest Officer, Kasargode in having granted permission was done in good faith and that there is no violation of any existing laws or rules made thereunder by granting permission for shooting, no trees were fallen or no roads were newly





constructed nor breaking of or clearing of the land has been undertaken for the purpose of film shooting. It is further stated that in obedience to the enquiry report, the Chief Conservator of Forests, Northern Circle, Kannur has issued show cause notice to the DFO concerned, as is evident from Ext.R1(c).

6. After considering the arguments of the petitioner, who was appearing in person, and also going through the affidavit and averments of the respondents, I am of the opinion that necessary action has been taken pursuant to Ext.P1 report. There will be a further direction to the respondents to finalise the proceedings already initiated pursuant to the directions in Ext.P1 report submitted pursuant to Ext.P2 judgment, subject to the decision in WP(C) No.7059/2020. The respondents are also directed to consider whether any further additional conditions need be imposed in the matter while granting permission to use the forest for non-forest activities like the one done in the present case, so that no damage is



caused to the forest and wild life. With the above said direction, WP(C) No.7107 of 2020 is disposed of.

WP(C) No.7059 of 2020

7. The above writ petition is filed challenging Ext.P11 report in Ext.P12 notice to the extent it made applicable to the petitioner herein.

8. Petitioner is presently working as Range Forest Officer, Kasargode. He has retired from service while the writ petition was pending consideration. Pursuant to the directions in Ext.P10 judgment (which is produced as Ext.P2 judgment in WP(C) No.7107/2020), Ext.P11 report (which is produced as Ext.P1 dated 21.7.2018 in WP(C) No.7107/2020) was submitted. Pursuant to the directions in Ext.P11 report disciplinary proceedings were initiated against the petitioner and Ext.P12 show cause notice was issued, to which the petitioner had submitted Ext.P13 objection. Petitioner contend that he is not liable to be proceeded pursuant to Ext.P11 report and therefore, he seeks for quashment of Ext.P12



notice issued against him. Petitioner submits that he has absolutely no role in the issues involved and there is no dereliction of duty on his part. Petitioner submits that he is an honest officer, who was always very diligent in performing his official duties. The production executive in connection with a film shooting tried to enter the reserve forest (Karaduka Reserve Forest) for the purpose of seeing the site, which was objected to by the petitioner and the said aspect was communicated to the DFO, Kasargode, who is the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent herein. The 5<sup>th</sup> respondent granted permission for commercial shooting in the reserve forest for 15 days as per Ext.P1. Thereupon the petitioner issued necessary instructions to the Section Forest Officer, Karaduka Section by Ext.P2 letter dated 29.9.2018. Petitioner while on night patrol duty on 28.9.2018 found that in the guise of the permission granted, the production team was transporting materials to the reserve forest for construction of a temporary shed on top of a tree which was not permitted. Later on by Ext.P3, the



5<sup>th</sup> respondent granted further permission to put up set inside the reserve forest for commercial film shooting. Later Ext.P3 was cancelled by the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent and Ext.P4, a new permit, was granted for putting up film set. The production executive in the guise of Ext.P4 order has illegally transported sand and mud from outside for constructing a road through the forest which was objected to by the petitioner, but later on the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent by Ext.P5 even granted permission for the same. The petitioner even denied permission to the other vehicles to pass through the reserve forest and submit that only on the strength of Exts.P1 to P5 orders issued by the DFO, Kasargode, loads of mud carrying in the tipper lorry was put in the reserve forest, which was also reported to the DFO, Kasargode as per Ext.P6 communication. Later on, a complaint was preferred by one Sudhir Kumar, based on which an enquiry was conducted by the Additional Principal Chief Conservator of Forests (Northern Region) and on the basis of the said enquiry report, the 6<sup>th</sup> respondent cancelled



Ext.P6 order, granting permission for putting the mud in view of the violation, but by this time the damage had already been done on the strength of the orders passed by the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent. The petitioner was also summoned by the Additional Principal Chief Conservator of Forests (Northern Region) as part of the enquiry and the petitioner has deposed the true relevant facts before him and thereafter Ext.P7 report was submitted by the enquiry authority. In Ext.P7 report, it is specifically stated that before granting permission for undertaking film shooting inside the reserve forest, the application submitted by the production executive was never forwarded to the Range Forest Officer, Kasargode, the petitioner herein, and the Divisional Officer granted permission on his own without conducting an enquiry through the petitioner and issuance of other consequential permission by the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent is dubious and evoke suspicion. In the report, it is recommended that disciplinary action should be initiated against the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent, who



is the Divisional Forest Officer, Kasargode and that legal proceedings shall also be initiated and that the said Divisional Forest Officer, the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent herein, shall not be given charge of any responsible posts in future. Petitioner further submits that as per Ext.P8, petitioner again wrote to the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent about the presence of wild elephants and that it could be a threat for shooting of the film. The petitioner was transferred to Attappady and that the said transfer order was under challenge before the Kerala Administrative Tribunal and the Tribunal directed the Government to consider the grievance of the petitioner and therefore the Government by Ext.P9 order set aside the orders of transfer issued by the Forest Department and directed the petitioner to be reinstated in the present station. Petitioner submits that the permission and sanction for film shooting was given by the Government on the basis of the recommendation of the higher officials and the petitioner has nothing to do with the said proceedings and he had



made valid objections from the very beginning itself, whenever violations were found. Thereupon, a writ petition was filed as WP(C) No.1645 of 2019 by the petitioner in WP(C) No.7107/2020 consequent to which Ext.P11 report was submitted by the enquiry committee, wherein a recommendation was made to take action against the field staff concerned of the concerned range office and also against the DFO concerned.

9. Petitioner submits that the said direction in Ext.P11 to the extent it affect the petitioner, is liable to be interfered by this Court in as much as the petitioner is the only officer who had opposed the very film shooting and that the petitioner's hands were tied on account of the fact that order permitting illegal activities had been issued by the higher ups in the Forest department and the petitioner cannot be blamed for the same. Pursuant to Ext.P11 petitioner was issued with Ext.P12 show cause notice to which petitioner submitted Ext.P13 reply. Petitioner submits that the proceedings now initiated as per



Ext.P12 is absolutely arbitrary and unjust and is liable to be interfered by this Court. Petitioner further submits that since he has already retired from service the employee employer relationship has now terminated whereby dis-entitling the Government from initiating disciplinary action against him. Even otherwise the petitioner could not be proceeded against since there is no dereliction of duty on his part as alleged in Ext.P12 notice.

10. A detailed counter affidavit has been filed by the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent wherein it is stated that an enquiry was conducted and in Ext.P11 enquiry report, certain directions were issued and Ext.P12 was issued in compliance of the directions contained therein.

11. The 5<sup>th</sup> respondent has filed a detailed counter affidavit wherein it is stated that it is only on the basis of a recommendation of the committee in Ext.P10 report that the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent has issued show cause notice to the petitioner to give a chance to explain his side and no other





positive action was taken against him. It is also contended that the transfer order issued to transfer the petitioner from his present station is a routine administrative action of the department and it has no relation to the issues in connection with the permission granted for film shooting. It is also contended that though permission has been granted by the Government, it is the primary duty of the field officers to prevent any illicit activities in the reserve forests.

12. I have heard the contentions on both sides.

13. Admittedly, petitioner has retired from service. A perusal of Exts.P1 and P6 and the pleadings in the writ petition would reveal that the illegalities committed were pointed out by the petitioner to the higher officials at the relevant point of time. A perusal of Exts.P1, P3, P4 and P5 would reveal that necessary permissions have been granted by the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent alone. Pursuant to a complaint raised by one P.V. Sudhir Kumar, an enquiry was conducted by the Additional Chief



Forest Conservator (Northern Region) and a detailed enquiry was conducted, and in the enquiry report it is specifically stated that all the permissions have been granted by the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent personally without even calling for a report from the petitioner who was the Range Forest Officer, Kasargode then, and that in Ext.P6 it is further stated that certain modified orders were also granted to the film production company incorporating certain changes by the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent and the intention behind the same is suspicious. In Ext.P6 the only recommendation is to take action against the DFO, Kasargode including disciplinary proceedings and also recommended that the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent DFO shall not be given charge of any responsible posts in future.

14. The contention of the petitioner is that, he was transferred to Attappady in connection with the said allegations that has occurred due to the permission granted for film shooting and pursuant to the order passed by the Kerala Administrative Tribunal in OA (Ernakulam)No.828/2019, Ext.P9



order was issued by the Government, whereby the transfer of the petitioner was cancelled and he was directed to be reinstated in the present station. A perusal of Ext.P9 would reveal that there is a finding that petitioner was transferred in connection with the statement he has given before in the enquiry which culminated in Ext.P6 report and it is due to the said reason he has been transferred. In the said order it was further found that non co-operation towards the senior officials, which has been stated as a reason for transferring the petitioner, was only for the reason that the petitioner did not support the illegal action taken by the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent in granting permission for film shooting in violation of the Act and Rules. The Government also found that the petitioner is a person who has been performing his duties with utmost sincerity and truthfulness. It is taking note of all these aspects that the transfer order issued against the petitioner was cancelled. A perusal of Ext.P9 would reveal that the transfer itself was in



connection with the issues that has cropped up due to the illegal permission granted by the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent for film shooting inside the reserve forest. So a perusal of Exts.P6 and P9 would clearly show that, whatever dereliction if any, that has been found in Ext.P11 report can be attributed to the petitioner. In Ext.P11 report there is no specific direction that disciplinary action should be initiated against the petitioner, but only stated that the field staff of the concerned range office could be found fault with for not preventing the dumping of soil. It is also to be seen that the Divisional Forest Officer is also found fault with in Ext.P11 report.

15. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, and nature of the allegation and taking into consideration the contentions on both sides, especially, taking note of Exts.P6 and P9, I am of the opinion that there is no dereliction of duty on the part of the petitioner as alleged in Ext.P12 notice. The petitioner has now retired from service also.



Therefore, Ext.P11 report to the extent it made the petitioner responsible for the lapses and consequential Ext.P12 notice are quashed.

The above writ petition is allowed as above.

sd/-

**VIJU ABRAHAM,  
JUDGE**

pm

**APPENDIX OF WP(C) 7107/2020**

## RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

- Exhibit R1(a) True copy of the GO(Ms)37/2013/FWLD dated 30.3.2013
- Exhibit R1(b) True copy of the order no F.No 11306/2014-FC dated 7.10.2014
- Exhibit R1(c) True copy of the order No. R-6980/18 dated 20.12.2019

## PETITIONER EXHIBITS

- EXHIBIT P4 TRUE COPY OF THE LICENSE GRANTED FOR ERECTING STRUCTURES.
- EXHIBIT P5 GUIDELINES FOR DIVERSION OF FOREST AND FOR NON PROFIT PURPOSE UNDER FOREST CONSERVATION ACT 1980 DATED 13 FEBRUARY 2014.
- EXHIBIT P6 TRUE COPY OF THE STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT PLEADER WITH THE HIGH COURT.
- EXHIBIT P7 TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER SUBMITTED BY CCF, KANNUR WITH THE COMMISSION.
- EXHIBIT P8 TRUE COPY OF REPORT BY APCCR (NORTHERN REGION), ADDRESSED TO PRINCIPAL SECRETARY EXPRESSED HIS AGAINST ABOUT MALICIOUS ACTIVITIES IN THE FOREST.
- EXHIBIT P9 TRUE PHOTOGRAPHS OF DAMAGED FOREST BY FILLING SOIL, ERECTED STRUCTURES AND DIGGING THE LAND.
- EXHIBIT P10 TRUE COPY OF PERMISSION FOR VEHICLES ALLOWED IN THE FOREST.
- EXHIBIT P1 TRUE COPY OF THE COMMISSION REPORT, SUBMITTED BY MINISTRY OF ENVIRON AND FORESTRY.
- EXHIBIT P12 LICENSE DETAIL OF ALL THE ORDERS



GRANTED FOR PERMIT SHOOTING.

EXHIBIT P13 TRUE PHOTOGRAPHS SHOWING THE GARBAGE  
AND PLASTICS DUMPED IN THE FOREST.

RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT R3 (a) : TRUE COPY OF THE GUIDELINES ISSUED VIDE  
LETTER NO.11-306/2014-FC DATED  
07/10/2014.

EXHIBIT R3 (b) : TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER NO.7-6/2019-F  
DATED 25/09/2019.

EXHIBIT R3 (c) : TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER NO.R6980/18  
DATED 20/12/2019.

EXHIBIT R3 (d) : TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER  
NO.KFDHQ/28817/18-CWW/WL11 DATED  
27/12/2019.

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT P11 TRUE PHOTOGRAPHS SHOWING AFTERMATH OF  
MOVIE SHOOTING.

EXHIBIT P2 TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT OF HONBLE  
HIGH COURT OF KERALA, WPC 1645/2019.

EXHIBIT P3 TRUE COPY OF THE LICENSE GRANTED FOR  
FILLING SOIL.

**APPENDIX OF WP (C) 7059/2020**

## RESPONDENT EXHIBITS

- Exhibit R5(b) True copy of the GO(MS) No. 37/2013/FWLD dated 30.3.2013
- Exhibit R5(c) True copy of the letter No F No 11306/2014-FC dated 7.10.2014 of Government of India.
- Exhibit R5(a) True copy of the order No. B3-17545/00 dated 16.7.2018 of the Additional PCCF Thiruvananthapuram.

## PETITIONER EXHIBITS

- EXHIBIT P4 THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO. AGA3-3423/18 DATED 1-10-2018 ISSUED BY THE DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER, KASARGODE
- EXHIBIT P5 THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO. KGAE-3423/18 DATED 3-10-2018 OF THE DFO, KASARGODE
- EXHIBIT P6 THE TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER NO. C2/460/2018 DATED 5-10-2018 ISSUED BY THE PETITIONER TO THE DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER, KASARGOD
- EXHIBIT P7 THE TRUE COPY OF THE REPORT NO. B3-2702/2016 DATED 10-10-2018 OF THE ADDITIONAL PRINCIPAL CHIEF FOREST CONSERVATOR, KOZHIKODE, OBTAINED BY THE PETITIONER UNDER THE RTI ACT.
- EXHIBIT P8 THE TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER NO C2/460/2018 DATED 24-10-2018 OF THE PETITIONER TO DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER, KASARGOD
- EXHIBIT P1 THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO. KGA3-3423/18 DATED 27-09-2018 OF THE DFO, KASARGODE RECEIVED UNDER THE RTI ACT.
- EXHIBIT P10 THE TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 17-06-2019 IN W.P(C) NO. 1645 OF 2019





- EXHIBIT P11 THE TRUE COPY OF THE REPORT NO. F NO. F (C) A/12.7/608/KER 826 DATED 19-08-2019 OF THE MINISTRY FOR FORESTS ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE
- EXHIBIT P12 THE TRUE COPY OF THE SHOW CAUSE NOTICE NO. R 6980/18 DATED 20-12-2019 ISSUED BY THE CHIEF FOREST CONSERVATOR, NORTHERN CIRCLE, KANNUR
- EXHIBIT P13 THE TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY DATED 6-2-2020 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER.
- EXHIBIT P14 THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO FWLD A1//117/2018-FWLD DATED 25-10-2018 ISSUED BY THE GOVERNMENT.
- EXHIBIT P9 THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO GO(RT) NO 509/2019/F AND WLD DATED 26-12-2019
- EXHIBIT P2 THE TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED BY THE PETITIONER DATED 29-09-2018 TO THE SECTION FOREST OFFICER, KARADUKA SECTION
- EXHIBIT P3 THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO. KGA3-3423/18 DATED 28-09-2018 ISSUED BY THE DFO, KASARGODE