



2025:KER:28662

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE BASANT BALAJI

WEDNESDAY, THE 2ND DAY OF APRIL 2025 / 12TH CHAITHRA, 1947OP(C) NO. 2392 OF 2024

CMA NO.23 OF 2024 OF DISTRICT COURT & SESSIONS COURT,KOTTAYAM
ARISING OUT OF THE JUDGMENT DATED IN OS NO.14 OF 2024 OF ADDITIONAL
MUNSIFF COURT ,KOTTAYAM

PETITIONER/S:

- 1 BENJAMIN C JOSEPH
AGED 52 YEARS
CHIRAYIL HOUSE, MADAPPALLY VILLAGE, MAMOOD.P.O,
CHANGANACHERRY TALUK, KOTTAYAM DISTRICT, PIN - 686536
- 2 ANIL JOHN ABRAHAM
AGED 68 YEARS
THEKKANATHU HOUSE, KEEZHACHERIMAL VILLAGE, CHENGANNOOR.P.O,
CHENGANNUR TALUK, ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT, PIN - 689121
- 3 ADV. SHAJI MATHEW GEORGE
AGED 58 YEARS
PULIMALAKUNNEL HOUSE, MALLAPPALLY VILLAGE,
PERUMPARAMAVU.P.O, MALLAPPALLY TALUK, PATHANAMTHITTA
DISTRICT, PIN - 689587

BY ADV ARUN THOMAS

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 MADHYA KERALA DIOCESE OF THE CHURCH OF SOUTH INDIA
REP.BY ITS SECRETARIES, DIOCESAN OFFICE, NORTON CLERGY HOME,
CATHEDRAL ROAD, KOTTAYAM VILLAGE, KOTTAYAM TALUK,
KOTTAYAM.P.O, PIN - 686001
- 2 REV.FR.CHACKO VARGHESE
AGED 62 YEARS
CONVENOR, TELLERS COMMITTEE, MADHYA KERALA DIOCESE OF CHURCH
OF SOUTH INDIA, VICAR, CHURCH OF SOUTH INDIA, ARPOOKARA.P.O,
ARPOOKARA KARA, ARPOOKARA VILLAGE, KOTTAYAM, PIN - 686008
- 3 REV.THOMAS PAIKAD
VICAR, CSI ST.PETER'S CHURCH, PUTHUPPALLY.P.O, KAYAMKULAM,



2025:KER:28662

PIN - 690527

- 4 REV.VIJU VARKEY GEORGE
VICAR, CSI ST.PAULS CHURCH, KALLUMALA.P.O, MAVELIKARA, PIN - 690110
- 5 REV.NEBU SKARIAH
VICAR, CSI ST.THOMAS CHURCH, PINNAKANADU, KALAKETTY.P.O, KOTTAYAM, PIN - 686508
- 6 REV.ALEX P OOMMEN
VICAR, CSI ST.THOMAS CHURCH, THOLASSERY, THIRUVALLA, PIN - 689101
- 7 REV.SAJI K SAM
VICAR, CSI ST.ANDEREW'S CHURCH, PANNIMATTOM, CHANNANIKADU.P.O, KOTTAYM, PIN - 686533
- 8 REV.JOHN ANDREWS
VICAR, CSI ST.ALL SAINTS CHURCH, PATHANAMTHITTA.P.O,, PIN - 689645
- 9 REV.DR.P.K.KURUVILLA
VICAR, CSI ST.THOMAS CHURCH, KUMBANEEL.P.O, PATHANAMTHITTA, PIN - 689547
- 10 REV.RENJI K GEROG
VICAR, CSI ST.PAULS CHURCH, KAPPIL, KAPPIL ESTATE P.O, KRISHNAPURAM (VIA), PIN - 690533
- 11 REV.PAUL P MATHEW
VICAR, CSI ST.TRANSFIGURATION CHURCH OF WARIKKADU, KUTTAPUZHA.P.O, THIRUVALLA, PIN - 689531
- 12 REV.JACOB JOHNSON
VICAR, CSI COUNSELING DEPARTMENT, BAKER COTTAGE, BAKER HILL, KOTTAYAM, PIN - 686001
- 13 REV.ANOOP GEORGE JOSEPH
VICAR CSI ST.JOHNS CHURCH,MULEKUNNU, PUTHAKUZH. P.O, PAMPADY (VIA), KOTTAYAM, PIN - 686521
- 14 REV.SAM MATHEW ROY
VICAR, CSI ST.IMMANUEL CHURCH, PUNNAPRA.P.O, KAPPAKADA, ALAPPUZHA, PIN - 688044
- 15 REV.KISHORE K PONGANPARA
VICAR, CSI ST.MARK'S CHURCH, KUNNUM WEST, KAVALAM.P.O,, PIN - 688506



2025:KER:28662

- 16 JACOB PHILIP MONKUZHY
KUNNAYYATHU GARDENS, PULLIKKANAKKU.P.O, KAYAMKULAM (VIA),
ALAPPUZHA, PIN - 690537
- 17 CHANDY ABRAHAM
AMBAT HOUSE, NEDUNGADAPPALLY.P.O, KOTTAYAM, PIN - 686545
- 18 PHILIP VARGHESE
CATECHIST, CSI ST.PHILIP CHURCH, POONKASSERY, PARIPPU.P.O,
KOTTAYAM, PIN - 686024
- 19 SUKU C OOMMEN
THELLIYIL HOUSE, BEHIND EBENEZER LODGE, LOYOLA ROAD,
SREEKARYAM.P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695017
- 20 DAVID LUKOSE
AJI BHAVANAM, KADAPPA, MYNAGAPPALLY.P.O, KOLLAM, PIN -
690519
- 21 NEETHU JOSE
PUTHENVEED PULITHURUTHU, EZHUMANATHURUTH.P.O,
MUTTUCHIRA, .KOTTAYAM, PIN - 686613
- 22 ARUN ABRAHAM
VALUMANNIL HOUSE, MALLAPPALLY WEST.P.O, PATHANAMTHITTA, PIN
- 689585
- 23 RANI ELIZABETH
MAMUNDAYIL HOUSE, THAZHATHANGADY.P.O, KOTTAYAM, PIN - 686005
- 24 ALEX M NINAN
MALLASASERIL HOUSE, KOZHUVALLOOR.P.O, CHENGANNUR, PIN -
689521
- 25 ALEX V VARGHESE
VAYALUMKAL HOUSE, MUNDATHANAM.P.O, KANGAZHA, KOTTAYAM, PIN -
686541
- 26 ISSAC VATTAVELI
VATAVELI HOUSE, ERICADU EAST, PUTHUPPALLY.P.O, KOTTAYAM, PIN
- 686011
- 27 DR.JOBO KORAH THOMAS
PLACKIEL HOUSE, NATTAKOM.P.O, KOTTAYAM, PIN - 686013
- 28 BIBIN J JACOB
KARIYATTAPUZHA HOUSE, PEROOR.P.O, KOTTAYAM, PIN - 686637



2025:KER:28662

- 29 JACOB PHILIP KALLUMALA, LAY SECRETARY, CSI MADHYA KERALA
DIOCESE, CSI DIOCESAN OFFICE, KOTTAYAM, PIN - 686001
- 30 MANNU Y THOMAS
A M COTTAGE, PUTHUPALLY.P.O, KAYAMKULAM, ALAPPUZHA, PIN -
690527
- 31 LENI SUSAN AJITH
KOKKODTHU HOUSE, 31ST MILE, MUNDAKAYAM.P.O,, PIN - 686513
- 32 SREENI DANIEL JOHN,KUNNELPARAMBIL HOUSE, POZHNIKOL.P.O,
KADUTHURUTHY, PIN - 686604
- 33 SHINY M JACOB
KANIYAMKULAM HOUSE, NEAR CMS COLLEGE, CHUNGAM, KOTTAYAM, PIN
- 686001
- 34 ADV.THOMAS JACOB, VALIAVEETIL HOUSE, ELANTHOOR.P.O,
PATHANAMTHITTA, PIN - 689643
- 35 JICKY JACOB ANDREWS,MODYIL HOUSE, VILLA.NO.1, ASERMOUNT
VILLAS, PUTHUPALLY.P.O, KOTTAYAM, PIN - 686011
- 36 TITTU THOMAS, OTTATHENGIL HOUSE, PADIMON.P.O, MALLAPPALLY,
PATHANAMTHITTA, PIN - 689587
- 37 JESSY S DEY
DAISY VILLA, MUNDAKAYAM.P.O,, PIN - 686513
- 38 RONNY JOHN JACOB, VAZHAPARAMBIL HOUSE, ERAVIPEROOR.P.O,
PATHANAMTHITTA, PIN - 689542
- 39 JACOB GEORGE (SUNIL KALLELY),LENKATHARA HOUSE, KALLELY.P.O,
KONNI (VIA), PATHANAMTHITTA, PIN - 689691
- 40 ADV.MELKCHI JOSEPH OOMEN
NACKOLAKKAL, ALUMMOOTIL HOUSE, KOLLAkadavu.P.O,
CHENGANNUIR, PIN - 689509
- 41 ABY DAVID KATTANAM
ABY'S COTTAGE, PALLICKAL.P.O, KATTANAM, PIN - 690503
- 42 ANNIE ANIL
POOVAKATTU HOUSE, THALAVADY.P.O, ALAPPUZHA, PIN - 689572
- 43 NEETHU SUJEESH,KOLLAMPARABIL HOUSE, VETTIMUKAL.P.O,
ETTUMANOR, PIN - 686631



2025:KER:28662

- 44 VIBIN ABRAHAM,KOCHIKUZHY HOUSE, ANICADU.P.O, MALLAPPALLY WEST, PATHANAMTHITTA, PIN - 689589
- 45 BABU OOMMEN.P,PANVELIL HOUSE, PADIMON.P.O, MALLAPPALLY, PATHANAMTHITTA, PIN - 689587
- 46 ELIZABETH PAUL
PALLITHAZHE HOUSE, VAKATHANAM.P.O, KOTTAYAM, PIN - 686538
- 47 PETER.K.J, READER,CSI ST.JAMES CHURCH, KAVALACHIRA, PUTHUPPALLY.P.O, KOTTAYAM, PIN - 686011
- 48 E.R.GEORGE MATHEW, ELENJIMOOTTIL PUTHENVEEDU, THENGELI.P.O, KUTTOOR, THIRUVALLA, PIN - 689106
- 49 MATHEW VARGHESE (REJI KAVIYOOR)
PAYYAMPRA KATHETTU, KAVIYOOR.P.O, THIRUVALLA, PIN - 689582
- 50 BENCY K THOMAS, THOTTIPPAREOKKAL HOUSE, VALLAMALA, KUNNAMTHANAM.P.O, THIRUVALLA, PIN - 689581
- 51 MARY LEENA PHILIP, CHIRACKAVUMKAL HOUSE, NOOROMMAVU.P.O, PUNNAVELY, PATHANAMTHITTA, PIN - 689589
- 52 SAJI EARA, KOZHUPPEKULAM HOUSE, EARA NORTH.P.O, NEELAMPEROOR.P.O, CHANGANACHERRY, PIN - 686534

BY ADVS.

GEORGE VARGHESE (PERUMPALLIKUTTIYIL)

JACOB P. ALEX

JOSEPH P.ALEX (K/1-C/2002)

MANU SANKAR P. (K/000823/2018)

AMAL AMIR ALI (K/000773/2019)

MANU SRINATH (D/1420/2014)

LIJO JOHN THAMPY (K/1313/2018)

RIYAS M.B. (K/000629/2023)

NIVEDITA MUCHILOTE (K/2556/2023)

THIS OP (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 02.04.2025, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



2025:KER:28662

JUDGMENT(Dated this the 2nd day of April 2025)

Petitioners filed O.S. No.14 of 2024 before the Munsiff Court, Kottayam, to declare that election conducted by the defendants on 14.12.2023, as null and void and to restrain the defendants or anybody under them from assuming the office of the newly elected executive committee without resolving the complaints lodged by the plaintiffs. Along with the suit, an application under Order 39 Rule 1 read with Section 151 CPC was filed to restrain the defendants or anybody under them from assuming the office of the newly elected executive committee without resolving the complaint lodged by the plaintiffs. The learned District Judge (Vacation) granted an interim ex parte injunction in I.A.No. 3 of 2023, in Civil M.P. No.80 of 2023.

2. The 1st respondent filed I.A.No.6 of 2023 in I.A. No.3 of



2025:KER:28662

2023 in Civil M.P.No.80 of 2023, to modify the interim injunction, as the church is not in a position to perform its regular function, including financial transactions and from disbursing salary to its staffs. The said I.A. was dismissed as per Ext.P8. The suit was numbered as O.S. No.14 of 2024 and injunction application as I.A. No.2 of 2024 before the Munsiff Court, Kottayam. The learned Munsiff heard the plaintiffs and the defendants and dismissed the same holding that the balance of convenience was not in favour of the plaintiffs and no irreparable injury will be caused to the plaintiffs, if injunction is not granted in their favour.

3. The plaintiffs took up the matter before the District Judge by filing C.M.A. No.23 of 2024. After an elaborate consideration of the facts and circumstances of the case, the learned District Judge dismissed the appeal and confirmed the order in I.A. No.2 of 2024 by Ext.P24. The petitioners challenge Ext.Nos.P18 and



2025:KER:28662

P24 in this O.P.(C).

4. Short facts of the case are as follows: An election was conducted on 14.12.2023 for the executive committee of the 1st respondent diocese and Ext.P2 result was published. The petitioner figures as sl no.9 in the general list, and he was issued with Ext.P3 to be present in the newly elected diocese on the Executive Committee to be held on 23.12.2023. On 22.12.2023, Ext.P4 list of the executive committee, after recounting, was published wherein the 1st petitioner was excluded. The case of the petitioner is that the recounting was done without intimating any of the candidates and the tellers who counted the votes in the election. Immediately, the petitioners filed the suit before the District Judge (vacation), Kottayam, and moved for an injunction restraining the newly elected executive committee members from assuming the office.

5. After a detailed hearing on I.A.No.2 of 2024, the trial



2025:KER:28662

court came to a definite conclusion that the recounting was conducted without giving sufficient notice to persons who were elected after the 1st counting. At the same time, taking note of the fact that several institutions are run by the 1st respondent and thus, swearing in the executive committee is inevitable for the functioning of the 1st respondent and that the management of the 1st respondent and the entire community will be affected. The finding that the balance of the convenience in favour of the defendants and no irreparable injury will be caused to the plaintiffs, the injunction application was dismissed.

6. The lower appellate court came to the conclusion that whether notices were issued to all the persons concerned before recounting is to be decided based on evidence. The function of the executive committee is necessary as so many institutions are run by the 1st respondent church. Therefore, the lower appeal court went a step ahead and held that the plaintiffs also did not



2025:KER:28662

have a prima facie case for injunction. So, all 3 factors which are necessary for the grant of the injunction are not in favour of the plaintiffs and, therefore, concurred with the finding of the learned Munsiff.

7. The counsel for the respondents relied on the judgment of the apex court in **Indiabulls Asset Reconstruction Company Limited v. Ram Kishore Arora and Others (2023 KHC 6558)**, wherein the apex court relying on the judgment in **Union of India and others v. M/s.Raj Grow Impex LLP and others (2021 SCC OnLine Sc 429)**, held as follows:

"194. In addition to the general principles for exercise of discretion, as discussed hereinbefore, a few features specific to the matters of interim relief need special mention. It is rather elementary that in the matters of grant of interim relief, satisfaction of the Court only about existence of prima facie case in favour of the suitor is not enough. The other elements i.e., balance of convenience and likelihood of irreparable injury, are not of empty formality and carry their own relevance; and while exercising its discretion in the matter of interim relief and adopting a particular course, the Court needs to weigh the risk of injustice, if ultimately the decision of main matter runs counter to the course being adopted at the time of granting or refusing the interim relief. We may usefully refer to the relevant principle stated in the decision of



2025:KER:28662

Chancery Division in *Films Rover International Ltd. v. Cannon Film Sales Ltd.*: 1986 (3) All ER 772 as under: -

"...The principal dilemma about the grant of interlocutory injunctions, whether prohibitory or mandatory, is that there is by definition a risk that the court may make the "wrong" decision, in the sense of granting an injunction to a party who fails to establish his right at the trial (or would fail if there was a trial) or alternatively, in failing to grant an injunction to a party who succeeds (or would succeed) at trial. A fundamental principle is therefore that the court should take whichever course appears to carry the lower risk of injustice if it should turn out to have been "wrong" in the sense I have described. The guidelines for the grant of both kinds of interlocutory injunctions are derived from this principle."

In *Garment Craft v. Prakash Chand Goel* [(2022) 4 SCC 181]

the apex court has held as follows:

"15. xxx xxx xxx xxx. The High Court exercising supervisory jurisdiction does not act as a court of first appeal to reappreciate, reweigh the evidence or facts upon which the determination under challenge is based. Supervisory jurisdiction is not to correct every error of fact or even a legal flaw when the final finding is justified or can be supported. The High Court is not to substitute its own decision on facts and conclusion, for that of the inferior court or tribunal. The jurisdiction exercised is in the nature of correctional jurisdiction to set right grave dereliction of duty or flagrant abuse, violation of fundamental principles of law or justice. The power under Article 227 is exercised sparingly in appropriate cases, like when there is no evidence at all to justify, or the finding is so perverse that no reasonable person can possibly come to such a conclusion that the court or tribunal has come to. It is axiomatic that such discretionary relief must be exercised to



2025:KER:28662

ensure there is no miscarriage of justice.

16. Explaining the scope of jurisdiction under Article 227, this Court in *Estralla Rubber v. Dass Estate (P) Ltd.* has observed:

“6. The scope and ambit of exercise of power and jurisdiction by a High Court under Article 227 of the Constitution of India is examined and explained in a number of decisions of this Court. The exercise of power under this article involves a duty on the High Court to keep inferior courts and tribunals within the bounds of their authority and to see that they do the duty expected or required of them in a legal manner. The High Court is not vested with any unlimited prerogative to correct all kinds of hardship or wrong decisions made within the limits of the jurisdiction of the subordinate courts or tribunals. Exercise of this power and interfering with the orders of the courts or tribunals is restricted to cases of serious dereliction of duty and flagrant violation of fundamental principles of law or justice, where if the High Court does not interfere, a grave injustice remains uncorrected. It is also well settled that the High Court while acting under this Article cannot exercise its power as an appellate court or substitute its own judgment in place of that of the subordinate court to correct an error, which is not apparent on the face of the record. The High Court can set aside or ignore the findings of facts of an inferior court or tribunal, if there is no evidence at all to justify or the finding is so perverse, that no reasonable person can possibly come to such a conclusion, which the court or tribunal has come to.”

It is held by the apex court in **Babhutmal Raichand Oswal v. Laxmibai R. Tarte and another** [1975 (1) SCC 858] that the High Court cannot while exercising jurisdiction under Article 227



2025:KER:28662

of the Constitution of India, interfere with the findings of fact recorded by the subordinate court or Tribunal. Its function is limited to see that the subordinate court or Tribunal functions within the limits of its authority. It cannot correct mere errors of fact by examining the evidence and reappreciating it.

Therefore, in the light of the finding of facts by both courts, and the discretion exercised by the Munsiff, this court is not justified in interfering with the finding of facts, more particularly, relying on the judgments of the apex court in the above cited decisions.

Therefore, no interference is warranted with Ext.P18 order in I.A. No.2 of 2024 in O.S. No.14 of 2024 and Ext.P24 judgment in C.M.A. No.23 of 2024; thus, this O.P.(C) is dismissed.

Sd/-

BASANT BALAJI, JUDGE



2025:KER:28662

APPENDIX OF OP(C) 2392/2024

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

Exhibit P1	TRUE COPY OF THE AMENDED CONSTITUTION AS ON 15-12-2007 OF THE MADHYA KERALA DIOCESE OF THE CHURCH OF SOUTH INDIA
Exhibit P2	TRUE COPY OF THE PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE ELECTION RESULT PUBLISHED IN THE NOTICE BOARD TAKEN BY THE PETITIONERS THROUGH THEIR MOBILE PHONE ALONG WITH LEGIBLE HAND WRITTEN COPY OF THE SAME MADE BY THE PETITIONERS
Exhibit P3	TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE ISSUED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT TO THE 1ST PETITIONER
Exhibit P4	TRUE COPY OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE LAY PERSONS LIST 2023-2026 (AFTER RECOUNTING ON 22-12-2023) PUBLISHED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT
Exhibit P5	TRUE COPY OF THE CIVIL M.P.NO.80/2023 BEFORE THE DISTRICT JUDGE (VACATION), KOTTAYAM, LATER RENUMBERED AS O.S.NO.14/2024 ON THE FILES OF THE COURT OF THE MUNSIFF, KOTTAYAM
Exhibit P6	TRUE COPY OF THE I.A.NO.3/2023 IN CIVIL M.P.NO.80/2023 BEFORE THE DISTRICT JUDGE (VACATION), KOTTAYAM RENUMBERED AS I.A.NO.2/2024 IN O.S.NO.14/2024 ON THE FILES OF THE COURT OF THE MUNSIFF, KOTTAYAM
Exhibit P7	TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 28-12-2023 IN I.A.NO.3/2023 IN CIVIL M.P.NO.80/2023 PASSED BY THE HON'BLE VACATION COURT (ADDL.DISTRICT JUDGE-IV)
Exhibit P8	TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 01-01-2024 IN I.A.NO.6/2023 IN I.A.NO.3/2023 IN CIVIL M.P.NO.80/2023
Exhibit P9	TRUE COPY OF THE OBJECTION DATED 10-01-2024 FILED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT/DEFENDANT
Exhibit P10	TRUE COPY OF THE OBJECTION DATED 15-02-2024 FILED BY THE RESPONDENTS/DEFENDANTS NOS.3 TO 11 AND 13 TO 15
Exhibit P11	TRUE COPY OF THE OBJECTION DATED 15-02-2024 FILED BY THE RESPONDENTS/DEFENDANTS NOS.16, 17, 21, 22, 23 AND 26
Exhibit P12	TRUE COPY OF THE OBJECTION DATED 15-02-2024 FILED BY THE RESPONDENTS/DEFENDANTS NOS.32, 34, 39, 44, 45 AND 46
Exhibit P13	TRUE COPY OF THE OBJECTION DATED 10-02-2024 FILED BY THE RESPONDENTS/DEFENDANTS NOS.18, 31, 35, 42 AND 47
Exhibit P14	TRUE COPY OF THE OBJECTION DATED 16-02-2024 FILED BY THE RESPONDENTS/DEFENDANTS NOS.20, 25 AND 37
Exhibit P15	TRUE COPY OF THE COUNTER AFFIDAVIT DATED 19-02-2024 FILED



2025:KER:28662

BY THE RESPONDENTS/DEFENDANTS NOS.24, 29, 41, 48, 49, 50, 51 AND 52

Exhibit P16 TRUE COPY OF THE OBJECTION DATED 15-02-2024 FILED BY THE RESPONDENTS/DEFENDANTS NOS.27, 28, 30, 33, 36 AND 38

Exhibit P17 TRUE COPY OF THE COUNTER AFFIDAVIT DATED 19-02-2024 FILED BY THE RESPONDENTS/DEFENDANTS NO.40.

Exhibit P18 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 11-3-2024 ISSUED BY THE COURT OF MUNSIFF, KOTTAYAM IN I.A.NO.2/2024 IN O.S.NO.14/2024

Exhibit P19 TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION DATED 12-3-2024 FILED IN THE COURT OF MUNSIFF, KOTTAYAM

Exhibit P20 TRUE COPY OF THE C.M.A.NO.23/2024 DATED 15TH MARCH 2024 IN I.A.NO.2/2024 IN O.S.NO.14/2024

Exhibit P21 TRUE COPY OF THE I.A.NO.2/2024 IN C.M.A.NO.23/2024 DATED 15TH MARCH 2024 IN I.A.NO.2/2024 IN O.S.NO.14/2024

Exhibit P22 TRUE COPY OF THE OBJECTION DATED 30-03-2024 FILED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT IN C.M.A.NO.23/2024

Exhibit P23 TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN O.P(C)NO.906/2024 DATED 8-4-2024

Exhibit P24 TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN CMA NO. 23/2024 DATED 27-8-2024 PASSED BY THE HON'BLE DISTRICT JUDGE, KOTTAYAM

Exhibit P25 COPY OF THE NOTICE ISSUED TO THE TELLERS COMMITTEE MEMBERS DATED 20-7-2024