SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com

Suresh vs the State of Kerala

Suresh vs the State of Kerala

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1647588

Court : Kerala

Decided On : Jul-29-2021

Judge : Honourable Mr. Justice Raja Vijayaraghavan V

Appeal No. : WP(C)/12636/2021

Appellant : Suresh

Respondent : The State of Kerala

Judgement :

WP(C) NO. 12636 OF 2021 1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJA VIJAYARAGHAVAN V THURSDAY, THE 29TH DAY OF JULY 2021 / 7TH SRAVANA, 1943 WP(C) NO. 12636 OF 2021 PETITIONER/S: SURESH AGED 35 YEARS S/O. MARIYADAS, SANTHI NIVAS, COLONY ROAD, MUNNAR P. O., KDH VILLAGE, DEVIKULAM TALUK, I DUKKI DISTRICT - 685 612. BY ADV G.SREEKUMAR (CHELUR) RESPONDENT/S:

1 THE STATE OF KERALA REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT, REVENUE DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695 001. 2 THE SUB COLLECTOR/REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER OFFICE OF THE SUB COLLECTOR/REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER, DEVIKULAM P.O., IDUKKI DISTRICT - 685 612. 3 THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR COLLECTORATE, PAINAVU P.O., IDUKKI DISTRICT - 685 603. 4 THE TALUK TAHSILDAR DEVIKULAM TALUK OFFICE, DEVIKULAM P. O., IDUKKI DISTRICT - 685 612. 5 THE VILLAGE OFFICER K D H VILLAGE, DEVIKULAM P. O., IDUKKI DISTRICT - 685 612. 6 CHINATHA AGED 59 YEARS W/O. THADES, COLONY ROAD, MUNNAR, IDUKKI DISTRICT - 685 612.

WP(C) NO. 12636 OF 2021 2 7 ALAGAR SWAMI AGED 48 YEARS, S/O.SUBBAI, COLONY ROAD, MUNNAR, IDUKKI DISTRICT - 685 612. 8 SUJA AGED 40 YEARS, W/O. ALEX, COLONY ROAD, MUNNAR, IDUKKI DISTRICT - 685 612. ADDL.R9 IMPLEADED *9 BINU PAPPACHAN, S/O.PAPPACHAN, AGED 41 YEARS, PUTHEN VEETTIL HOUSE, IKKA NAGAR, MUNNAR. IS IMPLEADED AS PER ORDER DATED 07.07.2021 IN IA NO.01/2021 IN WPC NO.12636/2021 SRI.Y. JAFAR KHAN, SENIOR GOVERNMENT PLEADER SHRI.K.P.JAYACHANDRAN, ADDL. ADVOCATE GENERAL A.A.SHIBI THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 29.07.2021, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING: WP(C) NO. 12636 OF 2021 3

JUDGMENT

Challenging the cancellation of land assignment pattas issued in favour of a certain Muthu, Alagarsamy and Suja by Exts.P9 to P11 as per orders dated 26.09.2019 passed by the 2nd respondent, the petitioner herein, claiming to be interested in the subject matter, has filed Exts.P13 to P15 appeals before the 3rd respondent purportedly under Rule 21 of the Kerala Land Assignment Rule,

1964. His main grievance in this writ petition is that the request made by the

petitioner to make available the statements of the beneficiaries retained in the office of the 2nd respondent in file No.A21297/2007 has not been acceded to by respondents 2 and 3. It is in the afore circumstances, that the petitioner has approached this Court seeking the following reliefs:

i) issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ order

or direction commanding the second respondent to furnish the statements as referred to in Ext.P23, being the statements made by the respondents 6 to 8 in the enquiry in terms of Ext.P22; before the third respondent as part of the enquiry proceedings in Ext.P24 within stipulated time limits in the interest of justice.

ii) issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ order

or direction commanding the third respondent to defer the enquiry based on Exts.P16 and P24, till the statements of the respondents 6 to 8 in its original form are obtained from the second respondent, for

conclusion of the proceedings in the enquiry, in the interest of justice.

2. The petitioner contends that the patta issued to the beneficiaries were cancelled on the ground that they themselves had given a statement

WP(C) NO. 12636 OF 2021 4 before the 2nd respondent that they had not applied for patta as per the provisions of the Land Assignment Act. This is clearly at variance with the assertions made by the beneficiaries in earlier proceedings. It is contended that when the beneficiaries were questioned by the revenue authorities and officers of the Vigilance department earlier, they had stated in emphatic terms that they had applied and obtained the assignment of land. The petitioner further contends that the assignees were also questioned by the revenue officials when

the special task force was constituted to drive out unauthorised encroachments. The beneficiaries were issued with notices by the Sub Collector to appear before the said authority for enquiry.

3. The petitioner contends that it would be evident from Ext.P23

report of the task force, that numerous thandaper holders holding questionable patta were summoned as early as in the year 2007 and they were heard and their statements were recorded. The beneficiaries whose assignments were cancelled were among them. The petitioner states that the statements recorded by the task force would be relevant in the enquiry before the 3rd respondent, which is still on. It is the duty of the 2nd respondent to furnish the said statements to the petitioner to enable him to substantiate that the party

respondents are blowing hot and cold at the same time. In the said circumstances, the petitioner submitted Ext.P25 application before the 3rd respondent on 18.09.2020. However, no steps are being taken to furnish the documents. This would clearly violate the rights of the petitioner and hence this writ petition. WP(C) NO. 12636 OF 2021 5

4. A statement has been filed by the 2nd respondent wherein it is

stated that the Kerala Government had taken over 500 Acres of land comprised in Sy.No.912 of KDH Village, Devikulam from Kannandevan Company for ponnumvila by order dated 05.04.1957 of the District Collector, Kottayam. A certain Mariadas, had encroached upon portions of the said Government land and obtained 15 pattas in the name of 15 different persons. While so, Sri.Binu Pappachan, the additional 9th respondent, filed a petition alleging procedural irregularities in issuance of patta and sought for cancellation of the same. Alleging inaction, the said respondent filed W.P.(C). No.33484 of 2017 before this Court and directions were issued to the 2nd respondent to conclude the proceedings. The 2nd respondent considered the matter and the patta of (1) Sri.Alagarswamy (s/o. Shanmughavel) L.A.No.96/99, (2) Smt.Udayasundari for

Muthu (L.A.94/99), (3) Mrs.Suja D/o Tedius (L.A.No.97/99) and (4) Mrs.Chinnathayi (L.A.No.54/99) were cancelled as they stated before the authority that they were unaware of the issuance of patta and that Sri.Mariadas had illegally taken patta in their name by means of forged documents and misrepresentation. It is contended that the 2nd respondent had acted as per the directions of this Court

and in tune with the provisions of the Land Assignments Rules, 1964. It is further contended that a perusal of the records evince the fact that the patta were issued without following the procedure stipulated in the Rules. It is further stated that the patta was cancelled on the basis of statements made by the beneficiaries before the Sub Collector. It is further submitted that the 2nd respondent had taken action on the basis of the

WP(C) NO. 12636 OF 2021 6 hearing notice issued on 16.05.2019 and not on the basis of notice dated 10.10.2007. A detailed enquiry was conducted with regard to Ext.P23 and it was revealed that no such statement was recorded by the task force pursuant to the notice dated 10.10.2007. Though as per Ext.P22, the Sub Collector had directed the parties to appear on 17.10.2007, Ext.P23 dated 15.05.2007 does not speak of any proceedings which took place on that day and the details of the persons who were present.

5. In the statement filed by the 3rd respondent, the contentions

advanced by the 2nd respondent is reiterated. It is further stated that the petitioner had submitted an application before the 3rd respondent to consider the statements given by the original assignees in the year 2007 to substantiate his case that the version of the beneficiaries were not correct as they have been stating different versions at different times. The 3rd respondent summoned the file concerned and on verification, it was found that there was no such statement as contended by the petitioner.

6. Sri.Binu Pappachan is the person who had approached this Court by

filing W.P.(C) No.33484 of 2017 seeking directions to the 5th respondent to initiate proceedings against Mariadas, the father of the petitioner herein. An application for impleadment was filed, which was allowed by this Court. In the affidavit filed in support of the application seeking impleadment, it is stated that the father of the petitioner herein was the caretaker of trees in the Social Forestry Scheme. He had submitted an application under the Land Assignment

WP(C) NO. 12636 OF 2021 7 Rules in his own name and in the name of 14 relatives/employees and had obtained patta without the knowledge of the assignees. It is stated that the procedure prescribed under the Land Assignment Act as well as the Rules framed thereunder were not complied with. In the said circumstances, he had submitted an application for cancellation of patta and when no action was taken, he had approached this Court. It is contended that the beneficiaries had given statements before the 2nd respondent that it was at the instance of Mariadas that they had applied for assignment and also that they had not occupied the patta land. It is further stated that a vigilance case was registered as V.C.No.10/03-IDK as per orders issued by the Director, VACB and on verification of the records, it was revealed that in respect of L.A.No.94/99,

committee after scrutiny. A copy of the vigilance report obtained under the RTI

Act has also been produced as Ext.R9(3). It is further stated that the beneficiaries had filed separate counter-affidavits in W.P.(C).No.34773/2014 before this Court, copies of which have been produced as Ext.R9(4), R9(4)(a) and R9(4)(b) wherein they have reiterated that they have nothing to do with the assignment of land in their name and it was the handiwork of the aforesaid Mariadas. It is further stated that Smt.Suja, Smt.Chinnatha, Sri.Muthu and Sri.Alagarswamy had filed affidavits before the 1st respondent reiterating that they have not applied for patta and that they had nothing to do with the patta covered under the various cancelled patta. The beneficiaries have also given statements before the Special Tahsildar, Munnar on the same lines. It is further

WP(C) NO. 12636 OF 2021 8 stated that the provisions of the Land Assignments Act and the Rules have been violated in its entirety. Finally, it is contended that Ext.P23 would not reveal that any of the patta holders whose assignments were cancelled had in fact been included in the 82 beneficiaries or that they had appeared before the task force pursuant to Ext.P22. It is further stated that the petitioner has no locus standi to approach this Court as he has claimed right over the property on the strength of forged agreements that are admittedly unregistered.

7. I have considered the submissions advanced and have gone through the records.

8. The matter essentially relates to the cancellation of Patta issued to

certain individuals. The Patta was cancelled by the 2nd respondent based on a proceeding that was set in motion by the additional 9th respondent. The beneficiaries have themselves appeared before the 2nd respondent in flesh and blood and had given their version. They contended that Sri.Mariadas, the father of the petitioner, in conjunction with some of the revenue authorities have manipulated records and have managed to obtain patta in the name of the said individuals. Some of the beneficiaries asserted that they did not sign the application, that they have never seen or possessed the land, and that they have not resided therein. Some of them have given statements that though they had signed the application for patta, after sanctioning the same, the father of the petitioner took over the patta land and he has been possessing the same ever since. Some of the beneficiaries were employees of Mariadas and some of

WP(C) NO. 12636 OF 2021 9 them were his relatives. They had also stated that the aforesaid Mariadas had persuaded them to furnish statements contrary to the actual facts and in the circumstances, they were then in, they were forced to oblige.

9. The contention of the petitioner is that his request for supply of

certain statements furnished by the beneficiaries before the task force is not being furnished to him despite his request. As to how the petitioner is interested in the subject matter is not known. All that he says is that he is possessing the patta lands on the strength of some agreements executed by the beneficiaries. From the various documents submitted, it is evident that the cancellation of the Patta is on the strength of the statements given by the beneficiaries and for violation of the provisions of the Land Assignment Rules. It is trite that the petitioner cannot aspire to acquire more rights than what has been conferred to the assignees.

10. The case of the petitioner is set up on Exts.P22 and P23. Exhibit

P23 is the report of the Taskforce dated 15.5.2007, wherein the steps taken by them are detailed date wise. The petitioner highlights the events which took place on 07.05.2007. The same reads thus:

(3) 07-05-2007

() 82 & , . WP(C) NO. 12636 OF 2021 10

11. All that is stated is that notices were issued to 82 Thandapper

holders and they were heard and their statements were recorded. There is no mention of the details of any of those persons or of those beneficiaries whose patta were cancelled. Exhibit P22 is the notice dated 10.10.2007 issued to Smt. Suja asking her to appear on 17.10.2007 at 11 p.m. There is also an endorsement that the party was present on 17.10.2007. The 3rd respondent in the counter filed by him has stated that the file was called for and he could not find any statement. The petitioner has produced Exhibits P26 to P29 statements given by the beneficiaries given before the Dy. Superintendent wherein they have stated that they had applied for and obtained patta in their own name. He has also produced the counter-affidavits filed by the beneficiaries in W.P.(C) No.

apply for patta and that they have never seen or resided in the said property. In Exhibit P30 affidavit filed by Smt.Suja in W.P (C) No. 34773 of 2014, she has stated thus:

3. The 12th respondent conducted an enquiry on 24-04-2015. I

personally appeared before the 12th respondent on that day and had given a statement before him. In that statement I have given the true facts which are within my personal knowledge, which are true and correct.

4. It is submitted that I am a person born and brought up in Kodukkamboor village.

5. I have no connection of whatsoever nature with the land in Sy.

No. 912 in KDH village, Munnar or the land covered by L.A. 97/99. I have not ever possessed or enjoyed the said land. I never resided in KDH Village. I did not sign

any application for getting patta for the land or submitted before any authorities. The signatures seen in WP(C) NO. 12636 OF 2021 11

> patta or patta mahazar are not of mine. I did not sign on any of those documents. I had not given any statement before the Tahsildar for the purpose. At the time when the Patta was issued I was not even married. I was not issued with the patta. I never transferred the patta to anyone. It is learnt that there is a house in the land and an electric connection is availed to the premises. But had not owned any house at Munnar at any point of time or availed electric connection. I did not let out the building to anyone. It is understood that the said property and house are occupied by the 10th respondent, who is my paternal uncle. Due to his insistence/influence and due to my ignorance I had given a statement in an enquiry held by the Vigilance at the office of the RDO and Panchayat office that the land belongs to me and the same was given to me at the time of marriage. The said statement is against facts. I have not transferred any property in to the name of the 10th respondent.

6. It is submitted that I had no knowledge about the attempt to take possession or encroach into any government land on the basis of patta created in my name. I never consented or permitted any one to do that.

12. Similar affidavits have been filed by the other beneficiaries as well. They have stated the circumstances under which they had stated a different version when they were questioned by the Officers of the Vigilance Department.

13. I find that the petitioner herein has preferred the appeal invoking

Section 21 of the Land Assignment Rules. His prayer in this writ petition is limited to the issuance of directions to the 3rd respondent to issue copies of the statements of the beneficiaries stated to have been recorded by the task force in the year 2007. As discussed earlier, the 3rd respondent has perused the files

WP(C) NO. 12636 OF 2021 12 and has stated before this Court in unequivocal terms that no such statements are available in the file. Now that the appeal has

been taken on the file and the same is stated to be pending, I am of the view that the only orders that are required to be issued are to expedite the proceedings and finalise the same after considering the entire materials made available by both sides and after affording adequate opportunities to present their respective versions. The 3rd respondent shall also consider whether the provisions of the Assignment Act and the Rules were complied with in its letter and spirit at the time of issuance of Patta and the locus standi of the petitioner to mount any challenge.

This Writ Petition will stand disposed of. Sd/- RAJA VIJAYARAGHAVAN V JUDGE ps WP(C) NO. 12636 OF 2021 13 APPENDIX OF WP(C) 12636/2021 PETITIONER(S) EXHIBITS EXHIBIT P1 A TRUE COPY OF THE DOCUMENT IN THE NAME OF THE PETITIONER DATED 10.08.12. EXHIBIT P2 A TRUE COPY OF THE TAX RECEIPT ISSUED BY THE MUNNAR VILLAGE OFFICER DATED 5.06.18. EXHIBIT P3 A TRUE COPY OF THE OWNERSHIP CERTIFICATE IN THE NAME OF THE SUJA DATED 12.11.03. EXHIBIT P4 A TRUE COPY OF THE BUILDING PERMIT IN THE NAME OF SUJA DATED 28.10.03. EXHIBIT P5 A TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE ISSUED TO SUJA DATED 10.10.07. EXHIBIT P6 A TRUE COPY OF THE TAX PAID RECEIPT IN THE NAME OF SUJA DATED 02.06.18. EXHIBIT P7 A TRUE COPY OF THE AGREEMENT IN THE NAME OF THE PETITIONER DATED 25.08.12. EXHIBIT P8 A TRUE COPY OF THE TAX PAID RECEIPT ISSUED BY THE MUNNAR VILLAGE OFFICER IN THE NAME OF THE ALAGARSWAMI DATED 11.06.18. EXHIBIT P9 A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER ISSUED CANCELING LA NO.94 OF 99 OF THE ADDL. TAHSILDAR, DEVIKULAM IN THE NAME OF MUTHU. EXHIBIT P10 A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER OF CANCELING LA NO.96 OF 99 IN THE NAME OF ALAGARSWAMI DATED 26.09.19. EXHIBIT P11 A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER OF CANCELLATION OF LA NO.97 OF 99 IN THE NAME OF SUJA DATED 26.09.19. EXHIBIT P12 A TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DELIVERED IN W.P.(C) NO.33484 OF 17 DATED 6.2.18 BY THIS HON'BLE COURT. WP(C) NO. 12636 OF 2021 14 EXHIBIT P13 A TRUE COPY OF THE APPEAL MEMORANDUM NUMBERED AS APPEAL NO.C2 137063/19 DATED 10.10.19. EXHIBIT P14 A TRUE COPY OF THE APPEAL NO.C2 137063/19 DATED 10.10.19. EXHIBIT P15 A TRUE COPY OF THE APPEAL MEMORANDUM IN APPEAL NO.C2 137058 OF 19 DATED 10.10.19. EXHIBIT P16 A TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE

ISSUED DATED 26.8.2020. EXHIBIT P17 A TRUE COPY OF THE REPORT OF THE OFFICER OF THE VIGILANCE DEPARTMENT DATED 7.1.2014. EXHIBIT P18 A TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION OF THE PETITIONER DATED 30.09.2020. EXHIBIT P19 A TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION OF THE PETITIONER DATED 22.09.2020. EXHIBIT P20 A TRUE COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION SERVED ON THE PETITIONER DATED 28.09.2020. EXHIBIT P21 A TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DELIVERED IN OP(CRL) NO.333 OF 20 DATED 5.1.21 BY THIS HON'BLE COURT. EXHIBIT P22 A TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE ISSUED TO SUJA BY THE SUB COLLECTOR, DEVIKULAM DATED 10.10.07. EXHIBIT P23 A TRUE COPY OF THE REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE DATED 15.05.09 BY THE SECOND RESPONDENT. EXHIBIT P24 A TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE ISSUED DATED 9.6.21 BY THE THIRD RESPONDENT. EXHIBIT P25 A TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER AND OTHERS BEFORE THE THIRD RESPONDENT DATED 18.09.20 IN EXT.P24 ENQUIRY. EXHIBIT P26 A TRUE COPY OF THE STATEMENT OF SUJA

RECORDED BY THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, VIGILANCE AND ANTI CORRUPTION BUREAU, IDUKKI DISTRICT, IDUKKI UNIT DATED WP(C) NO. 12636 OF 2021 15 NIL. EXHIBIT P27 A TRUE COPY OF THE STATEMENT OF CHINNATHA MADE BEFORE THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, VIGILANCE AND ANTI CORRUPTION BUREAU, IDUKKI UNIT DATED 28.05.07. EXHIBIT P28 A TRUE COPY OF THE STATEMENT OF MUTHU TO THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, VIGILANCE AND ANTI CORRUPTION BUREAU, IDUKKI UNIT DATED 28.07.07. EXHIBIT P29 A TRUE COPY OF THE STATEMENT OF ALAGARSWAMI TO THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, VIGILANCE AND ANTI CORRUPTION BUREAU, IDUKKI UNIT DATED 28.07.07.

EXHIBIT P30 A TRUE COPY OF THE COUNTER AFFIDAVIT FILED BY SUJA IN W.P.(C) NO.34773 OF 2014 BEFORE THIS HON'BLE COURT DATED NIL. EXHIBIT P31 A TRUE COPY OF THE COUNTER AFFIDAVIT FILED BY ALAGARSWAMI IN W.P.(C) NO.34773 OF 2014 BEFORE THIS HON'BLE COURT DATED NIL. EXHIBIT P32 A TRUE COPY OF THE STATEMENT AND

AFFIDAVIT FILED BY CHINNATHA DATED 24.04.15 AND 30.03.15. EXHIBIT P33 A TRUE COPY OF THE STATEMENT AND AFFIDAVIT OF MUTHU DATED 24.04.15 AND 3.05.15. EXHIBIT P34 A TRUE COPY OF THE STATEMENT OF SUJA AND AFFIDAVIT DATED 24.04.15 AND 30.03.15. EXHIBIT P35 A TRUE COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF ALAGARSWAMI DATED 09.04.15. EXHIBIT P36 A TRUE COPY OF THE REPORT OF THE RDO, DEVIKULAM DATED 27.04.07. RESPONDENT (S) EXHIBITS : ANNEXURE R2(a) A TRUE COPY OF THE STATEMENTS RECORDED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT. EXHIBIT R9(1) TRUE COPY OF STATEMENTS GIVEN BY PATTADARS WP(C) NO. 12636 OF 2021 16 OF CANCELLED PATTAS BEFORE 1ST RESPONDENT. EXHIBIT R9(2) A TRUE COPY OF PATTA FILE OF CHINNATHA (LA NO.54/99) EXHIBIT R9(2)(a) A TRUE COPY OF PATTA FILE OF SUJA (LA NO.97/99). EXHIBIT R9(2)(b) A TRUE COPY OF PATTA FILE OF MUTHU (LA NO.94/99) EXHIBIT R9(2)(c) A TRUE COPY OF PATTA FILE OF ALAGARSWAMI (LA NO.96/99) EXHIBIT R9(3) TRUE COPY OF VIGILANCE REPORT OBTAINED FROM VACB, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM OFFICE UNDER RTI ACT. EXHIBIT R9(4) TRUE COPY OF COUNTER AFFIDAVIT FILED BY SUJA IN W.P.(C) NO.34773/2014. EXHIBIT R9(4)(a) TRUE COPY OF RELEVANT PAGE OF COUNTER AFFIDAVIT FILED BY MUTHU IN W.P.(C) NO.34773/2014. EXHIBIT R9(4)(b) TRUE COPY OF COUNTER AFFIDAVIT FILED BY ALAGARSWAMI, IN W.P.(C) NO.34773/2014. EXHIBIT R9(5) TRUE COPY OF AFFIDAVIT DATED 30.03.2015 SWORN BY CHINNATHA NOTARIZED BY ADV. AJITH POTTAS. EXHIBIT R9(5)(a) TRUE COPY OF AFFIDAVIT DATED 30.03.2015 SWORN BY SUJA NOTARIZED BY ADV.AJITH POTTAS. EXHIBIT R9(5)(b) TRUE COPY OF AFFIDAVIT DATED 03.05.2015 SWORN BY MUTHU NOTARIZED BY ADV.AJITH POTTAS. EXHIBIT R9(5)(c) TRUE COPY OF AFFIDAVIT DATED 09.04.2015 SWORN BY ALAGARSWAMI NOTARIZED BY ADV.AJITH POTTAS. EXHIBIT R9(6) TRUE COPY OF THE STATEMENT GIVEN BY SUJA TO SPECIAL TAHSILDAR DATED 24.04.2015. EXHIBIT R9(7) TRUE COPY OF THE ENQUIRY REPORT DATED 28.04.2015 SENT BY SPECIAL TAHSILDAR TO THE WP(C) NO. 12636 OF 2021 17 4TH RESPONDENT. EXHIBIT R9(8) TRUE COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION DATED NIL SENT BY DISTRICT COLLECTOR TO SPECIAL TAHSILDAR.

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com