



**INDIAN LAW REPORTS
KERALA SERIES**

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

NOMINAL INDEX

		Pages
Arunkumar V.A	v. State of Kerala	.. 414
Chairman-Cum-Managing Director, BSNL	v. Tittin. P	.. 379
Gopi P.S.	v. S.I. of Police	.. 387
Madhusoodhanan Nair, K.	v. State of Kerala	.. 373
M/s.Maharashtra Apex Corporation Ltd.	v. Balaji G	.. 450
Narayani	v. Sreedharan	.. 400
Purushothaman, K.	v. Kerala State Co-Operative Employees' Pension Board	.. 382
Shankara Rai	v. Thimmanna Rai	.. 436

INDEX TO JOURNALS, NOTIFICATIONS and SPEECHES

Speech

Full Court Reference held in the High Court of Kerala on 25th October, 2011 on the occasion of retirement of Hon'ble Mr. Justice M.C. Hari Rani	.. ix - xvi
---	-------------

INDEX TO ACTS AND RULES (Central & Kerala)

ACTS

Central

1882—Act 4 of 1882—Transfer of Property Act Sections 19 and 21	<i>See</i> .. 400
---	-------------------

Kerala

1999—Act 8 of 1999—Lok Ayukta Act		
Sections 2(a) and 7(3)	See ..	414
Sections 2(a)(b) and (h), 7(3), 7(1) and (2)	See ..	414
Section 2(o) (vii) (D)	See ..	414
Sections 7(1), (2) and 7(3)	See ..	414
Sections 7(3)	See ..	414

Madras

1949—Act 9 of 1949—Aliyasanthana Act		
Section 36(6)	See ..	436

RULES

Kerala

1994—Kerala Co-operative Societies Employees Self Financing Pension Scheme		
Paragraph 19(1)(a)	See ..	382
1997—Arbitration and Conciliation (Court) Rules, 1997		
Rule 9	See ..	450

SUBJECT INDEX

Aliyasanthana Act, 1949 (Madras Act IX of 1949)—Section 36(6)—Partition of Kutumba property—Principles to be followed while interpreting document executed by members of the family concerning disposition of family property.

Shankara Rai v. Thimmanna Rai I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala .. 436

Aliyasanthanam Law—Essentials of Aliyasanthanam law and similarities with Marumakkathayam law explained.

Shankara Rai v. Thimmanna Rai I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala .. 436

Arbitration and Conciliation (Court) Rules, 1997 (Kerala)—Rule 9—Executing Court cannot direct decree holder to pay balance stamp duty in accordance with Kerala Stamp Act on the award passed by an arbitrator, outside Kerala—Stamp Act, 1959(Kerala Act 17 of 1959).

M/s.Maharashtra Apex Corporation Ltd. v. Balaji G I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala .. 450

Civil Law—Differences between joint will and mutual will—Explained—A joint will is a single testamentary instrument constituting or containing the will of two or more persons based on an agreement to make a conjoint will—If the joint will is

executed in pursuance of an agreement or contract between the executant to dispose of their property to each other or to a third party in a particular mode or manner and reciprocal in their provisions, it is a joint and mutual will—It is to emphasise and denote the contractual elements which distinguishes it from a joint will and it is described as “mutual” or “reciprocal”.

Narayani v. Sreedharan I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 400

Constitution of India—Article 165—Advocate General for the State— An Advocate who ceased to be a Judge of the High Court, consequent on his failure to accept transfer to another High Court, is not disqualified from being appointed as Advocate General.

Madhusoodhanan Nair, K. v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 373

Constitution of India—Article 226—Act of vandalism and destruction of public property in the guise of protest—The authorities charged with enforcement of law have a duty to fix responsibility on the persons who organized such protest, for the purpose of recouping the damage caused to the public property—The High court under Article 226 of the Constitution has ample powers to assess, quantify and fix liability for the loss caused to the public property as well as to recover the same—Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act, 1984 (Central Act 3 of 1984)

Gopi P.S. v. S.I. of Police I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 387

Constitution of India—Article 226—Compassionate Employment Scheme—Denial of benefit under the Compassionate Employment Scheme due to subsequent change of norms is not proper—Beneficial schemes are to be implemented as per the norms existing as on the date of application.

Chairman-Cum-Managing Director, BSNL v. Tittin. P I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 379

Constitution of India—Article 226—Vigilance Enquiry—Allegation of victimization at the hands of the Chief Minister who is also in charge of the Vigilance and Anti Corruption Bureau—Accepting such a contention would mean that no agency in the state would be competent to conduct investigation so long as the present incumbent is in office—This is against settled legal principles regarding the independence enjoyed by the investigating officer.

Arunkumar V.A v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 414

Construction of statutes—The General Rule of Construction of a statute is not only to look at the words but also to look at the context, the collocation and the object of such words relating to such matter and interpret the meaning according to what would appear to be the meaning intended to be conveyed by the use of the word under the circumstances.

Arunkumar V.A v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 414

Kerala Co-operative Societies Employees Self Financing Pension Scheme, 1994 (Kerala)—*Paragraph 19(1)(a)*—*Employees of the co-operative society, who were on probation before the introduction of the pension scheme, are not entitled to count their period of probation for computing the qualifying service for pension—Such persons are entitled to count the qualifying service for pension only from the date on which they enrolled in the pension scheme—The employees, who were on probation as on the date of commencement of the scheme, are entitled to count the period of probation to reckon the qualifying service for pension in the event the employer has remitted contribution covering the period of probation.*

Purushothaman, K. v. Kerala State Co-Operative Employees'

Pension Board I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 382

Lok Ayukta Act 1999(Kerala Act 8 of 1999)—*Sections 2(a) and 7(3)*—*From the unambiguous words used in the statute, it is clear that under Section 7(3) of the Act the legislature intended to refer only cases involving action as defined in Section 2(a), which will not include cases where actions involve allegation or grievance.*

Arunkumar V.A v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 414

Lok Ayukta Act 1999(Kerala Act 8 of 1999)—*Section 2(a)(b) and (h), Section 7(3) and Section 7(1) and (2)*—*Section 7(1) and (2) takes in only cases of action of public servants which involve allegation or grievance as defined in Section 2(b)& (h) of the Act—The subject matter of reference under Section 7(3) of the Act can only be the action of a public servant, which means that the actions should be in his capacity as a public servant or in the purported discharge of his duties.*

Arunkumar V.A v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 414

Lok Ayukta Act 1999(Kerala Act 8 of 1999)—*Section 2(o) (vii) (D)*—*The employees of IHRD, which is a society registered under the Travancore Cochin Literary, Scientific & Charitable Societies Act 1955 under the control of Government of Kerala, would be public servants for the purpose of the Act, only if a notification is issued by the Government of Kerala in terms of Section 2(o) (vii) (D).*

Arunkumar V.A v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 414

Lok Ayukta Act 1999(Kerala Act 8 of 1999)—*Section 7(3)*—*IHRD not notified in terms of Section 2(o) (vii)(D) at the time of making reference under Section 7(3) —If the initial reference is without jurisdiction, subsequent notification issued under Section 2(o) (vii)(D) would not rectify the fundamental defect in the initial reference.*

Arunkumar V.A v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 414

Lok Ayukta Act 1999(Kerala Act 8 of 1999)—*Section 7(3) and Section 7(1) and (2) —In view of the non-obstante clause contained in Section 7(3) of the Act, Section 7(3) will have its full operation and Section 7(1) & (2) will not be an impediment, for a reference being made for an investigation—To invoke Section 7(1) & (2) of the Act, the action complained of should also involve “grievance” or “allegation” whereas Section 7(3) only requires an “action” to make a reference to the Lok Ayukta.*

Arunkumar V.A v. State of Kerala I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 414

Transfer of Property Act, 1882(Central Act 4 of 1882)—*Sections 19 and 21— Property which belongs exclusively to the executants settled in favour of another by a document, retaining the life interest of the executant in the property and providing that on his death the other would get absolute right in the property—It cannot be said that there was no transfer of interest in praesenti because of the retention of life interest of the executant as there was a divesting of the right of the executant, except his life interest.*

Narayani v. Sreedharan I.L.R. 2011 (4) Kerala . . 400

* * *