

IN THE COURT OF THE ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE-II, THALASSERY  
Present: Smt. Titty George, Additional District Judge-II, Thalassery  
Saturday, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of March, 2026, 30<sup>th</sup> Phalguna, 1947.

**LAR (NHA) No.04/2024**  
(LAC 7787 (XVI) dated. 26-03-2021)

Special Tahsildar, Land Acquisition, LA NH 2, ] Competent Authority/  
Kannur. ] Petitioner

Vs.

1 K.V.Balachandran, Vasantham House, Puzhathi ]  
Someswary, Chirakkal.P.O, PIN-670011. ]

**Suppl:-** ]

2 Chirakkal Kovilakam Devasawam Chirakkal Kan- ] Respondents/  
nur, Rep.by Executive Officer, K.Venu, Aged 56 ] Claimants  
years, residing at 'Sreekrishna', Meethalevayalil, ]  
Naduvathoor.P.O, Quilandy. ]  
(Supplemental R2 impleaded as per order in ]  
IA 01 /2025 dated 09-06-2025) ]

This petition coming on the 16<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026 for final hearing before me in the presence of the Additional Government Pleader for the Petitioner/Competent Authority; and of Smt.Shija.K.M, Advocate for the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent/claimant; S/Sri.Jayakrishnan.V and Pradeep Kumar.V Advocates for the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondents; and having stood over to this day for consideration; the court passed the following:-

**AWARD**

This is the reference from Special Deputy Collector & Competent Authority, LA (NHAI), Kannur at Taliparamba under Section 3H (4) of the National Highways Act 1956.

2. An extent of 0.2303 H of land in Resurvey No.136/1 (New 136/5) of Puzhathi desom in Chirakkal Village, Kannur Taluk was acquired by Government for the development of National Highway No.66 from the possession of the respondent. Compensation for the entire extent of land as per the Award of even

number dated 26.03.2021 in LAC 7787 (XVI) is **₹72,06,380/- (Rupees Seventy two lakh six thousand three hundred and eighty only)**. The competent authority determined the amount of compensation. The land owners have not produced all documents proving the title of the property under acquisition, the payment of compensation amount is deferred until the absolute title over the property is proved by the land owner. Hence, the reference.

3. The 1st respondent filed claim statement stating that the acquired property earlier belonged to Kunnumkai Puthiya Purayil Aboobacker and it was assigned to Elambilal Kizhakke Veetil Balan Nair and his brother Narayanan Nair as per Reg. document No.444/1965 of SRO Valapattanam. Later, the said Balan Nair and his brother Narayanan Nair got Jenmam right jointly as per the Purchase certificate bearing No.17086/1976 from the Land Tribunal Kannur. After that, it was gifted to the 1st respondent as per the document No.1323/1986. The 1st respondent is in possession of the property with exclusive right. Hence, the 1st respondent is the only person entitled to get the award amount.

4. The 2nd respondent represented by its Executive Officer got impleaded as per order in IA 1/2025 and filed a claim statement as follows: The 2nd respondent is the Executive Officer of Chirakkal Kovilakam Devaswom who is empowered to represent the temple scheduled vide order dt 29.05.1972 in OA 8/71 of Deputy Commissioner for HR and CE (Administration) Department, Calicut. There are 38 temples included in the schedule appended with the said order and Kalarivathukkal Devaswom is 19 in the schedule attached to the scheme. The acquired property exclusively belongs to Kalarivathukkal Devaswom of Chirakkal Kovilakam Devaswom under Malabar Devaswom Board. The 1st respondent has no right over the property. The Land Acquisition Authorities concerned with oblique motive and in collusion with certain persons who project a claim over the acquired land in the strength of void and invalid documents wilfully abstained from making the Kalarivathukkal Devaswom the true owner of the acquired land. Adangal extract of land RS 136/1 of Chirakkal amson Puzhathi desom, Kannur shows that the supplemental 2nd respondent has the jenmam right over the property. Adangal extract

is supported by the title deeds produced by other respondents that will admit that Kalarivathukkal Devaswom was the ancient original Jenmi of the acquired land. All the registered documents produced by other respondents are void as they came into existence violating the legal provisions. As per Section 3(1)(x) of Kerala Land Reforms Act 1963 no lease could be created with respect to a religious/temple property. Moreover as per Section 29 of HR&CE Act any exchange, sale of mortgage and any lease of any immovable property belonging to, or given or endowed for the purpose of any religious institution shall be null and void unless it is sanctioned by the Commissioner as being necessary or beneficial to the institution. There is no sanction in the above matter. The petitioner has not sent any notice in the above matter. This was done to defeat the lawful right of the Kalarivathukkal Devaswom and thereby producing the unlawful gain to the said interested persons. Other respondents have no legal right whatsoever over the acquired land and they are made parties to the reference. The 2nd respondent is the only person entitled to the award amount deposited in court. Hence the award amount deposited in the reference may be released to the supplemental 2nd respondent.

5. The petitioner/Referring authority filed a statement stating that an extent of 0.2303 hectare of land in RS 136/1 (new Survey No.136/5) of Chirakkal Amsom Puzhathi Desom of Kannur Taluk was acquired for the development of National Highway 66. The individual demarcation could not be carried out since it is water logged and there are no physical boundaries for individual properties and disputes are also prevailing among land owners. The individual sketch and mahazar could not be prepared. Hence the sketch and mahazar were prepared on survey subdivision basis. Subsequently mahazar and sketch were prepared in the name of Thaikkandy Safeena, Sajina, Chinnan, Vijayaraghavan & others. An amount of Rs.72,06,380/- was awarded and the payment of compensation was deferred by the reason that the survey and demarcation of the land couldn't be carried out because of water logging in the locality. The owners have not produced all documents proving the title of the property under acquisition. In the above circumstances, the matter is referred to the Principal Civil Court, Thalassery for adjudication for invoking Section

3H (4) of NH Act 1956. On the basis of the above reference, an OP LA(NH)362/2021 case is filed before the Additional District Court, (ADC-IV), Thalassery. As per the order in IA 03/2022 in OP (LA)NH 362/2021, an Advocate Commission was appointed by the court and the Commissioner inspected the site and prepared the individual sketches with the assistance of Taluk Surveyor, Kannur after verifying the documents of each land owner. Then after, this office prepared individual award amount of each cases with individual sketch and had E-filed before the Hon'ble Dist. Court, Thalassery. After that the Hon'ble court has registered this case as ref.No.LAR(NH) 04/2024 (LAC 7787(XVI). In the above circumstances RS No.136/1 (New RS No.136/5) of Chirakkal Amsom Puzhathi Desom for an extent of 0.2303 hectare of land owned by Sri.K.V. Balachandran as per Document No.1689/2021 and their total amount of Rs.72,06,380/- awarded as the compensation amount, may be disbursed to him.

6. No oral evidence was adduced for 1st and 2nd respondents. Exts.A1 to A14 and A16 and A17 were marked on the side of the 1st respondent. Ext.A15 was marked on the side of supplemental 2nd respondent.

7. Heard both sides.

8. Following points arise for determination:

*I) Who is entitled to get the compensation amount deposited before the court, the 1st respondent or the supplemental 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent?*

*ii) Relief and costs.*

9. **Point No.(i):-** As per the reference, an extent of 0.2303 H of land in Resurvey 136/1 (New 136/5) of Chirakkal amsom in Puzhathi desom in Chirakkal Village of Kannur Taluk was acquired by Government for the development of National Highway No.66 from the possession of the 1st respondent. The 1st respondent claims that he is the absolute owner of the acquired property and relied on Exts. A1 to A14 and Exts. A16 and A17 to prove his right over the acquired property. Ext.A1 is the gift deed No.1689/2021 of SRO, Valapattanam executed by Elambilan Kizhakke Veetil Balan Nair in favour of Karadan Veetil Balachandran (1st respondent) in respect of the undivided half right in 39.25 Ares in RS136/147 of

Chirakkal village. Ext.A2 is the certified copy of Assignment Deed No.1323/1986 of SRO, Valapattanam executed by Kizhakke Veetil Narayanan Nair in favour of the 1st respondent in respect of the undivided half right in 39.25 Ares in RS136 of Chirakkal village. Ext.A3 is the certified copy of Assignment Deed No.444/1965 of SRO, Valapattanam executed by Kunnunkai Puthiyapurayil Abubakkar in favour of Elambilan Kizhakkeveetil Balan Nair and his younger brother Narayanan Nair. Ext.A4 is the certified copy of Assignment Deed No.33/1958 of SRO, Valapattanam executed by Chennyantakath Puthiyapurayil Bayithan and Abubackar in favour of Kunnunkai Puthiyapurayil Abubackar in respect of the property in RS 136. ExtA5 is the certified copy of Assignment Deed No.1403/1954 of SRO, Valapattanam executed by Vayachalil Cheriya Mammu and Usmayil Kunhi in favour of Puthiyapurayil Bayithan and his younger brother Abubackar. Ext.A16 is the certified copy of Assignment Deed No.1154/1950 of SRO, Valapattanam executed by Kunhamina Umma in favour of Vayachalil Cheriya Mammu and his younger brother Usmayil Kunhi in respect of property in RS 136. Ext.A17 is the certified copy of Assignment Deed No.692/1949 of SRO, Valapattanam executed by Chindan Vaidyer, Anandan, Krishnan and Puthiyaveetil Kunhircaman assigning kozhukanam right in favour of Kunhamina Umma in respect of property in RS 136. Ext.A6 is the certified copy of Marupattam Deed No.1350/1941 of SRO, Valapattanam executed by Puthiyaveetil Chindan in favour of Ramavarma Valiya Thamburan wherein item Nos.1 and 2 are properties in RS 136 of Chirakkal village. Ext.A7 is the certified copy of Partition Deed No.236/1936 of SRO, Valapattanam executed by Palakkeel Mavila Valappil Raman Nambiar, Elambilan Nallakkandi Govindan, Puthiya Veetil Anandan, Puthiya Veetil Chindan, Kollarethayikkal Bachi, Kunnankai Puthiyapurayil Ali, Punnakkal Mammad, Kunhabdulla, Avvokkar and Udumankutty wherein D schedule including property in RS 136 (old Sy.94/1) was allotted to Puthiya Veetil Chindan. Ext.A8 is the certified copy of tharakadharam No.128/1923 of SRO, Valapattanam executed by Rama Varma Valiya Raja of Chirakkal Kovilakam in favour of Mavila Valappil Raman Nallakkandi Govindan, Puthiya Veetil Chindan and others in respect of property in Sy.94/1. As per the recitals in Ext.A8 certified copy of deed No.

128/1923 of SRO Valapattanam, the property in Survey 94/1 in Chirakkal Amsom Puzhathi desom was outstanding with Chovakkaran Vengalath Tharavadu as tenants and as per the judgment in OS No:120/1917 on the file of Sub Court Thalassery, the tenancy was terminated and Chirakkal Kovilakam was directed to pay certain amount towards the value of improvements to the tenant Chovakkaran Vengalath Tharavad and in order to mobilise funds to pay the amount as per the decree, Chirakkal Kovilakam, through the erstwhile senior most member, Sri. Rama Varma Valiya Raja had created a fresh tenancy in favour of Raman and 4 others. So it is evident that even prior to 1923, the property referred therein was in possession of tenants on basis of registered deeds.

10. Exts.A9 and A11 are tax receipt and possession certificate issued by Chirakkal Village Officer in the name of the 1st respondent in respect of properties including 0.3925 H in RS 136/147. From Ext.A10 Thandaper account extract in the name of the 1st respondent it can be seen that 0.3925 H of property in RS 136/147 was last transacted from RS 136/147. As per Ext.A12 encumbrance certificate there is no liability over the said property for 8.09Ares in RS No.136 for the period from 01.09.2005 to 23.09.2025. Ext.A13 is the purchase certificate bearing No.17086/1976 of Land Tribunal, Kannur issued in the name of Elambilan Kizhakkeveetil Balan Nair and Narayanan in respect of 39.25 Ares in RS 136. As per Ext.A14 certificate issued by Village Officer, Chirakkal, certifying that even though the Resurvey No.136 was shown in Ext.A1 title deed in respect of 39.25 Ares, on site inspection the correct Resurvey No. is found to be 136/1.

11. Ext.A15 is the Adangal extract marked on the side of 2nd respondent to prove their claim. In Ext.A15, the owner of 5.7742 Acres of wet land in RS 136/1 (old Sy. 94/1, 96) 'Cheriya Kaipadu nilam Kaliyar Nilam' is shown as Kalarivathukkal Dewaswom Uralan Chirakkal Kovilakathu Valiya Rajavu. It is an admitted fact that the property originally belonged to Chirakkal Kovilakam and in Jenm to Kalarivathukkal Devaswom. Admittedly, the acquired property in the reference is in the possession of the 1st respondent. The description of the

property is one and the same in all documents including Ext.A15- 'Cheriya Kaipadu Nilam'.

12. According to counsel for 1st respondent the disputed property along with other properties were outstanding with various tenants from 1917 onwards that by change of hands it is now in the possession and ownership of the 1st respondent and supplemental 2nd respondent Devaswom never had any possession or right over the same for more than 100 years. On the other hand, counsel for the 2nd respondent argued that as per Ext.A15, adangal extract, the ownership remained with the 2nd respondent and any deed executed in respect of the Dewasam property without sanction of the Commissioner as prescribed in S.29 of the Madras Hindu Act Religious and Charitable Endowments Act,1951 is void ab initio. It is further submitted that the earlier Act, Madras Hindu Religious Endowments Act, 1927, which was in force prior to the enactment of 1951 Act, also prohibited alienation of the Dewasom property without obtaining sanction from Commissioner. Counsel for the 2nd respondent relied on the decision of the Hon'ble High Court in **Payyannur Co-op. Educational Society v. Narayanan (2000 (3) KLT 129)** wherein it was held that any alienation of property belonging to religious institutions, without sanction from the Commissioner as being necessary or beneficial to the estate, will be null and void. Reliance was placed on decision in **2014 (1) KLT SN 26 (C.No34) Janaki Amma v. Sree Amruthamangalam Kshethram Moorthi** wherein it was held that lease of temple property for want of sanction u/s. 29 would make it null and void and even a plea of deemed tenancy cannot be entertained.

13. The relevant provisions are as follows:

**S.76(1) of the Madras Hindu Religious Endowments Act 1927** reads as follows: "No exchange, sale or mortgage and no lease for a term exceeding five years of any immovable property belonging to any mutt or temple shall be valid or operative unless it is necessary or beneficial to the mutt or temple and is sanctioned by the Board in the case of mutts and excepted temples and by the committee in the case of other temples.

**S.29(1) of Madras Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Act, 1951** reads as follows: "Any exchange, sale or mortgage and any lease of any immovable property belonging to, or given or endowed for the purpose of, any religious institution shall be null and void unless it is sanctioned by the Commissioner as being necessary or beneficial to the institution:"

14. According to counsel for the 1st respondent both the above Acts have no application since the property has been in possession of tenants by virtue of registered documents prior to the 1927 enactment. The Madras Hindu Religious Endowments Act 1927 was repealed by S.5 of Madras Hindu Religious And Charitable Endowments Act, 1951. Though, the Madras Hindu Religious And Charitable Endowments Act, 1951 (Madras Act No: XIX of 1951) Central Act received the assent of the President on 27.08.1951, it was notified in Kerala in 1956 only by virtue of Kerala Adaptation of Laws Order, 1956. Hence the Act was made applicable in Kerala only in 1956 and till then the previous Act governed the field. It is further pointed out that the provision under the earlier enactment is also not applicable to the case on hand since this provision has no retrospective effect to take away the rights of tenants who were in possession much prior to the coming into force of the Act.

15. Relying on decisions in **State of Kerala and Another v. Mohammed Basheer ( 2019 (1) KHC 750)** and **Jithesh v. State of Kerala and Others (2013 KHC 674)** counsel for the 1st respondent submitted that on application by before the Land Tribunal, Ext.A13 purchase was issued to Elambilan Kizhakkeveetil Balan Nair and Narayanan and as per S.72K (2) of the Land Reforms Act, once Ext.A13 purchase certificate was issued in favour of Elambilan Kizhakkeveetil Balan Nair and Narayanan, it is conclusive proof of right, title and interest over the property stated therein and therefore the supplemental 2nd respondent cannot claim any right over the acquired property. Hence, counsel for the 1st respondent prayed to allow the claim of the 1st respondent and to order disbursement of the deposited amount in his favour.

16. Counsel for supplemental 2nd respondent countered the argument contenting that Ext.A13 purchase certificate cannot be considered as conclusive in this case as the the 1st respondent has not produced the order dated 29.9.76 of the Kannur Land Tribunal in OA 17086/76 and hence it cannot be presumed that the Land Tribunal had complied with all procedural formalities and notice was issued to the landlords and statements were sought from them. Counsel for the 2nd respondent also argued that Ext.A13 purchase certificate is not binding on the 2nd respondent as the properties of the Dewasom is exempted from provisions regarding tenancies as per S.3(1) (x) of the Kerala Land Reforms Act. The counsel for 2nd respondent relying on **decision of Hon'ble High Court in WP (C No.16689 of 2013 (I) dated 16.10.2014 (Prasanna Kumar v. State of Kerala)** argued that as Land Tribunal failed to conduct due enquiries and to afford reasonable opportunity of hearing to all parties, Ext.A13 purchase certificate cannot be considered as a valid one binding on the 2nd respondent Dewasom. Reliance was also placed on decision of Hon'ble High Court in **Travancore Devaswom Board v. Mohanan Nair (2013 (3) KLT 132)** in support of the arguments.

17. It is also argued that the Land Tribunal failed to comply rules 9 and 10 of Kerala Land Reforms (Vesting and Assignment) Rules, 1970 and the Land Tribunal did not independently examine whether the land is one coming under the exempted category u/s.3(1)(x) of Land Reforms Act and no information was sought on that regard also. According to counsel for 2nd respondent non production of the order of Land Tribunal in OA 17086/76 would invalidate the claim of the 1st respondent on basis of A13 purchase certificate and the Land Tribunal will get jurisdiction only when the said issue was resolved and therefore Ext.A13 purchase certificate cannot be considered as a valid one.

18. Counsel for 1st respondent countered these arguments contenting that as per the proviso to exemption under s. 3(1) (x) of Kerala Land Reforms Act, exemption claimed by the supplemental 2nd respondent is not applicable to the rights of tenants to which they are entitled immediately before the commencement of the Act, either under the contract of tenancy or under any law in force. Reliance was

placed on decision of Hon'ble High Court in **Gopalan Nair v. State of Kerala (1988 KHC 259)** in support of the argument.

19. So now the question to be considered is whether the argument of the counsel for supplemental 2nd respondent that the properties of the supplemental 2nd respondent are entitled for exemption as provided under s.3(1) (x) of the Kerala Land Reforms Act is sustainable.

20. In Chapter II, S.3(1)(x) of the Kerala Land Reforms Act, 1963 is as follows:

**S.3 . Exemptions:-** (1) *Nothing in this chapter shall apply to:-*

(x) *tenancies in respect of sites, tanks and premises of any temple, mosque or church (including sites belonging to a temple, mosque or church on which religious ceremonies are conducted) and sites of office buildings and other buildings attached to such temple, mosque or church, created by the owner, trustee or manager of such temple, mosque or church.*

*Provided that nothing in this clause shall affect the right to which a tenant was entitled immediately before the commencement of this Act under the contract of tenancy or under any law then in force.*

21. A plain reading of S.3(1) (x) of Land Reforms Act shows that temple sites, its premises, and sites belonging to temple where religious ceremonies are conducted are exempted from the purview of the Act. From the available evidence before the court it can be seen that the acquired property was originally a nilam which was leased out to tenants for cultivation. The 2nd respondent has no case that the acquired property was a temple site or temple premises or religious ceremonies were conducted there at any point of time. Argument of the counsel for 2nd respondent that the Land Tribunal has not considered this aspect before allowing the purchase certificate cannot be entertained now, as the 2nd respondent has not raised such a contention at any point of time and had not so far challenged Ext.A13 purchase certificate issued in favour of Elambilan Kizhakkeveetil Balan Nair and Narayanan. In such a circumstance, the acquired land cannot be considered as a temple site or its

premises and therefore, exemption claimed under section 3(1)(x) is not applicable to the acquired property.

22. The cited decision **Travancore Devaswom Board v. Mohanan Nair** relied by 2nd respondent is not at all applicable to the case on hand as Hon'ble High Court was dealing only with exemptions u/s.3(1) of KLR Act and in that case tenancy itself was disputed by the Board and tenancy was created after the commencement of the Act. So also, the proviso to Sec.3(1)(x) was not at all considered by the Court in that case.

23. The available evidence proves that the property in the reference was in possession of tenants prior to 1927 and the property remained in possession of tenants continuously up to the time of issuance of Ext.A13 purchase certificate. In the circumstance, proviso to Sec.3(1)(x) comes into operation and therefore the argument of the 2nd respondent that exemption Sec.3(1)(x) of the Kerala Land reforms Act is available to the Dewasom is not sustainable.

24. Moreover, tenants herein are also entitled to get protection under provisions of Malabar Tenancy Act, 1929 also. The Hon'ble Apex Court in **Rajendra Mohan N.K. Vs. Thirvamadi Rubber Company Ltd & Ors (2015 (9) SCC 326(SC))** has held that the property being in continuous possession of the tenant which was initially taken on lease in the year 1918 for 36 years, the tenant company was entitled to fixity of tenure in respect of the leasehold land both under the Malabar Tenancy Act, 1929 as well as under the Kerala Land Reforms Act. So also, the decision in **Kunhukutty Amma Vs Ravunni Menon & Ors reported in (1959 KHC 367)** that prohibition under s.76 of Madras Hindu Religious Endowments Act, 1927 can apply only to alienations made by trustees and cannot apply to renewals of leases and kanoms which are only ordinary acts of management also supports the claim of the 1st respondent.

25. Statutory provisions normally take effect only prospectively and retrospective operation has to be specifically provided in an enactment. Validity or invalidity of a transaction in relation to a statutory provision will have to be decided on the basis of the legal provision as it stood at the time of the transaction. There is no

provision in Madras Hindu Religious Endowment Act, 1927 to show that S. 76 of the Act has any retrospective effect. In the decision in **AIR 1929 MAD 322 (Chinnan Chettiar v. V Sundaraesa Ayyar And Others)** it is held that Sec.75 of Madras Religious Endowments Act, 1927 cannot have a retrospective effect.

26. Proviso to S. 3(1) (x) of the Kerala Land Reforms Act protects the right of the predecessors in interest of the 1st respondent who had tenancy rights much prior to the enactment of the Kerala Land Reforms Act, 1963. As per the decision in **Thayukutty v. Manikandan (2023 KHC 886)** a purchase certificate cannot be disregarded unless it is proved that it was inaccurate on its face or obtained by fraud. There is nothing before court to show that Ext.A13 purchase certificate was fraudulently obtained by Elambilan Kizhakkeveetil Balan Nair and Narayanan. So, the only conclusion possible is that the acquired property was outstanding with tenants before the coming into force of the Madras Hindu Religious Endowments Act, 1927 by way of registered documents and none of the provisions of the said Act or Madras Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Act, 1951 take away the vested rights with the tenants which had accrued prior to the coming into force of those Acts. So it is found that the acquired land was outstanding with tenants even prior to 1923 and by subsequent transfers the tenancy right was obtained by Elambilan Kizhakkeveetil Balan Nair and Narayanan who by virtue of Ext.A13 purchase certificate obtained absolute title over the acquired property. Exts. A1 to A14 and A16 and A17 prove that the 1st respondent has absolute title and possession over the acquired property at the time of acquisition. Hence, the point is found in favour of the 1st respondent.

27. **Point No.(ii):** In the light of the finding on point No.1, it is held that the 1st respondent is entitled to get the compensation of **₹72,06,380/- (Rupees Seventy two lakh six thousand three hundred and eighty only)** awarded by the competent authority. The reference is answered accordingly.

**In the result,**

- 1) The reference is answered holding that the 1st respondent is entitled to get the amount of **₹72,06,380/- (Rupees Seventy two lakh**

**six thousand three hundred and eighty only**) awarded by the Tahsildar for acquisition of land in Resurvey 136/1 (New 136/5) of Chirakkal amsom in Puzhathi desom, Chirakkal village, Kannur Taluk having an extent of 0.2303 Hectares of land acquired for the purpose of development of National Highway with the interest accrued in the fixed deposit;

2) Issue cheque accordingly.

(Dictated to the Confdl. Asst., typed by her, corrected and pronounced by me in open Court, on this the 21 st day of March, 2026).

#### ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE-II

#### **Respondent/Claimant's Exhibits:-**

- |     |            |   |
|-----|------------|---|
| A1  | 26-07-2021 | Janmam deed No.1689/2021 of SRO, Valapattanam executed by Elambilan Kizhakke Veetil Balan Nair.                                     |
| A2  | 05-06-1986 | Certified copy of Assignment Deed No.1323/1986 of SRO, Valapattanam executed by Kizhakke Veetil Narayanan Nair                      |
| A3  | 21-04-1965 | Certified copy of Assignment Deed No.444/1965 of SRO, Valapattanam executed by Kunnunkai Puthiyapurayil Abubakkar.                  |
| A4  | 08-01-1958 | Certified copy of Assignment Deed No.33/1958 of SRO, Valapattanam executed by Chennyantakath Puthiyapurayil Bayithan and Abubackar. |
| A5  | 12-11-1954 | Certified copy of Assignment Deed No.1403/1954 of SRO, Valapattanam executed by Vayachalil Cheriya Mammu and Usmayil Kunhi.         |
| A6  | 21-07-1941 | Certified copy of Marupattam Deed No.1350/1941 of SRO, Valapattanam executed by Puthiyaveetil Chindan.                              |
| A7  | 30-01-1936 | Certified copy of Partition Deed No.236/1936 of SRO, Valapattanam.  |
| A8  | 23-01-1923 | Certified copy of Charthadharam No.128/1923 of SRO Valapattanam.  |
| A9  | 04-04-2022 | Land Tax receipt issued by Village officer, Chirakkal.  |
| A10 | 04-01-2023 | Thandapper extract  |
| A11 | 30-12-2022 | Possession certificate issued by Village officer, Chirakkal.  |

- A12 04-10-2025 Certificate of encumbrance on property for the period 01-09-2005 to 23-09-2025.
- A13 29-09-2026 Purchase Certificate bearing No.17086/1976 of Land Tribunal, Kannur
- A14 18-07-2025 Certificate issued by Village officer, Chirakkal.
- A15 -- -- Adangal extract.
- A16 24-06-1950 Certified copy of Assignment Deed No.1154/1950 of SRO, Valapattanam
- A17 04-05-1949 Certified copy of Assignment Deed No.692/1949 of SRO, Valapattanam

**Respondent/Claimant's Witness:- Nil.**

**Petitioner's Witness & Exhibits:- Nil.**

Sd/-  
ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE-II

Fair/Copy of Order in  
LAR(NHA)No.04/2024  
Dated: 21-03-2026