



Indian Law Reports - Kerala Series

Abridged Index

ILR - INDEX OF REPORTED CASES dt. 24.06.2026

Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Central Act 26 of 1996)—Sections 5, 16(2), 16(5) and 37(2)(a)—High Court jurisdiction under Article 227 against order of Arbitrator rejecting jurisdictional plea under Section 16(2)—Maintainability—Where arbitral tribunal acts without inherent jurisdiction or where subject matter is non-arbitrable, High Court can exercise supervisory jurisdiction under Article 227 without waiting for final award—Disputes relating to restructuring of companies, division of assets and liabilities, change of Managing Director, and allotment or buy-out of shares in companies registered under Companies Act are not arbitrable—National Company Law Tribunal has exclusive jurisdiction over such disputes under Sections 241 and 242 of the Companies Act, 2013—Presence of a specialized statutory forum with exclusive jurisdiction is a clear indicator of non-arbitrability—Intra-company disputes affecting minority shareholders and third parties constitute actions in rem, not in personam, and are therefore not amenable to arbitration—Mere inclusion of an arbitration clause in an MOU between individual shareholders does not render non-arbitrable subject matter arbitrable—Arbitration proceeding in respect of the three companies terminated—Companies Act, 2013 (Central Act 18 of 2013)—Sections 241, 242—Constitution of India—Article 227 - Purushothaman Thitta v. Pothan Rajan and another - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 194 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:37218](#).

Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)—Sections 11 and 115—Order VII, Rule 11—A party cannot circumvent the finality of an adverse order by re-framing the same challenge under a different procedural provision—The

second application under Order VII Rule 11 of the CPC is barred by the principle of res judicata, inasmuch as the identical issue was directly and substantially in issue in the first Order VII Rule 11 proceedings, was heard and decided by the High Court which had attained finality—Section 6(5) of the Hindu Succession Act is a saving clause of narrow and strict application, and it does not create a jurisdictional bar to the institution of a suit for partition—The saving clause operates within the four corners of Section 6 and it does not override or abrogate the independent devolution that occurs under Section 8 upon the intestate death of a Hindu male—Revisional jurisdiction is supervisory in nature and limited in scope; the High Court may interfere only if the subordinate court has exercised a jurisdiction not vested in it by law, or has failed to exercise a jurisdiction so vested, or has acted in the exercise of its jurisdiction illegally or with material irregularity—Hindu Succession Act, 1956 (Central Act 30 of 1956)—Hindu Succession (Amendment) Act, 2005 (Central Act 39 of 2005)—Section 6 - Lalitha B.S. and others v. Bhuvanesh and others - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 192 (SC): [Neutral Citation No. 2026 INSC 499](#).

Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)—Section 92—Order XXXII Rule 3—It is not essential for the Court to pass an order in an application under Order XXXII Rule 3 before the institution of suit, and permission can be granted at any point of time—Failure to do so is not detrimental to the suit, and also in view of the circumstances of the case—Situations wherein suit by a worshipper is permissible, pointed out—Though in a suit by the next friend on behalf of the idol, recovery of possession cannot be granted by the Court to the next friend, the court can always restructure the relief and act accordingly—Once it is concluded that, the compromise entered between the trustee as well as the original second defendant is void, the Idol is entitled to maintain the suit through a worshipper and to have the compromise and the subsequent assignment nullified—Specific Relief Act, 1963 (Central Act 47 of 1963)—Sections 34 and 42—Madras Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Act, 1951 (Madras Act 19 of 1951)—Section 29(a) - Vijayakumaran and others v. Govindapuram Tempe and others - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 196 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:33749](#).

Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 (Central Act 23 of 1940)—Sections 3, 20, 21 and 32—In the light of the settled proposition of law about the indispensable nature of the requirement to have gazette notification to give effect to a legislation, if it is so prescribed, the prosecution cannot be heard to say that the requirement under Section 21 of the Act to effect gazette notification of the appointment of Inspectors specifying the areas assigned to them, is not of mandatory nature—Contingency in which the ‘defacto doctrine’ comes into play, explained—Privilege and protection of ‘defacto doctrine’ cannot be extended to such persons or authorities, who are parties to the issue and litigations which arose out of the acts and proceedings of those persons or authorities, performed in purported exercise of their powers - M/s Agron Remedies Pvt. Ltd. and others v. Drugs Inspector and another - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 193 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:34179](#).

Land Reforms Act, 1963 (Kerala Act 1 of 1964)—Sections 51 and 72K—Where the tenant voluntarily transfers the property to the landlord and does not dispute the said surrender having been hit by any coercion or undue influence, trespassers cannot raise the plea that the surrender by the tenant to the landlord is against the statute and therefore, the landlord does not derive title over the property—Notwithstanding the statutory prohibition under Section 51, tenant can always dedicate property in favour of idol and such dedication is not hit by Section 51 - Vijayakumaran and others v. Govindapuram Tempe and others - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 196 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:33749](#).

Penal Code, 1860 (Central Act 45 of 1860)—Section 376(2)(n)—A certificate equivalent to matriculation constitutes the highest category for age determination and if available, no other evidence can be relied upon—Once the Prosecution establishes the age of the minor as below 18 years, the question of consent cannot be considered—Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (Central Act No. 32 of 2012)—Sections 5(j)(ii), 5(l), 5(o), 5(p) r/w 6—Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children), 2015 (Central Act 2 of 2016) —Section 23 - Chevayi Mohandas v. State of Kerala - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 195 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:39131](#).

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