



2023:KER:69709

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BECHU KURIAN THOMAS

FRIDAY, THE 10TH DAY OF NOVEMBER 2023 / 19TH KARTHIKA, 1945

WP(C) NO. 3668 OF 2023

PETITIONER:

JANEESH P.S.
AGED 45 YEARS, S/O. SAMSUDEEN,
PANKATTAYAL HOUSE,
POOTHOLE P.O., THRISSUR DISTRICT,
KERALA, PIN - 680004

BY ADVS.
SRI.M.R.DHANIL
SMT.SENITTA P. JOJO

RESPONDENTS:

1 THE THRISSUR MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
CORPORATION OFFICE,
THRISSUR DISTRICT,
KERALA, PIN - 680001

2 THE SECRETARY
THRISSUR MUNICIPAL CORPORATION,
CORPORATION OFFICE,
THRISSUR DISTRICT,
KERALA, PIN - 680001

*3 BABURAJ,
AGED 54 YEARS, S/O VASU,
NEELAMBILLI HOUSE,
PORANATTUKARA DESOM,
PORANATTUKARA VILLAGE,
THRISSUR DISTRICT

*(ADDL.R3 IS IMPEADED AS PER ORDER DATED
06-02-2023 IN I.A. No.1/2023))



- *4 SURESH A K,
AGED 43, S/O KRISHNAN,
RESIDING IN THE ADDRESS AAROKKARAN HOUSE,
SEETHARAM MILL LANE, POONKUNNAM P.O,
DIVISION NO.2, THRISSUR CORPORATION,
THRISSUR DISTRICT, PIN 680002
- *5 ABBY VARGHESE
AGED 50, S/O VARGHESE,
RESIDING IN THE ADDRESS PULLOKARAN HOUSE,
NEDUPUZHA P.O, DIVISION NO.44
NEDUPUZHA, THRISSUR CORPORATION,
THRISSUR DISTRICT, PIN 680007
- *6 MUKESH
AGED 58, S/O BHASKARAN,
RESIDING IN THE ADDRESS KULAPARAMBIL HOUSE,
KOORKENCHERRY P.O, DIVISION NO.34,
KANNANKULANGARA, THRISSUR CORPORATION,
THRISSUR DISTRICT, PIN 680007
- *7 VINEESH
AGED 47, S/O RAMAKRISHNAN,
RESIDING IN THE ADDRESS THAYYIL HOUSE,
NEDUPUZHA P.O, DIVISION NO.4,
KOORKENCHERRY, THRISSUR CORPORATION,
THRISSUR DISTRICT, PIN 680015
- *8 RAMANATHAN K.,
AGED 64, S/O GOVINDANKUTTY NAIR,
RESIDING IN THE ADDRESS KUNNAMBATH HOUSE,
PULLAZHI P.O, DIVISION NO.47,
PULLAZHY, THRISSUR CORPORATION,
THRISSUR DISTRICT, PIN 680012

*(ADDL. RESPONDENTS 4 TO 8 ARE IMPEADED AS PER
ORDER DATED 28.10.2023 IN I.A. No.5/2023 IN W.P.
(C) No.3668/2023

BY ADVS.

SRI.SANTHOSH P.PODUVAL
SRI.ANAND KALYANAKRISHNAN
SRI.G.SREEKUMAR (CHELUR)



2023:KER:69709

W.P.(C) NO.3668/2023 & Conn. Cases

-:3:-

SRI . C . DHEERAJ RAJAN

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD
ON 28.10.2023, ALONG WITH W.P. (C) NOS. 5469/2023, 27414/2023,
THE COURT ON 10.11.2023 DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BECHU KURIAN THOMAS

FRIDAY, THE 10TH DAY OF NOVEMBER 2023 / 19TH KARTHIKA, 1945

WP(C) NO. 5469 OF 2023

PETITIONERS:

- 1 VINOD POLLANCHERY
AGED 51 YEARS, S/O JANARDHANAN (LATE),
POLLANCHERY HOUSE,
OLLUKAVU ROAD, CHIYYARAM,
THRISSUR, PIN - 680026
- 2 POORNIMA SURESH
AGED 44 YEARS, D/O R.S. SUNDARAM,
KRISHNA PAADAM,
GANAPATHY AGRAHARAM, PUNKUNNAM P.O.,
THRISSUR, PIN - 680002
- 3 AATHIRA V.
AGED 39 YEARS, D/O A. PRABHAKARAN NAIR,
PALLIPETTA HOUSE,
SKV COLLEGE ROAD, KANATTUKARA P.O.,
THRISSUR, PIN - 680011
- 4 RADHIKA N.V.
AGED 40 YEARS, D/O N.S. VELAYUDHAN,
NADUVANKUNNU HOUSE,
CHERUMUKKU TEMPLE ROAD, SURYA GARDENS,
THRISSUR, PIN - 680020
- 5 NIJI K.G.
AGED 36 YEARS, D/O K.K. GIRIJAVALLABHAN,
KANATTUKARA HOUSE,
KOTTAPURAM ROAD, POOTHOLE P.O.,
THRISSUR, PIN - 680004
- 6 N. PRASAD
AGED 48 YEARS,
S/O J. NARAYANAN EMBRANDIRI (LATE),
36/1155, GUNDARAO HOUSE,



PAZHAYANADAKKAVU, THRISSUR, PIN - 680001

BY ADVS.

SRI.ANAND KALYANAKRISHNAN

SRI.C.DHEERAJ RAJAN

RESPONDENTS :

- 1 THRISSUR MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
MUNICIPAL OFFICE ROAD, THEKKINKADU,
THRISSUR- 680 001
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY
- 2 SECRETARY
THRISSUR MUNICIPAL CORPORATION,
MUNICIPAL OFFICE ROAD, THEKKINKADU,
THRISSUR, PIN - 680001
- 3 M.K VARGHESE
AGED 66 YEARS,
FATHER'S NAME NOT KNOWN TO THE PETITIONERS,
MENACHERY HOUSE, MANNUTHY P.O,
THRISSUR DISTRICT, PIN - 680651
- 4 JANEESH P.S
AGED 45 YEARS, S/O SAMSUDEEN,
PANKATTAYAL HOUSE, POOTHOLE P.O.,
THRISSUR DISTRICT, PIN - 680004

BY ADVS.
SRI.SANTHOSH P.PODUVAL
SRI.M.R.DHANIL
SMT.SENITTA P. JOJO

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD
ON 28.10.2023, ALONG WITH WP(C)NO.3668/2023 AND CONNECTED
CASES, THE COURT ON 10.11.2023 DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BECHU KURIAN THOMAS

FRIDAY, THE 10TH DAY OF NOVEMBER 2023 / 19TH KARTHIKA, 1945

WP(C) NO. 27414 OF 2023

PETITIONER:

MUKESH K.B
AGED 57 YEARS, S/O BHASKARAN,
KOOLAPARAMBIL HOUSE,
KANNANKULANGARA, KOORKENCHERY P.O.,
THRISSUR, PIN - 680007

BY ADVS.
SRI.ANAND KALYANAKRISHNAN
SRI.G.SREEKUMAR (CHELUR)
SRI.C.DHEERAJ RAJAN

RESPONDENTS:

1 THRISSUR MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
MUNICIPAL OFFICE ROAD, THEKKINKADU,
THRISSUR- 680 001
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY

2 SECRETARY
THRISSUR MUNICIPAL CORPORATION,
MUNICIPAL OFFICE ROAD, THEKKINKADU,
THRISSUR, PIN - 680001

3 JANEESH P.S
AGED 45 YEARS, S/O SAMSUDEEN,
PANKATTAYAL HOUSE,
POOTHOLE P.O.,
THRISSUR DISTRICT, PIN - 680004

BY ADVS.
SRI.SANTHOSH P.PODUVAL
SRI.M.R.DHANIL



2023:KER:69709

W.P.(C) NO.3668/2023 & Conn. Cases

-:7:-

SMT.SENITTA P. JOJO

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD
ON 28.10.2023, ALONG WITH WP(C)NO.3668/2023 AND CONNECTED
CASES, THE COURT ON 10.11.2023 DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



“C.R.”

BECHU KURIAN THOMAS, J.

**W.P.(C) Nos.3668 of 2023,
5469 of 2023 & 27414 of 2023**

Dated this the 10th day of November, 2023**JUDGMENT**

The Thrissur Corporation owns a building in which a tourist home was conducted under the name “Bini Tourist Home”. The licensee who was conducting the said tourist home surrendered the building in 2020, and thereafter, it has not been functioning till date. The attempts of the Corporation to identify a licensee for running the said tourist home has not fructified till date. Finally, the attempts found fruition when Sri. Janeesh - the writ petitioner in W.P.(C) No.3668 of 2023, became the highest amongst five tenderers. However, after the said person was identified as a prospective licensee, disputes arose, provoking an alleged raucous at the meeting of the Corporation Council, resulting in these three writ petitions.

2. W.P.(C) No.3668 of 2023 is filed by Sri. Janeesh, while W.P.(C) No.5469 of 2023 and W.P.(C) No.27414 of 2023 are filed by some of the Councillors of the Thrissur Municipal Corporation.



3. While Sri. Janeesh has sought directions for execution of the agreement granting him the license to run the tourist home pursuant to the decision of the Corporation Council on 30.01.2023, a few councillors have challenged the said resolution of the Council and have also sought a direction not to execute the agreement pursuant to such a decision.

4. Sri. Janeesh pleaded in his writ petition that the tender submitted by him, pursuant to a public invitation, was accepted as he became the highest bidder to run the Bini Tourist Home. However, due to various disputes, the Secretary of the Corporation was not executing the agreement despite the Council decision of 30.01.2023.

5. Few of the Councillors of the Corporation, which include the writ petitioners in two of the writ petitions mentioned in the earlier paragraph, apart from the additional third respondent in W.P.(C) No.3668 of 2023, alleged that no decision was taken on 30.01.2023 and that there was neither any discussion nor any voting on the particular agenda at the said meeting.

6. According to the Councillors, the Mayor of the Corporation had selected Sri. Janeesh arbitrarily, contrary to the mandate of the Statute and even permitted him to deposit the security deposit without the decision of the Council. It is alleged that after proceeding to grant the license to Sri. Janeesh, a decision was seemingly created to have been taken at the



Council meeting. The Councillors allege that records have been falsely prepared to show that a resolution was passed on 30.01.2023 ratifying the decision of the Mayor to award the license to Sri. Janeesh, who had even caused damage to the tourist home in the meantime. They also pleaded that out of the total of 54 Councillors, 30 of them had dissented at the meeting, and therefore, the decision could not have been passed.

7. I have heard Sri.M.R.Dhanil, the learned counsel for the petitioner, Sri.Santhosh P. Poduval, the learned Standing Counsel for the Thrissur Corporation, Sri.G.Sreekumar Chelur and Sri.Anand Kalyanakrishnan, learned counsel for the Councillors.

8. A brief reference to certain relevant facts is essential. Bini Tourist Home, situated at the heart of Thrissur, belongs to the Corporation. From mid-1990s till 30.09.2020, Smt. Omana Asokan was the licensee running the tourist home, on which date she surrendered the building. Thereafter, attempts to identify a licensee through public auction failed. Auctions were conducted five times, i.e., on 12.10.2020, 03.11.2020, 26.02.2021, 15.11.2021 and again on 31.03.2022, but the licensee could not be identified. The selected tenderers either failed to abide by the terms of the tender or were not ready to pay the security deposit, or backed out. Thus, the loss to the Corporation was adding up and turning out to be substantial. The need to identify a licensee, therefore, became a necessity.



9. While so, on 16.09.2022, instead of a public auction, tenders were invited from the public to run the tourist home. Five persons submitted their offers, which included the earlier licensee, Smt. Omana Asokan, as well. When Smt.Omana Asokan submitted the lowest tender amount of Rs.5,45,000/- per month as license fee, Sri. Janeesh offered the highest at Rs.7,25,000/- per month. Therefore, Sri. Janeesh was called for negotiations, and in that process, he agreed to enhance the monthly license fee to Rs.7,50,000/- with a corresponding increase every three years. Thus, Sri. Janeesh was identified as the prospective licensee to run the Tourist Home.

10. Despite the Council allegedly taking a decision to grant the license to Sri. Janeesh, when the agreement was not being executed due to some internal disputes, he approached this Court seeking directions to execute the agreement. In this context, it is apposite to note that the grievance of Sri. Janeesh, projected in W.P.(C) No.3668 of 2023, stands practically redressed by virtue of the execution of the agreement and the decision of the Council on 10.04.2023 and 14.07.2023, taken after directions were issued by this Court. However, since in the interim order dated 06.02.2023 and 27.03.2023, this Court had observed that the decisions so taken would be subject to further orders and also that the building shall not be handed over to Sri. Janeesh, without getting orders



from this Court, the said writ petition survives.

11. The main question to be considered is whether the decision of the Municipal Council on 30.01.2022 ought to be interfered with by this Court.

12. There were five attempts at public auction, but none of them was successful enough to finalize a licensee. The tourist home, which was in a state of repair, has remained vacant since 2020, causing loss to the Corporation and, in turn, to the public. Thereafter, on 20.8.2022, a public notice was issued inviting the public to submit their quotes for running the tourist home. As mentioned earlier, the person who quoted the highest agreed to enhance the license fee to Rs.7,50,000/- with a corresponding increase every three years. Thus, after great effort, a licensee was identified.

13. As per section 215(2)(c) of the Kerala Municipality Act, 1994 (for short, 'the Act'), the only two modes in which a contract can be awarded, other than by renewal, is by public auction or tender. The term 'tender' refers to an invitation to bid for a work or a project. It is in the nature of an offer requesting acceptance. On the tender being accepted, the offeror becomes bound to perform the obligations undertaken. It is a process by which establishments, including governmental bodies, invite bids for various projects. The Black's Law Dictionary (Eighth Edition) refers to the



term as “a valid and sufficient offer of performance”, “an offer or bid put forward for acceptance”. In P. Ramanatha Aiyers Law Lexicon, 4th Edition, the term ‘tender’ is explained as an “offer and as something which invites and communicates to notify acceptance”. As long as the contract is not entered into in a private deal or in a secret arrangement, an invitation to the public to submit their bids will constitute a tender, satisfying the requirements of section 215(2)(c) of the Act.

14. On a perusal of the records produced in the three writ petitions and the counter affidavits filed by the respondent Corporation, it is evident that after failing in five public auctions, the Corporation had, at the initiative of the Mayor, resorted to tender proceedings by inviting quotes from the public. Since five persons had offered their quotes, which included even the prior licensee, Smt Omana Asokan, it is clear that there was public notice, and a competitive tender proceeding was conducted, with the highest amongst the tenderers selected as the licensee. In the circumstances of the case, the resort to tender proceedings was justified, and the rate offered was also found to be competitive. The prospective licensee has already deposited an amount of Rs. 98,85000/- towards security deposit in two instalments on 31.10.2022 and on 18.01.2023. He has also agreed to spend an amount of more than Rs. 3 crores for renovating the tourist home without any claim for refund of the said



amount spent for repairs.

15. The procedure of tender adopted by the Corporation is a process contemplated under section 215(2)(c) of the Act. The Corporation, as the owner of the property, has the liberty and right to choose one of the two modes available under the said provision. Therefore, this Court cannot find fault with the Mayor or the Corporation in resorting to such a procedure. In the absence of any apparent illegality, this Court finds no reason to interfere with the mode of tender resorted to by the Corporation.

16. The Councillors before this Court have contended that the decision taken by the Municipal Council on 30.01.2023 was invalid and cannot be the basis for the grant of license to Sri. Janeesh. The copy of the minutes of the said decision, produced as Ext.P7 in W.P.(C) No.27414 of 2023, is challenged by the petitioner therein, who is also a Councillor and who claims to have dissented at the meeting held on 30.01.2023. Though the petitioner alleges that out of 54 Municipal Council members, 30 of them had dissented from the resolution on 30.01.2023, there is no material to justify such an allegation. If 30 of the Councillors had dissented at the meeting, nothing prevented them from defeating the resolution by participating in the voting rather than indulging in the alleged disorderly conduct at the meeting.

17. Be that as it may, serial No.96 in Ext.P7 in W.P.(C) No. 27414 of



2023 relates to the minutes of the resolution regarding the licensing of Bini Tourist Home. The said resolution reads that the approval granted by the Mayor in anticipation of approval by the Council was ratified, and the duty of collecting the amount due from the licensee and to execute the license was entrusted with the Secretary. It is also seen from the introductory portion of the minutes that during the discussion relating to agenda item No.96 several of the Councillors got into the well of the Council Hall and started raising slogans and attempted to disrupt the proceedings. Some of the disrupting Councillors failed to heed to the repeated requests from the Mayor to return to their seats. At that juncture, at the request of other Councillors, who insisted on discussing the agenda, the Mayor again requested the Councillors to return to their seats and engage in a peaceful discussion. Since those disrupting the proceedings did not respond and continued their interference, the agenda was read, and decisions were taken, and thereafter, the meeting was closed. Following the decision, some of the Councillors caught hold of the neck of the Mayor and even pushed him down.

18. A reading of the above recital in the minutes of the meeting held on 30.01.2023 indicates that few of the elected Councillors refused to participate in the proceedings and attempted to disrupt the same. Though discussions are necessary, the same is not a reason to disrupt the



proceedings of the Municipal Council. When disruptions take place in a Council meeting, the chaos following it can bring the governance and administration of the Corporation to a standstill. The decision making process will also be affected prejudicially.

19. The decision of the majority of the Municipal Council is, irrespective of the dissent, the decision of the dissenting minority, too. If the Councillors disrupt the proceedings and refuse to participate in the discussions, they do so at their peril. They cannot thereafter turn around and object to the decisions taken therein as the governance of the Corporation has to be carried on, and they had opted out of the discussions and the consequent decision. If time-bound decisions are not taken, it would cause prejudice to the public at large. The interest of the public cannot be ignored by the elected representatives of the people by disrupting the proceedings. The Councillors are elected to voice the views of the people. The elected Councillors have no authority to disrupt the proceedings of the Council. The Councillors must be reminded that the decisions taken by the Municipal Council will be binding. Since those disrupting the proceedings of the Municipal Council cannot be regarded as having participated in the discussion, the allegation that 30 out of 54 Councillors dissented from the decision cannot be accepted. Further, it falls within the realm of disputed facts and cannot be adjudicated in a



proceeding under Article 226.

20. Apart from the above, a losing minority cannot take recourse to the jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to challenge the resolution of the Municipal Council. If every dissenter of a resolution is permitted to challenge the decision of the majority, there will never be an end to the process of decision-making. In this context, it is apposite to refer to the decision in **George C Kappan v. State of Kerala** (2006 (3) KLT 801). In the said decision, this Court had observed that when the Municipal Council takes a decision, a dissenting member cannot file any appeal or revision against the said decision. It was further observed that the dissenting member, being part of the Municipality itself, cannot challenge the decision of the Municipality before this Court because that decision becomes their decision as well, being the decision of the Council. The Municipal council cannot challenge its own decision, and if such a procedure is given the stamp of legality, that will give rise to a very anomalous situation, as even a sole dissenting member would become entitled to challenge the decisions of the Municipality before higher forums, which is not permitted under law.

21. The aforesaid decision was relied upon by another Single Judge of this Court in **Vanaraj v. Santhanpara Grama Panchayat** (2014 (1) KHC 766) wherein it was held that even if some of the members of the



Panchayat committee dissented, and the decision is carried by the majority, the principle of collective responsibility would make the same, the collective decision of the Panchayat. The expression 'Panchayat' would include the members who have dissented also.

22. In this context, it must be observed that if those persons who dissent against a decision taken by the Municipal Council are permitted to challenge the decisions of the Municipality, it will put spokes in the wheels of governance and administration. Every decision taken by the Municipal Council or local authority will be challenged by the minority, and the entire functioning of the local authority can come to a standstill. Such a procedure cannot be permitted under law. The principle that a decision taken by the majority becomes the decision of the house, including that of the minority, cannot be diluted, lest it lead to chaos and confusion. Thus, this Court fully endorses the principles laid down in the above two decisions.

23. The remedy provided under section 57 of the Kerala Municipality Act, 1994 is a mode available to the dissatisfied persons to question the resolution of the local authority. In the instant case, the Government has not interfered with any such proceeding, and therefore, the challenge raised in W.P.(C) No.27414 of 2023 against the decision of the Council on 30.1.2023 is only to be negated.



24. Petitioners in W.P.(C) No.5469 of 2023 challenged the communication dated 16.09.2022 produced as Ext.P2 in that writ petition inviting Sri. Janeesh for a negotiation. They also challenged the order dated 28.10.2022, accepting the tender submitted by Sri.Janeesh. Since, pursuant to the said offer, negotiations were conducted, and an agreement has already been executed after ratification by the Municipal Council, I do not find any reason to interfere with the said order or communication.

25. The exigency of the situation warranted immediate action to be taken to identify a prospective licensee. There are no proven malafides in selecting the licensee. The said licensee has been permitted to carry out renovation works at his own cost without claiming any amount from the Corporation. The cost of renovation works is stated to be more than Rs.3 Crores. Since the Corporation fund will not be utilised for such renovation works and the works done on the building will ultimately enure to the benefit of the Corporation itself, this Court finds no reason to interfere with any of the proceedings initiated by the Corporation in awarding the license to Sri. Janeesh to run the Bini Tourist Home, as well as the permission granted for carrying out the repair and renovation works.

26. Since an agreement has already been entered into by the Secretary of the Corporation with Sri. Janeesh, the Corporation is given permission to proceed to handover the building to him as per the terms of



2023:KER:69709

W.P.(C) NO.3668/2023 & Conn. Cases

-:20:-

the agreement and in accordance with law and also to permit him to carry out the repair and renovation works.

In the result, W.P.(C) No.5469 of 2023 and W.P.(C) No.27414 of 2023 are dismissed, while W.P. (C) No.3668 of 2023 is disposed of.

**Sd/-
BECHU KURIAN THOMAS
JUDGE**

vps

APPENDIX OF WP (C) 3668/2023

PETITIONER'S/S' EXHIBITS

- Exhibit P1 TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER NO. R12/17033/07
VOL 4 DATED 16/09/2022.
- Exhibit P2 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 28/10/2022
OF THE THRISSUR MUNICIPAL CORPORATION.
- Exhibit P3 TRUE COPY OF THE RECEIPT DATED
31/10/2022 HAVING RECEIPT NO. 4745 OF
THRISSUR MUNICIPAL CORPORATION.
- Exhibit P4 TRUE COPY OF THE RECEIPT DATED
18/01/2023 OF THE THRISSUR MUNICIPAL
CORPORATION.
- Exhibit P5 TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED
23/01/2023 IN WP (C) NO. 2332/2023.
- Exhibit P6 TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION MADE TO
THE 2ND RESPONDENT DATED 31/01/2023.
- Exhibit P7 TRUE COPY OF THE AGENDA AND DECISION NO.
96 OF THE THRISSUR MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
DATED 30/01/2023.
- Exhibit P8 TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 25/01/2023
OF THE 2ND RESPONDENT.
- Exhibit P9 TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY DATED 02/02/2023
OF THE PETITIONER.
- Exhibit P10 TRUE COPY OF THE DEMAND DRAFT DATED
03/02/2023 OF SOUTH INDIAN BANK,
THRISSUR HIGH ROAD BRANCH.
- Exhibit P11 TRUE COPY OF THE OFFER NOTICE DATED
01/09/2022 OF THE THRISSUR MUNICIPAL
CORPORATION.
- Exhibit P12 TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE DATED 07/11/2022
OF THE THRISSUR MUNICIPAL CORPORATION.
- Exhibit P13 TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED



- 03/02/2023.
- Exhibit P14 TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 06/02/2023.
- Exhibit P15 TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 10/02/2023 OF THE THRISSUR MUNICIPAL CORPORATION.
- Exhibit P16 TRUE COPY OF THE AGREEMENT DATED 13/02/2023.
- Exhibit P17 TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION BEFORE THE MAYOR THRISSUR MUNICIPAL CORPORATION DATED NIL.
- Exhibit P18 TRUE COPY OF THE RECEIPT OF THE THRISSUR MUNICIPAL CORPORATION DATED 07/03/2023.
- Exhibit P19 TRUE COPY OF THE DECISION OF THE THRISSUR MUNICIPAL CORPORATION COUNCIL DATED 10/04/2023
- Exhibit P20 TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 16/06/2023 IN WP (C) NO. 18352/2023
- Exhibit P21 TRUE COPY OF THE REQUEST LETTER DATED 01/07/2023
- Exhibit P22 TRUE COPY OF THE REQUEST LETTER DATED 12/07/2023
- Exhibit P23 TRUE COPY OF THE CORPORATION COUNCIL DECISION DATED 14/07/2023

RESPONDENT'S/S' EXHIBITS

- Exhibit -R1(a) A COPY OF LETTER DATED 29/10/22 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER
- Exhibit -R1(b) A COPY OF RESOLUTION NO. 96 OF THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF 1ST RESPONDENT CORPORATION DATED 30/1/23
- Exhibit -R1(c) A COPY OF LETTER ISSUED TO THE STATION HOUSE OFFICER, THJRISSUR TOWN EAST



POLICE STATION

- Exhibit -R1(d) A COPY OF OFFICE NOTE DATED 14/2/23
- Exhibit R3(a) THE TRUE COPY OF THE MINUTES DATED 31.01.2023 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT TO ONE ADV. PRAMOD UNDER RIGHT TO INFORMATION
- Exhibit R3(b) THE TRUE COPY OF THE DISSENT NOTE OF UDF COUNCILORS GIVEN IN THE LETTER HEAD DATED 31.01.2023
- Exhibit R3(c) THE TRUE COPY OF THE DISSENT NOTE DATED 30.01.2023 GIVEN BY COUNCILORS OF THE NDA
- Exhibit R3(d) THE TRUE COPY OF THE QUOTATION SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER TO THE 2ND RESPONDENT HEREIN OBTAINED THROUGH RIGHT TO INFORMATION WITHOUT DATE
- Exhibit R3(e) THE TRUE COPY OF THE PHOTOGRAPHS SHOWING THE DEMOLITION OF BINI TOURIST HOME
- Exhibit R3(f) THE TRUE COPY OF CMP 457/2023 DATED 21.01.2023 PREFERRED BY ONE ANEESHKUMAR AGAINST THE PETITIONER
- Exhibit R3(g) THE TRUE COPY OF THE COMPLAINT DATED 07.02.2023 PREFERRED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT BEFORE THE STATION HOUSE OFFICER, THRISSUR EAST POLICE STATION

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 5469/2023

PETITIONER'S/S; EXHIBITS

- Exhibit P1 THE TRUE COPY OF THE OFFER NOTICE DATED 01.09.2022 ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT
- Exhibit P2 THE TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE DATED 16.09.2022 ISSUED BY THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF THE 1ST RESPONDENT
- Exhibit P3 THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 28.10.2022 ISSUED BY DEPUTY SECRETARY OF THE 1ST RESPONDENT TO THE 4TH RESPONDENT
- Exhibit P4 THE TRUE COPY OF THE RECEIPT DATED 31.10.2022 ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT TO THE 4TH RESPONDENT
- Exhibit P5 THE TRUE COPY OF THE RECEIPT DATED 18.01.2023 SHOWING THE REMITTANCE OF AN AMOUNT OF RS.7413750/- BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT HEREIN BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT
- Exhibit P6 THE TRUE COPY OF THE PHOTOGRAPHS SHOWING THE DEMOLITION OF BINI TOURIST HOME
- Exhibit P7 THE TRUE COPY OF THE COMMISSION REPORT SUBMITTED BY THE ADVOCATE COMMISSIONER IN O.S 179/2023 DATED 09.02.2023 BEFORE THE MUNSIFF COURT, THRISSUR
- Exhibit P8 THE TRUE COPY OF CMP 457/2023 DATED 21.01.2023 PREFERRED BY ONE ANEESHKUMAR AGAINST THE 4TH RESPONDENT
- Exhibit P9 THE TRUE COPY OF THE FIR IN CRIME 382/2023 REGISTERED BY TOWN EAST POLICE, THRISSUR DISTRICT DATED 08.02.2023
- Exhibit P10 THE TRUE COPY OF THE QUOTE SUBMITTED BY



- THE 4TH RESPONDENT
- Exhibit P11 THE TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 29.10.2022 ISSUED BY 4TH RESPONDENT TO 3RD RESPONDENT
- Exhibit P12 THE TRUE COPY OF THE COMPLAINT DATED 16.01.2023 SUBMITTED BY SAID COUNCILOR A.K. SURESH BEFORE THE 2ND RESPONDENT
- Exhibit P13 THE TRUE COPY OF THE COMPLAINT DATED 17.01.2023 PREFERRED BY A.K. SURESH BEFORE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE, THRISSUR ALONG WITH THE RECEIPT
- Exhibit P14 THE TRUE COPY LETTER ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT TO THE 4TH RESPONDENT ON 25.01.2023
- Exhibit P15 THE TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY DATED 02.02.2023 ISSUED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT IN HIS INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY TO THE 2ND RESPONDENT
- Exhibit P16 THE TRUE COPY OF THE MINUTES DATED 31.01.2023 OBTAINED THROUGH ONE ADV. PRAMOD BY RIGHT TO INFORMATION
- Exhibit P17 THE TRUE COPY OF THE DISSENT NOTE OF UDF COUNCILORS GIVEN IN THE LETTER HEAD DATED 31.01.2023
- Exhibit P18 THE TRUE COPY OF THE DISSENT NOTE DATED 30.01.2023 GIVEN BY COUNCILORS OF THE NDA
- Exhibit P19 THE TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE WITH AGENDA DATED 19.10.2022 ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT TO THE 2ND PETITIONER HEREIN
- Exhibit P20 THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 27.03.2023 IN WPC NO. 3668 OF 2023 PASSED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT
- Exhibit P21 THE TRUE COPY OF THE DECISION DATED 10.04.2023 TAKEN BY THE MUNICIPAL



- COUNCIL OBTAINED THROUGH RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT TO ONE MR. PRAMOD.K
- Exhibit P22 THE TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 13.04.2023 ADDRESSED TO THE ENGINEER BY THE SECRETARY OF THE MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OBTAINED THROUGH RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT TO ONE MR. PRAMOD.K
- Exhibit P23 THE TRUE COPY OF THE AGREEMENT DATED 07.07.2023 BETWEEN MIJOY MAMMU KODENCHERY AND THE AUTHORITIES OF THE THIRSSUR MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OBTAINED THROUGH RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT TO ONE MR. PRAMOD.K
- Exhibit P24 THE TRUE COPY OF THE OFFICE NOTES OF THE 1ST RESPONDENT CORPORATION DATED 10.04.2023, 25.04.2023, 08.05.2023, 30.05.2023, 07.07.2023 EVIDENCING THE FACTUM OF SELECTION OF MIJOY MAMMU TO RENOVATE THE BINI TOURIST HOME OBTAINED THROUGH RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT TO ONE MR. PRAMOD.K
- Exhibit P25 THE TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 16.06.2023 PASSED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT IN WPC NO. 18352/2023
- Exhibit P26 THE TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGES OF NOTICE DATED 07.07.2023 BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
- Exhibit P27 THE TRUE COPY OF THE NOTE SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONERS TO THE 2ND RESPONDENT DATED 14.07.2023
- RESPONDENT'S/S' EXHIBITS
- Exhibit -R1(a) A copy of letter dated 29/10/22 submitted by the 4th respondent
- Exhibit -R1(b) A copy of resolution No. 96 of the Municipal Council of 1st respondent



2023:KER:69709

W.P.(C) NO.3668/2023 & Conn. Cases

-:27:-

Corporation dated 30/1/23

Exhibit -R1(c)

A copy of letter issued to the Station
House Officer, Thjrissur Town East
Police Station

Exhibit -R1(d)

A copy of Office note dated 14/2/23

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 27414/2023

PETITIONER'S/S' EXHIBITS

- Exhibit P1 THE TRUE COPY OF THE OFFER NOTICE DATED 01.09.2022 ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT
- Exhibit P2 THE TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE DATED 16.09.2022 ISSUED BY THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF THE 1ST RESPONDENT
- Exhibit P3 THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 28.10.2022 ISSUED BY DEPUTY SECRETARY OF THE 1ST RESPONDENT TO THE SAID JANEESH
- Exhibit P4 THE TRUE COPY OF THE RECEIPT DATED 31.10.2022 ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT
- Exhibit P5 THE TRUE COPY OF THE RECEIPT DATED 18.01.2023 SHOWING THE REMITTANCE OF AN AMOUNT OF RS.7413750/- BY JANEESH BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT
- Exhibit P6 THE TRUE COPY OF THE PHOTOGRAPHS SHOWING THE DEMOLITION OF BINI TOURIST HOME
- Exhibit P7 THE TRUE COPY OF THE MINUTES DATED 31.01.2023 OF THE THRISSUR MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
- Exhibit P8 THE TRUE COPY OF THE DISSENT NOTE PREFERRED BY THE COUNCILORS OF UDF DATED 31.01.2023
- Exhibit P9 THE TRUE COPY OF THE DISSENT NOTE OF NDA COUNCILORS GIVEN IN THE LETTER HEAD DATED 30.01.2023

RESPONDENT'S/S' EXHIBITS

- Exhibit -R1(a) A copy of the relevant clause in Kerala Public Works Department Manual Revised Edition 2012.