

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.M.SHAFFIQUE

WEDNESDAY, THE 11TH DAY OF NOVEMBER 2015/20TH KARTHIKA, 1937

WP(C).No. 7309 of 2006 (T)

PETITIONER(S):

**T. GRACE THANKADURAI,
W/O. THANKADURAI, GOLDEN BAKERY, MOOLAKKADAI
MUNNAR, DIST. IDUKKI.**

**BY ADVS.SRI.K.REGHU KOTTAPPURAM
SRI.M.MUKESH**

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. THE MUNNAR GRAMA PANCHAYATH
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY, MUNNAR, DIST.IDUKKI.**
- 2. THE SUB COLLECTOR, DEVIKULAM,
DIST. IDUKKI.**
- 3. THE COMMISSIONER & SECRETARY TO GOVT.,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT, STATE OF KERALA
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**
- 4. THE TAHASILDAR, DEVIKULAM TALUK,
MUNNAR, DIST. IDUKKI**

R4 INCORPORATED AFTER TAKING PERMISSION FROM COURT.

**R1 BY ADV. SMT.AYSHA YOUSEFF, SC, MUNNAR G.PANCHAY
ADV. SMT.MOLLY JACOB, SC, MUNNAR G.PANCHAYAT
R2-4 BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER P.K.ABDUL RAHMAN**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON
11-11-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**

VS

WP(C).No. 7309 of 2006 (T)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS :

- EXT.P1 - A TRUE COPY OF THE SALE DEED NO.305/1996 DATED 30.1.1996 OF
 S.R.O. DEVIKULAM**
- EXT.P2 - A TRUE COPY OF THE SALE DEED NO.446/1982 DATED 1.1.1982**
- EXT.P3 - A TRUE COPY OF THE BUILDING TAX RECEIPT DATED 18.2.2006**
- EXT.P4 - A TRUE COPY OF THE TAX RECEIPT DATED 28.12.2005 ISSUED BY
 VILLAGE OFFICER.**
- EXT.P5 - A TRUE COPY OF THE RECEIPT DATED 4.2.2006**
- EXT.P6 - A TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED BY MUNNAR GRAMA
 PANCHAYAT NO.A3-98/06 DATED 17.2.2006**
- EXT.P7 - A TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS NO.D3-1832/06 DATED 27.2.2006**
- EXT.P8 - A TRUE COPY OF LAND BOARD AWARD NO.LB(A)2-5227/71 DATED
 29.3.1974**
- EXT.P9 - A TRUE COPY OF THE DEED OF RATIFICATION DATED 28.11.1978**
- EXT.P10 - A TRUE COPY OF THE 1ST POONJAT CONCESSION DATED 11.7.1877.**

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS :

- EXT.R1(a)- TRUE COPY OF LETTER NO.A2-89/05 DATED 12.1.2006**

/TRUE COPY/

PA TO JUDGE

VS

S. Siri Jagan, J.

=====

W.P(C) No. 7309 of 2006

=====

Dated this, the 5th day of January, 2012.

J U D G M E N T

The learned counsel for the petitioner seeks adjournment. Adjournment is declined. Counsel present is not prepared to argue the case. The petitioner is also not present. The writ petition is therefore dismissed for default.

Sd/- S. Siri Jagan, Judge.

Tds/

[True copy]

P.S to Judge.