



## Indian Law Reports - Kerala Series

### Abridged Index

#### I.L.R.- Index of reported cases dt. 07.10.2026

**Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 OF 1908)**—Order I Rule 8—When requisite publication under Order 1 Rule 8 of the CPC has been completed, allowing any aggrieved party to join the suit and no other parties, including Local authority, have appeared, the suit can be disposed of on merits - Rajan C. and others v. Nani Amma - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 322 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:69654.](#)

**Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)**—Order IX Rules 7 and 13—Application to set aside an order setting a defendant ex parte—Period of limitation—Rule 7 operates with reference to the stage of the proceedings and not by any rigid period of limitation—Application can be made at any adjourned hearing before the hearing of the suit is concluded, upon showing good cause for previous non-appearance—No separate application for condonation of delay required—Application under Order IX, Rule 7 CPC is not governed by Article 137 of the Limitation Act—Limitation Act, 1963 (Central Act 36 of 1963)—Article 137 - Devaki and Others v. Chandrika Ayyappan - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 324(FB) : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:73180.](#)

**Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 (Central Act 70 of 1971)**—Section 15(2)—Criminal Contempt—Sanction granted by Advocate General—Complaint addressed to the Chief Justice based on unverified newspaper reports attributing adverse oral remarks against a litigant to a sitting Judge— Authors/publishers of the reports not

impleaded—Factual correctness of reports not established—Sanction order unsustainable—Freedom of media to report proceedings—Media has a duty to satisfy the requirement of fidelity, context and verification, before reporting Court proceedings - Aswakumar S. v. Kochouseph Chittilappilly - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 323 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:74965](#).

**Dentists Act, 1948 (Central Act 16 of 1948)**—Section 16A—If the undisputed or admitted facts lead to only one conclusion or a single possible legal outcome, the Court need not quash an order or direct the authority to redo a proceeding, merely because there was a failure to call for an explanation—When an opportunity of hearing had already been granted to the institution and on the basis of such an opportunity, a re-inspection was also conducted, which revealed that deficiencies had not been rectified, the purpose of calling for an explanation from the institution under Section 16A (2) by the State Government would not advance the case of the institution—Role of State Government in the matter of withdrawal or cancellation of recognition is only minimal—In the matter of maintenance of standards of dental education, a strict approach has to be adopted—Dental Council of India (Establishment of New Dental College, Opening of Higher Courses of Study or Training and Increase of Admission Capacity of Dental Colleges)Regulations, 2006—Regulations 6 and 11A - Principal, Century International Institute of Dental Science and Research Centre v. Union of India and others - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 320 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:63134](#).

**Essential Commodities Act, 1955 (Central Act 10 of 1955)**—Sections 6A and 6B—Without initiating any proceedings for confiscation of the commodity seized, Government does not have the right to take over the commodity - Karthikeyan C. v. State of Kerala and others - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 316 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:55127](#).

**Evidence Act, 1872 (Central Act 1 of 1872)**—Sections 3 and 114—Definition of “proved”—Under Section 114 of the Evidence Act, the court may infer any fact likely to have occurred by evaluating the evidence against the ordinary course of nature, human conduct, and business affairs—The question of entrustment of gold ornaments, in most cases, depends upon an appreciation of the oral evidence—The process of arriving at a conclusion, guided by the broader principles embodied in Sections 3 and 114 of the Indian Evidence Act, should invariably be based on the facts and circumstances of each case and not on any rigid rule—Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023 (Central Act 47 of 2023)—Sections 53 and 119 - Shan Baby and another v. Roshny Shan - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 321 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:71420](#).

**Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947)**—Section 2(s)—Proposition

that there could not be any challenge against the Preliminary Orders in Industrial Disputes pending before the Labour Court/Tribunal is not an absolute proposition of law—Constitution of India—Article 226 - Alexander O.T. v. General Secretary, Industrial Complex Labour Union (INTUC) and another - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 317 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:63826](#).

**Judges**—Restraint to be observed by Judges in open court—Oral observations which are not necessary for adjudication and touching upon character or reputation of the parties ought to be avoided—Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct, 2002—Restatement of Values of Judicial Life, 1999 - Aswakumar S. v. Kochouseph Chittilappilly - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 323 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:74965](#).

**Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (Central Act 59 of 1988)**—Sections 163A, 166 and 168—Claim petition filed under Section 163A—Negligence pleaded and proved—Quantum claimed exceeding limits of structured formula—Tribunal should convert claim to one under Section 166 to award just and higher compensation, where negligence is pleaded and evidence let in to prove negligence - Sanoj Kumar v. Salim A.M. and others - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 319 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:66026](#).

**Prevention of Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1988 (Central Act 46 of 1988)**—Sections 3 and 9—When constitutionally guaranteed rights of a citizen are at stake, though he may have been implicated in criminal offences, the same cannot dilute or diminish the constitutional safeguards available to him—Delay, in itself, is not a conclusive factor in cases involving preventive detention—Principal consideration would be whether the delay has been adequately explained and whether such delay has resulted in breaking the live and proximate nexus between the detenu's prejudicial activities—Constitutionally guaranteed right of detenu stands negated by the inordinate delay in disposing of his representation preferred under Article 22 (5) as well as due to the mechanical and unreasonable manner of such disposal—Constitution of India—Article 22(5) - Thara L.S. v. Union of India and others - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 318 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:52368](#).

**Pl. visit our website- [www.ilrkerala.gov.in](http://www.ilrkerala.gov.in)**

\*\*\*\*\*