



**INDIAN LAW REPORTS  
KERALA SERIES**

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

**NOMINAL INDEX**

	Pages
APL (India) Pvt. Ltd. v. Chairman, Cochin Port Trust	.. 277
Balakrishnan Master T. v. Ramachandran Master K.M.	.. 323
Jayarajan v. Sabitha	.. 306
Max New York Life Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Insurance Ombudsman	.. 301
M/s. Shastha Enterprises v. M/s. Olam International Ltd	.. 334
New India Assurance Co. Ltd. v. Balakrishnan	.. 311

**INDEX TO ACTS AND RULES (Central & Kerala)**

**ACTS**

**Central**

1963—Act 38 of 1963—Major Port Trusts Act	
Section 42	<i>See</i> .. 277
Sections 47A, 61 and 62	<i>See</i> .. 277
1973—Act 2 of 1974—Code of Criminal Procedure	<i>See</i> .. 323
Section 372	<i>See</i> .. 323
Section 401(4)	<i>See</i> .. 306
1984—Act 66 of 1984—Family Court Act	
Sections 20 and 21	<i>See</i> .. 301
1986—Act 68 of 1986—Consumer Protection Act	
Section 2(r)(1)(ix)	<i>See</i> .. 311
1988—Act 59 of 1988—Motor Vehicles Act	
Section 2 (37)	<i>See</i> .. 334
1996—Act 26 of 1996—Arbitration and Conciliation Act	
Section 9	<i>See</i> .. 334
Section 34	<i>See</i> .. 334

1996—English Arbitration Act Section 70(2)	<i>See</i> ..	334
<b>Kerala</b>		
1989—Family Court (Procedure) Rules Rules 10 and 13	<i>See</i> ..	311
1989—Motor Vehicles Rules Rule 6	<i>See</i> ..	306

## SUBJECT INDEX

<b><i>Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Central Act 26 of 1986)—Section 9—</i></b>		
<i>When the opposite party in a petition under Section 9 disputes the existence of the arbitration agreement, the court must necessarily decide whether there is such an agreement which is valid in law—Burden to show existence of the agreement is on the applicant.</i>		
M/s. Shastha Enterprises v. M/s. Olam International Ltd.		
	I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . .	334
 <b><i>Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Central Act 26 of 1986)—Section 34—</i></b>		
<i>Even if there is an exclusion of Section 34 in an international commercial arbitration, the party can approach the court under Section 34 and impugn the award on the ground of public policy.</i>		
M/s. Shastha Enterprises v. M/s. Olam International Ltd.		
	I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . .	334
 <b><i>Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974)—Section 372—</i></b>		
<i>Proviso—The applicability of the proviso has to be reckoned with reference to the date of the Judgment rendered by the court and not the date of incident which gave rise to the prosecution of the accused—Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Act, 2008 (Central Act 5 of 2009)—Section 2(wa).</i>		
Balakrishnan Master T. v. Ramachandran Master K.M. I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala ..		
		323
 <b><i>Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974)—Sections 372</i></b>		
<i>proviso and 401(4)—Where a right of appeal is provided, a revision at the instance of the defacto complainant is not entertainable.</i>		
Balakrishnan Master T. v. Ramachandran Master K.M. I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . .		
		323

**Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974)**—*Prospective operation of the proviso to Section 372 of the Code will not enable the victim to prefer appeal where Judgment had been rendered prior to the coming into force of the Amendment Act of 2009 (31-12-2009)—In cases where Judgment is rendered on or after 31-12-2009, the victim has a right to prefer an appeal before the competent court to which an appeal ordinarily lies in the event of conviction of the accused in such case.*

Balakrishnan Master T. v. Ramachandran Master K.M. I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala .. 323

**Consumer Protection Act, 1986 (Central Act 68 of 1986)**—*Section 2(r)(1)(ix)—Unfair trade practise—Offering insurance policy without disclosing that insured will have to pay tax in addition to the insurance premium amounts to unfair trade practise—If the tax component is not revealed to the insured at the time of issuing the policy, Insurer cannot claim such tax from the insured during term of the policy.*

Max New York Life Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Insurance Ombudsman  
I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala

.. 301

**English Arbitration Act, 1996**—*Section 70 (2)—The embargo contained in Section 70(2) of the English Arbitration Act would not prohibit consideration of an application under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.*

M/s. Shastha Enterprises v. M/s. Olam International Ltd. I.L.R. 2011

(4) Kerala .. 334

**Family Courts Act, 1984 (Central Act 66 of 1984)**—*Sections 20 and 21—The overriding effect of the Family Courts Act in terms of Section 20 of the Central enactment will override any prescription in the Civil Rules of Practice which is inconsistent with the provisions of the Family Courts Act—The Family Court (Procedure) Rules having been issued in exercise of the statutory power contained in Section 21 of the Family Courts Act, the Rules would also get protection of Section 20 and would therefore have overriding effect over Civil Procedure Code to the extent of the inconsistency—Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908)—Section 12.*

Jayarajan v. Sabitha I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala

.. 306

**Family Court (Procedure) Rules, 1989 (Kerala)**—*Rules 10 and 13—All that is required to be produced along with an appeal under Section 19(1) of the Family Court Act is the copy of the Judgment certified to be true copy by the court which passed the Judgment—There is no further requirement that the appeal should be accompanied by a copy certified in terms of Rules 253*

*and/or 254 of the Civil Rules of Practice—Civil Rules of Practice, 1971 (Kerala)—Rules 253 and 254.*

Jayarajan v. Sabitha I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 306

**Major Port Trusts Act, 1963 (Central Act 38 of 1963)**—*Sections 47A, 61 and 62—Cochin Port Trust cannot levy ground rent for more than 75 days in respect of containers.*

APL (India) Pvt. Ltd. v. Chairman, Cochin Port Trust I.L.R. 2011 (4)  
Kerala . . 277

**Major Port Trusts Act, 1963 (Central Act 38 of 1963)**—*Section 42—Port trust is legally obliged to have the containers shipped in destuffed within a reasonable time.*

APL (India) Pvt. Ltd. v. Chairman, Cochin Port Trust I.L.R. 2011 (4)  
Kerala . . 277

**Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (Central Act 59 of 1988)**—*Section 2 (37)—Transport Vehicle—The status of transport vehicle does not depend on the manner of use of vehicle at a given point of time—Even if the vehicle is used for purposes other than for carriage of passengers, the driver shall possess licence and badge.*

New India Assurance Company Ltd. v. Balakrishnan I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 311

**Motor Vehicle Rules, 1989 (Kerala)**—*Rule 6—Driver of Authorikshaw not authorised to drive it—Lack of badge is not a fundamental breach of policy condition so as to exonerate the insurer.*

New India Assurance Company Ltd. v. Balakrishnan I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 311

\* \* \*