

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.S.MANIKUMAR

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAJI P.CHALY

TUESDAY, THE 13TH DAY OF JULY 2021 / 22ND ASHADHA, 1943

WP(C) NO. 12219 OF 2021

PETITIONER:

ISACC VARGHESE, STATE PRESIDENT,
ALL KERALA ANTI-CORRUPTION AND HUMAN RIGHTS PROTECTION
COUNCIL, P. B. NO.29, PALAKKAD,
RESIDING AT THANNICKAL HOUSE, HILL VIEW NAGAR,
KANCHIKODE WEST, PALAKKAD-678623.

BY ADV. MANSOOR.B.H.

RESPONDENTS:

- 1 STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY ITS ADDITIONAL CHIEF SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF HOME AFFAIRS, SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN-695001.
- 2 STATE POLICE CHIEF,
POLICE HEAD QUARTERS, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN-695001.
- 3 DEPUTY INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE,
THRISSUR RANGE, OFFICE OF THE D.I.G., THRISSUR-680004.
- 4 STATION HOUSE OFFICER,
KODAKARA POLICE STATION, THRISSUR DISTRICT-680684.

BY SENIOR GOVERNMENT PLEADER SHRI P. NARAYANAN

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 13.07.2021,
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

WP(C):12219/2021

-:2:-

“C.R”

JUDGMENT

Dated this the 13th day of July, 2021

S. Manikumar, CJ

Instant writ petition has been filed with the prayers to issue a writ of mandamus or any other writ order or direction, commanding the 2nd respondent, viz., State Police Chief, Police Headquarters, Thiruvananthapuram, to take action on Exhibit-P3 representation dated 28.05.2021 submitted by the petitioner, seeking effective investigation in Crime No.146/2021 of Kodakara Police Station, and to entrust the investigation to Crime Branch or constitute a Special Investigation Team (SIT), under the supervision of an officer, not below the rank of ADGP.

2. Short facts leading to the filing of the writ petition are, Crime No.146/2021 was registered on the file of Kodakara Police Station under Section 395 of the IPC, in connection with robbery of hawala money, alleged to have been transported from Kozhikode to Kochi, which was meant for election campaigning of a national party in the Kerala Legislative Assembly elections. The crime was registered on the basis of a statement given by one Mr. Shamjeer (the *de facto* complainant), who was the driver of the car, used for the alleged commission of offence. The crux of the prosecution case is that on 3.4.2021, about 4.40 a.m., while the

WP(C):12219/2021

-:3:-

de facto complainant and his friend were travelling in an Ertiga Car, they were waylaid and attacked by a gang, on the Kodakara Flyover, and took away Rs.25 lakhs, including the car. The injured in the above incident has stated to the police that the amount was entrusted by one Mr. Dharmarajan of Kozhikode.

3. Petitioner has further stated that the investigation conducted by the police discloses that the actual amount was more than Rs.25 lakhs and it was a hawala transaction. An amount of Rs.1 Crore and gold ornaments worth Rs.5 lakhs were already recovered by the police from the accused. It is reported that the actual amount could be Rs.3.50 Crores and the money was meant for BJP Assembly Election Campaigning. While the initial complaint was of theft of Rs.25 lakhs, there are allegations that the car was actually carrying cash worth crores of rupees.

4. Petitioner has further stated that during the course of investigation, several office bearers of a national party were summoned and interrogated, but nobody was arrested till date, except the accused involved in the execution of robbery. As per media reports, the investigation team had questioned the BJP State Organizing Secretary Mr. M. Ganesh and other local leaders, but there is no progress, with

WP(C):12219/2021

:-4:-

regard to the source of hawala money and the persons behind the transactions. Petitioner has also stated that there are allegations that the hawala money came from Karnataka and the same was handed over to the candidates during election campaign.

5. The grievance of the petitioner is that though Exhibit-P2 F.I.R was registered, the 3rd respondent has not conducted any investigation in the matter, in order to unearth the entire racket behind the black money transaction. According to the petitioner, the persons involved in the black money transactions are highly influential and the police has not conducted any scientific investigation, such as polygraph and Narco analysis of the suspected persons and has not collected the call detail records of the accused. He also pointed out that hawala money transactions were carried out through a helicopter used for the election campaigning of BJP by its State President.

6. Aggrieved by the alleged faulty investigation, petitioner has preferred Exhibit-P2 complaint before the State Police Chief, Thiruvananthapuram, 2nd respondent, pointing out the involvement of culprits and laches in the investigation. However, no action was taken so far. In such circumstances, he has filed this writ petition.

WP(C):12219/2021

-:5:-

7. In support of the reliefs sought for, petitioner has, *inter alia*, raised the following grounds:

A. The inaction on the part of the 2nd respondent in taking action on Exhibit-P2 complaint is highly illegal and arbitrary, warranting interference of this Court.

B. Facts mentioned in Exhibit-P2 complaint would disclose the shabby investigation conducted by the 3rd respondent.

D. The 3rd respondent has neither questioned the material witnesses nor taken any action, to arrest the actual culprits behind the black money transactions.

E. In the nature of allegations and gravity of offences, a scientific investigation is highly warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case. The persons involved in the black money transactions are highly influential and the police has not conducted any scientific investigations in the matter, such as polygraph and Narco analysis of suspected persons and has not collected the call detail records of the arrested accused.

F. The present investigation lacks proper co-ordination between central agencies, since involvement of central agencies are also required for efficient investigation. There is no co-ordination in the investigation, warranting special investigation under the monitoring of an officer, not below the rank of ADGP, particularly in the context of inter state ramifications.

G. The prevailing corruption in the country seriously impairs the right of the people to live in a corruption free and crime free

society. This is in violation of Article 21 of the Constitution of India. The right to life guaranteed also includes in its fold the right to live in a society, which is free from crime and corruption.

8. On this day, when the matter came up for hearing, on the basis of the instructions received, Mr. P. Narayanan, learned Senior Government Pleader appearing for the respondents, submitted that after considering the facts and circumstances in Crime No.146/2021 on the file of Kodakara Police Station, the Director General of Police & State Police Chief, Kerala, Thiruvananthapuram, has already issued proceedings vide Order No.T5/68497/2021/PHQ, dated 05.05.2021, constituting a Special Investigation Team (SIT), to conduct investigation in Crime No.146/2021 of Kodakara Police Station, Thrissur Rural District, registered under Sections 120(b) and 395 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, on 07.04.2021.

9. Learned Senior Government Pleader further submitted that without verifying as to whether, the respondents have given due consideration to the nature of crime and investigation, and the appropriate orders issued, constituting a Special Investigation Team, as early as on 5.5.2021, the petitioner, claiming himself to be the State President of All Kerala Anti Corruption and Human Rights Protection Council, a State-wide Organisation, having its registered office at Palakkad, has filed the instant

WP(C):12219/2021

:-7:-

writ petition on 6.6.2021 seeking for a direction to the State Police Chief, Thiruvananthapuram (respondent No.2), to take action on Exhibit-P3 representation dated 28.05.2021 for effective investigation in Crime No.146/2021 of Kodakara Police Station, and to entrust the investigation to Crime Branch or constitute a SIT, under the supervision of an officer, not below the rank of ADGP. Hence, he prayed for dismissal of the writ petition.

10. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

11. Proceedings of the Director General of Police and State Police Chief, Kerala, Thiruvananthapuram, vide Order No.T5/68497/2021/PHQ dated 5.5.2021, is extracted hereunder:

"POLICE DEPARTMENT
KERALA

PROCEEDINGS OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE &
STATE POLICE CHIEF, KERALA, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

Sub:- Investigation of Crime No.146/2021 of Kodakara P.S. in Thrissur Rural District, dated 07.04.2021, registered u/s.120(b) and 395 IPC – Constitution of Special Investigation Team - Regarding

ORDER No.T5/68497/2021/PHQ, dated 05.05.2021

In the circumstances reported vide reference cited, a Special Investigation Team (SIT) is constituted to conduct

WP(C):12219/2021

-:8:-

Investigation of the Case in Crime No.146/2021 of Kodakara P.S., in Thrissur Rural District registered u/s.120(b) and 395 IPC on 07.04.2021.

The Special Investigation Team will be headed by Sri.A.Akbar, IPS, DIG, Thrissur Range, with the following members:

Sri. Sojan M.J., SP, CB CU-II, Ernakulam
Sri. E.S.Bijumon, Addl. SP, Kollam Rural
Sri. Raju V.K., Dy.SP, Palakkad
Sri. Joy P., CI, Palakkad South P.S.
Sri. Benny Jacob, CI, Mulamthuruthi P.S., Ernakulam Rural
Sri. Sinoj, SI, Thrissur East P.S.
Sri. Sreejith, SI, Palakkad South P.S.

The SIT will take over the investigation with immediate effect. The SIT is authorized to conduct investigation outside the State also as part of the investigation.

The Dy.SP, Chalakkudy, the present Investigating Officer, is directed to hand over the Case Diary and all other files and related documents to the SIT immediately.

(Loknath Behera IPS)
Director General of Police &
State Police Chief"

12. Acting on the above, the Deputy Inspector General of Police, Thrissur Range, Thrissur, has issued proceedings dated 05.05.2021 and the same is extracted hereunder:

"PROCEEDINGS OF THE DEPUTY INSPECTOR GENERAL OF
POLICE, THRISSUR RANGE, THRISSUR

Present : A. Akbar IPS

WP(C):12219/2021

:-9:-

Sub:- Investigation of Crime No.146/2021 u/s. 120(b), 395 IPC dated 07.04.2021 of Kodakara PS, Thrissur Rural – Designating Sri. V.K.Raju, DySP, Palakkad as the Investigating officer – Orders issued – reg.

Read:- Order No.T5-68497/2021/PHQ dated 05.05.2021

ORDER No.B3-7444/2021/... dated 05.05.2021

As per the Order read above, a Special Investigating Team headed by the undersigned was constituted for conducting investigation of the case in Crime No.146/2021 u/s. 120(b), 395 IPC dated 07.04.2021 of Kodakara PS, Thrissur Rural.

Among the Team Members, Sri. V.K.Raju, DySP, Palakkad Sub Division will be the Investigating officer of the case. Sri. Sojan M.J., SP CBCU II, Ernakulam will personally supervise the day to day investigation of the case and shall submit weekly progress to the undersigned. He will see that all the team members of the SIT are providing necessary support to the Investigating Officer in ensuring fruitful investigation in the case. A comprehensive Plan of Action shall also be made. The I/O is also at liberty to utilize the service of competent police officers/personnel of the Districts of Thrissur Range with the concurrence of the undersigned.

The I/O shall take over the investigation forthwith and complete the same in a time bound manner.

Sd/-
Deputy inspector General of Police,
Thrissur Range, Thrissur.”

13. Petitioner claims himself to be the State President of All Kerala Anti Corruption and Human Rights Protection Council. According to him,

though during the course of investigation, several office bearers of BJP, a political party, were summoned and interrogated, nobody was arrested. It is his further contention that initially, the complaint was registered alleging theft of Rs.25 lakhs, but there are allegations that the car alleged to have been involved in the commission of offence was actually carrying cash worth several crores of rupees. Petitioner has further alleged that though Exhibit-P2 First Information Report was registered on 07.04.2021, the Deputy Inspector General of Police, Thrissur Range, Thrissur, respondent No.3 has not conducted any investigation into the matter. Persons involved in the black money transactions were highly influential and, therefore, police has not arrested any persons.

14. According to the petitioner, as per media reports, the investigation team had questioned some BJP persons, but there is no progress with regard to the hawala money. That apart, police has not collected the call detail records of the accused.

15. Based on the above, learned counsel for the petitioner contended that there is faulty investigation. Merely because certain persons, allegedly belonging to BJP, a national party, were summoned and interrogated, but then nobody was arrested, does not lead to a conclusion

WP(C):12219/2021

:-11:-

that persons summoned should be arrested and that, therefore, there is no progress in the investigation. Arrest depends upon the incriminating material available against those summoned and it is for the Investigating Officer, to consider as to whether, arrest is required or not.

16. Contention of the petitioner that persons involved in the black money transactions are highly influential and that is why police has not conducted scientific investigation in the matter, such as polygraph and Narco analysis, as stated above, cannot be countenanced, for the reason that the said contention is without basis. There is no material to substantiate the abovesaid contention. That apart, the contention that the vehicle involved in the alleged incident was carrying cash worth crores, is also without any basis.

17. Petitioner has also relied on media reports, as stated supra, to contend that the investigation is faulty. In this context, let us consider a few decisions on the aspect of maintainability of a Public Interest Litigation purely based on newspaper reports, as under:

(i) In **Laxmi Raj Shetty and Another v. State of Tamil Nadu** [(1988) 3 SCC 319], at paragraphs 25 and 26, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under:

"25. We cannot take judicial notice of the facts stated in a news item being in the nature of hearsay

secondary evidence, unless proved by evidence aliunde. A report in a newspapers is only hearsay evidence. A newspaper is not one of the documents referred to in Section 78(2) of the Evidence Act, 1872 by which an allegation of fact can be proved. The presumption of genuineness attached under Section 81 of the Evidence Act to a newspapers report cannot be treated as proved of the facts reported therein.

26. It is now well settled that a statement of fact contained in a newspapers is merely hearsay and therefore inadmissible in evidence in the absence of the maker of the statement appearing in Court and deposing to have perceived the fact reported. The accused should have therefore produced the persons in whose presence the seizure of the stolen money from Appellant 2's house at Mangalore was effected or examined the press correspondents in proof of the truth of the contents of the news item. The question as to the admissibility of newspaper reports has been dealt with by this Court in **Samant N. Balakrishna v. George Femandez and Ors.** [(1969) 3 SCR 603]. There the question arose whether Shri George Femandez, the successful candidate returned to Parliament from the Bombay South Parliamentary Constituency had delivered a speech at Shivaji Park attributed to him as reported in the Maratha, a widely circulated Marathi newspaper in Bombay, and it was said:

"A newspaper report without any further proof of what had actually happened through witnesses is of no value. It is at best a second-hand secondary evidence. It is well known that reporters collect information and pass it on to the editor who edits the news item and then publishes it. In this process the truth might get perverted or garbled. Such news items cannot be said to prove themselves although they may be taken into account with other evidence if the other evidence is forcible."

We need not burden the judgment with many citations. There is nothing on record to substantiate the facts as reported in the newspapers showing recovery of the stolen amount from the residence of Appellant 2 at Mangalore. We

have therefore no reason to discard the testimony of PW 50 and the seizure witnesses which go to establish that the amount in question was actually recovered at Madras on the 29th and the 30th as alleged."

(ii) In **S.A. Khan v. Ch. Bhajan Lal and Another** reported in (1993) 3 SCC 151: AIR 1993 SC 1348, at paragraph 22, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under:

"22. In the present case, no evidence has been let in proof of the statement of facts contained in the newspaper report. The absence of any denial by Ch. Bhajan Lal will not absolve the applicant from discharging his obligation of proving the statement of facts as appeared in the Press report. In fact, Ch. Bhajan Lal in his counter affidavit has taken a stand that the statements attributed to him based on the newspaper report are mere hearsay and cannot in law be relied upon for the purpose of initiating such proceedings. Therefore, in the absence of required legal proof, the Court will not be justified in issuing a suo motu notice for contempt of court."

(iii) In **Ravinder Kumar Sharma v. The State of Assam and Ors.**, reported in AIR 1999 SC 3571, at paragraph 25, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under:

"25. Newspaper reports regarding the Central Government decision could not be any basis for the respondents to stop action under the Assam Control Order of 1961. The paper reports do not specifically refer to the Assam Control Order, 1961. In fact, Government of Assam itself was not prepared to act on the newspaper reports, as stated in its wireless message. Section 81 of the Evidence Act was relied upon for the appellant, in this behalf, to say that the newspaper reports were evidence and conveyed the necessary information to one and all including the respondents 2 and 3. But the presumption of genuineness attached under Section 81 to newspaper reports cannot be treated as proof of the facts stated therein. The statements of fact in newspapers are merely hearsay *Laxmi Raj Setty v. State of Tamil Nadu* [1988CriLJ1783]."

(iv) In **Vikas Vashishth v. Allahabad High Court** [(2004) 13 SCC 485], the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under:

"4. At the very outset, we put it to the petitioner that a bare perusal of the petition shows that it is based entirely on newspaper reports and asked him whether before filing the petition he has taken care to verify the facts personally. His answer is in the negative. In the writ petition all the 21 High Courts have been included as respondents and Union of India has also been impleaded as the 22nd respondent. We asked the petitioner what has provoked him to implead all the High Courts as respondents and he states that it is his apprehension that similar incidents may occur in other High Courts though there is no factual foundation for such appreciation.

5. After affording the full opportunity of hearing, we are satisfied that what purports to have been filed as a public interest litigation is nothing more than a "publicity interest litigation". It is writ large that it has been filed without any effort at verifying the facts by the petitioner personally."

(v) In **Rohit Pandey v. Union of India** reported in (2005) 13 SCC 702, Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under:

"1. This petition purporting to be in public interest has been filed by a member of the legal fraternity seeking directions against the respondents to hand over the investigation of the case pertaining to recovery of light machine gun, which is said to have been stolen from the army according to reports published in two newspapers, to the Central Bureau of Investigation for fair investigation to ensure that the real culprits who are behind such theft of army arms and ammunition endangering the integrity and sovereignty of the country may be brought to book and action may be taken against them in accordance with law. The only basis for the petitioner coming to this Court are two newspaper reports dated 25-1-2004, and the other dated 12-2-2004. This petition was immediately filed on 16-2-2004 after the aforesaid second newspaper report appeared. On enquiry from the learned counsel, we have learnt that the petitioner is a young advocate having been

in practice for a year or two. The Union of India, the State of Uttar Pradesh and the Chief Minister of the State of Uttar Pradesh, have been arrayed as party respondents. In the newspaper reports, there is no allegation either against the Union of India or against the Chief Minister.

2. We expect that when such a petition is filed in public interest and particularly by a member of the legal profession, it would be filed with all seriousness and after doing the necessary homework and enquiry. If the petitioner is so public-spirited at such a young age as is so professed, the least one would expect is that an enquiry would be made from the authorities concerned as to the nature of investigation which may be going on before filing a petition that the investigation be conducted by the Central Bureau of Investigation. Admittedly, no such measures were taken by the petitioner. There is nothing in the petition as to what, in fact, prompted the petitioner to approach this Court within two-three days of the second publication dated 12-2-2004, in the newspaper Amar Ujala. Further, the State of Uttar Pradesh had filed its affidavit a year earlier i.e. on 7-10-2004, placing on record the steps taken against the accused persons, including the submission of the charge-sheet before the appropriate court. Despite one year having elapsed after the filing of the affidavit by the Special Secretary to the Home Department of the Government of Uttar Pradesh, nothing seems to have been done by the petitioner. The petitioner has not even controverted what is stated in the affidavit. Ordinarily, we would have dismissed such a misconceived petition with exemplary costs but considering that the petitioner is a young advocate, we feel that the ends of justice would be met and the necessary message conveyed if a token cost of rupees one thousand is imposed on the petitioner "

(vi) In **Holicow Pictures Pvt. Ltd. v. Prem Chandra Mishra and Ors.** reported in (2007) 14 SCC 281, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under:

"18. Courts must do justice by promotion of good faith, and prevent law from crafty invasions. Courts must maintain the

social balance by interfering where necessary for the sake of justice and refuse to interfere where it is against the social interest and public good. (See **State of Maharashtra v. Prabhu** (1995) ILLJ 622 SC, and **Andhra Pradesh State Financial Corporation v. GAR Re-Rolling Mills and Anr.** [1994] 1 SCR 857. No litigant has a right to unlimited draught on the Court time and public money in order to get his affairs settled in the manner as he wishes. Easy access to justice should not be misused as a licence to file misconceived and frivolous petitions. [See **Dr. B.K. Subbarao v. Mr. K. Parasaran** (1996 CriLJ 3983)]. Today people rush to Courts to file cases in profusion under this attractive name of public interest. They must inspire confidence in Courts and among the public.

19. As noted supra, a time has come to weed out the petitions, which though titled as public interest litigations are in essence something else. It is shocking to note that Courts are flooded with large number of so called public interest litigations where even a minuscule percentage can legitimately be called as public interest litigations. Though the parameters of public interest litigation have been indicated by this Court in large number of cases, yet unmindful of the real intentions and objectives, Courts are entertaining such petitions and wasting valuable judicial time which, as noted above, could be otherwise utilized for disposal of genuine cases. It is also noticed that petitions are based on newspaper reports without any attempt to verify their authenticity. As observed by this Court in several cases newspaper reports do not constitute evidence. A petition based on unconfirmed news reports, without verifying their authenticity should not normally be entertained. As noted above, such petitions do not provide any basis for verifying the correctness of statements made and information given in the petition. It would be desirable for the Courts to filter out the frivolous petitions and dismiss them with costs as aforestated so that the message goes in the right direction that petitions filed with oblique motive do not have the approval of the Courts."

WP(C):12219/2021

-:17:-

18. Petitioner has further contended that police has not collected the call detail records of the accused. We are unable to understand as to how, the petitioner could ascertain on Oath, such averments, without any basis.

19. Though the petitioner has contended that as a State President of All Kerala Anti Corruption and Human Rights Protection Council, a State-wide Organisation, and as a responsible person, he has every right to seek for transfer of investigation or to constitute a SIT, petitioner has not chosen to verify as to whether, the police department has considered as to whether the matter required investigation by the local police or to constitute a SIT. Thus, taking note of the circumstances of the case and Crime No.146/2021 of Kodakara Police Station, the Director General of Police and State Police Chief, Kerala, respondent No.3, has constituted a Special Investigation Team along with seven other members, which includes the Deputy Inspector General of Police, Thrissur Range (respondent No.3), and the Superintendent of Police, CBCU-II, Ernakulam.

20. The Director General of Police & State Police Chief, has ordered that the SIT will take over the investigation in Crime No.146/2021 of Kodakara Police Station. That apart, he has also authorised the SIT to

WP(C):12219/2021

-:18:-

conduct investigation outside the State. The Deputy Superintendent of Police, Chalakkudy, Investigating Officer in Crime No.146/2021, has been directed to handover the case diary and all other files and related documents to the SIT.

21. As stated supra, orders have been issued by the Deputy Inspector General of Police, Thrissur Range, Thrissur. Without ascertaining the abovesaid factual details, petitioner, claiming to be the State President of All Kerala Anti Corruption and Human Rights Protection Council, has filed the instant writ petition on 9.6.2021 i.e., one month after the date of issuance of the proceedings dated 05.05.2021. Petitioner has not made any verification about the course of investigation, but made bald averments in the writ petition.

22. On a consideration of the entire facts and circumstances, we are of the view that the instant writ petition, filed without ascertaining the truth, and the factum of change of investigation, to be done by the SIT, is liable to be dismissed with costs. In this context, let us consider the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Indian Council for Enviro-Legal Action v. Union of India (UOI) and Ors.** [(2011) 8 SCC 161], wherein, at paragraphs 191 & 192, it was observed as under:

"191. In consonance with the principles of equity, justice and good conscience, Judges should ensure that the legal process is not abused by the litigants, in any manner. The court should never permit a litigant to perpetuate illegality by abusing the legal process. It is the bounden duty of the court to ensure that dishonesty and any attempt to abuse the legal process must be effectively curbed and the court must ensure that there is no wrongful, unauthorized or unjust gain for anyone by the abuse of the process of the court. One way to curb this tendency is to impose realistic costs, which the respondent or the defendant has, in fact, incurred, in order to defend himself in the legal proceedings. The courts would be fully justified even imposing punitive costs where legal process has been abused. No one should be permitted to use the judicial process for earning undeserved gains or unjust profits. The court must effectively discourage fraudulent, unscrupulous and dishonest litigation.

192. The court's constant endeavour must be to ensure that everyone gets just and fair treatment. The court while rendering justice must adopt a pragmatic approach and in appropriate cases, realistic costs and compensation be ordered, in order to discourage dishonest litigation. The object and true meaning of the concept of restitution cannot be achieved or accomplished unless the courts adopt a pragmatic approach in dealing with the cases."

23. Accordingly, we dismiss the writ petition imposing Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) as costs, to be deposited in the Account No.3922992468-4 of State Bank of India, Trivandrum City (70028), P. B.

WP(C):12219/2021

-:20:-

No.22, M. G. Road, Statue - 695001, created for providing financial aid to the children in the State of Kerala, suffering from rare diseases, within one month from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this judgment, failing which, the 2nd respondent/State Police Chief, is directed to address the District Collector, Thrissur, to take action under the provisions of the Kerala Revenue Recovery Act, 1968. The directions issued above shall be implemented.

Pending interlocutory applications, if any, shall stand dismissed.

Sd/-
S. Manikumar
Chief Justice

Sd/-
Shaji P. Chaly
Judge

vpv & krj

WP(C):12219/2021

:-21:-

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

- | | |
|------------|--|
| Exhibit P1 | COPY OF THE REGISTRATION CERTIFICATE BEARING NO.CA 597/2006 ISSUED BY THE SOCIETIES REGISTRAR, PALAKKAD ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF EXT.P1. |
| Exhibit P2 | COPY OF THE F.I.R IN CRIME NO.146/2021 OF KODAKARA POLICE STATION, ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF EXT.P2. |
| Exhibit P3 | COPY OF THE G-MAIL COMPLAINT SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER DATED 28.05.2021 AND ITS ACKNOWLEDGMENT RECEIPT, ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF EXT.P3. |

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS:- 'NIL'

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO C.J.