Indian Law Reports - Kerala Series

Abridged Index

I.L.R. – Index of cases reported dt. 18.11.2026

Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974)—Section 229—Request to stay trial pending investigation—Accused nos. 24 and 25, arrested in 2018, sought to keep the trial in Sessions Case (against accused nos. 1–16) in abeyance until the investigation against them was concluded and a final report filed—Petitioners failed to demonstrate specific harm caused by ongoing trial proceedings, as evidence recorded in their absence would not be used against them unless statutory exceptions under Section 299 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (CrPC) or Section 33 of the Evidence Act applied-Not obligatory to hold a joint trial, which will prolong the trial of the main accused- There is clear, distinguishable difference in the nature and character of evidence to be let in vis-à-vis the main accused and Petitioners—Court cannot lose sight of the right of the victim for a speedy trial—Evidence Act, 1872 (Central Act 1 of 1872)—Section 33 - Najeeb and another v. State of Kerala and others - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 368 : Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:78634.

Contract Act, 1872 (Central Act 9 of 1872)—A Bill of Quantity (BoQ) contract is not automatically divisible merely because its price is broken into numerous priced items–There is no single mechanical formula that decides whether a contract is divisible or composite (entire/indivisible)—An 'entire contract' (indivisible contract) is one where the entire fulfilment by one party of his obligations is a condition precedent to the liability of the other party—A contract has to be read as a whole to understand the intention of the parties—A word cannot be picked out indiscriminately

and interpreted de hors the object and purpose of the contract—Mere use of the words “item-wise supply” will not make a contract BoQ contract when it appears to be an indivisible contract leaning towards a “lump-sum contract”—Constitution of India—Article 226 - M/s. PRG Buildcon India Pvt. Ltd. v. Kerala Water Authority and others - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 367 : Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:73174.

Contract Act, 1872 (Central Act 9 of 1872)—A term cannot be implied just because it is reasonable to do so or that it would make the performance of the contract more just, convenient or beneficial to one party—Where there is an express contract between the parties, they cannot resort to an implied one—The Court will construe the words used by the parties in their agreement giving those words their natural and ordinary meaning—Constitution of India—Article 226—Interpretation of statutes - M/s. PRG Buildcon India Pvt. Ltd. v. Kerala Water Authority and others - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 367 : Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:73174.

Co-operative Societies Act, 1969 (Kerala Act 21 of 1969)—Section 32—In the absence of exceptional circumstances warranting a departure from the fair procedure under Section 32(1) and (2) of the Act, the requirement of issuing a prior show cause notice and consulting the financing Bank or the Circle Cooperative Union concerned, ought not to have been dispensed with—An action of a statutory authority that is not supported by cogent reasons that show the basis of such action casts doubt on the bona fides of the authority concerned in taking such action—Unlike in a situation where the reinstatement is directed in the backdrop of an employer-employee relationship, when it comes to reinstating a democratically elected body such as the Managing Committee of a Co-operative Society, any factor that vitiates the order of supersession passed against them must operate to their advantage in securing an immediate reinstatement through restoration of the status quo ante - Mani Viswanath and others v. State of Kerala and others - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 369 : Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:84208.

Electronic Filing Rules for Courts (Kerala), 2021—Rule 8 (2)—Plaint and Vakalath executed with electronic signatures—Refusal by filing section to number the suit citing lack of resources to verify electronic signatures is unsustainable—Production of audit trail showing chronological record of execution process constitutes sufficient compliance—Court directed to receive and number the plaint—Information Technology Act, 2000 (Central Act 21 of 2000) - Aneesh v. Akhil Das - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 370 : Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:67560.

Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (Central Act 59 of 1988)—Sections 19 (1A) and 206(4)—Power of licensing authority to disqualify from holding a driving licence—In the case of a first offence, disqualification under Section 19 (1A) can only be for a period of three months and cannot extend beyond that period - Adithya Prem v. State of Kerala and others - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 371 : Neutral Citation

No.2026:KER:84951.

Pl. visit our website- www.ilrkerala.gov.in

******