



Indian Law Reports - Kerala Series

Abridged Index

I.L.R. – Index of reported cases dt. 14.10.2026

Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)—Order VI Rule 17—Amendment of pleadings—Interpretation of ‘due diligence’—Amendment of pleadings after commencement of trial—Contention that the mistake in the plaint schedule was noticed only at the stage of cross-examination cannot be accepted in a case where the written statement had been filed as early as in 2013—The restrictions for permitting an amendment is contained in the proviso itself and the same cannot be watered down by adding situations where the test should not be applied - Roy Kurian v. Elizabeth Kurian - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 326 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:68600](#).

Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)—Order VII Rule 7—Power of Court to mould reliefs—Declaration of title and vacant possession—Technicalities in Family Disputes—The Family Court may lay down its own procedure with a view to arriving at the truth of the facts alleged by one party and denied by the other - Family Courts Act, 1984 (Central Act 32 of 1984)—Section 10(3) - Raslin v. Kurudankandi Shameer - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 331 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:73656](#).

Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)—Order XXVI—Commission Report—It is only a piece of evidence and is not sacrosanct - Court is not bound by it—It is still open for either party to prove that the finding of the commissioner is

flawed based on other cogent evidence - Abdul Razzak S. v. Suraja Devi C.B. and another - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 328 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:67882.](#)

Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)—Order XXVI Rules 9 and 10—Objection to the report of the commissioner—Defendants were present at the property when the commissioner commenced his inspection and had no case that the measurement done by the commissioner was improper—Application to set aside the report filed after defendants themselves raised a counterclaim is clearly an afterthought—The decision in Sabu v. Sasi [2022(2) KLT 722] only highlighted the procedure to be followed under the Kerala Survey and Boundaries Act and cannot be understood to have granted a fresh cause of action to the parties to file an application for remitting the report of the commissioner in a case where the commissioner has already returned the findings and the parties failed to raise any objection - Abdul Razzak S. v. Suraja Devi C.B. and another - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 328 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:67882.](#)

Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)—Order XXVI Rule 10(3)—Report of the commissioner—Stage at which it can be set aside—Once the commissioner's report is accepted in evidence, it is impermissible for the court to strike off the same from the evidence—The application, if any, to set aside the report of the commissioner or the objections, if any, ought to have been pressed before the court decided to receive the reports in evidence—Entertaining the application for setting aside the report of the commissioner after the closure of evidence is wholly impermissible and is a procedural irregularity which requires correction - Abdul Razzak S. v. Suraja Devi C.B. and another - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 328 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:67882.](#)

Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974)—Scope of Suo motu revision examined—Retrial—All that the High Court can do is : (i) to set aside the judgment of conviction and sentence and acquit the accused; (ii) while doing so, order for a retrial and (iii) in the alternative, while maintaining the conviction, reduce the sentence—Where the Sessions Judge has not considered the evidence in its entirety while entering a finding on the offences committed by the accused, the High Court has the power to order retrial—Evidence having been already recorded, the trial is reverted to the stage of hearing the matter on merits and the trial before that stage is kept intact - Biju v. State of Kerala - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 327 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:72978.](#)

Constitution of India—Articles 19, 21, 226 and 227—Development of public walkway—Vesting of reclaimed land—Assignment of patta to Development Authority—There was a vesting of the extent of 25 hectares of land in Sy.No.843 of Ernakulam Village in GIDA and such vesting was to the exclusion of any titular interest over the land in favour of the Corporation of Kochi.—The vesting of the land

in GIDA was for the specific purpose of development of the land as per the development schemes prepared by GIDA from time to time—GIDA is entitled to install commercial kiosks on adjacent deck space to the walkway by the side of Queens way, Kochi—Flat owners living in adjacent properties cannot object to construction of Kiosks - Kerala Town and Country Planning Act, 2016 (Act 9 of 2016), Sections 51 & 56—Kerala Municipality Act, 1994 (Act 20 of 1994) - Goshree Islands Development Authority (GIDA) and another v. Tritvam Apartment Owners Association (TAOA) and others - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 330 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:76784](#).

Constitution of India—Article 226—Allocation of Roster—Master of the Roster—Scope of inquiry in private property disputes—Bench not holding the Public Interest Litigation roster is not competent to expand a private writ petition into a representative action on behalf of the general public—Rules of the High Court of Kerala, 1971 - Goshree Islands Development Authority (GIDA) and another v. Tritvam Apartment Owners Association (TAOA) and others -I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 330 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:76784](#).

Family Courts Act, 1984 (Central Act 66 of 1984)—Section 14—Exclusion of evidence of oral agreement—Overriding effect of Section 14 of Family Courts Act—Admissibility of evidence varying terms of a document—The Family Court can take into consideration any such statement, information or document if it finds that the same is necessary for effectively resolving the dispute—Once the Family Court arrives at such conclusion, it can rely on any such evidence dehors Section 92—Such discretion should be exercised with due care and caution, having regard to the laudable objects underlying Section 92—Indian Evidence Act, 1872 (Central Act 1 of 1872)—Section 92 - Raslin v. Kurudankandi Shameer - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 331 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:73656](#).

Limitation Act, 1963 (Central Act 36 of 1963)—Article 135—Enforcement of decree granting mandatory injunction—Period of limitation for filing execution petition—Dismissal of regular Second Appeal as not pressed— Formal decree drawn up by High Court — Merger of subordinate court decrees in the appellate decree—Limitation of three years runs from the date of the decree in Second Appeal and not from the date of the First Appellate Court decree, irrespective of whether the second appeal was decided on merits or not—Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)—Section 100 - Sree Subrahmaniam Kshetara Seva Samithi v. Unnikrishnan M. and others - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 329 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:72671](#).

Penal Code, 1860 (Central Act 45 of 1860)—Sections 354, 376 and 511—Sexual assault—Evidence of the victim—It is well settled law that, in a case of sexual

assault, the evidence of the victim, if found to be of sterling quality, can be acted upon as the sole basis of conviction—Finding of the Sessions Judge disbelieving the overt acts spoken by the victim with the aid of the evidence of the witness to whom she had not narrated the remaining part of the overt acts, found to be not justifiable in the eye of law and would require reconsideration - Biju v. State of Kerala - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 327 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:72978](#).

Wakf Act, 1995 (Central Act 43 of 1995)—Sections 3(ee), 54(4) and 83(1) (post 2013 amendment)—Prior to amendment of Section 83, a suit for eviction of a tenant could not be filed before the Tribunal under Section 83 (1)—Only C.E.O. had the power to order removal of encroachment, before the amendment—After amendment, C.E.O. does not have the power, he can only move the Tribunal for removal of any encroachment from wakf property or for eviction of a tenant, lessee etc. if he is satisfied of the encroachment or of the unauthorized occupation of a wakf property—There is no conflict between the decisions in Hamza Hajee P.K. v. Kerala State Wakf Board, and Jamal v. Union of India, on the one hand and Mechery Vijayakumar v. Kinasseri Yateem Khana, on the other hand - Transfer of Property Act, 1882 (Central Act 4 of 1882) - Ramani and others v. Kozhikode Puthiyapalliparipalana Committee and another - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 325 (F.B) : Neutral Citation No.2022:IO:KER:18.

Wakf Act, 1995 (Central Act 43 of 1995)—Section 54 (prior to Amendment Act 27 of 2013)—Scope of the term “encroacher”—Inclusion of tenants and lessees holding over—Competence of Chief Executive Officer—Under Section 54, before the amendment of the Section in 2013, CEO had every right to order eviction of an encroacher -The term ‘encroacher’ takes within its ambit a tenant, lessee or mortgagee also—Precedent in Ramesh Gobindram v. Sugra Humayun Mirza Wakf confined to unamended Section 83(1) and does not curtail the independent statutory machinery under Section 54—The dictum in P.E. Sarjith v. Misbahul Huda Educational Trust lays down the correct law and is not rendered against the binding precedent laid down by the Supreme Court in Ramesh Gobindram v. Sugra Humayun Mirza Wakf and Faseela M. v. Munnerul Islam Madrassa Committee—Wakf Rules, 1996 (Kerala)—Rule 2(ha) - Ramani and others v. Kozhikode Puthiyapalliparipalana Committee and another - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 325 (F.B) : Neutral Citation No.2022:IO:KER:18.

Pl. visit our web site- www.ilrkerala.gov.in
