

**IN THE COURT OF THE SUB JUDGE, CHERTHALA****Present: Ms. Lakshmy.S, Sub Judge****Monday, the 19<sup>th</sup> January 2026 / 29<sup>th</sup> Pausha 1947****IA.1/2026 in AS.2/2026**

(Filed on 19.01.2026)

**Petitioners/:**  
**Appellants**

1. Thama Dineshan, aged 57 years,  
W/o. Late Dineshan, Vadakke Pulikkal,  
K.R. Puram.P.O, Chennam Pallippuram Muri,  
Pallippuram Village
2. Abhijith, aged 28 years, S/o. Late Dineshan,  
Vadakke Pulikkal, K.R. Puram.P.O,  
Chennam Pallippuram Muri, Pallippuram Village

By Adv. Gurudas. H. Mallan, Adv. Sudheer. P.  
Adv. P.M. Rahila, Adv. K.P. Jayakumar,  
Adv. V.H. Nandakumar & Adv. Parvathy. M.P

**Respondents**

- :1. Jith. V.R, Vadakke Pulikkal, K.R. Puram.P.O,  
Chennam Pallippuram Muri, Pallippuram Village  
Cherthala Taluk, Alappuzha District
2. Akhila, aged 29 years, D/o. Late Dineshan,  
Vadakke Pulikkal, K.R. Puram.P.O,  
Chennam Pallippuram Muri, Pallippuram Village

By Adv. Thomas. J. Panat

This petition coming on for hearing on 19.01.2026 and the court on the same day passed the following:

**ORDER**

Heard the counsel for the petitioner and perused records. No caveat reportedly pending. The suit was for declaration of perspective easement, mandatory and prohibitory injunctions. The suit was dismissed by the trial court and hence, the appeal is preferred. The appellant has an arguable case and if the status of the disputed property is altered, the same would cause much hardships to the petitioner. Hence both parties are directed to maintain status quo with respect to plaint C schedule way as revealed through Ext.C1 commission report till 02.02.2026. Comply Order 39 Rule 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure. Issue notice to the respondents. For return of notice 02.02.2026.

(Pronounced by me in the open Court on this the 19<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2026)

Sd/-  
LAKSHMY.S,  
SUB JUDGE

Appendix : Nil

Id/-  
SUB JUDGE