

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 1 :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.S.MANIKUMAR

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAJI P.CHALY

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATHISH NINAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 23RD DAY OF MARCH 2022 / 2ND CHAITHRA, 1944

WP(C) NO. 17301 OF 2020

PETITIONER/S:

SABEENA E.K.
AGED 34 YEARS
D/O. KASIM, PUTHENPARAMBIL HOUSE, KUNNATHERI,
CHOORNIKKARA VILLAGE, ERNAKULAM – 683 106.

BY ADVS.
K.PRAVEEN KUMAR
SMT.M.S.SHAMLA

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 DISTRICT COLLECTOR,
ERNAKULAM – 682 030.
- 2 REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER,
FORT KOCHI, ERNAKULAM – 682 001,
- 3 TAHSILDAR,
TALUK OFFICE, PARAVUR – 683 513.
- 4 VILLAGE OFFICER,
ALANGAD VILLAGE, ALANGAD – 683 511.
- 5 LOCAL LEVEL MONITORING COMMITTEE
ALANGAD GRAMA PANCHAYATH, REPRESENTED BY ITS CONVENER,
(AGRICULTURAL OFFICER, KRISHI BHAVAN, ALANGAD, ALANGAD,
ERNAKULAM – 683 511.

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 2 :

- 6 STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY, REVENUE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM – 695 001.
- 7 DISTRICT LEVEL AUTHORIZED COMMITTEE,
REPRESENTED BY REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER, FORT KOCHI,
ERNAKULAM – 682 001.

BY SRI. S. RENJITH, SPL. GOVERNMENT PLEADER

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 23.03.2022, ALONG WITH WP(C) Nos. 17301, 17578, 17837, 18106, 18356, 18653, 19080, 22888, 22995, 23115, 24264, 24396 of 2020 650/2021, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 3 :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.S.MANIKUMAR

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAJI P.CHALY

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATHISH NINAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 23RD DAY OF MARCH 2022 / 2ND CHAITHRA, 1944

WP(C) NO. 17578 OF 2020

PETITIONER/S:

SHAKEELA KAMAL
AGED 44 YEARS
W/O KAMAL, ERVADIKKARAN HOUSE, MAPRANAM P.O.THRISSUR
DISTRICT-680 712.

BY ADVS.
SAIJO HASSAN
SRI.BENOJ C AUGUSTIN
SRI.RAFEEK. V.K.
SMT.P.PARVATHY
SMT.SURYA P SHAJI
SMT.AATHIRA SUNNY

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER
IRINJALAKUDA, THRISSUR DISTRICT-680 121.
- 2 LOCAL LEVEL MONITORING COMMITTEE,
REPRESENTED BY THE AGRICULTURAL OFFICER, ALOOR,
IRINJALAKUDA, THRISSUR DISTRICT-680 121.
- 3 THE SECRETARY,
ALOOR GRAMA PANCHAYATH, IRINJALAKUDA, THRISSUR DISTRICT-
680 121.
- 4 THE PRINCIPAL AGRICULTURAL OFFICER,
KRISHI BHAVAN, ALOOR, THAZHEKKAD P.O.THRISSUR-680 697.

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 4 :

BY ADVS.

BY SRI. S. RENJITH, SPL. GOVERNMENT PLEADER

R3 BY SRI.PHILIP T.VARGHESE, SC, ALOOR GRAMA PANCHAYAT

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
23.03.2022, ALONG WITH WP(C).17301/2020 AND CONNECTED CASES,
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 5 :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.S.MANIKUMAR

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAJI P.CHALY

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATHISH NINAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 23RD DAY OF MARCH 2022 / 2ND CHAITHRA, 1944
WP(C) NO. 17837 OF 2020

PETITIONER/S:

GAURI
AGED 56 YEARS
D/O. KALYANIAMMA, NARATTUVALAPIL HOUSE, THANISSERI P O,
THRISSUR DISTRICT - 680 701.

BY ADVS.
SAIJO HASSAN
SRI.BENOJ C AUGUSTIN
SRI.RAFEEK. V.K.
SMT.P.PARVATHY
SMT.SURYA P SHAJI
SMT.AATHIRA SUNNY

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER
IRINJALAKUDA, THRISSUR DISTRICT - 680 121.
- 2 LOCAL LEVEL MONITORING COMMITTEE,
REPRESENTED BY THE AGRICULTURAL OFFICER, ALOOR,
IRINJALAKUDA, THRISSUR DISTRICT - 680 121.
- 3 THE SECRETARY
ALOOR GRAMA PANCHAYATH, IRINJALAKUDA,
THRISSUR DISTRICT - 680 121.
- 4 THE PRINCIPAL AGRICULTURAL OFFICER,
KRISHI BHAVAN, ALOOR, THAZHEKKAD PO, THRISSUR - 680 697.
BY ADV SRI.PHILIP T.VARGHESE, SC, ALOOR GRAMA PANCHAYAT
BY SRI. S. RENJITH, SPL. GOVERNMENT PLEADER
R3 BY SRI. PHILIP T. VARGHESE, SC

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
23.03.2022, ALONG WITH WP(C).17301/2020 AND CONNECTED CASES,
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 6 :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.S.MANIKUMAR

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAJI P.CHALY

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATHISH NINAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 23RD DAY OF MARCH 2022 / 2ND CHAITHRA, 1944

WP(C) NO. 18106 OF 2020

PETITIONER/S:

A.V.ASKAR ALI
AGED 27 YEARS
S/O.MAMMADKOYA, RESIDING AT 15/584, FATHIMA MANZIL,
PALLIKANDY, POST KALLAI, KOZHIKODE-673 003, REPRESENTED BY
POWER OF ATTORNEY HOLDER MAMMEDKOYA, S/O.KUNHAYIN, AGED
75 YEARS, RESIDING AT 15/584, FATHIMA MANZIL, PALLIKANDY,
POST KALLAI, KOZHIKODE-673 003.

BY ADVS.
V.V.SURENDRAN
SRI.P.A.HARISH

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR
CIVIL STATION, KOZHIKODE-673 020.
- 2 THE DISTRICT LEVEL AUTHORISED COMMITTEE,
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN, THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL
OFFICER, CIVIL STATION, KOZHIKODE-673 020.
- 3 THE LOCAL LEVEL MONITORING COMMITTEE,
PERUMANNA PANCHAYATH, REPRESENTED BY ITS
CONVENER/AGRICULTURAL OFFICER, PERUMANNA PANCHAYATH,
PERUMANNA, KOZHIKODE-673 016.
- 4 THE PERUMANNA GRAMA PANCHAYATH,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, P.O.PERUMANNA, KOZHIKODE-673
016.
- 5 THE SECRETARY, PERUMANNA GRAMA PANCHAYATH,

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 7 :

P.O.PERUMANNA, KOZHIKODE-673 016.

BY SRI. S. RENJITH, SPL. GOVERNMENT PLEADER

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 23.03.2022, ALONG WITH WP(C).17301/2020 AND CONNECTED CASES, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 8 :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.S.MANIKUMAR

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAJI P.CHALY

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATHISH NINAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 23RD DAY OF MARCH 2022 / 2ND CHAITHRA, 1944

WP(C) NO. 18356 OF 2020

PETITIONER/S:

JINIMOL P
AGED 32 YEARS
SREENILAYAM, THURAVOOR P.O, ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT

BY ADVS.
N.RAGHURAJ
SHRI.SREEKUMAR S

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 THE AGRICULTURAL OFFICER
KRISHI BHAVAN, THAIKKATUSSERY, ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT 688 524
- 2 THE LOCAL LEVEL MONITORING COMMITTEE,
REPRESENTED BY ITS CONVENER, THE AGRICULTURAL OFFICER,
KRISHI BHAVAN, THAIKKATUSSERY, ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT 688 524
- 3 THE DISTRICT LOCAL LEVEL MONITORING COMMITTEE,
REPRESENTED BY ITS CONVENER, THE PRINCIPAL AGRICULTURAL
OFFICER, 2ND FLOOR, COLLECTORATE BUILDING, CIVIL STATION,
ALAPPUZHA 688 001

BY SRI. S. RENJITH, SPL. GOVERNMENT PLEADER

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
23.03.2022, ALONG WITH WP(C).17301/2020 AND CONNECTED CASES,
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 9 :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.S.MANIKUMAR

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAJI P.CHALY

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATHISH NINAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 23RD DAY OF MARCH 2022 / 2ND CHAITHRA, 1944

WP(C) NO. 18653 OF 2020

PETITIONER/S:

RAJAN PARAMMAL
AGED 43 YEARS
S/O.KOCHAN, PARAMMAL HOUSE, KOLAPPURAM SOUTH,. A R NAGAR,
THIRURANGADI TALUK, MALAPPURAM-656 305.

BY ADVS.
ALEXANDER GEORGE
SMT.CHITHRA R.SHENOY

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, MALAPPURAM
PIN-676 505.
- 2 REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER/SUB COLLECTOR,
CHAIRMAN OF THE DISTRICT LEVEL AUTHORISED COMMITTEE,
PERINTHALMANNA-679 322.
- 3 LOCAL LEVEL MONITORING COMMITTEE,
AR NAGAR PANCHAYATH, AR NAGAR, MALAPPURAM-676 305.

BY SRI. S. RENJITH, SPL. GOVERNMENT PLEADER

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
23.03.2022, ALONG WITH WP(C).17301/2020 AND CONNECTED CASES,
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 10 :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.S.MANIKUMAR

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAJI P.CHALY

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATHISH NINAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 23RD DAY OF MARCH 2022 / 2ND CHAITHRA, 1944

WP(C) NO. 19080 OF 2020

PETITIONER/S:

SALI SIMSON
AGED 22 YEARS
D/O.SIMSON, KUTTIKATT HOUSE, VELUR P.O., THRISSUR DT. - 680
601.

BY ADV SHOBY K.FRANCIS

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 DISTRICT LEVEL AUTHORIZED COMMITTEE
REPRESENTED BY ITS CONVENER AND PRINCIPAL AGRICULTURAL
OFFICER, OFFICE OF THE PRINCIPAL AGRICULTURAL OFFICER,
THRISSUR - 680 020.
- 2 THE CHAIRMAN, DISTRICT LEVEL AUTHORIZED COMMITTEE (RDO,
THRISSUR)
AYYANTHOLE P.O., THRISSUR - 680 003.
- 3 LOCAL LEVEL MONITORING COMMITTEE OF VELUR GRAMA
PANCHAYATH
REPRESENTED BY ITS CONVENER AND AGRICULTURAL OFFICER,
KRISHI BHAVAN, VELUR P.O., THRISSUR DISTRICT -680 601.
- 4 CONVENER AND AGRICULTURAL OFFICER
(LOCAL LEVEL MONITORING COMMITTEE OF VELUR GRAMA
PANCHAYATH), KRISHI BHAVAN,VELUR P.O., THRISSUR DISTRICT -
680 601.
- 5 VILLAGE OFFICER (MEMBER, LOCAL LEVEL MONITORING COMMITTEE

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 11 :

OF VELUR GRAMA PANCHAYATH)
VELUR P.O., THRISSUR - 680 601.

6 VELUR GRAMA PANCHAYATH
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, PANCHAYATH OFFICE, VELUR P.O.,
THRISSUR DT. -680 601.

7 SECRETARY, VELUR GRAMA PANCHAYATH
VELUR P.O., THRISSUR DT. - 680 601.

BY ADV SRI.PREMCHAND M.

BY SRI. S. RENJITH, SPL. GOVERNMENT PLEADER

R6 & R7 BY SRI. M. PREMCHAND, SC

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
23.03.2022, ALONG WITH WP(C).17301/2020 AND CONNECTED CASES,
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 12 :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.S.MANIKUMAR

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAJI P.CHALY

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATHISH NINAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 23RD DAY OF MARCH 2022 / 2ND CHAITHRA, 1944

WP(C) NO. 22888 OF 2020

PETITIONER/S:

BALAMANI
AGED 46 YEARS
S/O. RAMKUMAR, CHENDUVARAI ESTATE, LOWER DIVISION,
DEVIKULAM, IDUKKI DISTRICT.

BY ADVS.
C.S.MANILAL
SRI.S.NIDHEESH

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 THE STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVT., REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
SECRETARIAT, TRIVANDRUM 695 001.
- 2 THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR,
IDUKKI 685 602
- 3 THE DISTRICT LEVEL AUTHORIZED COMMITTEE,
IDUKKI, REPRESENTED BY THE CHAIRMAN, REVENUE DIVISIONAL
OFFICER/SUB COLLECTOR, DEVIKULAM, IDUKKI 685 613.

BY SRI. S. RENJITH, SPL. GOVERNMENT PLEADER

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
23.03.2022, ALONG WITH WP(C).17301/2020 AND CONNECTED CASES,
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 13 :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.S.MANIKUMAR

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAJI P.CHALY

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATHISH NINAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 23RD DAY OF MARCH 2022 / 2ND CHAITHRA, 1944

WP(C) NO. 22995 OF 2020

PETITIONER/S:

VIMALA.C
AGED 45 YEARS
W/O. LATE SIVADASAN, PERIMKARAMKADU VEEDU, EAST MATHUR,
MATHUR P.O., ALATHUR, PALAKKAD.
BY ADV V.A.JOHNSON (VARIKKAPPALLIL)

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 PRINCIPAL SECRETARY AND COMMISSIONER
AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 001.
- 2 THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR
CIVIL STATION, PALAKKAD-678 001.
- 3 THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER
CIVIL STATION, PALAKKAD-678 001.
- 4 PRINCIPAL AGRICULTURE OFFICER
CIVIL STATION, PALAKKAD-678 001.
- 5 AGRICULTURE OFFICER
KRISHI BHAVAN, MATHUR, MATHUR P.O., PALAKKAD-678 571.
- 6 VILLAGE OFFICER
MATHUR-I VILLAGE OFFICE, MATHURY P.O., PALAKKAD-678 571.
- 7 LOCAL LEVEL MONITORING COMMITTEE

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 14 :

MATHUR GRAMA PANCHAYAT, MATHUR, PALAKKAD-678 571,
REPRESENTED BY ITS CONVENER.

BY SRI. S. RENJITH, SPL. GOVERNMENT PLEADER

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
23.03.2022, ALONG WITH WP(C).17301/2020 AND CONNECTED CASES,
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 15 :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.S.MANIKUMAR

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAJI P.CHALY

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATHISH NINAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 23RD DAY OF MARCH 2022 / 2ND CHAITHRA, 1944

WP(C) NO. 23115 OF 2020

PETITIONER:

ABDUL GHANI
AGED 46 YEARS
S/O.KUNHIMOIDEEN, MANNUKKADVAN HOUSE, POONTHAPPALA,
THIRUVALI VILLAGE, NILAMBUR, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT, 676 123.
BY ADV R.RANJITH (MANJERI)

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 STATE OF KERALA
REP.BY THE SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
DEVELOPMENT AND FARMERS' WELFARE, 1ST FLOOR, ANNEX-II,
SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 001.
- 2 THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR,
COLLECTORATE, UP HILL, MALAPPURAM 676 505.
- 3 TAHSILDAR
NILAMBUR TALUK, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT, 676 329.
- 4 AGRICULTURAL OFFICER,
THIRUVALI, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT, 676 123
- 5 VILLAGE OFFICER,
THIRUVALI VILLAGE, NILAMBUR TALUK, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT, 676
123
- 6 THIRUVALI GRAMAPANCHAYATH,
REP.BY ITS SECRETARY, THIRUVALI, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT, 676 129.

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 16 :

BY SRI. S. RENJITH, SPL. GOVERNMENT PLEADER

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
23.03.2022, ALONG WITH WP(C).17301/2020 AND CONNECTED CASES,
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 17 :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.S.MANIKUMAR

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAJI P.CHALY

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATHISH NINAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 23RD DAY OF MARCH 2022 / 2ND CHAITHRA, 1944

WP(C) NO. 24264 OF 2020

PETITIONER/S:

SATHEESHAN
AGED 55 YEARS
S/O.PARAMU C.K., THEKKE ALUNGAL VELI, VADUTHALA JETTY,
AROOKUTTY VILLAGE, ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT-688 535.

BY ADVS.
ESM.KABEER
SHRI.N.KRISHNA RAJA MAULI

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR
CIVIL STATION, KAKKANAD, ERNAKULAM, PIN-682 030.
- 2 THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER,
FORT KOCHI, PIN-682 001.
- 3 THE TAHSILDAR,
PARAVUR TALUK, TALUK OFFICE, S.PARAVOOR, ERNAKULAM
DISTRICT, PIN-682 307.
- 4 THE VILLAGE OFFICER,
ELOOR VILLAGE, ELOOR FERRY ROAD, VERAPOLI, ELOOR,
ERNAKULAM, PIN-683 501.
- 5 THE LOCAL LEVEL MONITORING COMMITTEE,
REPRESENTED BY AGRICULTURAL OFFICER, KRISHI BHAVAN, ELOOR

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 18 :

MUNICIPALITY, ELOOR P.O., PARAVUR TALUK, ERNAKULAM,
PIN-683 501.

BY SRI. S. RENJITH, SPL. GOVERNMENT PLEADER

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
23.03.2022, ALONG WITH WP(C).17301/2020 AND CONNECTED
CASES, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 19 :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.S.MANIKUMAR

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAJI P.CHALY

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATHISH NINAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 23RD DAY OF MARCH 2022 / 2ND CHAITHRA, 1944

WP(C) NO. 24396 OF 2020

PETITIONER/S:

- 1 SHAILAJA
AGED 50 YEARS
W/O.GOPI MOHAN, KOLLAYIL HOUSE, HARMONY STREET, PATTAMBI,
PALAKKAD DISTRICT
 - 2 VIDHU
D/O.GOPI MOHAN, KOLLAYIL HOUSE, HARMONY STREET, PATTAMBI,
PALAKKAD DISTRICT
- BY ADVS.
K.MOHANAKANNAN
SMT.T.V.NEEMA

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR
PALAKKAD, PIN-678 001
- 2 PRINCIPAL AGRICULTURAL OFFICER
PALAKKAD -678 001
- 3 LOCAL LEVEL MONITORING COMMITTEE
REP.BY AGRICULTURAL OFFICER, PATTAMBI, PALAKKAD DISTRICT-679
303
- 4 REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER
PALAKKAD, PIN-679 003

BY SRI. S. RENJITH, SPL. GOVERNMENT PLEADER

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 23.03.2022, ALONG WITH WP(C).17301/2020 AND CONNECTED CASES, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 20 :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.S.MANIKUMAR

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAJI P.CHALY

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATHISH NINAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 23RD DAY OF MARCH 2022 / 2ND CHAITHRA, 1944
WP(C) NO. 650 OF 2021

PETITIONER/S:

ANISH P.A.
S/O. KUNJUKRISHNAN, PULAKATTUMMOOTIL HOIUSE, CHATHAKARY
P.O, PERINGARA VILLAGE, THIRUVALLA TALUK,
PATHANAMTHITTA DISTRICT-689 112.

BY ADV UNNI. K.K. (EZHUMATTOOR)

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, AGRICULTURAL
DEPARTMENT, GOVT. SECRETARIATE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695
001
- 2 DISTRICT LEVEL AUTHORIZED COMMITTEE,
PATHANAMTHITTA DISTRICT, REPRESENTED BY ITS CONVENER,
PRINCIPAL AGRICULTURAL OFFICER, CIVIL STATION,
PATHANAMTHITTA-689 645
- 3 CHAIRMAN (REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER, ADOOR),
DISTRICT LEVEL AUTHORISED COMMITTEE,
PATHANAMTHITTA DISTRICT-691 523.
- 4 LOCAL LEVEL MONITORING COMMITTEE,
PERINGARA GRAMAPANCHAYATH, REPRESENTED BY ITS CONVENER,
AGRICULTURAL OFFICER, KRISHI BHAVAN, CHTHAMKERY P.O,
THIRUVALLA-689 112.

BY SRI. S. RENJITH, SPL. GOVERNMENT PLEADER

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
23.03.2022, ALONG WITH WP(C).17301/2020 AND CONNECTED
CASES, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 21 :

'CR'

Dated this the 23rd day of March, 2022.

[WP(C) Nos. 17301, 17578, 17837, 18106, 18356, 18653, 19080, 22888, 22995, 23115, 24264, 24396 of 2020 and 650/2021]

JUDGMENT

SHAJI P. CHALY, J.

This batch of writ petitions have come up before us on a reference made by a learned single Judge of this Court, as per the Order dated 14th day of September, 2020 in W.P.(C) No. 18356 of 2020 and connected cases, and orders subsequently made in the other writ petitions, doubting the correctness of a judgment of a Division Bench of this Court in ***Yousuf Chalil v. State of Kerala*** [2019 KHC 5618=2019(4) KLT 540=ILR 2019 4 Ker. 531], and on a consequential reference order dated 1st February, 2022 passed by the Division Bench.

2. The basic question involved in all these writ petitions is, whether a person, who purchased a bit of paddy land after the commencement of the Kerala Conservation of Paddy Land and Wetland Act, 2008 (hereinafter called 'the Act, 2008), is entitled to prefer an application under Section 5(3)(i) r/w Section 9 of Act, 2008 for permission to reclaim the same, for construction of a residential building.

3. In fact, the said question was answered in the negative by a learned single Judge of this Court in ***Thankachan v. District Collector*** [2017 (3) KLT 35], which was followed by a learned single Judge in ***Yousuf Chalil v. State of Kerala*** [2019 (4) KLT 33]; however the said Judgment was reversed by a Division Bench in ***Yousuf Chalil*** (supra), and held that applications filed by the purchasers of a bit of paddy land, for reclamation for construction of a residential building, after the coming into force of Act, 2008 are also liable to be considered by the statutory authorities under Act, 2008. The petitioners in the instant writ petitions are claiming the benefit of the Division Bench judgment in ***Yousuf Chalil*** (supra).

4. In some of the writ petitions, challenge is against the order passed by the primary as well as the appellate authority under the Act, 2008 and in some others, the order passed by the primary authority is under challenge and in yet another set of writ petitions, the applications are pending before the primary authority.

5. As pointed out above, the subject matter arises under the Act, 2008. The term 'paddy land' is defined under Section 2(xii) of the Act, 2008 to mean all types of land situated in the State where paddy is cultivated at least once in a year or is suitable for paddy cultivation but is uncultivated and left fallow, and it includes its allied constructions like bunds, drainage channels, ponds and canals.

6. As per Section 3(1) of the Act, 2008 dealing with 'prohibition on conversion or reclamation of paddy land', on and from the date of commencement of the Act, the owner, occupier or the person in custody of any paddy land shall not undertake any activity for the conversion or reclamation of such paddy land, except in accordance with the provisions of the Act. However, sub-Section (2) thereto specifies that nothing contained in sub-section (1) shall apply to the cultivation of any intermediary crops that are cultivated without changing the ecological nature of the paddy land, or the strengthening of the outer bunds for protecting the cultivation.

7. Therefore, on a close analysis of Section 3, it can be seen that after the introduction of the Act, 2008, on and with effect from 12.08.2008, no owner, occupier or the person in custody of any paddy land can undertake any activity for the conversion or reclamation of such paddy land, except in accordance with the provisions of the Act.

8. Section 5 deals with constitution of Local level Monitoring Committee and sub-Section (1) specifies that there shall be a Local Level Monitoring Committee in each Panchayat or Municipality, consisting of the members specified in sub-section (2), for the purpose of monitoring the implementation of the provisions of the Act. To sort out the issue at hand, sub-Section (3) of Section 5, which deals with 'the power of the Local Level Monitoring Committee', is significant.

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 24 :

Clause (1) thereto specifies that subject to the provisions of the Act, the Committee shall have the power to recommend to the District Level Authorized Committee for the reclamation of paddy land for construction of residential building for the owner of the paddy land.

9. The proviso thereto, however, circumscribes the maximum area that can be permitted for reclamation for the construction of the residential building and as per which, the committee shall not recommend for filling up of paddy land of more than an extent of 4.04 Ares in a Panchayat, or an extent of 2.02 Ares in a Municipality/Corporation, as the case may be.

10. There are other provisions contained under sub-Section (3) of Section 5 dealing with the matters regarding the utilization of paddy field for public purposes, recommendation to be made by the Local Level Monitoring Committee, inspection to be done by the Committee, the sketch to be provided, reports to be made to the Revenue Divisional Officer etc. However, we are basically concerned with clause (1) of sub-Section (3) of Section 5 alone.

11. On a perusal of sub-Section (3) of Section 5, it is clear that the benefit of conversion of paddy land is given for the construction of residential buildings for the owner of the paddy land alone. It is also clear that the Local Level Monitoring Committee is only vested with the power to recommend to the District Level Authorized Committee to

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 25 :

have reclamation of paddy land for the said purpose.

12. Section 9 of the Act, 2008 deals with the constitution of the District Level Authorised Committee. Sub-Section (1) thereto specifies that notwithstanding anything contained in Section 3, each Collector shall constitute in the District, a District Level Authorised Committee for considering the applications for reclamation of paddy land for the construction of residential building to the owner of paddy land and for taking suitable decision. However, the proviso thereto also restricts the power of the District Level Authorised Committee that, it shall not take any decision granting permission for the filling up of paddy land for the construction of residential building exceeding an extent of 4.04 Ares in a panchayat and an extent of 2.02 Ares in a Municipality/Corporation, as the case may be.

13. Sub-Section (2) of Section 9 deals with the constitution of the District Level Authorised Committee. Sub-Section (6) thereto confers a right on any aggrieved person to prefer an appeal before the Collector, if aggrieved by any decision taken by the District Level Authorised Committee, within thirty days from the receipt of the decision. However, sub-Section (8) again curtails the power of the District Level Authorised Committee by specifying that notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1), no application shall be considered by the District Level Authorised Committee, unless the

Local Level Monitoring Committee has recommended as follows:

- (i) such reclamation shall not adversely affect the ecological condition and the cultivation in the adjoining paddy land;
- (ii) the owner of the paddy land or his family do not own a suitable land for this purpose in the District;
- (iii) the building to be constructed is for his own purpose; and
- (iv) such paddy land is not situated surrounded by other paddy lands.

14. Sub-Section (9) of Section 9 makes it clear that the order issued by the District Level Authorised Committee under sub-Section (5) of Section 9, or by the District Collector under sub-Section (7), shall clearly indicate the survey number of the land and the extent of the land in each survey number for which sanction has been accorded, and a sketch of such land indicating the details shall also be appended to the order.

15. Those are the provisions required for consideration of the issue in these writ petitions. As we have pointed out above, the question to be considered is whether the term 'owner' specified in Sections 3, 5(3) and 9 could also be an owner of a bit of paddy land purchased after the coming into force of the Act, 2008, to secure the benefit of Section 9(9) of the Act, 2008.

16. In ***Thankachan*** (supra), a learned single Judge of this Court has found that the purpose of exemption is for constructing a residential house in a paddy land occupied by the owner and the

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 27 :

intention is to provide the cultivator/farmer/agriculturist with a residence within his cultivable paddy land; however, if a purchaser of a bit of paddy land, after the coming into force of the Act, 2008, is permitted to apply for reclamation as provided under Section 5(3) r/w Section 9, such an exercise could lead to gross misuse, since, then, large extent of paddy land could be fragmented into small plots and sold to different individuals, who could then separately seek exemption. It was also held therein that different members of a family would also claim exemption for small tracts of land, out of a commonly held paddy land, citing a desire to have an independent homestead and if that is permitted to be done, it would be defeating the very object of the enactment, which has the preservation of paddy lands at its core.

17. Therefore, in sum and substance, the learned single Judge in **Thankachan** (supra) has clearly held that a purchaser of a bit of land, after the coming into force of Act, 2008, is not entitled to seek for exemption in contemplation of Section 5(3) r/w Section 9 of Act, 2008. The said judgment of the learned single Judge that was followed by another learned single Judge in **Yousuf Chalil** (supra), was overruled by a Division Bench in **Yousuf Chalil v. State of Kerala and others** [2019 KHC 5618] holding that it is for the Local Level Monitoring Committee, at the first instance, to consider the

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 28 :

application preferred by the petitioner and in view of the fact that there is no express prohibition contained in the Act, it is for the statutory authority to decide the application preferred by the petitioner and in case the primary authority finds that the application preferred by the petitioner has to be recommended, the same is liable to be forwarded with its recommendation to the District Level Authorised Committee. Therefore, it can be seen that the Division Bench in **Yousuf Chalil** (supra) has basically held that the purchaser of a bit of paddy land, after the coming into force of the Act, 2008, is also entitled to make an application seeking reclamation of the paddy land for the construction of a residential building in contemplation of the afore discussed provisions.

18. Later, yet another learned single Judge in **Sudheesh R v. State of Kerala and others** [2020 (5) KHC 357] has held that the benefit should be confined only to the owner of a paddy land at the time when the Act, 2008 came into force ie., on 12.08.2008. However, another learned single Judge of this Court in **Murali K. v. State of Kerala and others** [2020 (4) KHC 214] followed the Division Bench judgment in **Yousuf Chalil's** case and directed to consider the application by the Local Level Monitoring Committee to ascertain as to whether the petitioner therein is entitled to secure any benefit as per the provisions discussed above.

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 29 :

19. At the outset, it is made clear that in the writ petitions on hand, all the petitioners are purchasers of a bit of paddy land from the original owners of the paddy land, except the petitioner in W.P.(C) No. 18356 of 2020 namely Jinimol P, who came into possession of an extent of 34.81 Ares of property by virtue of Ext. P1 settlement deed dated 12.07.2018. However, her application was also rejected taking into account the imperative conditions contained under Section 9 of Act, 2008, by the Local Level Monitoring Committee.

20. Now, the question remains to be considered is whether the proposition of law laid down by the learned single Judges in ***Thankachan, Yousuf Chalil and Sudeesh*** (supra) or the proposition of law laid down by the Division Bench in ***Yousuf Chalil*** is the correct one.

21. In order to understand the true purport of the expression 'owner of paddy land' specified under Sections 3, 5(3) and 9 of the Act, 2008, the "statement of objects and reasons" for the introduction of the Act, 2008 has to be taken into consideration. The Act, 2008 is an Act introduced to conserve the paddy land and wetland 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.

22. It further elucidates that even though Kuttanad in Alappuzha

District and Palakkad and such other paddy fields of Kerala remained as the granaries of the State of Kerala, the situation has changed for the last few decades and there has been an alarming shift from subsistence food farming to cash crops; and that the area under rice cultivation has drastically declined from above eight lakhs hectares in the year 1970s to nearly two lakhs hectares in 2000s mainly due to the conversion of the paddy lands, and the State of Kerala is importing more than eighty percent of its rice requirements from other States. Therefore, the State felt that the paddy fields, throughout Kerala, is facing severe threats as they are being converted to cash crop plantations and even the marshes are filled for new constructions and the majority of land owners feel that the paddy cultivation is not economically viable and they aspire to shift into remunerative crops and cropping patterns.

23. 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. Similarly, it was found that the wetland is also converted, 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.

24. In view of the fact that the Act, 2008 has been introduced to make an agrarian reform, some of the judgments of the Apex Court would throw light in order to arrive at a reasonable and logical conclusion.

25. In ***Ambika Prasad Mishra v. State of U.P.***, [(1980) 3 SCC 719], a Five Member Constitution Bench, in the realm of land reforms legislation, had held that the backdrop suggests that agrarian legislation, organised as egalitarian therapy, must be judged, not meticulously for every individual injury but by the larger standards of abolition of fundamental inequalities, frustration of basic social fairness and shocking unconscionableness; and that a social surgery, supervised by law, minimizes, not eliminates, individual hurt while promoting community welfare; and further that the court, in its interpretative role, can neither be pachydermic nor hyperreactive when landholders, here and there lament about lost land. It was also held that it is perfectly open to the legislature, as ancillary to its main policy to prevent activities which defeat the statutory purpose, to provide for invalidation of such actions; that when the alienations are invalidated because they are made after a statutory date fixed with a purpose, there is sense in that prohibition; otherwise, all the lands would have been transferred and little would have been left by way of surplus.

26. Likewise, in ***Sonia Bhatia v. State of U.P*** [(1981) 2 SCC 585], it was held, in the realm of a gift provided by the donor, after the introduction of the U.P. Imposition of Ceiling on Land Holdings Act 1960, that transfer after January 24th of 1971 would have to be ignored. The relevant portion of the said judgment reads thus:

“... we are afraid, however laudable the object of the donor may have been, the gift has to fail because the genuine attempt of the donor to benefit his granddaughter seems to have been thwarted by the intervention of sub-section (6) of Section 5 of the Act. This is undoubtedly a serious hardship but it cannot be helped. We must remember that the Act is a valuable piece of social legislation with the avowed object of ensuring equitable distribution of the land by taking away land from large tenure-holders and distributing the same among landless tenants or using the same for public utility schemes which is in the larger interest of the community at large. The Act seems to implement one of the most important constitutional directives contained in Part IV of the Constitution of India. If in this process a few individuals suffer severe hardship that cannot be helped, for individual interests must yield to the larger interests of the community or the country as indeed every noble cause claims its martyr.”

27. The discussion made above would make it clear that the agrarian reform envisioned by the State legislature by introducing the Act, 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.

28. With the above aspects in the background, we proceed to consider the contentions advanced by the petitioners. According to the petitioners, no distinction can be made by and between a pre-statute owner and a post-statute owner, and if any such classification is made, it would be unreasonable and further no intelligible differentia can be gathered as far as the proprietary right is concerned regarding the property. It is also submitted that the dichotomy given to the term 'owner' by the learned single Judges in ***Thankachan*** and ***Yousuf Chalil*** (supra) as pre-statute and post statute owner is artificial and it is not so contemplated by the Act, 2008.

29. Therefore, according to the petitioners, if such an interpretation is given, it creates chaos, confusions and friction in the working of the statute and hence, ordinary, normal and literal interpretation of the term 'owner' is to be adopted. It is submitted that if such a differentiation is to be made by and between a pre-statute owner and post statute owner, it would be clearly violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India. It is also pointed out that the statement of objects and reasons for the introduction of Act, 2008 clearly shows that the Act has only intended to regulate the reclamation and not a complete prohibition from reclaiming a paddy land.

30. That apart, it is submitted that the right in immovable property is a vested right and the same cannot be taken away, except

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 34 :

by a legislation with specific parameters and not by an interpretative process, especially when the term 'owner' is not defined in the Act. Therefore, according to the petitioners, on a conjoint reading of Sections 3, 5(3) and 9, it is clear that every owner of paddy field, irrespective of purchase of bit of paddy land after the introduction of Act, 2008, is entitled, as of right, to make an application seeking reclamation for the construction of a residential building.

31. Respective counsel have also submitted that if a restrictive interpretation is made to the term 'owner' contained in the aforesaid provisions, the constitutional right conferred on the owner of a property under Article 300A of the Constitution of India would become otiose. That apart, it is submitted that the *non obstante* clause contained in Section 9 makes it clear that it takes in the whole of Section 3, and the right of a subsequent owner after the introduction of Act, 2008 is salvaged by employing the *non obstante* clause in Section 9. It is further submitted that the right in immovable property is a right *in rem* and is an essential and fundamental principle of Property Law.

32. We have heard the learned counsel for the petitioners Sri. N. Raghuraj, Sri. C. S. Manilal and Sri. Unni K.K and other learned counsel, and Sri. S. Ranjit, learned Special Government Pleader appeared for the State, and perused the pleadings and materials on

record.

33. In our considered opinion, the expression 'owner of a paddy field' specified under the provisions of sections deliberated above, has to be considered in the backdrop of the statement of objects and the reasons discussed above. The State of Kerala, once upon a time, was a self sufficient State in the matter of paddy cultivation, and production of rice for the use of people in the State; however, finding that the cultivation is not feasible, the owners have started cultivation of other crops by filling up the paddy fields, and also started construction of buildings of various categories by developing the paddy fields. Even though the Kerala Land Utilisation Order, 1967 was in force and imperative conditions were incorporated in the said legislation to secure permission from the District Collectors of the concerned Districts to utilise the paddy land for other purposes, it was not an effective one so as to curb the menace of conversion of paddy fields and reclamation of the same.

34. It was in the above backdrop that the State Government has introduced the Act, 2008 on and with effect from 12.08.2008, which Act is extending to the whole of the State of Kerala. The Act has undergone amendments in 2011, 2015, 2016, 2018 and 2020 in order to tackle various situations. In fact, as per the provisions of the Act, 2008, the Local Level Monitoring Committee is empowered to prepare

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 36 :

a data bank of the paddy fields within the respective Panchayats/Municipalities/Corporation. However, later the State felt that some of the properties included in the data bank were already reclaimed and thereupon, a proviso to Section 5(4) was introduced in the Act, 2008 empowering the Revenue Divisional Officer concerned to consider any application for removal of the property from the data bank.

35. Section 27A of the Act was introduced on and with effect from 30.12.2017 and rules were also framed in order to grant permission for change of nature of the unnotified paddy land. The term 'unnotified land' is defined under Section 2(xviiA) of the Act 2008, which reads thus:

"(xviiA) "unnotified land" means the lands within the area of jurisdiction of the Committee which have been included as paddy land or wetland in the basic tax register maintained in Village Offices, but are not notified as paddy land or wetland under sub-section (4) of section 5 or where data bank has not been published under the provisions of clause (i) of sub-section (4) of section 5, the lands which have already been filled up on the date of commencement of this Act and are not paddy land according to the report of the Kerala State Remote Sensing Centre and the Local Level Monitoring Committee or where the report of the Kerala State Remote Sensing Centre is not available, lands which are not paddy land according to the report of the Local Level Monitoring Committee;"

36. Therefore, the regulation intended by the Government in the objects and reasons of the Act is the utilization of the paddy field

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 37 :

already converted for other purposes when the Act came into force, and the intention was to protect and maintain the existing paddy field already included in the data bank and which remained as such when the Act came into force. To cite an example, if the original owner is having an extent of one acre of paddy land in a panchayat area and if he sells the same to 10 persons who are not having any other suitable land for construction of a house, then the purchasers are entitled to make an application seeking reclamation of the land in contemplation of Section 5(3) r/w Section 9 of the Act, 2008 and if that is permitted, successively, the prohibition contained under Section 3 of the Act, 2008 can be easily flouted.

37. The intention of the Act, 2008 has to be taken into account while interpreting the term 'owner' specified in Sections 3, 5(3) and 9 of the Act, 2008. The terminology 'owner' employed under the said provisions of the Act, 2008 has to be given a purposive and literal interpretation, since it is with the object of protecting the paddy fields from being reclaimed and used for other purposes, the Act, 2008 was introduced. In our view, if any other interpretation is given to the word 'owner', it would clearly defeat the natural and ordinary sense intended by the framers of law to it. Therefore, the term 'owner' contained under the provisions would have to be given a strict interpretation insofar as the undertaking of any activity for the

conversion or reclamation of such paddy land is concerned as contemplated under the aforementioned provisions. When we analyse the purport of the Act, we feel that the provisions of the Act are to be read together to assign meaning to the significant terminologies employed in the provisions, failing which we would be doing injustice to the legislative intent to sustain and promote paddy cultivation in the State.

38. Merely because a bit of paddy land is purchased by a person, subsequent to the introduction of the Act, 2008, that will not preclude the purchaser to utilise the paddy field for cultivation of paddy, and in that sense, the purchaser becomes an owner; and there is no prohibition or other inhibitions created under the Act, 2008 detaining the purchaser/owner from carrying on with paddy cultivation. Therefore, the purchaser of a bit of paddy land, subsequent to the introduction of the Act, 2008, would definitely be an owner of a paddy land, but he is not entitled to get the benefit of Section 5(3) r/w Section 9 of the Act, 2008.

39. On a perusal of Section 9(8), it is clear that while making the recommendation, the Local Level Monitoring Committee shall specify that such reclamation shall not adversely affect the ecological conditions and cultivation in the adjoining paddy land; the owner of the paddy land or his family does not own suitable land for the

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 39 :

purpose in that District; and that the building is to be constructed for his own purpose; and such paddy land is not situated surrounded by other paddy lands. So, even for an original owner of paddy land, the permission for reclamation in contemplation of Section 5(3) r/w Section 9 is not absolute, which makes it clear that the provisions of Sections 3, 5(3) and 9 would have to be given the utmost strict interpretation insofar as the 'owner' of the paddy land specified thereunder is concerned.

40. Again, it is clear from Section 9(8)(ii) that the owner of the paddy land, is entitled to secure the benefit of the provision for reclamation, only if the owner or his family does not own a suitable land for the purpose anywhere in the District, which also clearly exposes the strict sense intended by the legislature to the term 'owner seeking reclamation'.

41. Taking into account the above aspects, we are of the considered opinion that the owner of the paddy land who is entitled to seek conversion or reclamation in contemplation of the provisions of Act, 2008, is the owner of the paddy land on the date of coming into force of the Act, 2008 i.e., 12.08.2008.

42. Therefore, we have no hesitation to hold that the decision rendered by the learned single Judges in ***Thankachan, Yousuf Chalil and Sudheesh R*** (supra) that a purchaser of a bit of paddy land after

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 40 :

the coming into force of Act 2008 is not entitled to seek reclamation of the paddy land for construction of a residential building is the correct law, and the judgment of the Division Bench in ***Yousuf Chalil v. State of Kerala and others*** (supra) is not the correct law.

43. Normally, in view of the reference answered as above, the writ petitions ought to have been sent back to the learned single Judge for appropriate consideration. But, as per the documents produced and the pleadings put forth in the writ petitions, it is quite clear and evident that all the petitioners, except the petitioner in W.P.(C) No. 18356 of 2020, are purchasers of a bit of paddy land after the coming into force of the Act, 2008 and therefore, no interference can be made to the order passed by the primary and appellate authorities, and no direction can be given to the primary authority for consideration of the pending applications under Section 5(3) r/w Section 9 of the Act, 2008, and therefore it would not serve any purpose. Therefore, we dismiss all the other writ petitions, in view of the findings rendered above.

44. Insofar as the petitioner in W.P.(C) No. 18356 of 2020 is concerned, she is the beneficiary of a settlement deed executed by and between the legal heirs of a deceased owner of a paddy land. In the light of the law laid down by us as above, it needs to be ascertained as to who was the owner of the land in question as on

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 41 :

12.08.2008 and whether such person satisfied all the stipulations under Sections 5 and 9 of the Act, 2008. As per Section 9(8), it is clear that neither the owner of a paddy land, nor his family shall own a suitable land. In that view of the matter, we are of the opinion that the application submitted by the said writ petitioner can be directed to be reconsidered in accordance with law.

Therefore, the said writ petition is allowed and accordingly, we quash Ext. P5 order dated 08.02.2019 passed by the Local Level Monitoring Committee, and consequently direct the Local Level Monitoring Committee, Thykkattuserry, Alappuzha District, the 2nd respondent therein, to reconsider the application submitted by the petitioner in contemplation of Section 5(3) r/w Section 9 of the Act, 2008, in the light of the law laid down as above.

sd/-

**S. MANIKUMAR,
CHIEF JUSTICE.**

sd/-

**SHAJI P. CHALY,
JUDGE.**

sd/-

**SATHISH NINAN,
JUDGE.**

Rv

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 42 :

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 17301/2020

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

EXHIBIT P1	TRUE COPY OF THE LAND TAX RECEIPT DATED 5.8.2019
EXHIBIT P2	TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT EXTRACT OF DATE BANK.
EXHIBIT P3	TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION DATED 25.05.2020 SUBMITTED BEFORE THE 5TH RESPONDENT.
EXHIBIT P4	THE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE DATED 27.11.2019 ISSUED BY THE VILLAGE OFFICER.
EXHIBIT P5	TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 20.03.2020 IN WP(C) NO. 8983/2020.

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS: NIL

/True Copy/

PS To Judge.

rv

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 43 :

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 17578/2020

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

EXHIBIT P1	TRUE COPY OF THE GIFT DEED NO 1777 OF 2017 DATED 22.7.2017
EXHIBIT P2	TRUE COPY OF THE BASIC TAX RECEIPT DATED 19.5.2019
EXHIBIT P3	TRUE COPY OF THE POSSESSION CERTIFICATE DATED 12.12.2018
EXHIBIT P4	TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE ISSUED BY THE VILLAGE OFFICER DATED 12.12.2018
EXHIBIT P5	TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION FILED BEFORE THE LLMC DATED 15.10.2018
EXHIBIT P6	TRUE COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT DATED 15.10.2018
EXHIBIT P7	TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER ISSUED BY THE AGRICULTURE OFFICER DATED 26.8.2019

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS: NIL

/True Copy/

PS To Judge.

rv

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 44 :

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 17837/2020

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

- | | |
|------------|--|
| EXHIBIT P1 | TRUE COPY OF THE GIFT DEED NO.1226 OF 2017 DATED 14.06.2017. |
| EXHIBIT P2 | TRUE COPY OF THE LAND TAX RECEIPT DATED 23.04.2018. |
| EXHIBIT P3 | TRUE COPY OF THE POSSESSION CERTIFICATE DATED 12.12.2018. |
| EXHIBIT P4 | TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE ISSUED BY THE VILLAGE OFFICER DATED 12.12.2018. |
| EXHIBIT P5 | TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION FILED BEFORE THE LLMC DATED 15.10.2018. |
| EXHIBIT P6 | TRUE COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT DATED 15.10.2018. |
| EXHIBIT P7 | TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER ISSUED BY THE AGRICULTURE OFFICER DATED 26.08.2019. |

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS: NIL

/True Copy/

PS To Judge.

rv

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 45 :

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 18106/2020

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

- EXHIBIT P1 A TRUE COPY OF THE ASSIGNMENT DEED EXECUTED BY M/S. MUHAMMED AND ABDUL LATHEEF IN FAVOUR OF THE PETITIONER AND HIS WIFE DATED 26.2.2018.
- EXHIBIT P2 A TRUE PHOTOGRAPH SHOWING THE LIE AND NATURE.
- EXHIBIT P3 A TRUE COPY OF THE RECEIPT DATED 9.5.2018 ISSUED BY PERUMANNA PANCHAYATH.
- EXHIBIT P4 A TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGES OF THE DATA BANK OF PERUMANNA PANCHAYATH.
- EXHIBIT P5 A TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION MADE BY THE PETITIONER ALONG WITH THE OBSERVATION OF THE 3RD RESPONDENT.
- EXHIBIT P6 A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 29.11.2018 OF THE 2ND RESPONDENT.
- EXHIBIT P7 A TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT OF THIS HONOURABLE COURT IN WPC 3466/2017 DATED 06.06.2017.
- EXHIBIT P8 A TRUE COPY OF THE MEMORANDUM OF APPEAL DATED 29.12.18.
- EXHIBIT P9 A TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT OF THIS HONOURABLE COURT IN WPC 5136/2019 DATED 20.02.2019
- EXHIBIT P10 A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER OF THE 1ST RESPONDENT DATED 16.12.2019.
- EXHIBIT P11 A TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN COC 2531/2019 DATED 17.08.2020.

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS: NIL

/True Copy/

PS To Judge.

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 46 :

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 18356/2020

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT P1	TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE SETTLEMENT DEED BEARING NO. 1671/18 DATED 12-07-2018 OF PANAVALLY SRO.
EXHIBIT P1	TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE LOCATION SKETCH OF THE PROPERTY COVERED BY EXT.P1 SETTLEMENT DEED
EXHIBIT P2	TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE PROPERTY COVERED BY EXT.P1 SETTLEMENT DEED.
EXHIBIT P3	TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE APPLICATION DATED 06-06-2019
EXHIBIT P3	TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE CERTIFICATE DATED 13-05-2019.
EXHIBIT P3	TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE CERTIFICATE DATED 13-05-2019
EXHIBIT P3	TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE CERTIFICATE DATED 20-05-2019.
EXHIBIT P4	TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE REPLY BEARING NO. T.S.Y 13/2019-20 DATED 11-02-2020
EXHIBIT P5	TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE REPLY BEARING NO. T.B(1)/R.T.I/392/2020 DATED 08-02-2020
EXHIBIT P6	TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE JUDGMENT REPORTED IN 2019 KHC 5618
EXHIBIT P7	TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE JUDGMENT REPORTED IN 2020(4) KHC 214.

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS: NIL

/True Copy/

PS To Judge.

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 47 :

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 17837/2020

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

- | | |
|------------|--|
| EXHIBIT P1 | TRUE COPY OF THE GIFT DEED NO.1226 OF 2017 DATED 14.06.2017. |
| EXHIBIT P2 | TRUE COPY OF THE LAND TAX RECEIPT DATED 23.04.2018. |
| EXHIBIT P3 | TRUE COPY OF THE POSSESSION CERTIFICATE DATED 12.12.2018. |
| EXHIBIT P4 | TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE ISSUED BY THE VILLAGE OFFICER DATED 12.12.2018. |
| EXHIBIT P5 | TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION FILED BEFORE THE LLMC DATED 15.10.2018. |
| EXHIBIT P6 | TRUE COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT DATED 15.10.2018. |
| EXHIBIT P7 | TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER ISSUED BY THE AGRICULTURE OFFICER DATED 26.08.2019. |

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS: NIL

/True Copy/

PS To Judge.

rv

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 48 :

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 18106/2020

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

- EXHIBIT P1 A TRUE COPY OF THE ASSIGNMENT DEED EXECUTED BY M/S. MUHAMMED AND ABDUL LATHEEF IN FAVOUR OF THE PETITIONER AND HIS WIFE DATED 26.2.2018.
- EXHIBIT P2 A TRUE PHOTOGRAPH SHOWING THE LIE AND NATURE.
- EXHIBIT P3 A TRUE COPY OF THE RECEIPT DATED 9.5.2018 ISSUED BY PERUMANNA PANCHAYATH.
- EXHIBIT P4 A TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGES OF THE DATA BANK OF PERUMANNA PANCHAYATH.
- EXHIBIT P5 A TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION MADE BY THE PETITIONER ALONG WITH THE OBSERVATION OF THE 3RD RESPONDENT.
- EXHIBIT P6 A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 29.11.2018 OF THE 2ND RESPONDENT.
- EXHIBIT P7 A TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT OF THIS HONOURABLE COURT IN WPC 3466/2017 DATED 06.06.2017.
- EXHIBIT P8 A TRUE COPY OF THE MEMORANDUM OF APPEAL DATED 29.12.18.
- EXHIBIT P9 A TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT OF THIS HONOURABLE COURT IN WPC 5136/2019 DATED 20.02.2019
- EXHIBIT P10 A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER OF THE 1ST RESPONDENT DATED 16.12.2019.
- EXHIBIT P11 A TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN COC 2531/2019 DATED 17.08.2020.

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS: NIL

/True Copy/

PS To Judge.

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 49 :

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 18356/2020

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT P1	TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE SETTLEMENT DEED BEARING NO. 1671/18 DATED 12-07-2018 OF PANAVALLY SRO.
EXHIBIT P1	TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE LOCATION SKETCH OF THE PROPERTY COVERED BY EXT.P1 SETTLEMENT DEED
EXHIBIT P2	TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE PROPERTY COVERED BY EXT.P1 SETTLEMENT DEED.
EXHIBIT P3	TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE APPLICATION DATED 06-06-2019
EXHIBIT P3	TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE CERTIFICATE DATED 13-05-2019.
EXHIBIT P3	TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE CERTIFICATE DATED 13-05-2019
EXHIBIT P3	TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE CERTIFICATE DATED 20-05-2019.
EXHIBIT P4	TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE REPLY BEARING NO. T.S.Y 13/2019-20 DATED 11-02-2020
EXHIBIT P5	TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE REPLY BEARING NO. T.B(1)/R.T.I/392/2020 DATED 08-02-2020
EXHIBIT P6	TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE JUDGMENT REPORTED IN 2019 KHC 5618
EXHIBIT P7	TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE JUDGMENT REPORTED IN 2020(4) KHC 214.

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS: NIL

/True Copy/

PS To Judge.

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 50 :

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 18653/2020

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

- | | |
|------------|--|
| EXHIBIT P1 | TRUE COPY OF SALE DEED NO.585/2017 OF THIRURANGADI SRO. |
| EXHIBIT P2 | TRUE COPY OF LETTER DATED 27.08.2020 ISSUED BY AR NAGAR SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE BANK, AR NAGAR, MALAPPURAM. |
| EXHIBIT P3 | TRUE COPY OF REPORT OF AGRICULTURAL OFFICER AND VILLAGE OFFICER. |
| EXHIBIT P4 | TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT PAGES OF RECOMMENDATION MADE BY 3RD RESPONDENT LLMC ON 08.02.2018. |
| EXHIBIT P5 | TRUE COPY OF ORDER DATED 05.01.2019 ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT. |
| EXHIBIT P6 | TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 27.11.2019 PASSED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT. |

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS: NIL

/True Copy/

PS To Judge.

rv

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 19080/2020

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

- EXHIBIT P1 TRUE COPY OF THE BASIC TAX RECEIPT DATED 19/6/2020 ISSUED BY THE 5TH RESPONDENT.
- EXHIBIT P2 TRUE COPY OF THE POSSESSION CERTIFICATE ISSUED BY 5TH RESPONDENT DATED 8/8/2020.
- EXHIBIT P3 TRUE COPY OF LOCATION SKETCH DATED 1/7/2019 ISSUED BY THE 5TH RESPONDENT.
- EXHIBIT P4 TRUE COPY OF THE RENTAL AGREEMENT DATED 27/5/2020.
- EXHIBIT P5 TRUE COPY OF CERTIFICATE ISSUED BY THE 5TH RESPONDENT DATED 11/8/2018.
- EXHIBIT P6 TRUE COPY OF INTIMATION DATED 12/2/2019 ISSUED BY THE 7TH RESPONDENT TO THE PETITIONER.
- EXHIBIT P7 TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION DATED 3/8/2020 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER TO THE 3RD RESPONDENT IN FORM NO.1 UNDER RULE 5 OF THE KERALA CONSERVATION OF PADDY AND WET LAND RULES, 2008.
- EXHIBIT P8 TRUE COPY OF APPLICATION FORM UNDER SEC. 9 OF THE KERALA CONSERVATION OF PADDY AND WET LAND ACT, 2008 DATED 10/8/2020 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER TO THE 2ND RESPONDENT FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE SAME BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT.
- EXHIBIT P9 TRUE COPY OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT CARD DATED 17/8/20.

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS: NIL

/True Copy/

PS To Judge.

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 52 :

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 22888/2020

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

- | | |
|------------|--|
| EXHIBIT P1 | TRUE COPY OF THE SALE DEED DATED 20-06-2019. |
| EXHIBIT P2 | TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PORTION OF THE BASIC TAX REGISTER. |
| EXHIBIT P3 | TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION OF THE PETITIONER ALONG WITH DECLARATION DATED 23-1-2020. |
| EXHIBIT P4 | TRUE COPY OF THE REPORT OF THE AGRICULTURAL OFFICER DATED NIL. |
| EXHIBIT P5 | TRUE COPY OF THE REPORT OF THE LLMC DATED 30-06-2020. |
| EXHIBIT P6 | TRUE COPY OF THE DECISION OF THE 3RD RESPONDENT DATED 29-07-2020. |
| EXHIBIT P7 | TRUE COPY OF THE CIRCULAR REV/P1/248/2019 DATED 17-2-2020. |
| EXHIBIT P8 | TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN W.P(C) NO 3466/17 DATED 6-6-2017. |

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS: NIL

/True Copy/

PS To Judge.

rv

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 53 :

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 22995/2020

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

- | | |
|------------|---|
| EXHIBIT P1 | TRUE COPY OF THE TAX RECEIPT DATED 7.6.2018 ISSUED IN THE NAME OF THE PETITIONER. |
| EXHIBIT P2 | TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE DATED 15.3.2017 ISSUED FROM THE DISTRICT HOSPITAL, PALAKKAD. |
| EXHIBIT P3 | TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE DATED 21.7.2020 ISSUED FROM THE MATHUR GRAMA PANCHAYAT. |
| EXHIBIT P4 | TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGE OF THE RATION CARD NO.1950024761. |
| EXHIBIT P5 | TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE DATED 21.7.2020 ISSUED BY THE 5TH RESPONDENT. |
| EXHIBIT P6 | TRUE COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION OF THE 4TH RESPONDENT DATED 1.9.2019. |
| EXHIBIT P7 | TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER NO.DCKPD/5070/2018/LRG.I DATED 12.2.2020 ALONG WITH RELEVANT PAGE OF ITS APPENDIX. |

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS: NIL

/True Copy/

PS To Judge.

rv

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 54 :

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 23115/2020

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

- EXHIBIT P1 A TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF SUB COLLECTOR
DATED 1/6/2015.
- EXHIBIT P2 A TRUE COPY OF PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE LAND OF THE
PETITIONER.
- EXHIBIT P3 TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
DATED 28/6/2019.
- EXHIBIT P4 TRUE COPY OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
LOCAL LEVEL MONITORING COMMITTEE, THIRUVALI,
DATED 1/11/2019.
- EXHIBIT P5 A TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDING OF THE DISTRICT
COLLECTOR DATED 26/2/2020.

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS: NIL

/True Copy/

PS To Judge.

rv

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 55 :

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 24264/2020

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

- | | |
|------------|---|
| EXHIBIT P1 | TRUE COPY OF THE TAX RECEIPT DATED 29.8.2019. |
| EXHIBIT P2 | TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT EXTRACT OF THE DATA BANK. |
| EXHIBIT P3 | PHOTOGRAPH OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PETITIONER. |
| EXHIBIT P4 | TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION SUBMITTED BEFORE THE 5TH RESPONDENT DATED 3.9.2020. |
| EXHIBIT P5 | TRUE COPY OF THE ACKNOWLEDGEMENT CARD DATED 6.9.2020. |
| EXHIBIT P6 | TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN WP(C) NO.8983/2020 DATED 20.3.2020. |

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS: NIL

/True Copy/

PS To Judge.

rv

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 56 :

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 24396/2020

PETITIONERS' EXHIBITS:

- EXHIBIT P1 TRUE COPY OF DOCUMENT NO.99/1/18 DATED 10.1.2018 OF SRO, PATTAMBI
- EXHIBIT P2 TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONERS BEFORE THE 3RD RESPONDENT WITH ANNEXURES
- EXHIBIT P3 TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION DATED FILED BY THE PETITIONER TO DELETE THE PROPERTY FROM THE DATA BANK
- EXHIBIT P4 TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONERS BEFORE THE 4TH RESPONDENT DATED 8.2.2019
- EXHIBIT P5 TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN W.P.(C) NO.4503/2019 DATED 14.2.2019.
- EXHIBIT P6 TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE 2ND RESPONDENT WITH REPORT OF THE LOCAL LEVEL MONITORING COMMITTEE DATED 19/7/2019.
- EXHIBIT P7 TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE 1ST RESPONDENT DATED 22.9.2020.

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS: NIL

/True Copy/

PS To Judge.

W.P.(C) No. 17301/2020 & batch : 57 :

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 650/2021

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

- EXHIBIT P1 TRUE COPY OF THE POSSESSION CERTIFICATE DATED 20.05.2019.
- EXHIBIT P2 TRUE COPY OF THE SALE DEED NO. 1204/2017 OF SRO THIRUVALLA.
- EXHIBIT P3 TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE ISSUED BY THE SECRETARY OF KODAMKERY PADASEKHARA SAMITHY.
- EXHIBIT P4 TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION DATED 21.5.2019 SUBMITTED TO THE 4TH RESPONDENT.
- EXHIBIT P5 TRUE COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF THE PETITIONER.
- EXHIBIT P6 TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE ISSUED BY THE VILLAGE OFFICER, PERINGARA DATED 30.04.2019.
- EXHIBIT P7 TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE ISSUED BY THE VILLAGE OFFICER, THEKKEKKARA DATED 29.4.2019.
- EXHIBIT P8 TRUE COPY OF THE LOCATION SKETCH PREPARED BY THE VILLAGE OFFICER, PERINGARA.
- EXHIBIT P9 TRUE COPY OF THE MINUTES DATED NIL OF THE 4TH RESPONDENT.

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS: NIL

/True Copy/

PS To Judge.