

M.N.Jayaram vs Additional Director General of Police (Crime Branch),

M.N.Jayaram vs Additional Director General of Police (Crime Branch),

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1465607

Court : Kerala

Decided On : Aug-31-2022

Judge : Honourable Mr. Justice Anil K.Narendran,Honourable Mr.Justice P.G. Ajithkumar

Appeal No. : WP(C)/8536/2020

Appellant : M.N.Jayaram

Respondent : Additional Director General of Police (Crime Branch),

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL K.NARENDRAN & THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.G. AJITHKUMAR WEDNESDAY, THE 31ST DAY OF AUGUST 2022 / 9TH BHADRA, 1944 W.P.(C) NO. 8536 OF 2020 PETITIONER: M.N.JAYARAM AGED 44 YEARS, S/O LATE NARAYANA WARRIER, RESIDING AT PISHARIKOVIL WARRIAM, EROOR, TRIPUNITHURA-682 306. Party in person RESPONDENTS:

1 ADDITIONAL DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE (CRIME BRANCH), THYCAUD P.O., THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN-695 014. 2 THE

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER, TRIPUNITHURA DEVASWOM GROUP, TRIPUNITHURA-682 301. 3 DEVASWOM OFFICER, (PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER), SHREE POORNATHRAYEESA TEMPLE, TRIPUNITHURA, PIN-682 301. 4 THE STATE INFORMATION COMMISSIONER, SIC OFFICE, KERALA, PUNNAN ROAD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 001. 5* SREE POORNATHRAESA KAKSHETHRA UPADESAKA SAMITHY, REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, EAST NADA, THRIPPUNITHURA, ERNAKULAM- 682301.

*IS SUO MOTU IMPEADED AS ADDITIONAL R5 AS PER ORDER DATED 30.11.2021 IN WPC 8536/2020 BY ADVS. R1 & R4 BY SRI.S.RAJMOHAN, SR.GP R2 & R3 BY K.P.SUDHEER,SC,COCHIN DEVASWOM BOARD R5 BY R.K.MURALEEDHARAN THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR FINAL HEARING ON 19.07.2022, THE COURT ON 31.08.2022 DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

JUDGMENT

Ajithkumar, J.

The petitioner claiming to be a member of the RTI Federation, Ernakulam District and activist filed this Writ Petition invoking the provisions under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. He seeks the following reliefs:-

i) To set aside that part of Ext.P7 order dated 30.01.2020 of the 4th respondent directing the petitioner to approach court and remand the case for proper adjudication as per the RTI Act, 2005; ii) To issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction directing the 1 st respondent to investigate into the corrupt practices and financial irregularities at the 3rd respondent Devaswom pertaining to Vrischikolsavam 2018 at Poornathrayeesa Temple, Tripunithura.

2. Alleging that the 3rd respondent refused to furnish

information as per Ext.P2 application of the petitioner dated 17.12.2018, he approached the 4th respondent by filing a complaint, C.P.No.214/5/19/SIC. The 4th respondent issued Ext.P1 order directing the 3rd respondent to furnish information, which was with respect to the income and expenditure of Vrischikolsavam 2018 in the Sree Poornathrayeesa Temple, Tripunithura. Accordingly, Ext.P3 information was furnished. Dissatisfied with the correctness of the answers given, the petitioner approached the 4th respondent again by filing another complaint, Ext.P6. As per Ext.P7 order dated 31.01.2020, the 4th respondent directed the petitioner to approach the court for the redressal of his grievance. Accordingly, he approached this Court with the present Writ Petition.

3. The 3rd respondent filed a counter affidavit,

producing therewith Exts.R3(A) and R3(B). An additional counter affidavit was filed along with Ext.R3(C) to R3(I). It is contended that the Writ Petition was filed without any bona fides. The mother of the petitioner, Smt.Radha Warasyar was a Kazhakom in Pisharikovil Temple, which is under Chakkumkulam Devaswom of the Cochin Devaswom Board. She filed W.P.(C) No.13926 of 2018 with a prayer that the petitioner be allowed to help her in doing the work of Kazhakom. As per Ext.R3(A) judgment, the said Writ Petition was disposed of without acceding to the prayer. Later, the petitioner filed W.P.(C) No.38036 of 2019 seeking police protection. That Writ Petition was dismissed as per Ext.R3(B) judgment. As per the direction in Ext.P1 information was furnished. It is totally baseless that incorrect information was furnished in Ext.P3. The petitioner approached the 3rd respondent alleging that the information furnished to him was

not satisfactory. It was in the said circumstances, Ext.P4 order

was issued by the 4th respondent, which is not illegal. In fact, the petitioner has been misusing the provisions of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (for short RTI Act), and therefore, the Writ Petition is not liable to be entertained. This Court held that the Temple Advisory Committees coming under the Malabar Devaswom Board do not come under the purview of RTI Act and the same principle is

applicable to the 5th respondent, which was impleaded by this Court suo motu. Answers to question No.3 to 8 in Ext.P2 were furnished on the basis of the data given by the additional 5th respondent. It is incorrect that the 3rd respondent mechanically has given the information.

4. In the additional counter affidavit filed by the 3rd

respondent it is pointed out that even after furnishing Ext.P3, the petitioner preferred applications seeking information with respect to the same matters. Pursuant to Exts.P11(a) dated 17.09.2020 and Ext.P12 dated 02.01.2021 applications, the 3rd respondent obtained answers to similar queries. Thereafter the 3rd respondent received Ext.R3(H) notice dated 07.03.2022 from the 4th respondent pursuant to a complaint filed by the petitioner. A reply to the said notice was submitted and a copy of the same is Ext.R3(I). It is evident from the said aspects that the petitioner has been misusing the provisions of the RTI Act. Accordingly, the 3rd respondent seeks to dismiss the petition.

5. The 5th respondent has filed a counter affidavit,

wherein it is contended that the entire income and expenditure in connection with Vrischikolsavam 2018 and 2019 were audited. The difference in the amount of donations received in connection with the Vrischikolsavam Festival has occurred, since the correct figure could be arrived only after the audit. All the details regarding the income and expenditure of Vrischikolsavam 2018 and 2019 were furnished to the 3rd respondent. There is absolutely no irregularity in the conduct of or financial matters connected to the Festival. All information sought by the petitioner and available with the respondent was already furnished.

6. Separate reply affidavits were filed by the petitioner to the counter affidavit filed by respondents 3 and 5.

7. The petitioner submitted oral arguments in person.

Heard the learned Senior Government Pleader, learned Standing Counsel for respondents 2 and 3 and the learned counsel appearing for the additional 5th respondent.

8. The petitioner approached the 3rd respondent with

a grievance that the information required as per Ext.P2 application was not furnished by the 3rd respondent. The 4th respondent accordingly had issued Ext.P1 direction on 27.08.2019 to furnish all the information sought as per Ext.P2. Accordingly, as per Ext.P3 answers to all the queries in Ext.P2 were furnished on 08.10.2019. Of course, there was delay. But the delay stood condoned as per the orders of the 4th respondent.

9. The petitioner again approached the 4th respondent

with Ext.P6 petition, alleging that the information furnished by the 3rd respondent was not satisfactory. It was after considering that the 4th respondent issued Ext.P7. Paragraph Nos.3 and 4 in Ext.P7 read as follows: 3. "\$ + . . "\$ + + ..

4.

. 6 . . . + : . . + , ? + . + ? 6 .

10. The observation in Ext.P7 is that, had satisfactory

answers been given to the petitioner, he would not have approached the 4th respondent Commission again. Observing so, the 4th respondent as per Ext.P7 directed the petitioner to approach the court for the redressal of his grievance and thereby desisted from taking any action under Section 18 or 20 of the RTI Act. The petitioner would contend that the 4th respondent by issuing such a direction, has abdicated its powers, and by refusing to exercise its powers in scant disregard to the provisions under Sections 18 and 20 of the RTI Act the 4th respondent acted illegally and irresponsibly.

11. A State Information Commission is constituted

under Section 15 of the RTI Act. Section 18 defines the powers and responsibilities of the State Information Commission. Section 18 reads,- 18. Powers and functions of Information Commission.-

(1) Subject to the provisions of this Act, it shall be the duty of the Central Information Commission or State Information Commission as the case may be to receive and inquire into a complaint from any person,-

(a) who has been unable to submit a request to a

Central Public Information Officer, or State Public Information Officer as the case may be, either by reason that no such officer has been appointed under this Act, or because the Central Assistant Public Information Officer or State Assistant Public Information Officer, as the case may be, has refused to accept his or her application for information or appeal under this Act for forwarding the same to the Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer or Senior Officer specified in sub-section (1) of section 19 or the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission, as the case may be;

(b) who has been refused access to any information requested under this Act;

(c) who has not been given a response to a request for information or access to information within the time limits specified under this Act;

(d) who has been required to pay an amount of fee which he or she considers unreasonable;

(e) who believes that he or she has been given incomplete, misleading or false information under this Act; and

(f) in respect of any other matter relating to requesting or obtaining access to records under this Act.

(2) Where the Central Information Commission or State Information Commission, as the case may be, is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds to inquire into the matter, it may initiate an inquiry in respect thereof.

(3) The Central Information Commission or State

Information Commission, as the case may be shall, while inquiring into any matter under this section, have the same powers as are vested in a civil court while trying a suit under the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, in respect of the following matters, namely:-

(4) summoning and enforcing the attendance of persons and compel them to give oral or written evidence on oath and to produce the documents or things;

(b) requiring the discovery and inspection of documents;

(c) receiving evidence on affidavit;

(d) requisitioning any public record or copies thereof from any court or office;

(e) issuing summons for examination of witnesses or documents; and

(f) any other matter which may be prescribed.

(4) Notwithstanding anything inconsistent contained in

any other Act of Parliament, or the State Legislature, as the case may be, the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission, as the case may be, may, during the inquiry of any complaint under this Act, examine any record to which this Act applies which is under the control of the public authority, and no such record may be withheld from it on any grounds.

12. If a second appeal is preferred by an aggrieved

person, the same has to be dealt with by the State Information Commission under the provisions of Section 19 of the Act. Section 20 of the Act empowers the State Information Commission while deciding on a complaint or an appeal to impose a penalty. Section 20 reads as follows:- 20. Penalties.-

(1) Where the Central Information Commission or the

State Information Commission, as the case may be, at the time of deciding any complaint or appeal is of the opinion that the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, has, without any reasonable cause, refused to receive an application for information or has not furnished information within the time specified under sub-section (1) of section 7 or malafidely denied the request for information or knowingly given incorrect, incomplete or misleading information or destroyed information which was the subject of the request or obstructed in any manner in furnishing the information, it shall impose a penalty of two hundred and fifty rupees each day till application is received or information is furnished, so however, the total amount of such penalty shall not exceed twenty-five thousand rupees: Provided that the Central Public Information

Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, shall be given a reasonable opportunity of being heard before any penalty is imposed on him: Provided further that the burden of proving that he acted reasonably and diligently shall be on the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be.

(2) Where the Central Information Commission or the

State Information Commission, as the case may be, at the time of deciding any complaint or appeal is of the opinion that the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, has, without any reasonable cause and persistently, failed to receive an application for information or has not furnished information within the time specified under sub-section (1) of section 7 or malafidely denied the request for information or knowingly given incorrect, incomplete or misleading information or destroyed information which was the subject of the request or obstructed in any manner in furnishing the information, it shall recommend for disciplinary action against the Central

Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, under the service rules applicable to him.

13. In the said provisions, or anywhere else in the RTI

Act, no power is invested in the State Information Commission to direct a complainant, who seeks information, to approach the court for the redressal of his grievance. On a perusal of Ext.P4 request submitted to the 3rd respondent for information and P6, the complaint submitted before the 4th respondent, it is quite clear that what the petitioner sought is action under the RTI Act and nothing else. Needless to say that the 4th respondent shall have powers that are invested on it as per the provisions of the RTI Act and nothing more.

14. Question as to furnishing of information to the

petitioner against query Nos.1 to 8 mentioned in Ext.P4 alone is the matter involved. The petitioner approached the 4th respondent with the grievance that incorrect or incomplete information was furnished to him. It is then the absolute statutory obligation of the 4th respondent to consider the grievance of the petitioner and take an appropriate decision as per the provisions contained in Section 18, 19 or 20 of the RTI Act, as the case may be. The 4th respondent does not have any authority to direct a complainant to approach the court to get his grievance redressed with respect to a question that is wholly coming within the purview of RTI Act. By issuing such a direction in Ext.P7, the 4th respondent abdicated its powers and failed to discharge its statutory duties and obligations. So much so, the direction in Ext.P7 is unsustainable in law and liable to be set aside.

15. The question then is whether or not any further

action on the request of the petitioner for getting information as per Ext.P4 is required. The definite contention of the 3rd respondent is that the petitioner without any bona fides has approached it asking for same information repeatedly. It is alleged that in order to wreak his personal vengeance, he has been submitting applications one after the other claiming information. In this regard, the learned counsel appearing for the 3rd respondent would place reliance on the decision of

the Apex Court in Central Board of Secondary Education & another v. Aditya Bandopadhyay [(2011) 8 SCC 497].

16. In answer to the said contention, the petitioner

would submit that he used to approach not only the 3rd respondent but also other temple authorities, whenever he finds malpractices on the part of such authorities. He is an activist and as a person interested to see that the affairs of the temple are conducted in the proper way, he has been trying to get information and take appropriate action wherever it is required.

17. In Aditya Bandopadhyay (supra), the Apex Court

held,-

37. The right to information is a cherished right. Information and right to information are intended to be formidable tools in the hands of responsible citizens to fight corruption and to bring in transparency and accountability. The provisions of RTI Act should be enforced strictly and all efforts should be made to bring to light the necessary information under clause (b) of Section 4(1) of the Act which relates to securing transparency and accountability in the working of public authorities and in discouraging corruption. But in regard to other information, (that is information other than those enumerated in Section 4(1)(b) and (c) of the Act), equal importance and emphasis are given to other public interests (like confidentiality of sensitive information, fidelity and fiduciary relationships, efficient operation of governments, etc.). Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under RTI Act for

disclosure of all and sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counter - productive as it will adversely affect the efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing

information. The Act should not be allowed to be misused or abused, to become a tool to obstruct the national development and integration, or to destroy the peace, tranquility and harmony among its citizens. Nor should it be converted into a tool of oppression or intimidation of honest officials striving to do their duty. The nation does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of public authorities spends 75% of their time in collecting and furnishing information to applicants instead of discharging their regular duties. The threat of penalties under the RTI Act and the pressure of the authorities under the RTI Act should not lead to employees of a public authorities prioritising 'information furnishing', at the cost of their normal and regular duties.

18. It is seen from Ext.R3(a) that the mother of the

petitioner wanted the Cochin Devaswom Board to allow the petitioner to assist his mother in her work of Kazhakom in the Pisharikovil Temple, which is under the management of the 3rd respondent. His request was not allowed. This Court directed the mother of the petitioner to take a decision of her own on the option of nominating another person in her place to do the work of Kazhakom. Thereby the requirement of the petitioner to get permission to assist her mother as the Kazhakom in Pisharikovil Temple stood refused. Later, he filed W.P.(C) No.30386 of 2019 alleging that there were threats to his life since he sought certain information from the temple authorities. As per Ext.R3(B), the said prayer was declined holding that the actual dispute was in relation to the right claimed by the petitioner or her mother in the status as Kazhakom. From the said documents, it is evident that the petitioner has reason to wreak vengeance against Devaswom authorities.

19. A few other facts averred by the 3rd respondent

further amplify the malafides of the petitioner. The petitioner filed this Writ Petition challenging Ext.P7. His contention is that the 4th respondent improperly exercised its jurisdiction on his complaint . He has approached this Court by filing this Writ Petition after Ext.P7, thereby he has presented his grievance before this Court. When this Court seized of the matter it was not possible or legally permissible for

the petitioner again to approach the 3rd or 4th respondent with fresh applications for the same purpose.

20. Ext.P12 is an application for information submitted

by the petitioner before the 3rd respondent on 02.01.2021. As per it he sought information with respect to the Vrischikolsavam Festival 2018 including income and expenditure statement, details of which were the information mainly asked for vide Ext. P4 also. A perusal of Ext.P12(a) which is the reply to Ext.P12 dated 02.01.2021 further evince that what had been required in query Nos.3 and 4 were the information already furnished to the petitioner. It is seen from Ext.R3(H) that the petitioner approached the 4 th respondent again raising grievance with respect to the same matter.

21. The scheme of the RTI Act is that a party seeking

information has to make the request in accordance with Section 6; the disposal of the request shall be in accordance with Section 7 and filing of an appeal where a person is aggrieved by a decision of the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officers, in accordance with Section 19. Section 18 provides for making complaints and lays down the procedure for entertaining a complaint, and also making enquiry. Section 18 thus enables the State Information Commission to exercise complete control over the functioning of the Public Information Officers in regard to the receipt of application, furnishing of information and the process of appeal under the RTI Act. Once a complaint is entertained and enquired into by the State Information Commission under Section 18 or an appeal is considered and decided under Section 19 with regard to the request for information from a public authority, that should be the final decision in the matter binding the parties. Thereafter the applicant cannot submit a new application before the Public Information Officer or complaint under Section 18 or an appeal or second appeal under Section 19 of the RTI Act with a request for the same information. No such request, complaint or appeal a second time is entertainable under the provisions of the RTI Act.

22. In that view, no person is permitted to approach

the same authority with successive applications to get the same information. Hence, the act of the petitioner approaching the 4th respondent raising the same allegations as in Ext.P6 and seeking again to get information regarding the income and expenditure for Vrischikolsavam Festival 2018 in Poornathrayeesa Temple, Tripunithura, is nothing but an abuse of the process of law. The continuous and incessant attempts of the petitioner to seek information with respect to the same matter saying that he was not satisfied with the answers itself is enough to conclude that his intention is nothing but causing inconvenience to the public authorities and not a bona fide one. As held by the Apex Court in Aditya Bandopadhyay (supra) no person shall be allowed to misuse or abuse the provisions of the RTI Act, especially when the attempt is smacked by mala fides and done as a tool to obstruct the smooth functioning of the office of the public authority. Therefore, we are of the view that there is no further action or direction with respect to the petitioners plea for getting information relating to the income and expenditure of the Vrischikolsavam Festival 2018 or 2019 is required.

23. The learned Standing Counsel appearing for

respondents 2 and 3 would contend that the Temple Advisory Committee is not amenable to the provisions of the RTI Act and therefore, Ext.P4 application insofar as it concerns the details to be obtained from additional 5th respondent is not entertainable. The learned Standing Counsel relied on the principle laid down by this Court in A.C.Bhanunni @ Valluvanattukara Vallabha Valiya Raja v. Commissioner, Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments (Admn.) Department [2011 (2) KLT 312] to fortify that contention. It was held that the Temple Advisory Committees constituted in the Temples under the control of the Malabar Devaswom Board are not amenable to the provisions of the RTI Act. Religious institutions and endowments of the Malabar Devaswom Board also were held to be not subject to the provisions of the RTI Act. The main reason stated for that is the Temples and functionaries under the Malabar Devaswom Board are functioning not using the funds sanctioned by the Government. Whereas, going by the definition of Section 2(h) of the RTI Act, its provisions are applicable to establishments, which are substantially funded, directly or indirectly, by funds provided by the appropriate Government. The said proposition is not applicable to

the Temple Advisory Committees in the Temples under the Cochin Devaswom Board. It may be noted that as per Ext.P8, which is a circular issued by the Cochin Devaswom Board regulating the constitution of Temple Advisory Committees in the Temples under the Board, it has been declared that the Temple Advisory Committees would come within the purview of the RTI Act. In view of that the contention of the learned Standing Counsel for the Cochin Devaswom Board that the 5th respondent is outside the provisions of the RTI Act cannot be accepted.

24. The second relief is to direct the 1st respondent to

investigate the malpractices and financial irregularities in the 3rd respondent Devaswom, pertaining to Vrischikolsavam Festival 2018 in Poornathrayeesa Temple, Tripunithura. From the averments in the Writ Petition, it can be seen that the basis for seeking such a relief is that, in his view, there was every chance for corruption and mismanagement of funds in relation to the said Festival. He apprehends so for the reason that there was delay in auditing the accounts. Further reasons stated by him is that the answers given to his queries were far from truth and his satisfaction. Besides raising such bald allegations, nothing has been stated in the Writ Petition to enable this Court to infer even prima facie any kind of corruption or malpractice in the conduct of the Festival. Additional 5th respondent produced Ext.R5(a) and R5(b), copies of the audit report with respect to Vrischikolsavam Festival 2018 and 2019. The petitioner did not point out any specific instance of incorrect accounting or malpractice. From what has been stated above it is quite clear the intention of the petitioner is nothing but mudslinging the authorities of the Cochin Devaswom Board and the reason is his personal vendetta.

25. In *Kusum Lata v. Union of India* [(2006) 6 SCC

180] the Apex Court held that when there is material to show that a petition styled as a public interest litigation is nothing but a camouflage to foster personal disputes, that petition should be dismissed by the Court. If such petitions are not properly regulated and abuse averted, it becomes a tool in unscrupulous hands to release vendetta and wreak vengeance as well.

26. We stated above that the investigation is sought by

the petitioner without any basis and bona fides. Viewed in the light of the observations in the aforementioned decision, the relief of investigation claimed by the petitioner amounts to abuse of the process of this Court. Therefore the second relief is liable only to be declined. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is disposed of in the following terms:

1) Ext.P7 is set aside;2) the requests of the petitioner for

Vrischikolsavam Festival 2018 and 2019 are not required to be entertained; and

3) the writ petition as regards the relief of directing the 1

Vrischikolsavam, 2018 at Poornathrayeesa Temple, Tripunithura, is dismissed.

Sd/- ANIL K. NARENDRA, JUDGE Sd/- P.G. AJITHKUMAR, JUDGE dkr
APPENDIX OF WP(C) 8536/2020 PETITIONER EXHIBITS EXHIBIT P1 TRUE
COPY OF THE ORDER OF THE 4TH RESPONDENT DATED 27.8.2019 EXHIBIT
P2 TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION UNDER RTI FROM THE PETITIONER
TO 3RD RESPONDENT DATED 17.12.2018 EXHIBIT P3 TRUE COPY OF THE
REPLY FROM 3RD RESPONDENT TO PETITIONER DATED 8.10.2019 EXHIBIT
P4 TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION DATED 20.9.2019 EXHIBIT P5 TRUE
COPY OF THE REPLY DATED 10.12.2019 TO EXT.P4 EXHIBIT P6 TRUE COPY
OF THE PETITION DATED 11.10.2019 FROM THE PETITIONER TO THE 4TH
RESPONDENT EXHIBIT P7 TRUE COPY OF THE FINAL ORDER OF 4TH
RESPONDENT 31.1.2020 IN CP 214(50/19/SIC (FILE NO 5159/SIC-47/19)
EXHIBIT P8 TRUE COPY OF THE CIRCULAR DATED PAGES OF THE
BYELAW ON FORMATION OF TEMPLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE. EXHIBIT P9
TRUE COPY OF THE FINAL ORDER DATED EXHIBIT P10 TRUE COPY OF
ORDER DATED 29/5/2018 IN AP/1277(1) 2017/SIC. EXHIBIT P10 TRUE COPY
OF THE REPLY FROM THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY AND ASSISTANT
COMMISSIONER (R4 IN WPC) DATED EXHIBIT P11 TRUE COPY OF
COMMUNICATION FROM 3RD RESPONDENT TO 4TH RESPONDENT DATED
EXHIBIT P11(A) TRUE COPY OF THE RTI APPLICATION DATED FROM
PETITIONER TO THE PUBLICATION INFORMATION OFFICER (R3 EXHIBIT

P12 TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION UNDER RTI DATED 2.1.2021 TO PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER (R3) EXHIBIT P12(A) TRUE COPY OF REPLY TO THE EXT P12, NO PROPER ANSWER IS GIVEN ON ANACHAMAYAM TENDER. EXHIBIT P13 TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER DATED 05.04.2022 IN AP.2079(5)SIC FILE NO.13149/SIC-G7/2020. RESPONDENT EXHIBITS EXHIBIT R3(A) TRUE COPY OF JUDGMENT DATED 11.03.2019 IN WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO.13926 OF 2018 PASSED BY THIS COURT. EXHIBIT R3(B) TRUE COPY OF JUDGMENT DATED 13.01.2020 IN WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO.30386 OF 2019 PASSED BY THIS COURT. EXHIBIT R3(C) TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 17/10/19 SUBMITTED BY THE ADDITIONAL 5TH RESPONDENT TO THE 3RD RESPONDENT EXHIBIT R3(D) TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER NO C-5/2018, DATED 31/10/2019 ISSUED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT TO THE PETITIONER EXHIBIT R3(E) TRUE COPY OF THE APPEAL PREferred BY THE PETITIONER DATED 20/11/2019 BEFORE THE 2ND RESPONDENT EXHIBIT R3(F) TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER NO C-5/2018 DATED 30/11/2019 ISSUED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT TO THE ADDITIONAL 5TH RESPONDENT EXHIBIT R3(G) TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY NO C-5/2019, DATED 14/12/2020 SUBMITTED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT TO THE 4TH RESPONDENT EXHIBIT R3(H) TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE NO 13149/SIC- G7/2020 DATED 7/3/22 BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT TO THE 3RD RESPONDENT EXHIBIT R3(I) TRUE COPY OF THE REPLY NO C-5/2019, DATED 26/3/22 SUBMITTED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT TO THE 4TH RESPONDENT EXHIBIT R5(A) A TRUE COPY OF THE AUDIT REPORT SUBMITTED BY THE CYRIC AND ASSOCIATES CHARTED ACCOUNTANT, KOCHI DATED 17.12.2019 EXHIBIT R5(B) TRUE COPY OF THE RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS ACCOUNTS AUDITED BY THE CYRIAC AND ASSOCIATES, CHARTERED ACCOUNTANT, KOCHI, DATED 18.09.2020.