



Indian Law Reports - Kerala Series

Abridged Index

I.L.R. - INDEX OF REPORTED DECISIONS dt. 26.08.2026

Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Central Act 26 of 1996)—Section 9—Compromise recorded in Section 9 proceedings—An order recording a settlement between parties, arrived at pending a petition under Section 9 and recorded by the court on an application under Order XXIII Rule 3 CPC, is executable as a decree—Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)—Section 89, Order XXIII Rule 3 - Invis Private Limited v. Ajith M.R. and others - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 265 : [Neutral Citation No. 2026:KER:52944.](#)

Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)—Section 89, Order XXIII Rule 3, Order XLIII Rule 1A(2)—Execution of compromise decree based on Mediation Settlement—Challenge at execution Stage—If a party is aggrieved by terms of the Mediation Settlement agreement, he can invoke the power of the court under Order XXIII Rule 3 of the Civil Procedure Code and lead such evidence to show that the agreement entered between the parties are unconscionable—Aggrieved party cannot resist execution of the compromise decree—Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules, 2006 (Kerala)—Rule 25 - Manoj Jose and another v. George Joseph @ Varkey - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 264 : [Neutral Citation No. 2026:KER:58573.](#)

Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (Central Act 34 of 1948)—Section 76—Direction to implead the employees or their unions is obligatory, not optional—It follows that even in cases wherein the management has a contention that persons who were reckoned as employees by the ESI Corporation for assessing coverage and determining contribution payable were not “employees” as defined under the Act, the requirement of impleading the employees or their unions cannot be dispensed with—ESI Act is a labour welfare legislation, provisions of the Act is to be

construed bearing in mind the interest of the employees—Requirement under Section 76 is well preserved under Rule 16 of the Kerala Rules—As stipulated in Section 76 (1), all proceedings are to be instituted in the Court appointed for the local area in which the insured person was working at the time the question or dispute arose—Employees’ Insurance Court Rules, 1958 (Kerala)—Rule 16 - Employees State Insurance Corporation v. M/s Vettoor Hotels - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 261 : [Neutral Citation No. 2026 : KER : 53518.](#)

Government Law Officers (Appointment and Conditions of Service) and Conduct of Cases Rules, 1978 (Kerala)—Rule 8—Appointment of District Government Pleader-cum-Public Prosecutor—The District Collector prepares a list of eligible Advocates and forwards it to the District and Sessions Judge for consultation—Only those candidates approved by the District and Sessions Judge can be included in the Panel prepared by the District Collector, from which the Government may appoint—Consultation with the District and Sessions Judge must be real and effective—The opinion of the District and Sessions Judge is the most important factor—The District Collector cannot include any name not endorsed by the District and Sessions Judge in the Panel—Judicial review of such appointments is limited to examining whether the process is vitiated by illegality, irregularity or perversity, and does not extend to reassessing the comparative merit of candidates as evaluated by the District and Sessions Judge—Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974)—Section 24(4) - Joseph P.T. (Adv.) v. State of Kerala and others - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 268 : [Neutral Citation No. 2026:KER:52474.](#)

Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 (Central Act 25 of 1955)—Section 16—Legitimacy of children of void marriages—Second marriage contracted by a Hindu male during the subsistence of his first marriage is void—Second wife cannot be described as the “widow” of the deceased employee and is not entitled to his terminal/retirement benefits or family pension—Children born of such void marriage are, however, legitimate under Section 16 and are entitled to a share in the family pension and death-cum-retirement gratuity of the deceased, till they attain majority - Vasantha K. and another v. Kerala State Road Transport Corporation and others - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 262 : [Neutral Citation No. 2026:KER:45226.](#)

Insurance Act, 1938 (Central Act 4 of 1938)—Section 45—Life Insurance—Repudiation of claim within two years—Non-disclosure/suppression of pre-existing illness (Diabetes)—Whether the non-disclosed pre-existing condition had any direct nexus with the actual cause of death is irrelevant when repudiation occurs within the initial two-year period - Suppression of pre-existing medical history in response to specific queries constitutes breach of duty, making the repudiation legal and sustainable - Valsa K.K. v. H.D.F.C. Ltd. and another - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 267 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:59987.](#)

Law of Torts—Tortious Liability—Where a statutory authority is entrusted with the duty to take reasonable care for the protection of the public, it cannot escape liability for damage which is the reasonably foreseeable consequence of its failure to discharge that duty—An action in tort is founded upon a breach of a duty of care, whether arising from a positive act or an omission—Broadly stated, it’s

essential ingredients are: (i) the existence of a duty of care; (ii) that the duty is owed to the plaintiff or to a class of persons of which the plaintiff is a member (the pedestrians or persons using the public streets can be considered a class of persons in the given case); (iii) breach of that duty by the defendant and (iv) damage suffered by the plaintiff is a reasonably foreseeable and proximate consequence of the breach—Breach of statutory duty by the defendant Panchayat, resulting in physical injury to the plaintiff, is actionable in tort, particularly where the statute provides no other remedy and it's underlying policy is the protection of persons using the public streets - Eruvessy Grama Panchayat v. Tankappan - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 269 : [Neutral Citation No. 2026:KER:56094](#).

Limitation Act, 1963 (Central Act 36 of 1963)—Articles 72 and 113—Limitation of Suit seeking damages consequent to an incident that occurred due to the failure of the officials or the authority to discharge their statutory duty—Examined—Article 72 is intended to govern actions seeking compensation in respect of bona fide acts or omissions committed by public authorities—On the contrary, where a suit for damages is filed consequent to an incident that occurred due to failure of the officials or the authority to discharge their statutory duty or due to their wrongful act, this Article is not applicable—While enacting the Limitation Act, 1963, Parliament omitted general provision relating to suits in tort, pursuant to the recommendations of the Law Commission—Limitation period commenced only from the date on which the cause of action actually accrued, since the plaintiff had no occasion to institute a suit for damages until the damage was sustained, even though the omission or failure to discharge the public duty might have occurred earlier—The cause of action for the suit did not arise merely by reason of such omission—It accrued only when the consequential event, namely, the stray dog attack resulting in injuries to the plaintiff, occurred—As a result, suits claiming compensation for malfeasance, misfeasance or nonfeasance not arising out of contract are now governed by Article 113—Eruvessy Grama Panchayat v. Tankappan - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 269 : [Neutral Citation No. 2026:KER:56094](#).

Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (Central Act 61 of 1985)—Section 50—Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (Central Act 43 of 2023)—Compliance with Section 50 is not mandatory where contraband is recovered by chance during a personal search conducted without prior specific information - Muhammed Azad A.K. v. State of Kerala - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 260 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:49767](#).

Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (Central Act 26 of 1881)—Sections 118(a) and 139—“Signing”, “Issuance” and “Execution” of a cheque—Distinction between the above concepts explained - Francis T. Chacko v. Sajeevan T.K. - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 266 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:57175](#).

Panchayat Raj Act, 1994 (Kerala Act 13 of 1994)—Sections 166 and 254—Kerala Panchayat Raj (Licensing of Pigs and Dogs) Rules, 1998—Rules 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 13—Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960 (Central Act 59 of 1960)—Animal Birth Control (Dogs) Rules, 2001 (Central)—Rule 6—Statutory provisions related to Stray Dog Menace—Provisions examined - Eruvessy Grama Panchayat v. Tankappan - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 269 : [Neutral Citation No. 2026:KER:56094](#).

Panchayat Raj Act, 1994 (Kerala Act 13 of 1994)—Section 249 (1) (b)—Law of Limitation—Section 249(1)(b) restricts the period of limitation only in relation to suits or civil proceedings arising out of “anything done or purporting to be done under this Act” by the Panchayat or its officials in their official capacity—In its plain language, the provision does not curtail the period of limitation for a suit founded on the consequences of the omission or failure of the Panchayat or its officials to discharge a mandatory statutory duty imposed upon them under the Act—“Action” occurring in the said provision may not, in its context, include an omission—Statutory protection thereunder is intended to extend only to acts done, or purported to have been done, in the discharge of official functions, and not to a cause of action such as the present one, where the tortious liability arises from the consequence of an omission or failure to discharge a mandatory statutory duty - Eruvessy Grama Panchayat v. Tankappan - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 269 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:56094](#).

Trade Marks Act, 1999 (Central Act 47 of 1999)—Section 25(3)—Renewal of registration of trademark—Notice before removal of trademark from register—At the prescribed time before expiration of the last registration of a trade mark, the Registrar is mandatorily required to send notice, in the prescribed manner, to the registered proprietor of the date of expiration and the conditions as to renewal—No such notice issued by the Registry to the petitioner before expiry of registration— In the absence of compliance with the mandatory requirement of notice under Section 25(3) and Rule 58, the Registry cannot be permitted to remove the trademark from the register—Trade Marks Rules, 2017 (Central)—Rule 58 - Prasannan S. v. Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trademarks and another - I.L.R. 2026 Kerala OnLine 263 : [Neutral Citation No.2026:KER:53702](#).

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