



Indian Law Reports - Kerala Series

Abridged Index

ILR Index of reported cases dt. 30.04.2025

Constitution of India—Article 21—Right to travel abroad—Mere existence of a Red Corner Notice against an Indian citizen is not, by itself, sufficient ground to deny passport services—Sections 6(2)(d) and 6(2)(e)—Passports Act, 1967 (Central Act 15 of 1967) - Muhammed Rafsal v. Union of India and others - I.L.R. 2025 Kerala OnLine 142 : [Neutral Citation No. 2025:KER:26159](#).

Explosives Rules, 2008 (Central)—Rules 115 and 118—Application for renewal of licence cannot be rejected for reasons other those specified in Explosives Act or rules - Additional District Magistrate and others v. Augustin Joseph and another - I.L.R. 2025 Kerala OnLine 145 : [Neutral Citation No. 2025:KER:32306](#).

Family Courts Act, 1984 (Central Act 66 of 1984)— Section 7— Judgment of the Family court declaring the status of a person is a judgment in rem and the Central Administrative Tribunal cannot sit in appeal over the judgment of the Family court—An exparte judgment is as valid and legal as a judgment in a contested case— Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 (Central Act 13 of 1985)—Section 19 - Daisy v. Southern Railway and another - I.L.R. 2025 Kerala OnLine 141 : [Neutral Citation No. 2025:KER:23130](#).

Major Port Trusts Act, 1963 (Central Act 38 of 1963)—Sections 47A, 48, 49, 50, 51 and 111—A legislation is presumed not to be intended to have a retrospective

operation—Law passed today cannot apply to the events of the past—Anchorage charges brought in the revised SoR (Scale of Rates) will operate only prospectively— Introduction of a deeming fiction for the first time ought not to change the character of past transactions —An explanation or clarification cannot expand or alter the scope of the original provision, and clarification must not have the effect of saddling any party with an unanticipated burden or withdrawing from any party an anticipated benefit—‘Lex prospicit non respicit’ - GAC Shipping (India) Private Limited v. Union of India and others - I.L.R. 2025 Kerala OnLine 148 : [Neutral Citation No. 2025:KER:31154.](#)

Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (Central Act 59 of 1988)—Section 166— Pleadings in claim petition—Strict rules of pleadings are not applicable in a proceeding under Section 166 - Oriental Insurance Company Ltd. v. Hamza C. and others - I.L.R. 2025 Kerala OnLine 144: [Neutral Citation No. 2025:KER:30132.](#)

Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (Central Act 59 of 1988)—Section 173—Compensation payable to claimant can be enhanced in appeal filed by Insurer, even without separate appeal by claimant or Cross objection - Oriental Insurance Company Ltd. v. Hamza C. and others - I.L.R. 2025 Kerala OnLine 144: [Neutral Citation No. 2025:KER:30132.](#)

National Legal Services Authority (Lok Adalats) Regulation, 2009—Regulation Nos. 16 & 17—The regulations obligate the Lok Adalats to verify the identity of the parties not represented by a counsel—Even if the parties are represented and identified by their counsel, the Lok Adalat shall ensure that unscrupulous litigants do not commit fraud or forgery - Vaishakh A. Nair v. Managing Director K.S.R.T.C. and others - I.L.R. 2025 Kerala OnLine 146 : [Neutral Citation No. 2025:KER:32571.](#)

Transfer of Property Act, 1882 (Central Act 4 of 1882)—Sections 122 and 123— Delivery of possession is not an essential requirement for the gift to be valid - Abraham and others v. Ajitha Jayakumar and others - I.L.R. 2025 Kerala OnLine 143 : [Neutral Citation No.2025:KER:28702.](#)

Transfer of Registry Rules, 1966 (Kerala)—Procedure to be followed by the Revenue Officers under the TR Rules while considering an application for the transfer of registry (mutation) due to testamentary succession - Guidelines issued - Babu R. v. State of Kerala and others - I.L.R. 2025 Kerala OnLine 147 : [Neutral Citation No. 2024:KER:84934.](#)

Transfer of Registry Rules, 1966 (Kerala)—Rules 3(c), 14(2), 27 and Note (ii) of Rule 10—The authority to conduct an enquiry to prove the genuineness or execution of the Will cannot be conferred on the Revenue Officers as in the case of intestate succession inasmuch as an enquiry prescribed for the proof of execution of the Will in terms of Section 63 of the Indian Succession Act and Section 68 of the Indian Evidence Act falls within the realm of the Civil Court—The Revenue Officers under the TR Rules do not have the jurisdiction to adjudicate the correctness or

genuineness of the Will—Indian Succession Act, 1925 (Central Act 39 of 1925)—Section 63—Indian Evidence Act 1872 (Central Act 1 of 1872)—Section 68 - Babu R. v. State of Kerala and others - I.L.R. 2025 Kerala OnLine 147 : [Neutral Citation No. 2024:KER:84934](#).
