



INDIAN LAW REPORTS

KERALA SERIES

INDEX TO I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

NOMINAL INDEX		<i>Pages</i>
Abraham, K. K.	v. State of Kerala ..	341
Abdul Gafoor	v. S.I. of Police, Kottakkal ..	449
Ajith, K. N.	v. State of Kerala ..	962
Akbar, A.	v. State of Kerala ..	875
Ali, K.B.	v. Sree Sankaracharya University of Sanskrit ..	347
Ambika, M.P.	v. Chief Engineer ..	186
Anitha Rajan	v. R.D.O. ..	191
Antony	v. Padmavathy Amma ..	31
Anwar M. Easa	v. District Collector ..	515
Assistant Commissioner (Assessment)	v. M/s Martin & Harris Pvt. Ltd. ..	827
Ayakali Nadar S. K. Sons	v. P.K. Sivasankara Pillai ..	202
Balachandran, S.	v. State of Kerala ..	230
Balagopalan, P. K.	v. Dy. General Manager ..	829
Beena Kannan	v. Mathew, K.J. ..	250
Belsi.M.	v. Corporate Management of Latin Catholic Schools (F.B.) ..	256
Belsi, M.	v. Corporate Management of Latin Catholic Schools ..	269
Bency, N. L.	v. Dr. Preceline George ..	880
Bhagyalakshmy, P.	v. Secretary, R.T.A. Palakkad ..	560
Bhaskaran, P. R.	v. State of Kerala ..	741
Brihaspathi	v. Ramadasan ..	511
Chamber of Commerce	v. State of Kerala ..	542
Cheranalloor Service Co-operative Bank Ltd.	v. K. A. Alfred ..	267
Chief of Air Staff	v. Augustian, P. A. ..	613
Cochin Stock Exchange Ltd.	v. Dhanalakshmi Bank Ltd. ..	337
Commissioner for Workmen's Compensation, Thiruvananthapuram	v. ..	765
Daji Tomy	v. Transport Commissioner ..	461
Damodar S. Prabhu	v. Sayed Babalai, H.(S.C.) ..	577

Devan, S.	v.	Krishna Menon, C.	..	312
Dharmadom Paristhithi Samrakshna Samithi	v.	Dharmadom Grama Panchayath	..	547
Divakaran, T. V.	v.	State of Kerala	..	819
Dr. K.A.Koshy	v.	State of Kerala	..	481
Dr. M.I. Itty	v.	Kerala Financial Corporation	..	289
Dr. P. Pookunhi Koya	v.	Muhammed Hamdullah Sayed	..	680
Dr. Saiful Islam, A.	v.	University of Kerala	..	240
Dr. VellayaniArjunan	v.	The Enforcement Officer	..	282
Easwaran Namboodiri, V. G.	v.	Travancore Devaswom Board	..	588
General Manager, Telecom	v.	M. Krishnan (S.C.)	..	1
General Secretary	v.	Deputy General Manager	..	328
George, M. I.	v.	High Court of Kerala	..	213
George, V. J.	v.	George, V.V.	..	517
Hariharan, N.	v.	Haneesa Beevi. N.	..	411
Haseena Mansoor	v.	State of Kerala	..	891
HLL Lifecare Ltd.	v.	Hindustan Latex Labour Union	..	179
Indulekha	v.	Preethakumari	..	468
Ishaque, K. P.	v.	Raveendran Thampan	..	416
Janardhanan	v.	Rugmini	..	933
Jaya, K. P.	v.	Dr. C. S. Suchit	..	111
Jayadev Singh, A. K.	v.	M. A. Majeeth	..	882
Jelton, K. A.	v.	Superintending Engineer	..	938
John, G.	v.	Alosious	..	870
Joint Registrar of Co-operative Societies	v.	R. Gopalakrishna Pillai	..	403
Joseph, C. C.	v.	K.S.E.B.	..	208
Kanakamma	v.	B.Banerjee Babu	..	566
Karunakaran, K. P.	v.	K.V. ChandranPanikkar	..	275
Kunhumammed	v.	Ayishakutty	..	140
K.V.R. Auto Cars Pvt. Ltd.	v.	State of Kerala	..	956
Leelamma, P. D.	v.	Managing Committee, Perumanna Grama Panchayath	..	73
Leena, O. K.	v.	State	..	823
Low Heat Driers (P) Ltd.	v.	Biju George	..	703
Madhavan, K. B.	v.	Sub Registrar, Ernakulam	..	552
Manager, MDPS UP School	v.	Paulose, E.A. (F.B.)	..	89
Maya, S.	v.	State of Kerala	..	135
Mohammed Basheer, K. P.	v.	Deputy General Manager	..	393
Mohammed Riyas, P. A.	v.	Raghavan, M. K.	..	643
Mohammed, T.A.	v.	State of Kerala	..	356
M/s Crompton Greaves Ltd.	v.	M/s Navaneeth Hotels Pvt. Ltd.	..	534
M/s Panopharam	v.	Union of India	..	901
M/s Radha Picture Palace	v.	Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax	..	929
Muhammad Rafeeq	v.	BankofBaroda	..	815
Murukeshan	v.	State of Kerala	..	663
Narayanan, K. I.	v.	State of Kerala	..	3
Prabhakaran	v.	Sajini	..	465
Pradeep Kumar, P. R.	v.	Chengannur Municipality	..	942
Prasad Jacob	v.	State of Kerala	..	633
Principal, St. Joseph College of Communication	v.	CDRF	..	977
Pulkuzhiyil Mohammedkutty	v.	Pookkottil Sadanandan	..	217
Puthenpurayil Rajan	v.	Motheri Dileep Kumar	..	500

Qualified Private Medical Practitioners' Association	v.	State of Kerala	..	306
Radhamany	v.	State of Kerala (F.B.)	..	380
Ragesh, P. K.	v.	State of Kerala	..	172
Rajagopal, B.	v.	Jolly Xavier	..	117
Rajan, A.	v.	T. K. Kumari Kamalam	..	810
Rajilal, V.G.	v.	State of Kerala	..	794
Ramachandran Master, K. K.	v.	Dr. K. Jyothilal	..	23
Rappai, N.L.	v.	Pushpam @ Kochuthressia	..	973
Reena, R. P.	v.	Geena, R.S.(F.B.)	..	8
Reliance Telecommunications Ltd.	v.	S.I. of Police (F.B.)	..	592
Sajan Varghese	v.	K.S.E.D.C.Ltd.	..	362
Santhosh @ Rajeevan	v.	State of Kerala	..	455
Sarala Baby	v.	State of Kerala	..	224
Secretary, Cannanore District Muslim Educational Association	v.	State of Kerala (S.C.)	..	753
Sheshambal (Died) through L.Rs.	v.	M/s Chelur Corporation (S.C.)	..	79
Shybimon	v.	Haridas	..	442
Siva Prasad S. Shenoy	v.	State of Kerala	..	168
Snehasagar Charitable Trust	v.		..	738
Somasekharan Nair	v.	C.K. Divakaran Pillai	..	798
South Indian Bank Ltd.	v.	Labour Court	..	237
Sreyams Kumar, M. V.	v.	State of Kerala	..	845
State of Kerala	v.	Illath Narayanan	..	58
State of Kerala	v.	Valsamma	..	12
State of Kerala	v.	Raveendran Pillai, V. S. (F.B.)	..	106
State of Kerala	v.	Jose	..	491
State of Kerala	v.	Komalam	..	407
State of Kerala	v.	Ritha Thomas	..	495
State of Kerala	v.	M/s Seven Star Hotel	..	627
State of Kerala	v.	K. S. Distillery	..	885
State of Kerala	v.	Sushama Kumari	..	838
The Accounts Officer (Pension Sanction)	v.	K. J. Mariyamma	..	919
The Trivandrum Golf Club	v.	State of Kerala	..	768
Trivandrum Golf Club	v.	State of Kerala	..	47
Union of India	v.	P. N. Natarajan (S.C.)	..	371
Valanchery Grama Panchayat	v.	State of Kerala	..	199
Valappil Azeez	v.	Moidu	..	537
Venu, T. D.	v.	Commissioner of Excise	..	624
Vijayan	v.	State of Kerala	..	979

INDEX TO NOTIFICATIONS, JOURNALS, SPEECHES

Journal

Judicial Independence and Accountability .. i - vi

Notification

The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 .. i - xviii

Speech

Full Court Reference held in the High Court of Kerala on 9th April, 2010 on the occasion of the retirement of Hon'ble Mr. Justice K. Balakrishnan Nair, Judge, High Court of Kerala .. i -viii

Full Court Reference held in the High Court of Kerala on 13th May, 2010 on the occasion of the retirement of Hon'ble Mr. Justice P. R. Raman, Judge, High Court of Kerala .. ix - xvi

INDEX TO ACTS AND RULES (Central & Kerala)

ACTS

Central

1860—Act 45 of 1860— Penal Code		
Section 499 <i>See</i>	..	442
Sections 153 A and 295A <i>See</i>	..	633
Sections 279,337,304A <i>See</i>	..	979
1872—Act 9 of 1872—Contract Act		
Sections 134 and 140 <i>See</i>	..	289
1881—Act 26 of 1881—Negotiable Instruments Act		
Section 138 <i>See</i>	..	312
Section 138 <i>See</i>	..	577
Section 138 <i>See</i>	..	870
Section 141 <i>See</i>	..	577
1882—Act 5 of 1882—Easements Act		
Chapter VI <i>See</i>	..	768
1882—Act 2 of 18 82—Trusts Act		
Section 34 <i>See</i>	..	738
1894—Act 1 of 1894—Land Acquisition Act		
Section 23(1 A), Explanation <i>See</i>	..	230
Section 23(1 A) <i>See</i>	..	491
1894—Act 1 of 1894—Land Acquisition Act		
Section 18 <i>See</i>	..	838
1908—Act 5 of 1908—Code of Civil Procedure		
Section 80 (2) <i>See</i>	..	47
Section 115 <i>See</i>	..	47
Order XXXIX, Rule 1 <i>See</i>	..	31
Section 60 <i>See</i>	..	337
Order XI, Rule 21 <i>See</i>	..	465
Section 16 (d) <i>See</i>	..	534
Order 37, Rule 4 <i>See</i>	..	537
Section 11 <i>See</i>	..	768
Order 41, Rule 27 <i>See</i>	..	768
Order 41 <i>See</i>	..	823
Section 51 <i>See</i>	..	882
1908—Act 16 of 1908—Registration Act		
Section 17 (1)(b) <i>See</i>	..	517
1910—Act 9 of 1910—Telegraph Act		
Section 10 <i>See</i>	..	962
1932—Act 9 of 1932—Partnership Act		
Section 14 <i>See</i>	..	517

Section 48 <i>See</i>	..	973
1937—Act 26 of 1937—Muslim Personal Law (Shariat) Application Act	..	140
1940—Act 23 of 1940—Drugs and Cosmetics Act		
Section 18 (c) <i>See</i>	..	306
1947—Act 14 of 1947—Industrial Disputes Act		
Section 18 <i>See</i>	..	208
Section 33 (3) <i>See</i>	..	179
Section 15 <i>See</i>	..	237
Section 18 <i>See</i>	..	371
1950—Act 43 of 1950—Representation of the People Act		
Section 31 <i>See</i>	..	172
Section 32 <i>See</i>	..	172
1951 —Act 43 of 1951 —Representation of the People Act		
Section 123 (4) <i>See</i>	..	643
Sections 123,123(1) (A) <i>See</i>	..	680
Sections 123 (3), 123(4) <i>See</i>	..	680
1952—Act 19 of 1952—Employees Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act		
Section 14(1 A) <i>See</i>	..	282
1954—Act 37 of 1954—Prevention of Food Adulteration Act		
Section 20 A <i>See</i>	..	202
1955—Act 25 of 1955—Hindu Marriage Act		
Section 13B <i>See</i>	..	794
1956—Act 30 of 1956—Hindu Succession Act		
Section 23 <i>See</i>	..	933
1961—Act 43 of 1961—Income Tax Act		
Sections 144(1), 148(1) and 184(5) <i>See</i>	..	929
1961—Service—Pension Regulations for the Air force—Regulation 153 and Rule 1 of Appendix II <i>See</i>	..	613
1963—Act 36 of 1963—Limitation Act		
Section 19, Articles 1 and 14 <i>See</i>	..	362
Sections 18 and 19 <i>See</i>	..	566
1970—Act39 of 1970—Patents Act <i>See</i>	..	703
Section 2 (j) <i>See</i>	..	703
Section 108 <i>See</i>	..	703
1973—Act 2 of 1974—Code of Criminal Procedure		
Section 125 <i>See</i>	..	140
Section 190 <i>See</i>	..	172

Section 386 <i>See</i>	..	455
Section 386 (b) <i>See</i>	..	416
Section 386 (e) <i>See</i>	..	416
Sections 397 and 401 <i>See</i>	..	416
Section 438 <i>See</i> .. 481		
Section 397 (2) <i>See</i>	..	633
Section 156 (3) <i>See</i>	..	880
Sections 216,397 and 482 <i>See</i>	..	875
1985—Act 61 of 1985—Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act Sections 2 (xxiii a), 21 and 36 (A)(a) <i>See</i>	..	449
1986—Act 68 of 1986—Consumer Protection Act		
Sections 2 (d) and 3 <i>See</i>	..	1
Section 13 (3B) <i>See</i>	..	250
Section 2 (d) <i>See</i>	..	977
1988—Act 59 of 1988—Motor Vehicles Act		
Section 90 <i>See</i>	..	461
Section 167 <i>See</i>	..	765
2002—Act 54 of 2002—Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act		
Section 31(1) <i>See</i>	..	393
Section 35 <i>See</i>	..	815
2005—Act 39 of 2005—Hindu Succession (Amendment) Act		
Section 6 <i>See</i>	..	933
2008—Act 2 of 2009—The Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) (Union Territories) Order (Amendment) Act		
Section 2 <i>See</i>	..	680

Kerala

1959—Act 10 of 1960—Court Fees and Suits Valuation Act Section 59 <i>See</i>	..	341
1959-Act 17 of 1959—Stamp Act		
Section 18(1) and (2) <i>See</i>	..	191
Sections 18(1), 31 and 32 <i>See</i>	..	191
1960—Act 32 of 1960—Panchayats Act		
Section 179 (4) <i>See</i>	..	73
1963—Act 15 of 1963—General Sales Tax Act		
Section 17(3) <i>See</i>	..	627
Section 23 (B) (4), (7) <i>See</i>	..	827
1963—Act 1 of 1964—Land Reforms Act		
Section 72 K (2) <i>See</i>	..	810
1965—Act 2 of 1965—Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act		
Section 11 (3) <i>See</i>	..	79

Section 11 (3) 1st Proviso <i>See</i>	..	500
Section 11 (9) <i>See</i>	..	511
1968—Act 15 of 1968—Revenue Recovery Act <i>See</i>	..	515
1975—Act 7 of 1975—Building Tax Act		
Section 3 (1)(b) <i>See</i>	..	956
1994—Act 14 of 1994—Local Fund Audit Act		
Section 9 (2) <i>See</i>	..	3
1994—Act 13 of 1994—PanchayatRaj Act		
Section 161 (7) <i>See</i>	..	199
Section 34 (1)0) <i>See</i>	..	275
Section 52(1 A) <i>See</i>	..	275
Section 102 (1)(ca) <i>See</i>	..	275
Sections 35, 100, 101 and 107 <i>See</i>	..	217
Section 149 (3) <i>See</i>	..	217
Section 102 <i>See</i>	..	468
Section 185 B <i>See</i>	..	547
Section 34 (1)(g) <i>See</i>	..	798
Section 34 (1)0) <i>See</i>	..	798
Section 102 (1) (ca) and Section 52 (2A) <i>See</i>	..	798
1994—Act 20 of 1994—Municipality Act		
Section 270(1)(ii) <i>See</i>	..	552
Sections 19 and 93 (2) <i>See</i>	..	942
Section 93 (2) <i>See</i>	..	942
1999—Act 8 of 1999—Lok Ayukta Act		
Section 9 (5) <i>See</i>	..	23
RULES		
Central		
1989—Motor Vehicles Rules		
Rule 56 <i>See</i>	..	560
Kerala		
1953—Foreign Liquor Rules		
Rule 13 <i>See</i>	..	106
1958—State and Subordinate Services Rules		
Rule 14 (c) <i>See</i>	..	347
1959—Education Rules		
Chapter XIV A, Rule 45 <i>See</i>	..	89
Chapter XIV A, Rule 51A <i>See</i>	..	135
Chapter VI, Rule 3 <i>See</i>	..	495
1959—Service Rules		
Part III, Rule 118, Note I (i) (a) <i>See</i>	..	891
Part I, Rule 7 <i>See</i>	..	919

Part III, Rules 71,90(6) <i>See</i>	..	919
1968—Distillery and Warehouse Rules		
Rule 55 (4) <i>See</i>	..	885
1969—Co-operative Societies Rules		
Rule 44(1)(b) <i>See</i>	..	403
Rule 185 (2) (prior to amendment) <i>See</i>	..	411
1974—Excise and Prohibition Subordinate Service Rules		
Rules 1,2 and 8 <i>See</i>	..	819
1979—Rules Regarding Conditions of Service of Travancore Devaswom Board Establishment Employees		
Rule 8 (3) <i>See</i>	..	588
1981—Head Load Workers Rules		
Rules 17 and 27 <i>See</i>	..	542
1982—Criminal Rules of Practice <i>See</i>	..	875
Rule 131 <i>See</i>	..	380
2002—Abkari Shops Disposal Rules		
Rule 5(1) (a) <i>See</i>	..	407
Rule 7 (2) <i>See</i>	..	624
2008—Registration of Marriages (Common) Rules		
Rules 8,9 and 11 <i>See</i>	..	224
2009—Land Assignment Amendment Rules		
Rules 7 and 8 <i>See</i>	..	741
Regulations		
1976—Syndicate Bank Officer Employees' (Discipline and Appeal) Regulations		
Regulation 6 (12) and (13) <i>See</i>	..	829
1994—Lakshadweep Panchayaths Regulation		
Clause 3 (1)(d) <i>See</i>	..	680
Statute		
1977—Kerala University First Statutes		
Chapter 19, Statute 4 (8) <i>See</i>	..	240

SUBJECT INDEX

- Abkari Shops Disposal Rules, 2002 (Kerala)**—*Rule 5(l)(a)*—*Criminal Prosecution under Section 57 (a) stayed by the orders of the Supreme Court—The applicant cannot claim preference under Rule 5(1)(a)—Abkari Act, 1077 (Kerala Act 1 of 1077)—Section 57(a).*
- State of Kerala v. Komalam I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 407
- Abkari Shops Disposal Rules, 2002 (Kerala)**—*Rule 7(2)*—*The 2nd proviso to Rule 7(2) will be applicable to those shops which were licensed and had functioned in the same premises in the preceding years—It is not necessary that the shop had functioned in the same premises during the immediate preceding year.*
- Venu, T. D. v. Commissioner of Excise I.L.R.2010(2) Kerala .. 624
- Administrative Law**—*'Audi alteram partem'* —*The employer cannot revise terminal benefits payable to employees without giving the affected parties an opportunity of being heard—Food Corporations of India Act, 1964 (Central Act 37 of 1964)—Section 12A (4)(a) and (b) and 12A(4)(c).*
- Union of India v. P. N. Natarajan (S.C.) I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 371
- Administrative Law**—*Colourable exercise of power—Once custodian of power is influenced in its exercise, by considerations other than the purposes for which the power is vested, such exercise of power becomes a colourable exercise.*
- Pradeep Kumar, P. R. v. Chengannur Municipality and others
I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 942
- Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act, 1965(Kerala Act 2 of 1965)**—*Section 11(3)—Subsequent event, after filing of the Rent Control Petition, can be taken into consideration for deciding as to whether the bonafide need, still subsists—Eviction sought on the ground of personal requirement of the landlords—Rent Control Petitioners (landlords) died during the pendency of the proceedings—Legal Heirs not dependent on the landlords and living separately—The personal requirement of the landlords for the demised premises became extinct upon their death.*
- Sheshambal (Died) through L.Rs. v. M/s Chelur Corporation (S.C.)
ILR. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 79
- Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act, 1965 (Kerala Act 2 of 1965)**—*Section 11 (3) 1st Proviso—What is contemplated by the statute is ownership and possession by the landlord over another building and not over vacant land—Possession of vacant plot is no bar to claim eviction under Section 11 (3).*
- Puthenpurayil Rajan v. Motheri Dileep Kumar I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 500

Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act, 1965 (Kerala Act 2 of 1965)— <i>Section 11(9)— Even if notice is caused to be issued prior to the expiry of the specified period of the lease, the bar under Section 11(9) will not be attracted if the application before the Rent Control Court is filed after the expiry of the specified period of the lease.</i>		
Brihaspathi v. Ramadasan I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	511
Building Tax Act, 1975 (Kerala Act 7 of 1975)—Section 3 (I) (b)— <i>Exemption-Factory as defined under Section 2(m) of the Factories Act is entitled for exemption from the purview of the Act.</i>		
K. V. R. Auto Cars Pvt. Ltd. v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	956
Civil Law—Law of Torts—Suit for Compensation filed on the allegation of negligence by the Doctor who performed laparoscopic sterilization operation—Burden is on the claimant to prove that he had suffered damage due to the questionable and negligent act.		
State of Kerala v. Illath Narayanan I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	58
Civil Law—The Principles of "Res Ipsa Loquitur" is not automatically attracted in every case of medical negligence—Application of the Principles of Res Ipsa Loquitur in case of medical negligence—When attracted—Explained.		
State of Kerala v. Illath Narayanan I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	58
Civil Law—The rights of the parties to the suit stand crystallized on the date of the institution of the suit and therefore the decree in a suit should normally accord with the rights of the parties as they existed at the commencement of the Us.		
Antony v. Padmavathy Amma I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	31
Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)—Section 80(2)— <i>While considering an application for grant of Leave under Section 80(2) of the C.P.C., it is not the merit of the case that has to be considered—The court will have to consider only whether the suit is one to obtain an emergent relief.</i>		
Trivandrum Golf Club v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	47
Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)—Section 115— <i>Suit against Government—Return of Plaint consequent to refusal to grant leave under Section 80(2) C.P.C.—In the decision of the court declining leave there is a finality or cessation of proceedings before the institution of the suit—Revision against such an order is maintainable—Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)—Section 80(2).</i>		
Trivandrum Golf Club v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	47

- Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)**—*Order XXXIX, Rule 1—Construction of compound wall by successfully preempting the passing of a prohibitory order and in violation of the order of status quo passed by the Court—Court can order removal of the compound wall by passing an interim mandatory injunction.*
- Antony v. Padmavathy Amma I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 31
- Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)**—*Section 60—Saleable property of Judgment-debtor—Membership Card in Cochin Stock Exchange is not a saleable property of Judgment-debtor—Membership card is a personal privilege and it is not a property—Bank cannot execute money decree by sale of membership card.*
- Cochin Stock Exchange Ltd. v. Dhanalakshmi Bank Ltd.
I.L.R. 2010(2) Kerala .. 337
- Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)**—*Order XI, Rule 21—For the mere failure on part of the party who had been directed to answer interrogatories, Court cannot pass an order to strike out his defence—Court has to examine whether there was obstinacy amounting to wilful and deliberate non compliance of its order which warrants striking of his defence.*
- Prabhakaran v. Sajini I.L.R.2010(2)Kerala .. 465
- Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)**—*Section 16(d)—For determination of any right or interest with respect to immovable property, the suit should be instituted in the court where the subject-matter is situated—The parties to the dispute cannot agree to provide jurisdiction on a court where the property covered by the contract is not situated.*
- M/s.Crompton Greaves Ltd. v. M/s Navaneeth Hotels Pvt. Ltd.
I.L.R. 2010(2)Kerala .. 534
- Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)**—*Order 37, Rule 4—The defendant, in an application under Order 37, Rule 4 should not only show sufficient cause for his non-appearance but should also disclose the grounds on which he was entitled to defend the suit.*
- Valappil Azeez v. Moidu I.L.R.2010(2)Kerala .. 537
- Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)**—*Section 11—Resjudicata— The Principle of constructive resjudicata is applicable to the decisions rendered in writ petitions also.*
- The Trivandrum Golf Club v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 768

Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)—Order 41, Rule 27— <i>Additional evidence can be resorted to by the appellate court, only if it is deemed necessary, after examination of the evidence on record.</i>		
The Trivandrum Golf Club v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	768
Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)—Order 41— <i>When an appeal is dismissed or rejected, consequent to the dismissal of an application to condone the delay, the dismissal is subject to challenge in a second appeal and hence it is necessary to draw up a decree.</i>		
Leena, O.K. v. State I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	823
Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)—Section 51— <i>Proviso Clause (b)—Mere omission to pay the decree debt shall not result in arrest or detention of the judgment-debtor in civil prison—Where the judgment-debtor had denied his means to pay, it is for the court to satisfy that the judgment-debtor has means to pay and still he refuses or neglects to honour the decree.</i>		
Jayadev Singh, A. K. v. M. A. Majeeth I.L.R. 2010(2) Kerala	..	882
Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974)—Section 125 <i>—The right of a divorced Muslim wife to claim maintenance is not extinguished by enactment of the Muslim Women (Protection of Rights on Divorce) Act, 1986— Her right shall stand extinguished only when actual payment under Section 3 is made and the Court grants absolution under Section 127(3)(b)—Muslim (Women Protection of Rights on Divorce) Act, 1986—Section 3.</i>		
Kunhumammed v. Ayishakutty I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	140
Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974)—Section 190 <i>—Magistrate has no jurisdiction to dismiss the complaint at the pre-cognisance stage— Proper course is to reject the complaint.</i>		
Ragesh, P. K. v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	172
Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974)—Section 386 <i>—Appellate Court cannot enhance the sentence under Section 386 (b)(iii) or 386 (b)(e) unless the accused had been given an opportunity of showing cause against such enhancement.</i>		
Santhosh @ Rajeevan v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	455
Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974)—Section 386 (b) <i>—The expression "finding and sentence" in Section 386 (b)(i) of the Code must, in the appropriate context, be read as "finding and/or sentence"—Appellate Court can remand the case for re-trial for the purpose of imposing appropriate sentence—Wherever possible alteration of the sentence must be performed by a court by resort to the provisions of Section 386 (b)(iii) of the Code—</i>		

<i>Accused should be heard on the question of sentence before the trial court passes fresh sentence in accordance with law.</i>		
Ishaque, K. P. v. Raveendran Thampan I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	416
Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974)—Section 386(e) — <i>Clause (e) of Section 386 does not confer any jurisdiction on criminal courts to pass orders not contemplated under clauses (a) to (d)—Clause (e) only clothes the criminal appellate court to pass such consequential or incidental orders in the interest of justice, after passing orders of the type contemplated under clauses (a) to (d).</i>		
Ishaque, K. P. v. Raveendran Thampan I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	416
Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974)—Sections 397 and 401 — <i>Revisional jurisdiction must be understood and interpreted in the widest possible manner, so as to ensure that injustice is avoided and justice prevails— Wherever injustice/impropriety results from the procedure adopted by the subordinate courts, the revisional court can intervene to invoke its revisional powers to ensure that justice is done.</i>		
Ishaque, K. P. v. Raveendran Thampan I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	416
Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974)—Section 438 — <i>The necessary facts, not borne out by the FIR, remand report and case diary, on the basis of which the petitioner in a Bail Application desires the court to grant relief, should be stated by him in the application.</i>		
Dr. K. A. Koshy v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	481
Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974)—Section 438 — <i>Application for anticipatory bail is maintainable even in cases where the accused are sought to be arrested in execution of a non-bailable warrant issued by the Court.</i>		
Dr. K. A. Koshy v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	481
Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974)—Section 438 — <i>Application for anticipatory bail with respect to an offence alleged to have been committed in Punjab—Kerala High Court has jurisdiction to entertain the bail application and grant appropriate relief.</i>		
Dr. K. A. Koshy v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	481
Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974)—Section 397(2) — <i>The bar of revision under Section 397(2) is only in relation to any interlocutory order passed in an appeal, inquiry, trial or other proceeding pending before an inferior criminal court—An order granting bail during crime stage would not attract the bar under Section 397(2).</i>		
Prasad Jacob v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	633

- Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974)—Section 397(2)**
—If the order granting bail is perverse for the reason that irrelevant material of substantial nature was taken into account or relevant material omitted from consideration, the superior court would be justified in cancelling the bail.
- Prasad Jacob v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 633
- Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974)—Section 156(3)**
—In complaints which are forwarded for investigation by the courts u/s 156(3), it is not permissible for the police to transfer the F.I.R. to another police station for investigation on the ground that they have no territorial jurisdiction.
- Bency, N. L. v. Dr. Preceline George I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 880
- Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974)—Sections 216, 397 and 482—Order passed on petition filed to alter charge, is interlocutory in nature, as the same will not culminate the proceedings —Revision u/s 397 Cr.P.C. not maintainable—In the event of order vitiated by illegality, impropriety or error, exercise of inherent powers u/s 482 Cr. P.C. can be invoked.**
- Akbar, A. v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 875
- Constitution of India—Article 226—Maintainability of Writ Petition—Writ Petition is not maintainable when the party has invoked the statutory remedy available to him—High Court shall not entertain the Writ Petition in such a situation.**
- Reena, R. P. v. Geena, R. S. (F.B.) I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 8
- Constitution of India—Article 30—Right of minority to administer educational institution established by it—Prescription of qualification for the post of Headmaster by the State is not an infringement on the right of minority to administer it's institution—Education Rules, 1959 (Kerala) —ChapterXIVA, Rule 45 (as it stood prior to 25-1-2008).**
- Manager, MDPS UP School v. Paulose, E. A. (F.B.) I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 89
- Constitution of India—Article 226—Judicial Review of decision of Labour Court/ Industrial Tribunal by High Court—High Court will interfere only if the industrial adjudicator has strayed out of the jurisdiction conferred on it and not because the High Court has a different opinion about the decision taken.**
- Rajagopal, B. v. Jolly Xavier I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 117
- Constitution of India—Article 226—Police Harassment—Police do not have the authority to interfere in a dispute regarding the construction of a**

<i>sunshade in violation of the provisions of the Municipalities Act—Municipalities Act, 1994 (Kerala Act 20 of 1994)—Sections 406, 408, 550 and 551.</i>		
Siva Prasad S. Shenoy v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	168
Constitution of India—Article 30(1)—Appointment of Headmistress in aided minority school—Directions issued by the Full Bench in Kurian Lissy s case to evolve fair procedure for selection to the post of Headmaster still holds good, despite decision of Apex Court in Malankara Syrian Catholic College case— Education Rules, 1959 (Kerala)—Chapter XIVA, Rule 44(1).		
Belsi, M. v. Corporate Management of Latin Catholic Schools (F.B.) I.L.R.2010(2)Kerala	..	256
Constitution of India—Article 30(1)—Appointment of Headmistress in aided minority school—Directions issued by the Full Bench in Kurian Lizy s case to evolve fair procedure for selection to the post of Headmaster cannot apply to selection conducted prior to the decision of the Full Bench—Education Rules, 1959 (Kerala)—Chapter XIVA, Rule 44(1).		
Belsi, M. v. Corporate Management of Latin Catholic Schools I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	269
Constitution of India—Article 226—One time settlement scheme are notified to collect the arrears due to banks and not to refund the amounts already collected.		
Cheranalloor Service Co-operative Bank Ltd. v. K.A.Alfred I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	267
Constitution of India—Article 226—Writ of Mandamus cannot be issued to rule making authority to frame or amend the rule—No person has a legal right to insist that rule should be framed or amended in a particular manner—Rule making authority has no corresponding duty to amend or frame rules in a specified manner.		
George, M. I. v. High Court of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	213
Constitution of India—Article 226—Relief claimed in writ petition—When a statutory provision is challenged, the relief claimed should be for a declaration that it is unconstitutional and for a mandamus not to enforce it.		
George, M. I. v. High Court of Kerala I.L.R. 2010(2) Kerala	..	213
Constitution of India—Article 226—Policy decisions can be interfered with by the High Court only if such decision is unconstitutional.		

George, M. I. v. High Court of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	213
Constitution of India—Article 77—If the Government is authorised to do something by framing rules or by issuing notification, it can do the same thing by issuing executive order.		
George, M. I. v. High Court of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	213
Constitution of India—Article 226—Scope of Judicial Review of award of Labour Court—Choice of penalty is always subjective, about which two persons can take diametrically different views on the same set of facts—As long as the decision to award penalty is not perverse or arbitrary, High Court is not justified in interfering with penalty meted out by Labour Court as if it is exercising appellate power under Article 226—Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947)—Section 11 A.		
General Secretary v. Deputy General Manager I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	328
Constitution of India—Article 226—Police protection for construction of mobile towers—There is a statutory duty cast upon the police under Section 29(b)(d)(h) and (r) of the Kerala Police Act and under Section 149 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, to prevent any cognisable offence and to meet the threat to law and order—When construction of mobile towers and their energisation is being obstructed by a group of people based on their apprehension and without any legal right, the police cannot act as silent spectators—If the police fail in discharging their statutory duty, the same is liable to be corrected by issuing appropriate writ for police protection, so as to maintain rule of law.		
Reliance Telecommunications Ltd. v. S.I. of Police (F.B.) I.L.R. 2010(2) Kerala	..	592
Constitution of India—Article 226—Police Protection—The alternate remedy available under Order XXXIX, Rule 2A of the Code of Criminal Procedure may not be effective when a group of people, whose identity is not known, causes obstruction—Subject-matter of a case before the Civil Court and granting of injunction can only be in respect of a known person—Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)-Order XXXIX.		
Reliance Telecommunications Ltd. v. S.I. of Police (F.B.) I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	592
Constitution of India—Article 226—Police Protection—Availability of alternate remedy is not a bar to invoke the writ jurisdiction, particularly in matters of police protection—For refusing to invoke jurisdiction, the alternate remedy available should be equally convenient and effective as well.		
Reliance Telecommunications Ltd. v. S.I. of Police (F.B.) I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	592

<p>Constitution of India—<i>Article 226—Applicability of precautionary principle' in the matters connected with construction of mobile towers— Available materials would go to show that there is no such 'environmental threat' as observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in 'Tannery case' [(1996) 5 S. C. C. 64] and hence reliance cannot be placed on the said decision for pressing into service the precautionary principle.</i></p>	<p>Reliance Telecommunications Ltd. v. S. I. of Police (KB.) I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 592</p>
<p>Constitution of India—<i>Article 226—Custodial death of accused—Handing over of investigation to C.B.I.—In cases where Police Officers of the State are accused of custodial violence leading to death of a person in custody, it is not only desirable but also a public necessity to entrust the investigation with an independent investigating agency, preferably, the C.B.I.</i></p>	<p>Murukeshan v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 663</p>
<p>Constitution of India—<i>Article 226—Government decided to sanction Higher Secondary Course in a School but the decision could not be implemented due to litigation—Later Government changing policy and declining to sanction the course—Writ of Mandamus can be issued to sanction Higher Secondary Course to the Management which had a right to claim new batch in accordance with previous Government policy.</i></p>	<p>Secretary, Cannanore District Muslim Educational Association v. State of Kerala (S.C.) I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 753</p>
<p>Constitution of India—<i>Article 226—Writ of Mandamus—It is a Writ of wide magnitude and should reach out to quell injustice wherever it is found —Even a contractual or customary duty can be enforced by a Writ of Mandamus and not necessarily a public duty only.</i></p>	<p>Secretary, Cannanore District Muslim Educational Association v. State of Kerala (S.C.) I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 753</p>
<p>Constitution of India—<i>Article 15(1)—Even if the State may make any special provision for women it shall only be for the betterment of women and not otherwise— There cannot be any classification among women and children solely on the ground of religion.</i></p>	<p>Haseena Mansoor v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010(2) Kerala .. 891</p>
<p>Constitution of India—<i>Articles 15, 16 and 309—Service Rules made by the State Government are subject to the provisions of the Constitution and cannot admit of any classification on the ground only of religion in view of Articles 16(2) and 15(1) of the Constitution of India—Laws governing Government sennce should be secular in content.</i></p>	<p>Haseena Mansoor v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 891</p>

Constitution of India—Article 226—Police Protection—Lawlessness has to be prevented by the State at any cost—Constitutional Courts have a duty to see that laws are enforced.		
Sreyams Kumar, M. V. v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	845
Constitution of India—Article 226—Operational freedom of police—Though the police are free to discharge their functions in the most efficient and just manner in varying circumstances, police force should not be allowed to be reduced to inertia in the guise of operational freedom.		
Sreyams Kumar, M. V. v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	845
Constitution of India—Article 226—Even if statutory alternate remedy has become time barred, aggrieved party can challenge the order by invoking Writ jurisdiction of the High Court—Fact that statutory remedy has become time barred is a relevant criterion in deciding whether or not to exercise the discretionary jurisdiction under Article 226.		
M/s Panopharam v. Union of India I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	909
Constitution of India—Article 226—Relaxation offender conditions—Contractor, to whom amounts are due towards works executed, cannot claim relaxation of the mandatory condition of furnishing EMD, for participating in a subsequent tender, by adjustment of the amounts which are claimed to be due to him.		
Jelton, K. A. v. Superintending Engineer I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	938
Constitutional Law—Mala fide or extraneous motive for enacting a statute cannot be attributed to Legislature.		
Dr. P. Pookunhi Koya v. Muhammed Hamdullah Sayed I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	680
Consumer Protection Act, 1986 (Central Act 68 of 1986)—Sections 2(d) and 3— Forum constituted under the Act has no jurisdiction to adjudicate disputes in relation to Telephone bills, in view of the remedy by way of arbitration provided under Section 7B of Telegraph Act—Telegraph Act, 1885(Central Act 13 of 1885)—Section 7B.		
General Manager, Telecom v. M. Krishnan (S.C.) I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	1
Consumer Protection Act, 1986 (Central Act 68 of 1986)—Section 13 (33)— Interim order of CDRF—The Forum shall not pass any interim order which is likely to cause irreparable injury to opposite party—If the effect of an interim order cannot be reversed, if necessary, at the tim[^] of disposal of the case, no court shall pass such an interim order.		
Beena Kannan v. Mathew, K.J. I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	250
Consumer Protection Act, 1986 (Central Act 68 of 1986)—Section 2(d)— Student in a College cannot be termed as a consumer—University		

<i>cannot be sued before the CDRF by treating it as a service provider—Liability cannot be cast on a College, treating it to be a service provider, for the results of an examination, as the College only acts as an agent of the University in conducting examinations.</i>		
Principal, St. Joseph's College of Communication v. CDRF I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	977
Contract Act, 1872 (Central Act 9 of 1872)—Section 134—Discharge of Surety—Discharge of principal debtor by operation of law -will not absolve the surety from liability—Winding up of the principal debtor will not discharge liability of the surety.		
Dr. M. I. Itty v. Kerala Financial Corporation I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	289
Contract Act, 1872 (Central Act 9 of 1872)—Section 140—If the loss of security offered by principal debtor is not by deliberate act of principal debtor or creditor but by operation of law, surety is not absolved of his liability.		
Dr. M.I. Itty v. Kerala Financial Corporation I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	289
Co-operative Societies Rules, 1969 (Kerala)—Rule 44(l)(b)—The relationship has to be understood with reference to the employee in the society and not with reference to the candidate.		
Joint Registrar of Co-operative Societies v. R. Gopalakrishna Pillai I.L.R. 2010(2) Kerala	..	403
Co-operative Societies Rules, 1969 (Kerala)—Rule 185(2) (prior to amendment)— Prior approval stated in the Rule only means that promotion on regular basis based on dispensation of educational qualification to the employee concerned should be given only after getting approval from the Registrar—There is no need for committee of the Society to obtain approval from the Registrar before taking a decision to relax educational qualification of an employee for the purpose of promotion.		
Hariharan, N. v. Haneesa Beevi, N. I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	411
Court Fees and Suits Valuation Act, 1959 (Kerala Act 10 of 1960)—Section 59— Inquiry by the District Collector about the value of the estate— Report of the Collector about market value of the estate cannot be disregarded for violation of principles of natural justice—District Court is not bound by report of the Collector and it is open to the petitioner to adduce evidence to prove that the ' market value of the estate fixed by the Collector is wrong.		
Abraham, K. K. v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	341
Criminal Law—Practice and Procedure—The subordinate courts are not entitled to ignore a binding precedent of the Supreme Court or of the High Court.		
Mohammed, T. A. v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	356

- Criminal Law—Practice and Procedure—***In cases where the appellate court finds itself unable to impose an appropriate sentence, that court should either remand the case for re-trial for the purpose of imposing appropriate sentence, or, inform the High Court of the helpless position because of the procedural fetters and the inability to do justice.*
- Ishaque, K. P. v. Raveendran Thampan I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 416
- Criminal Rules of Practice, 1982 (Kerala)—Rule 131—***Infanticide committed by mother—Reference to Government by Sessions Judge for considering the propriety of reducing the sentence—Reference under Rule 131 has to be made only after imposition of sentence by the Court—Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974)—Sections 432 and 433.*
- Radhamany v. State of Kerala (F.B.) I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 380
- Criminal Rules of Practice, 1982 (Kerala)—Rule 131—***Rule 131 of the Rules framed by the High Court for making a reference to the Government in the matter of reducing the sentence imposed against the woman convicted of murder of her child/children and Rule 545 of the Prisons Rules by which the Government had directed the Advisory Board to consider cases of such woman immediately, reflect the human approach of the High Court and Government, by providing differential treatment to convicts of such murder—Rule 131 do not apply to all cases of infanticide and would apply in a case where a woman is convicted for committing murder of her own child/children.*
- Radhamany v. State of Kerala (KB.) I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 380
- Criminal Rules of Practice, 1982 (Kerala)—***Time-limits prescribed by superior courts are so made to ensure expeditious disposal—Between interests of justice and time-limit prescribed what shall prevail is interest of justice—Courts to apply for extension of time if justice cannot be achieved in prescribed time.*
- Akbar, A. v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 875
- Criminal Trial—Scene mahazar—***Scene mahazar is a very important piece of document to determine the negligence or rashness in a road traffic accident.*
- Vijayan v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 979
- Distillery and Warehouse Rules, 1968 (Kerala)—Rule 55(4)—***State can levy excise duty only on potable liquor and has no jurisdiction to levy excise duty on rectified spirit—Rule 55(4) of the Kerala Distillery and Warehouse Rules, 1968 held to be ultra vires and unenforceable insofar as it deals with levy of duty on wastage of spirit exceeding 0.5%—Abkari Act, 1077(Kerala Act 1 of 1077 M.E.)—Sections 17 and 18.*
- State of Kerala v. K. S. Distillery I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 885

Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 (Central Act 23 of 1940) — <i>Section 18(c)—License for sale of drugs and cosmetics—Private Hospitals should take license for dispensing medicine from the hospital—Private Hospitals cannot be exempted from the condition of taking license for dispensing medicine as in the case of Hospitals maintained or supported by the Government or a local body—Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945—Rule 123 and item 5A of Schedule K.</i>	
Qualified Private Medical Practitioners' Association v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	.. 306
Easements Act, 1882 (Central Act 5 of 1882) — <i>Chapter VI—A licensee, who is in permissive use, with no vested right of enjoyment over the land, is incompetent to claim a decree of perpetual injunction against the licensor, where the license arrangement is revocable and has been revoked by the licensor—The only remedy of the licensee is to sue for damages under Section 64 of the Easements Act—Specific Relief Act, 1963 (Central Act 47 of 1963)—Sections 6 and 38.</i>	
The Trivandrum Golf Club v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	.. 768
Education Rules, 1959 (Kerala) — <i>Chapter XIVA, Rule 45—Appointment of Headmaster of U.P. School—Rule 45 prescribes the qualifications for the post of Headmaster of an Upper Primary School—The rule does not merely provide for preference to a graduate teacher.</i>	
Manager, MDPS UP School v. Paulose, E.A. (F.B.) I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	.. 89
Education Rules, 1959 (Kerala) — <i>Chapter XIV A, Rule 51 A—Claim of protected teacher—Teacher retrenched after amendment of Rule 51A on 25-6-2005— She can claim any vacant teaching post in the school whether it is in a higher or lower category, provided she is qualified to be appointed to that post— Teacher retrenched prior to amendment of Rule 51 A, can claim appointment only in the same category of post.</i>	
Maya, S. v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	.. 135
Education Rules, 1959 (Kerala) — <i>Chapter VI, Rule 3—Correction of date of birth in school records—D.E.O. is the authority for sanctioning alteration of name and religion of the pupil and Commissioner for Govt. Examinations is the authority for sanctioning alteration in the date of birth in school records— Change of name of the pupil can be effected by D.E.O. even after the pupil leaves the school.</i>	
State of Kerala v. Ritha Thomas I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	.. 495
Employees Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (Central Act 19 of 1952) — <i>Section 14(1A)—The only person who can be proceeded against under Section 14 (1A) is the 'employer' as defined under Section 2(e)(ii) of the Act—There is no liability for an 'establishment' to pay-contribution or administrative charges and hence no person can be prosecuted under Section 14(1 A) of the Act in his capacity as a person 'in-charge of and responsible for the business of the establishment'.</i>	
Dr. Vellayani Arjunan v. The Enforcement Officer I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	.. 282

- Excise and Prohibition Subordinate Service Rules, 1974 (Kerala)**—*Rules 1,2& 8— An Excise Preventive Officer cannot claim promotion as Asst. Excise Inspector and further promotion as Excise Inspector with effect from the same day.*
- Divakaran,T.V. v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 819
- Foreign Liquor Rules, 1953 (Kerala)**—*Rule 13—Grant ofFL-3 Licence— Eligibility of applicant for licence should be considered as on date of consideration or disposal of the application and in accordance with law as on that date.*
- State of Kerala v. Raveendran Pillai, V. S. (F.B.) I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 106
- General Sales Tax Act, 1963 (Kerala Act 15 of 1963)**—*Section 17 (3)—When actual sales figures found in the computer statement maintained by the assessee are found to be much higher than the turnover accounted to the Department, the Assessing Officer can take the figures from the assessee's computer and make assessment treating the same as actual sales—When there is positive evidence of clandestine sales by the assessee, seen accounted in the assessee's computer, the Assessing Officer is perfectly justified in relying on the same for making assessment.*
- State of Kerala v. M/s Seven Star Hotel I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 627
- General Sales Tax Act, 1963 (Kerala Act 15 of 1963)**—*Section 23(B) (4), (7) — Amnesty benefit is provided for settlement of liability; on condition that reduced amount shall be paid by the assessee strictly within the time frame—Any contest against settled liability can be pursued only after payment under Amnesty Scheme.*
- Assistant Commissioner (Assessment) v. M/s Martin & Harris Pvt. Ltd. I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 827
- Head Load Workers Rules, 1981 (Kerala)**—*Rules 17 and 2 7—The Head Load Workers General Fund cannot be utilized for the printing and supply of registers and receipt books—The fund cannot be utilized for any purpose other than those provided in the Act, Rules or Schemes— Since the registers and records are to be maintained by the employers, the expenses for the maintenance of the said records also have to be met by the employers.*
- Chamber of Commerce v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 542
- Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 (Central Act 25 of 1955)**—*Section 13 B—There is no stipulation in the Hindu Marriage Act or Rules framed thereunder that a petition for divorce under Section 13 B of the Act should compulsorily be accompanied by a marriage certificate—Registration of Marriages (Common) Rules, 2008 (Kerala)—Rule 3.*
- Rajilal, V G. v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 794
- Hindu Succession Act, 1956 (Central Act 30 of 1956)**—*Section 23— Restriction under Section 23 would operate only when a dwelling*

house is actually partitioned by metes and bounds—Institution of a suit for partition by a female heir is not barred by Section 23.

- Janardhanan v. Rugmini I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 933
- Hindu Succession (Amendment) Act, 2005 (Central Act 39 of 2005)—**
Section 6— Section 6 of the Act, enforcing equality among the daughter and son of a coparcener under Mithakshara Law would apply with effect from 20-12-2004 in all cases where partition has not been effected either by execution and registration of a deed of partition or by decree of a Court.
- Janardhanan v. Rugmini I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kera.a .. 933
- Income Tax Act, 1961 (Central Act 43 of 1961)—Sections 144 (1), 148 (1) and 184 (5)—**
Return filed against notice under Section 148—Cannot be treated as a regular return under Section 139—Failures referred under Section 144(1) are absolute failures which cannot be remedied by filing return, based on notice under Section 148—Assessee entitled for deductions only if statutory provisions are complied with—Object of Section 184 (5) emphasised.
- M/s Radha Picture Palace v. Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 929
- Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947)—Section 33(3) —'Protected Workman'—**
Trade union has been given the right to choose the employee to be nominated as 'protected workman'—Employer can refuse to register such workman as protected workman only if the number of protected workmen exceed the stipulated number—Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957—Rule 61.
- HLL Life care Ltd. v. Hindustan Latex Labour Union I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 179
- Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947)—Section 18—**
Provisions of a long term settlement cannot be unilaterally changed by the Management by issuing an administrative order.
- Joseph, C. C. v. K.S.E.B. I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 208
- Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947)—Section 15—**
Labour Court—Labour Court is not 'Court' for the purpose of Limitation Act—Labour Court can entertain claim petition in respect of claims which are more than three years old—Limitation Act, 1963 (Central Act 36 of 1963)—Article 137.
- South Indian Bank Ltd. v. Labour Court I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 237

Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947)—Section 18— <i>Terms of a bipartite settlement cannot take away the right acquired by employees pursuant to statutory provision.</i>		
Union of India v. P.M. Natarajan (S.C.) I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	371
Interpretation of Statutes—Literal interpretation of fiscal statutes—In fiscal statutes what has to be looked into is not the spirit of the statute but the letter of the law—When two interpretations are possible court should adopt the interpretation in favour of the tax payer and against the Revenue.		
Madhavan, K. B. v. Sub Registrar, Ernakulam I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	552
Interpretation of Statutes—Every statute is prima facie prospective, unless it is expressly or by necessary implication made to have retrospective operation— When there is no express provision making the rules retrospective, it would have to be found out from the language of the provisions itself as to whether they are retrospective in nature.		
Bhaskaran, P. R. v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	741
Judgment—Judicial propriety—While deciding an appeal, Division Bench shall not set aside finding entered by Single Judge and remand the case for consideration by statutory authorities—In case of such a remand, the statutory authority will sit in appeal over Judgment of Single Judge of the High Court.		
Ramachandran Master, K.K. v. Dr. K. Jyothilal I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	23
Kerala University First Statutes, 1977—Chapter 19, Statute 4(8)—Date of acquiring qualification of Ph.D.—It is the date on which the Syndicate adopts the resolution to award the degree of Ph.D. to the researcher.		
Dr. Saiful Islam, A. v. University of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	240
Labour Law—Misconduct—Good behaviour to relatives of persons in management of the employer is not a condition of service— Misbehaviour to such persons cannot form the basis of a charge against the workman.		
Rajagopal, B. v. Jolly Xavier I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	117
Labour Law—Disciplinary proceedings—Bank Officers are required to maintain high degree of integrity and honesty in dealing with money— Quantum of loss suffered by management due to misfeasance of Bank Officer is irrelevant in determining the punishment as it is not the quantum of loss but the conduct of the delinquent, which is the relevant criterion.		
Balagopalan, P. K. v. Dy. General Manager I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	829

Labour Law — <i>Disciplinary proceedings—Imposing the penalty of compulsory retirement from service does not prevent the management from recovering the loss from the delinquent—Two charge memos and consequential disciplinary proceedings on the same set of facts are legally valid in the above circumstances.</i>		
Balagopalan, P. K. v. Dy. General Manager I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	829
Lakshadweep Panchayaths Regulation, 1994 — <i>Clause 3(1) (d)— 'Settle permanently'— A person who is ordinarily residing in the island or who is in possession of a dwelling place ready for occupation, is ordinarily resident of the island and settled permanently there.</i>		
Dr. P. Pookunhi Koya v. Muhammed Hamdullah Sayed I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	680
Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (Central Act 1 of 1894) — <i>Section 23 (1A), Explanation—Stay of dispossession simplicitor of the title holder from acquired land, will bring him within purview of Section 23 (1A)—He is not entitled to claim interest for the period during which the interim order was in force. B</i>		
Balachandran, S. v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	230
Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (Central Act 1 of 1894) — <i>Section 23 (1 A)— Interest on Solatium—In cases where the reference court has not considered the claim for interest on Solatium, the decree-holder is entitled to claim interest from the date of judgment of Apex Court in Sunder v. Union of India.</i>		
State of Kerala v. Jose I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	491
Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (Central Act 1 of 1894) — <i>Section 18— Compensation for building—Market value of a building has to be determined with reference to the price which a willing vendor might reasonably expect to obtain from a willing purchaser—Market value can be fixed after deducting depreciation from the present value of the building.</i>		
State of Kerala v. Sushama Kumari I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	838
Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (Central Act 1 of 1894) — <i>Section 18— Compensation for building—Land Acquisition Officer and Reference Court should not rely on schedule of rates of the PWD as the said rates are unrealistic—Market value of the building can also be determined on the basis of capitalisation of rental income.</i>		
State of Kerala v. Sushama Kumari I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	838
Land Assignment Amendment Rules, 2009 (Kerala) — <i>Rules 7 and 8— Restriction, imposed by amendment, against alienation of assigned land for a period of twenty-five years—Will apply only to assignments granted after 24-1-2009, the date on which the amended rules came into force.</i>		

Bhaskaran, P. R. v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	741
Land Reforms Act, 1963 (Kerala Act 1 of 1964) — <i>Section 72 K (2)—Purchase certificate issued by the Land Tribunal challenged in a Civil Suit seeking a decree of perpetual prohibitory injunction—Even if it is assumed that the Land Tribunal erred in issuing a purchase certificate for a larger extent than that is applied for, the correctness of the same cannot be impeached before a Civil Court.</i>		
Rajan, A. v. T. K. Kumari Kamalam I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	810
Limitation Act, 1963 (Central Act 36 of 1963) — <i>Section 19—To claim exemption under Section 19, the plaint must contain pleadings and the plaint shall also be supported by proof showing that such payment has been acknowledged in writing in the manner contemplated by the Section.</i>		
SajanVarghese v. K.S.E.D.C. Ltd. I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	362
Limitation Act, 1963 (Central Act 36 of 1963) — <i>Articles 1 and 14—The period of limitation prescribed under Article 1 is attracted only if, (1) there are two sets of independent transaction between parties, of which, in one transaction one of the parties should hold the position of debtor and the other that of creditor and in the other, the reverse; (2) the dealings should disclose independent obligations on both sides and each party must be able to say to the other, 'I have an account against you'.</i>		
Sajan Varghese v. K.S.E.D.C.Ltd. I.L.R.2010(2)Kerala	..	362
Limitation Act, 1963 (Central Act 36 of 1963) — <i>Sections 18 and 19—The acknowledgment must be by that person against whom the liability is sought to be enforced—In a case where the mortgagee seeks to enforce the right of redemption against the mortgagor, the acknowledgment will have to be by the mortgagee on whom the liability of redemption is fastened.</i>		
Kanakamma v. B. BanerjeeBabu I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	566
Local Fund Audit Act, 1994 (Kerala Act 14 of 1994) — <i>Section 9(2)—Sections 294 and 295 of Municipality Act does not repeal Section 9(2) of Local Fund Audit Act—Section 295 has enlarged the scope of local fund audit to other accounts of the Municipality—Municipality Act, 1994 (Kerala Act 20 of 1994)—Sections 294 and 295.</i>		
Narayanan, K. I. v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010(2) Kerala	..	3
Lok Ayukta Act, 1999 (Kerala Act 8 of 1999) — <i>Section 9(5)—Complaint can be rejected only on the grounds specified in Section 9(5) and not on the ground that the Government servant who gave the complaint did not obtain sanction of the Government to do so.</i>		
Ramachandran Master, K. K. v. Dr. K. Jyothilal I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	23

- Mohammedan Law**—*Talaq by husband—Talaq by husband wi/l be valid only if it is preceded by an attempt for reconciliation by two arbiters—If such a failed attempt for reconciliation had preceded pronouncement of talaq, it shall be deemed that there was a reasonable cause for such divorce—The reasonableness of the cause for divorce shall not be justiciable.*
- Kunhumammed v. Ayishakutty I.L.R.2010(2)Kerala .. 140
- Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (Central Act 59 of 1988)**—*Section 90—'Person aggrieved'— Rival operator can challenge the order of RTA or STAT only if the impugned order suffers from an illegality or impropriety of a serious nature and if he has a legal grievance against the order.*
- Daji Tomy v. Transport Commissioner I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 461
- Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (Central Act 59 of 1988)**—*Section 167—Option regarding claims for compensation—Injured who is entitled to claim compensation under both the Motor Vehicles Act and Workmen's Compensation Act, can opt to claim compensation under any one of the statutes—Workmen 's Compensation Act, 1923 (Central Act 8 of 1923).*
- Commissioner for Workmen's Compensation, Thiruvananthapuram I.L.R.2010(2)Kerala .. 765
- Motor Vehicles Rules, 1989 (Central)**—*Rule 56—Person seeking transfer of the vehicle upon death of the owner would have to satisfy the authority, by producing necessary documents, that he has 'succeeded' to the possession of the vehicle—Since the Rule does not stipulate the production of any particular document to prove the claim of the applicant, it is sufficient that he produces an acceptable document to prove his entitlement for much transfer.*
- Bhagyalakshmy, P. v. Secretary, R.T.A. Palakkad I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 560
- Municipality Act, 1994 (Kerala Act 20 of 1994)**—*Section 270(l)(ii)—Duty in the form of surcharge is not payable under Section 270 of the Municipality Act, on a certificate of sale issued by the authorised officer after conducting sale of the secured asset in the manner prescribed under the provisions of the SARFAESI Act and the Security Interest (Enforcement) Rules, 2002—Municipality (Assessment of Duty on Transfer of Property) Rules, 2003—Rule 2(c).*
- Madhavan, K. B. v. Sub Registrar, Emakulam I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 552
- Municipality Act, 1994 (Kerala Act 20 of 1994)**—*Sections 19 and 93(2)—A meeting convened to deal with a no confidence motion cannot be considered as a meeting of the council for the purpose of sec>.,m 93(2).*
- Pradeep Kumar, P. R. v. Chenganmir Municipality I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 942
- Municipality Act, 1994 (Kerala Act 20 of 1994)**—*Section 93 (2)—Cessation of membership of a councillor, who absents himself from the required number of meetings of the council or the standing committee, is*

<i>automatic—Such cessation of membership is not dependant on anything further—The intimation from the Secretary to the Council under Section 93(2) is subsequent to the councillor ceasing to be a member.</i>		
Pradeep Kumar, P. R. v. Chengannur Municipality I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	942
Muslim Personal Law (Shariat) Application Act, 1937 (Central Act 26 of 1937) — <i>A statutory provision in conflict with Muslim Personal Law shall prevail over the personal law—The non obstante clause applies only to custom or usage to the contrary—Section 125 Cr. P.C. is applicable to all Indians—Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973(Central Act 2 of 1974)—Section 125.</i>		
Kunhumammed v. Ayishakutty I.L.R.2010(2)Kerala	..	140
Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (Central Act 61 of 1985) — <i>Sections 2 (xxiii a), 2J and 36 (A)(a)—Small quantity—Whether an accused is to be convicted for an offence under Section 21(a) or 21(b) or 21(c) can be decided only based on the actual narcotic content by weight of the narcotic drug seized from him—It is not the actual quantity of the drugs seized, but the actual content of the narcotic drug which is relevant to decide whether it is a commercial quantity or small quantity—Clarificatory notification issued subsequent to the commission of the offence cannot be taken into consideration—S.O.No.2941(E) dated 18-11-2009.</i>		
Abdul Gafoor v. S. I. of Police, Kottakkal I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	449
Natural Justice — <i>Where a decision is taken in accordance with the rules of business and communicated in the name of the Governor, it cannot be overridden by the principles of natural justice.</i>		
The Trivandrum Golf Club v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	768
Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (Central Act 26 of 1881) — <i>Section 138—It is for the Court to determine the true reason for dishonour of the cheque—Court is not bound by the reason stated by Payee's bank for dishonour of the cheque.</i>		
Devan,S. v. Krishna Menon, C. I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	312
Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (Central Act 26 of 1881Y) — <i>Section 138—If the signature in the cheque produced by complainant is proved to be not genuine, the instrument cannot be reckoned as a cheque—Dishonour of the said instrument will not attract penal consequences envisaged in Section 138.</i>		
Devan, S. v. Krishna Menon, C. I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	312
Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (Central Act 26 of 1881) — <i>Section 141—Compounding of offence—Guidelines issued by Apex Court in respect of compounding of offence under Section 138—If the offence is compounded in the first or second posting, accused need</i>		

- not pay any cost—If the offence is compounded after the second posting before the trial court, accused should pay cost of 10% of Cheque amount as costs—If the offence is compounded before appellate court or High Court, accused should pay 15% as costs and if it is compounded before Supreme Court, accused should pay 20% as costs— Costs to be deposited before the Legal Services Authority where the Court is situated.*
- Damodar S. Prabhu v. Sayed Babalal, H. (S.C.) I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 577
- Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (Central Act 26 of 1881)—Section 138**
— Complainant should not file Complaints under Section 138 before various courts in respect of the same transaction— Complainant to specify in the affidavit along with the complaint that he has not filed any other complaint alleging offence under Section 138 in respect of same transaction before any other court— Any transgression of the above rule to be curbed by resort to heavy fine—Decision to have prospective effect.
- Damodar S. Prabhu v. Sayed Babalal, H. (S.C.) I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 577
- Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (Central Act 26 of 1881)—Section 138**
—Discharge of part liability before presentation of cheque—Notice issued demanding full amount of the cheque and complaint laid suppressing part payment— Complaint is not maintainable unless the part payment is noted by making an endorsement under Section 56 and mention is made in the complaint about the part payment.
- John, G. v. Alosious I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 870
- Panchayats Act, 1960 (Kerala Act 32 of 1960)—Section 179(4)—**
Resolution passed by the Panchayat recommending transfer of its Secretary -without giving an opportunity of hearing to the Secretary —Held Illegal—The powers under Section 179(4) has to be exercised in the manner prescribed by the said section.
- Leelamma, P. D. v. Managing Committee, Peramanna Grama Panchayath I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 73
- Panchayat Raj Act, 1994 (Kerala Act 13 of 1994)—Section 161 (7)—**
Cancellation of resolution—Panchayat can cancel its resolution only within three months of its passing and that too only if it is passed by 2/3rd majority.
- Valanchery Grama Panchayat v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 199
- Panchayat Raj Act, 1994 (Kerala Act 13 of 1994)—Section 34(1)0'**
—The North Malabar Gramin Bank, being a rural bank established under the Regional Rural Banks' Act, 1976 with contribution from the Central Government, State Government and the Syndicate Bank does not fall under the term Government as contemplated under Section 34(1) (j) of the Panchayat Raj Act.

- Karunakaran, K. P. v. K.V.ChandranPanikkar I.L.R. 2010 (2)Kerala .. 275
- Panchayat Raj Act, 1994 (Kerala Act 13 of 1994)**—*Section 52(1A)—Non-compliance of the requirements under Section 52(1 A) has to be alleged and established by pleading and proving as to the manner in which the candidate had suffered the disqualification—Non-supplying of information in the prescribed form to be furnished along with the nomination paper (Form 2A) or omission to furnish such details or even stating incorrect details by itself would not be sufficient to hold the nomination given by the candidate to be invalid or that the candidate was disqualified from contesting the election.*
- Karunakaran, K. P. v. K. V. ChandranPanikkar I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 275
- Panchayat Raj Act, 1994 (Kerala Act 13 of 1994)**—*Section 102(l)(ca)—To make out a case under Section 102(l)(ca) it must be established that the details furnished by the elected candidate under sub-section (1A) of Section 52 were 'fake'—Omission to supply certain details in Form 2A or even a wrong statement therein, by itself cannot render that form to be 'fake'.*
- Karunakaran, K. P. v. K. V. Chandran Panikkar I.L.R.2010(2)Kerala .. 275
- Panchayat Raj Act, 1994 (Kerala Act 13 of 1994)**—*Sections 35, 100, 101 and 107— The prayer in the election petition challenging the election of the returned candidate cannot become infructuous on the ground that the returned candidate has been disqualified by the Election Commission under Section 35.*
- Pulkuzhiyil Mohammedkutty v. Pookkottil Sadanandan I.L.R.2010(2) Kerala .. 217
- Panchayat Raj Act, 1994 (Kerala Act 13 of 1994)**—*Section 149(3)—The pendency of an election petition is not a ground on which the court can prevent the authority from conducting the election as mandated under the provisions of Section 149(3).*
- Pulkuzhiyil Mohammedkutty v. Pookkottil Sadanandan I.L.R. 2010(2) Kerala .. 217
- Panchayat Raj Act, 1994 (Kerala Act 13 of 1994)**—*Section 102—A Court trying an Election Petition is competent to compare the admitted signatures of the voters with the disputed counter foils or documents— Whether such a course has to be adopted depends upon the materials produced—The Court trying the election petition has to exercise its discretion judicially.*
- Indulekha v. Preethakumari I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 468
- Panchayat Raj Act, 1994 (Kerala Act 13 of 1994)**—*Section 102—Secrecy of the Ballot is sacrosanct and therefore a recounting of votes is permissible only upon a clear case where the ground for recounting is fully alleged and pleaded by materials.*
- Indulekha v. Preethakumari I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 468

- Panchayat Raj Act, 1994 (Kerala Act 13 of 1994)**—*Section 102—Court cannot automatically direct recounting of postal ballots based on bald allegations without any particulars regarding improper reception and rejection of postal ballots.*
- Indulekha v. Preethakumari I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 468
- Panchayat Raj Act, 1994 (Kerala Act 13 of 1994)**—*Section 185B—By virtue of the provisions contained in Chapter XXI, power to consider and pass orders on the application for building permit is exclusively conferred on the Secretary of the Panchayat—The Panchayat Committee gets jurisdiction to consider the application only if reference is made to it under Section 235 K.*
- Dharmadom Paristhithi Samrakshna Samithi v. Dharmadom Grama Panchayath I.L.R. 2010(2) Kerala .. 547
- Panchayat Raj Act, 1994 (Kerala Act 13 of 1994)**—*Section 34(l)(g)—Petitioner entering into a contract with the Panchayat in his capacity as convenor of the beneficiary committee—The liability incurred as the convenor of the beneficiary committee cannot be termed as a personal liability, forming the basis for disqualification under Section 34(1)(g)—Kerala Panchayat Raj (Removal of Disqualification of Candidates and Members in Certain Cases) Rules 1995— Rule 3.*
- SomasekharanNair v. C.K. DivakaranPillai I.L.R.2010(2)Kerala .. 798
- Panchayat Raj Act, 1994 (Kerala Act 13 of 1994)**—*Section 34(1)(j)—Revenue Recovery Proceeding initiated against the returned candidate for recovery of amount due to bank stayed by the Government—The disqualification under Section 34(1)(j) is not attracted.*
- SomasekharanNair v. C.K.DivakaranPillai I.L.R.2010(2)Kerala .. 798
- Panchayat Raj Act, 1994 (Kerala Act 13 of 1994)**—*Section 102(l)(ca) and Section 52(2A)—Election of a returned candidate could be set aside only if the details furnished in Form 2A is fake—The allegation of material suppression in Form 2A would not constitute sufficient pleadings to reach at a conclusion that the details furnished in Form 2A is fake and to render the election of the returned candidate void.*
- SomasekharanNair v. C.K.DivakaranPillai I.L.R.2010(2)Kerala .. 798
- Partnership Act, 1932 (Central Act 9 of 1932)**—*Section 14—Partners may convert their individual property as property of the firm and vice versa by an agreement—^45 soon as the partners intend that their individual property should become property of the partnership and that property is treated as such, then by virtue of Section 14, it becomes property of the partnership.*
- George, V. J. v. George, V. V. I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 517

Partnership Act, 1932 (Central Act 9 of 1932) — <i>Section 14—Transfer of individual property of a partner to another partner in his individual capacity—Such a conveyance will not make the property, partnership property—Such an arrangement has to be reduced to writing and registered.</i>		
George, V. J. v. George, V. V. I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	517
Partnership Act, 1932 (Central Act 9 of 1932) — <i>Section 48—Dissolution of firm—Auctioning of tenancy right as an asset of the firm—Tenancy right forms part of the assets of the firm, subject to the terms of the partnership deed and contract between the parties.</i>		
Rappai, N. L. Pushpam @ Kochuthressia Engineer I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	973
Patents Act, 1970 (Central Act 39 of 1970) — <i>'Patent '</i> — <i>The concept and necessity for granting patent explained.</i>		
Low Heat Driers (P) Ltd. v.Biju George I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	703
Patents Act, 1970 (Central Act 39 of 1970) — <i>Section 2(j)— 'Invention '</i> — <i>Invention is the sine qua nonfor claiming patent—When the definition of invention includes any new and useful improvement of any new and useful machine, apparatus or other article, Sections 3(d), (f) & (h) cannot have any application.</i>		
Low Heat Driers (P) Ltd. v.Biju George I.L.R.2010(2)Kerala	..	703
Patents Act, 1970 (Central Act 39 of 1970) — <i>Section 108—Infringement of patent right—Infringement can be detected only by an examination and comparison of the patented invention and the device against which infringement is alleged.</i>		
Low Heat Driers (P) Ltd. v.Biju George I.L.R.2010(2)Kerala	..	703
Penal Code, 1860 (Central Act 45 of 1860) — <i>Section 499—Defamation—The Criminal Liability of a party in respect of a statement made in a judicial proceeding on oath or otherwise, must be determined by reference to the provisions under Section 499I.P. C.—The doctrine of absolute privilege can be set up as a defence only in a suit for damages under the law of torts—No such privilege, beyond the limits of the exemption embodied in Section 499I.P.C., is recognised by the Indian Penal Code.</i>		
Shybimon v. Haridas I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	442
Penal Code, 1860 (Central Act 45 of 1860) — <i>Sections 153A and 295A—The fundamental right to freedom of speech and expression in a secular State is not an absolute license to injure the religious faiths and beliefs of fellow citizens— Constitution of India—Article 19(1) (a).</i>		
Prasad Jacob v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	633

- Penal Code, 1860 (Central Act 45 of 1860)**—Sections 279, 337 and 304A—*Failure to mark scene mahazar and Motor Vehicle Inspector's report by the trial court—It is the duty of the trial court to ensure that all material witnesses are examined and material documents marked before closing the evidence—No witness, especially official witnesses, should be allowed to keep away from the Court and give room for the accused to escape from the clutches of law.*
- Vijayan v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 979
- Practise**—*Observations against Counsel appearing in the case—Unjustified as Counsel submits only on the basis of instructions given by the client.*
- Ramachandran Master, K.K. v. Dr. K. Jyothilal I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 23
- Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, 1954 (Central Act 37 of 1954)**—*Section 20 A— To invoke the power under Section 20A there should be some evidence before the Court—The power under Section 20A cannot be invoked even prior to adducing of any evidence before Court—Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974)—Section 319.*
- Ayakali Nadar, S. K. Sons v. P. K. Sivasankara Pillai I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 202
- Registration Act, 1908 (Central Act 16 of 1908)**—*Section 17 (l)(b)—Partners can bring their individual property into the common pool of the partnership firm, thereby making it partnership property—For such conversion no document, registered or otherwise, is required.*
- George, V. J. v. George, V. V. I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 517
- Registration of Marriages (Common) Rules, 2008 (Kerala)**—*Rules 8, 9 and 11— Registration of Marriage without the presence of both the spouses cannot be allowed—The Local Registrar however cannot insist on the presence of the parties to receive the memorandum in Form No. I—The Local Registrar shall receive the memorandum in Form No. I, even if it is presented by a third party or sent through post.*
- Sarala Baby v. State of Kerala I.L.R.2010(2)Kerala .. 224
- Representation of the People Act, 1950 (Central Act 43 of 1950)**—*Section 31 — Making false declaration in connection with preparation of electoral roll— Any offence committed prior to revision of electoral roll leading to inclusion of name in the electoral roll has nothing to do with electioneering and will not amount to an electoral malpractise by candidate or his election agent so as to fall under parts Viand VII of Act 43 of 1951—Magistrate can take cognisance of such offences— Representation of the People Act, 1951(Central Act 43 of 1951).*
- Ragesh, P. K. v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 172
- Representation of the People Act, 1950 (Central Act 43 of 1950)**—*Section 32 — The Section prohibits the Magistrate from taking cognisance only of offences committed by electoral officers, without complaint made by or order of, or under authority from the Election Commission or Chief Electoral Officer and not of offences committed by others.*

Ragesh, P. K. v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	172
Representation of the People Act, 1951 (Central Act 43 of 1951)—Section 123(4)— 'Corrupt practice'—Publication of a false statement in relation to personal character of a candidate—Ingredients required to be pleaded and proved laid down—That the statement made is false or is not true and that the returned candidate believes it to be false or not true is a 'material fact' which should be pleaded and omission to plead that material fact is fatal to the election petition.		
Mohammed Riyas, P. A. v. Raghavan, M. K. I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	643
Representation of the People Act, 1951 (Central Act 43 of 1951)—Section 123(4)— The allegation characterised as 'corrupt practice' si- >wW be one relating to the personal character of the candidate and not about his political character— Any political criticism of a candidate will not attract Section 123(4).		
Mohammed Riyas, P. A. v. Raghavan, M. K. I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	643
Representation of the People Act, 1951 (Central Act 43 of 1951)—Section 123— 'Corruptpractise'—Act done by an individual before he became the candidate cannot be construed as corrupt practise and is beyond the scope of election petition—Only on filing his nomination, an individual becomes the candidate.		
Dr. P. Pookunhi Koya v. Muhammed Hamdullah Sayed I.L.R. 2010(2) Kerala	..	680
Representation of the People Act, 1951(Central Act 43 of 1951)--Section 123 (1)(A)— 'Bribery'—Distribution of money by itself is not a corrupt practise—Unless there is pleading that it was by way of gratification with the intention of inducing the voters to vote for the returned candidate, there is no complete cause of action.		
Dr. P. Pookunhi Koya v. Muhammed Hamdullah Sayed I.L.R. 2010(2) Kerala	..	680
Representation of the People Act, 1951 (Central Act 43 of 1951)~Section 123 (3)— 'Appeal on the ground of religion'—Effigy and photographs do not constitute an appeal on the ground of religion—To constitute an appeal on the ground of religion, the appeal should be made on the basis of religion of the appellant and should be intended to create hatred among followers of different religions.		
Dr. P. Pookunhi Koya v. Muhammed Hamdullah Sayed I.L.R. 2010(2) Kerala	..	680
Representation of the People Act, 1951(Central Act 43 of 1951)—Section 123 (4)— 'Publication of statement of fact'—'Effigy'is not a statement of fact—Without any averment in the election petition that any statement of fact was made by the candidate which was reasonably calculated to prejudice the prospects of rival candidate's election and that the former believed the statement to be false or that he does not believe it to be true, there is no complete cause of action.		

Dr. P. Pookunhi Koya v. Muhammed Hamdullah Sayed	I.L.R. 2010(2) Kerala	..	680
Revenue Recovery Act, 1968 (Kerala Act 15 of 1968) — <i>There is no inhibition in the Revenue Recovery Act prohibiting collection of land tax in the name of the Thandaper holder and issuance of receipt thereof—The receipt of land tax and issuance of receipts will in no way hinder the revenue recovery proceedings.</i>			
Anwar M. Easa v. District Collector	I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	515
Rules Regarding Conditions of Service of Travancore Devaswom Board Establishment Employees, 1979 (Travancore) — <i>Rule 8 (3)—Employee is eligible for promotion only after successful completion of probation in lower post.</i>			
Easwaran Namboodiri, V. G. v. Travancore Devaswom Board	I.L.R. 2010(2) Kerala	..	588
Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (Central Act 54 of 200*) — <i>Section 31(1)—Rubber plantation is agricultural land and securitization proceedings cannot be initiated against rubber plantation.</i>			
Mohammed Basheer, K. P. v. Deputy General Manager	I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	393
Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (Central Act 54 of 2002) — <i>Section 35—Bona fide purchaser cannot invoke the principle of marshalling against secured creditor under SARFAESI Act—Provisions of the SARFAESI Act will override all other Acts including Section 56 of Transfer of Property Act—Transfer of Property Act, 1882 (Central Act 4 of 1882)—Section 56.</i>			
Muhammad Rafeeq v. Bank of Baroda	I.L.R. 2010(2) Kerala	..	815
Service — <i>Regularization of Provisional Hands—Provisional Employees, who were engaged against non-cadre post with out public notification, cannot claim regularization—Length of service of such employee is immaterial.</i>			
State of Kerala v. Valsamma	I;L.R.2010(2)Kerala	..	12
Service — <i>Equal pay for equal work—Similarity in designation or quantum of work is not determinative of equality in pay scales and factors like the source and mode of recruitment, qualifications, etc. have to be considered while considering the question of equal pay for equal work.</i>			
State of Kerala v. Valsamma	I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	12
Service — <i>Eligibility for selection—Qualification for selection should be assessed as on the last date fixed for receipt of application, unless otherwise specified in the notification—Qualification acquired after</i>			

- last date for receipt of application shall not be considered while assessing the eligibility of the candidate.*
- Jaya, K. P. v. Dr. C. S. Suchit I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 111
- Service**—*Transfer of Government Servants—Transfer norms are framed by the Government on the basis of public policy and is intended to be complied with as far as possible—Adherence to the norms for transfer will prevent arbitrariness, unfairness and abuse of power—Group transfers in the proximity of general transfers, should be avoided.*
- Ambika, M. P. v. Chief Engineer I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 186
- Service**—*Appointment to the post of Reader in University Department—Teaching experience should be gained after acquiring Ph. D. qualification.*
- Dr. Saiful Islam, A. v. University of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 240
- Service**—*Pension Regulations for the Air Force, 1961—Regulation 153 and Rule I of Appendix II—Grant of disability pension—Discharge of individual on his own request—The Rules in Appendix II cannot be relied on to hold that even in cases of discharge on grounds other than disability, merely because the person discharged was in a lower medical category than that in which he was at the time of recruitment, he has to be treated as invalided from service— Pension Regulation for the Army, 1961—Rule 173 A.*
- Chief of Air Staff v. Augustian, PA. I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 613
- Service**—*Disbursal of DCRG and other retirement benefits of a deceased Government servant—If the Government servant dies in harness, the identity of the person entitled to receive the DCRG due to the deceased employee has to be considered on the basis of the heirship, representation of the estate and other relevant conditions, if any, prescribed—There can be no classification solely on the ground of religion or sex, among those entitled to DCRG and other benefits referable to a deceased Government servant.*
- Haseena Mansoor v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 891
- Service Rules, 1959 (Kerala)**—*Part III, Rule 118, Note I (i) (a)—The provision 'except when the surviving parent happens to be a Muslim lady' in Note I(i)(a) of Rule 118 of Part III, K.S.R. held to be unconstitutional—The provision 'except when the surviving parent happens to be a Muslim lady' is made only to exclusively govern Muslim mothers and therefore, it amounts to hostile discrimination and hence is in violation of Articles 14, 15 and 21 of the Constitution of India.*
- Haseena Mansoor v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 891
- Service Rules, 1959 (Kerala)**—*Part I, Rule 7—Rule 7 of Part I empowers the K.S.E. Board to dispense with or relax the requirements of any rule in KSR, if it causes undue hardship in a particular case.*

The Accounts Officer (Pension Sanction) v. K. J. Mariyamma I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	919
Service Rules, 1959 (Kerala) — <i>Part III, Rules 71, 90(6)—Family pension—Married daughter deserted by husband is not a disabled divorced daughter or disabled widowed daughter of the pensioner as contemplated under Rule 90(6)(e)(j)(k), for the purpose of payment of family pension—The High Court cannot add to the definition of family on grounds of sympathy and direct payment of family pension to a person who does not come within the definition of the term family.</i>		
The Accounts Officer (Pension Sanction) v. K. J. Mariyamma I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	919
Stamp Act, 1959 (Kerala Act 17 of 1959) — <i>Section 18(1) and (2)—Article 44 (f)—Section (1) is attracted only in cases where an instrument chargeable with duty is executed outside India but is not duly stamped.</i>		
AnithaRajan v. R.D.O. I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	191
Stamp Act, 1959 (Kerala Act 17 of 1959) — <i>Sections 18(1), 31 and 32—The restrictions imposed by Sections 18(1) and 32(3) are applicable only in cases where an instrument is brought before the Collector under Section 31.</i>		
Anitha Rajan v. R.D.O. I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	191
State & Subordinate Services Rules, 1958 (Kerala) — <i>Rule 14 (c)—Purpose of the rule is to give seniority to a candidate in open quota, who was appointed subsequent to a candidate in reservation quota and belonging to the same community, so that a candidate with higher rank will be senior to a person with lower rank in the select list—It is immaterial whether the candidate in open quota is entitled to benefit of reservation or not.</i>		
Ali, K.B. v. Sree Sankaracharya University of Sanskrit I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	347
Syndicate Bank Officer Employees' (Discipline and Appeal) Regulations, 1976 — <i>Regulation 6 (12) and (13)—Enquiry Officer need not furnish copy of preliminary enquiry report to the delinquent, unless such report is relied on by the management to prove the charge against the delinquent.</i>		
Balagopalan, P. K. v. Dy. General Manager I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	829
Telegraph Act, 1910 (Central Act 9 of 1910) — <i>Section 10—Drawing of electric line through property of others—Court shall give paramount importance to the feasibility report prepared by the technical experts for drawing the line—Private interest should give way to public interest—Constitution of India—Article 226.</i>		
Ajith, K. N. v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala	..	962

<p>The Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) (Union Territories) Order (Amendment) Act, 2008 (Central Act 2 of 2009)—<i>Section 2—For a person to become a member of Lakshadweep Scheduled Tribe, it is not necessary that he should be born in Lakshadweep—Acceptance by the inhabitants of Lakshadweep is also not necessary for a person to become member of the Lakshadweep Scheduled Tribe.</i></p>	<p>Dr. P. Pookunhi Koya v. Muhammed Hamdullah Sayed I.L.R. 2010(2) Kerala .. 680</p>
<p>The Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) (Union Territories) Order (Amendment) Act, 2008 (Central Act 2 of 2009)—<i>The Act is not retrospective in operation merely because certain incidents are drawn from a date antecedent to the coming into force of the Act—The Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) (Union Territories) Order, 1951.</i></p>	<p>Dr. P. Pookunhi Koya v. Muhammed Hamdullah Sayed I.L.R. 2010(2) Kerala .. 680</p>
<p>Trusts Act, 1882 (Central Act 2 of 1882)—<i>Section 34—Permission should be granted by the Court for alienating property of the trust if sale is for the benefit of the trust—Permission can be granted even if the trust deed does not provide for sale of trust property by trustees.</i></p>	<p>Snehasagar Charitable Trust I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 738</p>
<p>Words and Phrases—<i>'Agricultural Land'— It is land which is used for growing crops by employing human skill and labour upon such land— The nature of crops cultivated does not determine whether the land is agricultural land or not.</i></p>	<p>Mohammed Basheer, K. P. v. Deputy General Manager I.L.R. 2010 (2) Kerala .. 393</p>

>>>>>

<<<<<