



"C.R."

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL K.NARENDRAN

&

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.G. AJITHKUMAR

THURSDAY, THE 14<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2023 / 23TH BHADRA, 1945

W.P. (C) NO. 27754 OF 2019

PETITIONER:

COCHIN DEVASWOM BOARD, REPRESENTED BY ITS  
SECRETARY, COCHIN DEVASWOM BOARD OFFICE,  
ROUND NORTH, THRISSUR-680001.

BY K.P.SUDHEER, STANDING COUNSEL, COCHIN  
DEVASWOM BOARD.

RESPONDENTS:

- 1 UNION OF INDIA, REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,  
MINISTRY OF SURFACE TRANSPORT,  
NEW DELHI-110001.
- 2 STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL  
SECRETARY, REVENUE (DEVASWOM),  
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, SECRETARIAT,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695001.
- 3 THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, ERNAKULAM,  
KOCHI-682030.
- 4 DEPUTY COLLECTOR(LA), ERNAKULAM, KOCHI-682030.
- 5 DISTRICT SURVEY SUPERINTENDENT, ERNAKULAM,  
KOCHI-682021.
- 6 THE SPECIAL TAHSILDAR(LA) GENERAL, ERNAKULAM,  
KOCHI-682030.
- 7 TAHSILDAR, KANAYANNUR TALUK, ERNAKULAM, KOCHI-  
682011.



W.P.(C) No.27754 of 2019

- 8 PROJECT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA, PROJECT OFFICE, VYTTILA, KOCHI-682019.
- 9 CHERANELLOOR GRAMA PANCHAYATH, CHERANELLOOR P O - 682034, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT, REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.
- 10 THE TEMPLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE, CHERANELLOOR BHAGAWATHY TEMPLE, CHERANELLOOR P.O, ERNAKULAM, PIN-682034, REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.

BY ADVS.

R1 BY SRI.S.MANU, DSGI

R2 BY SRI.M.H.HANIL KUMAR, SPECIAL GP (REVENUE)

R3 TO R7 BY SRI.S. RAJMOHAN, SR.GOVERNMENT PLEADER

R8 BY SRI.H.KIRAN

R9 BY T.K.AJITHKUMAR (VALATH)

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR FINAL HEARING ON 07.08.2023, THE COURT ON 14.09.2023 DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

**“C.R.”****JUDGMENT****P.G. Ajithkumar, J.**

The petitioner, Cochin Devaswom Board, is aggrieved by Ext.P14 order of the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent-District Collector, Ernakulam. As per the said order the claim of the petitioner for compensation in relation to 11.364 Ares of land comprised in re-survey No.120/13 of Cheranalloor Village, which was acquired for the construction of four line road connectivity to international Container Transshipment Terminal (ICTT), Vallarpadom was declined. Further, the correction carried out in the Settlement Register as per the order No.DSA.32/06 dated 19.04.2006 was cancelled in Ext.P14. The petitioner therefore filed this Writ Petition invoking the provisions of Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking a writ of certiorari quashing Ext.P14. The petitioner also seeks a declaration that it is entitled to get compensation for the said 11.364 Ares of land and an order directing respondents 2 to 8 to make payment of compensation.



2. The 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent has filed a statement dated 26.10.2019 explaining the facts and details of the proceedings culminating in Ext.P14 order. The 9<sup>th</sup> respondent-Cheranallor Grama Panchayat has filed a counter affidavit claiming that the property in question, which is indisputably a road, vested with the Panchayat by virtue of Section 169(1) of the Kerala Panchayat Raj Act, 1994. But the 9<sup>th</sup> respondent conceded that the said road was not entered in the asset register of the Panchayat.

3. The petitioner has filed a reply affidavit essentially to controvert the claim of the 9<sup>th</sup> respondent that the property in dispute has vested in the Panchayat. Paragraph No. 3 in the reply affidavit is extracted below:-

“3. It is submitted that the allegations in paragraph 3 of the counter affidavit that there was a public road through the property in Sy. No. 120/5 of Cheranallor village and the general public were using the road as a public road is absolutely incorrect and the said statement made by the 9<sup>th</sup> respondent is without any basis and materials. This deponent stoutly denies the said contention raised in paragraph 3 of the counter affidavit. The further allegation in paragraph 3 of the



counter affidavit that the alleged public road vested with the 9<sup>th</sup> respondent under Section 169(1) of the Kerala Panchayat Raj Act, 1994 is absolutely incorrect. The Secretary of the Grama Panchayat who participated in the hearing conducted by the Deputy Collector (Land Acquisition) and Deputy Collector (Land Records) categorically admitted that the Panchayath has no right over the property in question and the registers maintained by the Panchayath would not show that the property belonged to the Panchayath. The aforesaid contention was taken by the 9<sup>th</sup> respondent Grama Panchayath in terms of Exhibit P14 impugned order. The allegation that the Panchayath was maintaining the road and at the time of acquisition respondents 2 and 3 have taken possession of a portion of the public road and constructed the ICTT Road is also absolutely incorrect. It is submitted that the 9<sup>th</sup> respondent issued a communication dated 06.05.2017 to the Devaswom Officer, Chittoor seeking for issuing a no objection certificate for widening the road situates on the western side of the temple. In this regard true copy of the aforementioned letter dated 06.05.2017 issued by the 9<sup>th</sup> respondent to the Devaswom Officer, Chittoor is produced herewith and marked as **Exhibit P20**. It is submitted that the dictum laid down by this Honourable Court in the decision reported in 2015 (2) KLT 768 does not apply to the facts involved in this writ petition."



4. Heard the learned Standing Counsel for the Cochin Devaswom Board, the learned Deputy Solicitor General of India, the learned Special Government Pleader, the learned Standing Counsel for National Highway Authority of India and the learned Standing Counsel for the 9<sup>th</sup> respondent-Cheranallor Grama Panchayat.

5. An extent of 51.76 Hectares of land stretching Mulavukad, Kadamakkudy, Cherannoor and Thrikkakara North Villages was acquired for the construction of a road connecting the ICTT, Vallarpadam. The petitioner would contend that as part of such acquisition 11.364 Ares (28.07 cents) comprised in re-survey No.230/13 in Cheranallor Village belonging to the petitioner was also acquired. This property and its other parts comprised in re-survey No.120/5 was subdivided as survey No.125/5, 120/12 and 120/13 for the purpose of acquisition. The said property of 11.364 Ares is included in re-survey No.120/13. This property was already lying as a road, which has been used for religious purposes. Although the said property was acquired, no compensation



was given to the petitioner and therefore the Temple Advisory Committee of Cheranalloor Bhagavathy Temple approached the learned Ombudsman for the Cochin Devaswom Board. After enquiry the learned Ombudsman submitted report No.124/2012. On the basis of that report this Court initiated D.B.P.No.164 of 2012. Ext.P3 is the said report. Based on the directions in Ext.P3 a claim petition was submitted for getting the compensation for the acquired land. But that claim was not entertained. Therefore, the petitioner filed W.P.(C) No.8323 of 2015 before this Court.

6. D.B.P.No.167 of 2012 and W.P.(C) No.8323 of 2015 were disposed as per Ext.P9. By that judgment the order rejecting the claim petition, Ext.P8 was quashed and the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent was directed to consider the matter afresh. The claim of the petitioner was rejected by the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent as per Ext.P10 order. The petitioner therefore filed W.P.(C) No.34711 of 2018 before this Court and as per the judgment dated 31.10.2018 Ext.P10 order was set aside and the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent was directed to consider the matter again in the



light of the specific contentions taken up by the petitioner in the said Writ Petition. Ext.P11 is the judgment dated 31.10.2018 in the said Writ Petition. The matter was again considered by the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent. The petitioner has submitted an argument note, a copy of which is Ext.P12. The petitioner would allege that the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent, in total disregard of the directions contained in Ext.P11 judgment, rejected the claim of the petitioner and further proceeded to set aside the Order No.DSA.32/06 dated 19.04.2006 as per which the tenure of the property in dispute was altered as Cheranalloor Devaswom land.

7. The petitioner would specifically contend that the acquired property of 11.364 Ares of land comprised in re-survey No.120/13 of Cheranalloor Village, was in old re-survey No. No.81/4 and it belongs to Cheranalloor Bhagavathy Devaswom. When resurvey was conducted, the authorities mistakenly changed the tenure of the said land as puramboke and therefore the petitioner had approached the Revenue authorities for correction of the settlement and the basic tax





register. After necessary enquiry the tenure of the land was corrected by the District Survey Superintendent, thereby restoring the original entry that the said property belonged to Cheranelloor Bhagavathy Devaswom. Banking upon the said aspects, the petitioner is claiming that 11.364 Ares of land in re-survey No.120/13 of Cheranalloor Village belongs to Cheranelloor Devaswom and therefore the petitioner is entitled to get compensation.

8. The claim of the petitioner-Devaswom Board was declined by the Acquisition Authority and the District Collector. In Ext.P7 order of this Court in D.B.P.No.167 of 2012, the District Collector was directed to adjudicate the claim of the petitioner for compensation. The District Collector as per Ext.P8 order rejected the claim. The reasons stated are the following:-

“Though the petitioner (Temple Advisory Committee) had obtained correction in village records in their name through Superintendent of Survey and necessary corrections in the BTR afterwards they did not approach the Land Acquisition Officer with the corrected records till 2012 and they approached the Devaswom Board



Ombudsman only after expiry of 6 years. Still they have not produced any further documents to prove their title and possession on the said property. As the property taken possession was used by common public as public road the Cochin Devaswom Board or Cheranellur Bhagavathy Temple Devaswom is not having any exclusive possession over the property. The land has been developed as National Highway thereafter and is still in the use of the public. Since the property taken possession is tarred road used by the common public, the claimants are not eligible for any compensation as per the LA Act.”

9. The said order was set aside by this Court in Ext.P9 judgment and the District Collector was directed to take a fresh decision in the matter. The District Collector again as per Ext.P10 rejected the claim. Not only that as per Ext.P10 the decision taken by the re-survey authorities to change the tenure of the property as Devaswom’s land was also cancelled. When the petitioner challenged that order in W.P.(C) No.34711 of 2018 this Court directed the District Collector to consider the question once again by setting aside Ext. P10 order. The District Collector in obedience to the direction in Ext.P11, the judgment in W.P.



(C) No.34711 of 2018, considered the matter again but, more or less, a similar order was passed. Ext.P14 is the said order dated 02.08.2019. The reasons for rejecting the claim for compensation and to cancel the change of tenure carried out by the re-survey authorities of the land under acquisition were: the land was lying as a public road, it was tarred by the Cheranalloor Panchayat and has been in the use of the public as of right. Further, it was held that in the re-survey the acquired property was classified as class-2 puramboke. It was also observed that the property vested in the Cheranalloor Panchayat by virtue of the provisions of Section 169(1) of the Panchayat Raj Act.

10. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent by passing Ext.P14 order not only revealed his reluctance to understand the directions contained in Exts.P9 and P11 judgments, but also his inhibition to understand the provisions of the Kerala Survey and Boundaries Act, 1961 and the Kerala Panchayat Raj Act, 1994.



11. The learned Standing Counsel for the 9<sup>th</sup> respondent-Panchayat would submit that since the Panchayat carried out tarring work of the road in question, it vested with the Panchayat by virtue of the provisions of Section 169(1) of the Panchayat Raj Act. The learned Standing Counsel, however, conceded that this road never found a place in the assets register of the Cheranalloor Panchayat. The learned Senior Government Pleader would submit that the designated officers took a decision in the matter following the directions of the Government that no compensation can be granted for the property classified as puramboke or lying as road. The property in question having been classed as puramboke in the revenue records, only option for the officials was to reject the claim. Moreover, the delay in staking the claim by the petitioner for compensation is also pointed out as a reason to reject the claim. It is true that there occurred delay in staking the claim for compensation by the petitioner for the land in question. The effect of the delay shall be dealt with later.



12. Ext.P6 is a copy of the counter-affidavit filed by the project director for the acquisition in question. It is stated in it that 11.364 Ares of land in re-survey No.120/5 of Cheranalloor Village was acquired and the acquired land was subdivided as 120/13 of Cheranalloor Village. It is specifically stated that from the physical site inspection and verification of records maintained by the Superintendent of Survey and Land Records, the said property was found to be a road classed as puramboke. One fact noticed by the said authority was that this road was known as Temple road. On the aforesaid impression, the acquisition authorities proceeded with and declined compensation, treating the property as Government puramboke land lying as a public road.

13. Section 2(vi) of the Kerala Survey and Boundaries Act, 1961 defines "survey". Survey includes all operations incidental to the determination, measurement and record of a boundary or boundaries or any part of a boundary and includes a resurvey. True, it is an inclusive definition. But this definition or any other provision in the Act confers power on



the survey authorities to decide a question regarding title to a property. Section 4 of the Act empowers the Government or, subject to the control of the Government, the officer authorised in this behalf, may by notification in the Gazette, order the survey of any land or of any boundary of any land or of the boundary forming the common limit of any Government land and any registered land. A land owner may under Section 5 of the Act apply for survey of his land on the ground that a portion of his land has been lost by sea erosion or action of river. When a survey is ordered under any of the said provisions, Section 6 of the Act insists on the Survey Officer to publish a notification in the Gazette in the prescribed manner inviting all persons having any interest in the land or in the boundaries of which the survey has been ordered, to attend either in person or by agent at a specified place and time and from time to time thereafter when called upon for the purpose of pointing out boundaries and supplying information in connection therewith.



14. Section 13 of the Kerala Survey and Boundaries Act declares that when the survey of any land or boundary which has been notified under Section 4 or ordered under Section 5 has been completed in accordance with the orders passed under Section 9, Section 10 or Section 11, the Survey Officer shall notify as prescribed therein. Unless the survey so notified is modified by an order of the Collector under Section 13A or is modified by a decree of a Civil Court under the provisions of Section 14, the record of the survey shall be conclusive proof that the boundaries determined and recorded therein have been correctly determined and recorded.

15. Under Section 9 of the Act the Survey Officer has power to determine and record as undisputed any boundary in respect of which no dispute is brought to his notice. As per Section 10 of the Act, where a boundary is disputed, the survey officer shall, after making such inquiries as he considers necessary, determine the boundary and record it in accordance with his decision with reasons in writing for arriving at that decision. Those provisions make it clear that



the powers invested on the Survey Officers as well as the District Collectors under the Act is only to determine the boundaries of the land and not to decide title to the properties. Its corollary is that the survey authorities or the District Collector shall not decide the question of the title based on resurvey records.

16. In **Nandakumar v. District Collector, Ernakulam [2018 (2) KHC 58]**, a Division Bench of this Court observed that land conservancy proceedings cannot be carried out merely based on re-survey records. Entries in re-survey records are predominantly on the basis of possession as of now. They would be totally worthless, when the question is as to whether lands vested in Deities and controlled by the Devaswom Boards or trustees have been encroached upon and reduced to occupation by private persons or other agencies. Obviously, the prior revenue records have to be looked into to ascertain whether there is any parcel which stands vested, in a particular Deity. If that be so, collateral materials will also have to be looked into to ascertain the





genesis of the property. Even if there is no revenue record in that regard, the vesting, if any, in any deity has to be ascertained.

17. Ext.P16 is a copy of the note submitted by the Deputy Collector (L.A.). It was after considering the said note also the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent District Collector issued Ext.P14 order. Ext.P16 report reveals that the property comprised in re-survey No.120/5 originally was in survey No.81/4/1. As per the report name of the owner and possessor of the said property entered in the survey land register was Cheranalloor Devaswom. The report further says that 72 cents of land in old survey No.81/4/1 was Devaswom pathway, which could not be assigned. Further observations in Ext.P16 is that the re-survey authorities would have denoted the property as 'puramboke' since it was lying as a road being used by the public and its tarring work was undertaken by the Panchayat.

18. Ext.P12 is a copy of the argument notes submitted on behalf of the Cochin Devaswom Board before the District Collector in relation to Ext.P14 order. The aforesaid facts



pertaining to the land in question have been pointed out in Ext.P12. Further, copies of Exts.P17, P18 and P19 were produced before the District Collector. Ext.P17 is a copy of Verumpattam chit (lease deed) executed in favour of the Cochin Devaswom Board on 05.09.1951. In the schedule of this document, it has been narrated that the property in old survey No.81/4 is the pathway belonging to the Devaswom. Part of the said land was given on lease, obviously to enjoy and take usufructs from there. Ext.P18 is a copy of a purchase certificate dated 02.03.1976 issued by the Special Tahsildar (LA) No.II, Ernakulam. In its schedule the northern boundary of the property comprised in old survey No.81/3 is shown as Devaswom vaka road. Ext.P19 is a copy of the land register of Cheranelloor Devaswom maintained by the Cochin Devaswom Board. 72 cents of land comprised in old survey No.81/4 is included in it as belonging to Cheranelloor Devaswom. The District Collector did not advert to any of the said evidence produced before him. Without looking into those old documents, which apparently came into being much before



the resurvey, and also other materials the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent reached a conclusion that the said property was vested with the Panchayat. He relied on for that purpose essentially the resurvey records.

19. As pointed out above the survey or resurvey records are no documents of proof of title to a property. Apart from the resurvey records what weighed the District Collector to conclude the property in question is vested with the Panchayat is the claim of the 9<sup>th</sup> respondent-Panchayat that it had undertaken the tarring work of the Temple road. The learned Special Government Pleader would submit in this regard that property in question assumed the character of a road having the potential of being a public utility and in the user of the general public. Along with that its maintenance having been undertaken by the Panchayat, it ceased to have any exclusivity, for the individual interest and it vested in the panchayat under the provisions of Section 169(1) of the Panchayat Raj Act. The learned Special Government Pleader placed reliance on **Mariam Beevi v. Secretary, Athirampuzha**



**Grama Panchayath, Kottayam and others [2015 (2) KLT 768 : 2015 (3) KHC 199]** to fortify his contention. The said decision rendered by a learned Single Judge was affirmed by a Division Bench of this Court in **Mariam Beevi v. Secretary, Athirampuzha Grama Panchayath, Kottayam and others [2017 SCC OnLine Ker.7182]**.

20. In that case the dispute was with respect to a road being maintained by the local authority and included in the asset register of that local authority. While so, a declaration that the road continues to be a private road was sought. Unlike that, here the road in question though its tarring work was done by the 9<sup>th</sup> respondent was never brought to its asset register. The reason is obvious. It is a Temple road and has been in the user of the public, including for the purposes of religious activities. The local authority would have maintained it out of its social obligation. Albeit such maintenance, the road never was brought to the asset register. It being a property of the Deity, by such an overt act of tarring alone, the title of the Deity will not be divested. There shall be a



process known to law, such as acquisition, voluntary transfer, etc. for the Deity to lose its title to a property. In that view of the matter, the law laid down in **Mariam Beevi [2015 (3) KHC 199]** cannot have application to this case.

21. As observed hereinbefore entry in the resurvey and revenue records that the property is a puramboke, obviously, is on the basis of the subjective satisfaction of the authorities concerned. That would not have the effect of losing title of the Devaswom to the property in question. The 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent without understanding the law in the proper perspective took the view in Ext.P14 order that the petitioner does not have right in the road in question thereby cancelling the settlement of it in favour of the Devaswom and denied compensation.

22. As pointed out above, the materials placed on record established that 11.364 Ares of land in re-survey No.120/13, which was acquired, and its other parts originally was in survey No.8/4 of Cheranalloor Village. It belongs to the Cheranelloor Devaswom. It is the absolute obligation of the acquisition authority to give notice to the owner and occupier



of the property in view of the provisions of Section 9(3) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. No such notice was given to the petitioner, as evident from the contentions of the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent itself. It is true that public notice under Section 9(1) of the Land Acquisition Act was published. But, when the acquisition proceedings was completed without giving personal notice to the petitioner, its failure to make a claim for compensation in time cannot be found fault with.

23. In **Manharlal Shivlal Panchal and others v. Deputy Collector and Special Land Acquisition Officers and others [2022 SCC OnLine SC 1707 : 2023 (1) CCC 18]**, the Apex Court considered a question whether on account of the delay, which has sufficient justification, the claim for compensation could be rejected as barred by the law of limitation. Under Section 18(2) of the Land Acquisition Act, a claim has to be made within six months. In that case, the land owner challenged the acquisition, but eventually the challenge was turned down and the property was acquired. In that context, the Apex Court held that reference application



could not have been dismissed as barred by limitation. It is true that the facts of this case are different. But, the infraction of law occurred in the process of acquisition, especially that no notice as contemplated in Section 9(3) of the Land Acquisition Act was given to the petitioner, certainly justifies the delay in staking the claim.

24. Ordinarily this Court in the exercise of its powers under Article 226 of the Constitution of India does not decide a disputed fact involving question of title. But, this is a case where the revenue and acquisition authorities, in our view, decided the matter arbitrarily, in total disregard of the law and in negation of the real facts discernible from the materials placed before them. Despite giving such repeated opportunities, the acquisition authority and the District Collector did not correct the mistake and the claim for compensation by the petitioner was not considered in its proper perspective. In such circumstances, there is no meaning in again directing the District Collector to consider the merits or otherwise of the claim of the petitioner for



compensation. It is especially so when we found that the Cheranelloor Devaswom under the management of the Cochin Devaswom Board is the owner of the land in question and therefore Ext.P14 is liable to be set aside. Accordingly, we hold that the petitioner is entitled to get compensation for 11.364 of land comprised in re-survey No.120/13 of Cheranalloor Village.

25. This Writ Petition is allowed. Ext.P14 order dated 02.08.2019 of the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent is set aside. Respondent Nos.3, 4 and 6 are directed to quantify and pay compensation for the said 11.374 Ares of land comprised in re-survey No.120/13 of Cheranalloor Village to the petitioner within a period of three months from the date of production of a certified copy of this judgment.

**ANIL K. NARENDRAN, JUDGE**

**P.G. AJITHKUMAR, JUDGE**



APPENDIX OF WP(C) 27754/2019

## PETITIONER EXHIBITS

- EXHIBIT P1 TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGE OF THE BASIC TAX REGISTER MAINTAINED BY THE CHERANELLOOR VILLAGE.
- EXHIBIT P2 TRUE COPY OF FILED MAP IN RESPECT OF THE LAND AFTER ACQUISITION.
- EXHIBIT P3 TRUE COPY OF REPORT NO.124/2012 DATED 05.09.2012 IN COMPLAINT NO.187/2012 ON THE FILE OF THIS HON'BLE COURT.
- EXHIBIT P4 TRUE COPY OF ORDER DATED 13.2.2013 IN DBP NO.167/2012 PASSED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT.
- EXHIBIT P5 TRUE COPY OF CLAIM STATEMENT FILED BY THE PETITIONER IN DBP NO.167/2012 BEFORE THIS HON'BLE COURT.
- EXHIBIT P6 TRUE COPY OF COUNTER AFFIDAVIT DATED 30.07.2014 FILED BY THE DEPUTY GENERAL MANAGER OF NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY OF INDIA IN DBP NO.167/2012.
- EXHIBIT P7 TRUE COPY OF ORDER DATED 09.4.2014 IN DBP NO.167/2012 PASSED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT.
- EXHIBIT P8 TRUE COPY OF ORDER DATED 17.10.2014 PASSED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT.
- EXHIBIT P9 TRUE COPY OF JUDGMENT DATED 05.08.2015 IN WRIT PETITION(CIVIL) NO.8323/2015 PASSED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT.
- EXHIBIT P10 TRUE COPY OF ORDER NO.L3-17017/2017 DATED 05.05.2018 ISSUED BY THE THIRD RESPONDENT.



W.P.(C) No.27754 of 2019

- EXHIBIT P11 TRUE COPY OF JUDGMENT DATED 31.10.2018 IN WP(C) NO.34711/2018 PASSED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT.
- EXHIBIT P12 TRUE COPY OF THE ARGUMENT NOTES (WITHOUT DOCUMENTS) SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER ON 6.2.2019 BEFORE THE DEPUTY COLLECTOR (LAND ACQUISITION).
- EXHIBIT P13 TRUE COPY OF NOTICE NO.L3-1/017/17 DATED 16.05.2019 ISSUED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT.
- EXHIBIT P14 TRUE COPY OF ORDER NO.L3-17017/17 DATED 2.8.2019 ISSUED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT.
- EXHIBIT P15 TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGE OF FORM NO.7 CONTAINING THE DETAILS IN THE LAND REGISTER MAINTAINED BY THE REVENUE DEPARTMENT.
- EXHIBIT P16 TRUE COPY OF FILE NOT3 C3-82187/13 DATED 23.05.2017 OF THE 4TH RESPONDENT.
- EXHIBIT P17 TRUE COPY OF VERUMBATTA CHIT EXECUTED IN FAVOUR OF CDB ON 17.09.1951 BY ONE KALLIANI AMMA.
- EXHIBIT P18 TRUE COPY OF PURCHASE CERTIFICATE ISSUED BY THE SPECIAL TAHSILDAR (LR) ERNAKULAM DATED 02.03.1976.
- EXHIBIT P19 TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT PAGE OF TANATHU REGISTER MAINTAINED BY THE CDB.