



**INDIAN LAW REPORTS
KERALA SERIES**

INDEX TO I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala – Part IV

NOMINAL INDEX

	Pages
Ashraf P.M. v. Senior Intelligence Officer, DRI	.. 246
Balakrishnan P. v. Labour Court	.. 265
Hemanth Kumar v. S.I. of Police	.. 261
Jubilee Mission Medical College and Research Institute v. Government of Kerala	.. 225
Phoulad K. v. Bharath Sanchar Nigam Limited	.. 253
Pushpangadan N.P. v. Federal Bank Ltd. (F.B)	.. 196
Sampurna Behura v. Union of India (S.C.)	.. 193
Sumathikutty v. Manoj N.	.. 231
Union of India v. Aboobacker	.. 228

INDEX TO JOURNALS, NOTIFICATIONS and SPEECHES

Notification

S.R.O. No.2083 (E)	.. vii
--------------------	--------

INDEX TO ACTS AND RULES (Central & Kerala)

ACTS

Central

1908—Act 5 of 1908—Code of Civil Procedure	
Section 24	<i>See</i> .. 253
Section 24(5)	<i>See</i> .. 253

1947—Act 14 of 1947—Industrial Disputes Act		
Section 33(2)(b) and 33(3)	<i>See</i>	.. 265
Section 33(3)(b)	<i>See</i>	.. 265
1973—Act 2 of 1974—Code of Criminal Procedure		
Section 439	<i>See</i>	.. 261
1985—Act 61 of 1985—Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act		
Sections 42 and 43	<i>See</i>	.. 246
1988—Act 59 of 1988—Motor Vehicles Act		
Section 166	<i>See</i>	.. 231
2002—Act 54 of 2002—Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act	<i>See</i>	.. 196
Sections 13(4) and 17	<i>See</i>	.. 196
Kerala		
1975—Act 7 of 1957—Buildings Tax Act		
Section 3(b)	<i>See</i>	.. 225
RULES		
Central		
1957—Industrial Disputes Rules		
Rule 62(4)	<i>See</i>	.. 265
2002—Security Interest (Enforcement) Rules		
Rules 8 and 9	<i>See</i>	.. 196

SUBJECT INDEX

Buildings Tax Act, 1975 (Kerala Act 7 of 1975)—Section 3(b)—Exemption from payment of Building Tax—Medical College Hospital is primarily meant for rendering medical aid to patients—Exemption from payment of Building Tax can be claimed only if medical aid is provided free of charge to the patients.

Jubilee Mission Medical College and Research Institute v.
Government of Kerala I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala .. 225

- Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)**—Section 24—*It is within the powers of the High Court and the District Court to transfer a case from a court having no Jurisdiction to a court having jurisdiction—A petition under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act is a “proceedings” as understood in Section 24 of the Code of Civil Procedure—Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1966 (Central Act 26 of 1966)—Section 34.*
 Phoulad K. v. Bharath Sanchar Nigam Limited I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 253
- Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)**—Section 24(5)—*Merely for the reason that the expression “withdraw” is not mentioned in Section 24(5), it cannot be contended that District Court has no power to withdraw the suit or other proceedings from a court having no jurisdiction to itself and try or dispose off the same.*
 Phoulad K. v. Bharath Sanchar Nigam Limited I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 253
- Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974)**—Section 439—*Where public property is destroyed in the guise of strike or protest, the value of the same or even more should be directed to be deposited by the accused as a condition for granting bail—If the accused are found not guilty and acquitted, they would be entitled to get refund of the amount deposited by them—Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act, 1984 (Central Act 3 of 1984)—Section 3(1).*
 Hemanth Kumar v. S.I. of Police I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 261
- Constitution of India**—Article 32—*Home Departments and Director General of Police of the States/Union Territories to ensure that at least one police officer in every police station with aptitude is given appropriate training and orientation and designated as Juvenile or Child Welfare Officer to handle the juvenile or child in coordination with the police—Special Juvenile Police Unit comprising of all police officers designated as Juvenile of Child Welfare Officer to be created in every District or City to coordinate and to upgrade the police treatment of juveniles and the children—Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000 (Central Act 56 of 2000)—Section 63.*
 Sampurna Behura v. Union of India I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 193
- Constitution of India**—Article 254—*There is no conflict between the Securitisation Act and the Kerala Building (Lease & Rent Control) Act—They operate in different fields—The Securitisation Act is not a later law with respect to the same matter as that of the Rent Control Act—Securitisation And Reconstruction Of Financial Assets And Enforcement Of Security Interest Act , 2002.(Central Act 54 of 2002)*
 Pushpangadan N.P. v. Federal Bank Ltd. I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 196

Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947)—Sections 33(2)(b) and 33(3)—*The violation, if any, to comply with the requirement under Sections 33(2)(b) and 33(3) will not make the punishment imposed ‘Void ab initio’ so as to enable the workmen to claim the wages or such other benefits—The only remedy available to the workmen for challenging the order of discharge or dismissal is , as provided under Section 33(A) and Section 10 and he cannot maintain an application under Section 33C (2).*

Balakrishnan P. v. Labour Court I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 265

Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947)—Section 33(3)(b)—*“Protected workmen”*—*Mere submission of a list of “Protected workmen” by the trade union is not enough—The employer has to recognize the concerned workmen as “Protected workmen” and communicate the list of such recognized workmen to the registered trade union in writing within 15 days—The tenure of such ‘Protected workmen’ is for a period of 12 months from the date of communication of the list of recognized workmen by the employer—Industrial disputes Rules,1957. (Central)—Rule 61 and Industrial disputes Rules,1954(Kerala)—Rule 62.*

Balakrishnan P. v. Labour Court I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 265

Industrial Disputes Rules, 1957(Central)—Rule 62 (4)—*“Protected workmen”*—*In case of dispute, either by the inaction on the part of the employer or by refusing to recognize the workers named by the union as “protected workmen”, the remedy of the union is to approach the concerned conciliation officer, who is to consider the position and pass an order, which is to be final and binding.*

Balakrishnan P. v. Labour Court I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 265

Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (Central Act 59 of 1988)—Section 166—*Multiplier cannot be chosen based on age of the deceased alone—Identification of the multiplier with reference to the deceased alone can be done only in a case where the claimants are younger to the deceased and not in a case where the claimants are elder to the deceased and the claimants have only a shorter term of life expectancy/dependency than the expected life span of the deceased—The compensation fixed under Section 166 should not at any rate be lesser than the amount payable under Section 163 A.*

Sumathikutty v. Manoj N. I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 231

Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (Central Act 61 of 1985)—Sections 42 and 43—*Though provisions of Sections 42 and 43 should be complied with in letter and spirit, that does not mean that while complying with the requirements, the necessary things should be done at the spot itself*

where the person concerned is intercepted—Provisions of Section 42 and 43 cannot be construed in such a hyper technical manner, which would have the effect of expecting something to be preformed, which is practically impossible of performance.

Ashraf P.M. v. Senior Intelligence Officer, DIR I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 246

Securitisation And Reconstruction Of Financial Assets And Enforcement Of Security Interest Act, 2002 (Central Act 54 of 2002)—Sections 13(4) and 17—*A tenant whose right, title, interest or possession is affected by a measure taken under Section 13(4) of the Securitisation Act, would be entitled to make an application to the Debt Recovery Tribunal under Section 17 of the Securitisation Act.*

Pushpangadan N.P. v. Federal Bank Ltd. I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 196

Securitisation And Reconstruction Of Financial Assets And Enforcement Of Security Interest Act, 2002 (Central Act 54 of 2002)—The Securitisation Act has no overriding effect over the provisions of the Kerala Building (Lease and Rent Control) Act—*A tenant inducted in the premises before creation of the security interest cannot be summarily evicted under the provisions of Sections 13(4) and 14 of the Securitisation Act—Building (Lease and Rent Control) Act, 1965 (Kerala Act 2 of 1965).*

Pushpangadan N.P. v. Federal Bank Ltd. I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 196.

Security Interest (Enforcement) Rules 2002 (Central)—Rules 8 and 9—*The encumbrances referred to in Rule 9(9) are those encumbrances referred to in Rule 9(7)—It cannot be said that when a sales takes place under the provisions of the Securitisation Act, all encumbrances would automatically come to an end—The sale and purchase would be free from only those encumbrances which were known to the secured creditor and which were discharged in the manner provided in the rules—Decision reported in 2007 (2) K.L.T. 237 : I.L.R. 2007 (2) Kerala 292—Overruled.*

Pushpangadan N.P. v. Federal Bank Ltd. I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 196

Service—*Liability to pay interest for delay in disbursing gratuity—It is the duty of the appointing and controlling authorities to see that the pension and gratuity of every retiring personnel is sanctioned and paid immediately after retirement—Failure to do so has to be compensated by payment of interest which should be recovered from the employee responsible for the delay.*

Union of India v. Aboobacker I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 228