

**IN THE COURT OF ADDL.DISTRICT JUDGE-II (SPECIAL)
KOTTAYAM**

Present : Sri. Subash.S, Addl. District Judge-II (Special), Kottayam.

Monday, the 16th day of March 2026.
25th day of Phalguna 1947

O.P No. 18/2023.

Petitioners:-

1. M.M.Sasi, Aged 73 years, S/o. Madhavan,
residing at Puthenpurakkal House,
Devagiri P.O, Kangazha Village,
Changanacherry Taluk, Kottayam District.
2. V.K.Omana, Aged 65 years, W/o. M.M Sasi,
residing at Puthepurakkal House,
Devagiri.P.O, Kangazha Village,
Changanacherry Taluk, Kottayam District.

By Adv. Gangaprasad.S.

Respondents:-

1. The Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.,
represented by its authorised Officer,
400 KV Sub Station, Pallikara,
Kumarapuram.P.O, Kochi, 683565.
2. Kerala State Electricity Board,
represented by its Secretary, Vaidyuthi Bhavanam,
Pattom, Thiurvananthapuram.
3. State of Kerala represented by District Collector,
Kottayam.

4. The Special Tahsildar (LA)
Power Grid Corporation of India,
Chavittuvery P.O, Kottayam, 686006.

R1 By Adv. A.Basheer,

R2 by Adv. Deepthy S. Nath

R3 and R4 by Addl Government Pleader Adv.Cyril Thomas

This is a petition filed under Section 10 & 16 of the Indian Telegraph Act r/w.Sec.164 of Indian Electricity Act claiming enhancement of compensation.

This OP(Electricity) having been finally heard on 11.02.2026 and the court on 16.03.2026 passed the following :-

A W A R D

This is a petition filed under Section 16 (3) of the Indian Telegraph Act for the enhancement of compensation.

2. The petitioners' case in brief is as follows: 1st petitioner is the absolute owner of 3.3 ares of property comprised in survey No.218/9/2 of Kangazha Village, 1st and 2nd petitioners are the absolute owners of 22.50 ares of property comprised in resurvey No.218/19 of Kangazha Village. The petitioners are the absolute owners of another 17.20 ares of property comprised in resurvey No.218/18 of Kangazha village. To draw the Edamon - Kochi 400 KV electric line across the petitioners' property, the respondents cut down various highly

yielding trees in the said property. But the respondent paid only a meagre amount as compensation. According to the petitioner, the compensation awarded by the respondents was inadequate. By drawing the above-said line, the value of the said property has been diminished, and no sufficient compensation was given for the diminution of land value. In the circumstances, the petitioner preferred this petition for the enhancement of compensation.

3. The 1st respondent entered appearance and filed counter statement contending as follows: The petition for additional compensation is not maintainable either in law or on the facts. For the purpose of drawing 400 KV electric line as part of the construction of the Edamon - Kochi 400 KV line, the respondent has cut and removed trees standing in the property of the petitioner after observing all the necessary formalities. The respondent has paid full compensation towards trees and crops, land value towards the corridor area, and displacement allowance for curtailing the rights of property adjacent to the land where the electric line was drawn. The petitioner's claim for additional compensation is unfounded, exaggerated and

unsustainable. The respondent has paid compensation to the petitioner on the basis of the Package Compensation announced by the State Government, and hence petitioner is not entitled to get any additional compensation as claimed in the petition.

4. 2nd respondent filed objection, contending that the 2nd respondent is not a necessary party in this petition and 2nd respondent is not liable to pay any compensation to the petitioner.

5. On the side of the petitioner, Exts.A1 to A7 were marked. On the side of the respondent, Exts.B1 to B3 were marked. The commissioner's report and plan were marked as Exts.C1, C1(a) and C1(b).

6. The learned Counsels appearing for the petitioner and the respondent were heard.

7. The issues that arise for consideration are:

1. Are the petitioners entitled to get enhanced compensation for yielding trees?
2. Are the petitioners entitled to get enhanced compensation for nonyielding trees?
3. Are the petitioners entitled to get enhanced compensation for the diminution of land value?
4. Reliefs and costs?

8. **Issue Nos. 1 and 2**:- To establish the case of the petitioners, Exts.A1 to A7 were marked. Ext.A5 is a copy of the notice dated 08.10.2018. Ext.A6 is a copy of the certificate for compensation for tree clearance dated 06.04.2019, and Ext.A7 is a copy of the detailed valuation statement. As per Ext.A5, A6 and A7, the following trees were cut and removed from the petitioner's property.

Rubber	31 Nos.
Rubber (N.Y.)	20 Nos.
Pepper	21 Nos.
Mango (N.Y.)	3 Nos.
Coconut	2 Nos.
Cocco (N.Y.)	7 Nos.
Jackfruit	3 Nos.
Arecanut	1 No.
Teak	4 Nos.
Anjili	19 Nos.
Mahagoni	9 Nos.
Vatta	2 Nos.
Pana	12 Nos.
Chunda pana	4 Nos.
Pappaya	1 No.

9. Coming to the compensation awarded for yielding trees, it is useful to refer to the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Shaik Imambi v. Special Deputy Collector(LA), Telungu Ganga Project [2011 (11) SCC 639]*. In the said case, the

Hon'ble Apex Court adopted a 10-year multiplier for determining compensation for yielding trees. So, as held by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the said case, it would be just and reasonable to adopt a multiplier of 10 for determining compensation for yielding trees.

10. Coming to the compensation awarded for rubber trees, to draw electric line, the 1st respondent cut down 51 rubber trees. As per Ext.A7, 31 trees were yielding, and 20 were aged 6 years and nonyielding. The 1st respondent fixed compensation for the yielding trees at ₹99,676.20 and ₹69,000/- for nonyielding rubber trees. With respect to the non-yielding rubber trees, the learned counsel for the petitioners argued that if the said trees were not cut down, they would become yielding trees after 2 to 3 years, and hence the petitioners are entitled to compensation by considering the expected yield of the said trees. In support of his contention, he relied on the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Sarangapani. R (dead) through LRs. V the Special Tahsildar, Karur - Dindigul Broadguage Line* (2011 KHC 4880). In the said case the Hon'ble Apex Court observed as follows:

“Adverting to the arguments of the learned senior counsel on the issue of fixing market value of the trees, we find

that while the Reference Court had relied upon reports dated 7.11.1992 and 20.11.1992 of Shri P. Nagarajan, Agricultural Development Officer and the Court Commissioner for the purpose of recording a finding that as on the date of notification under S.4(1) of the Act, the age of the trees could be 8 to 9 years and in due course even the flowering trees would become fruit bearing trees and yield income for next 60 to 70 years. The High Court totally ignored the two reports and fixed market value of young trees by treating the same as timber. Learned senior counsel for the respondent could not put forward any tangible argument as to why the report of an expert should not be relied upon for the purpose of fixing value of the trees with reference to their expected yield. Therefore, we are convinced that the High Court committed an error by upsetting the view taken by the Reference Court on the issue of market value of the trees.”

11. In the present case, as per Ext.A7 detailed valuation statement, as on the date of cutting, the non-yielding rubber trees were aged 6 years and if those trees were not cut down, after 2 to 3 years they would become yielding trees and yield income for many years. Therefore, the petitioners are entitled to compensation for the said 20 rubber trees as well, with reference to their expected yield.

12. In *Sudevan v. KSEB (CRP No. 451/2012 decided on 16.09.2015)*, the Hon'ble High Court, after deducting expenditure towards maintenance, upkeep, and tapping

expenses, fixed the annual yield from a rubber tree as 15 kg. In the present case also after deducting the expenditure towards maintenance, upkeep, and tapping expenses, 15 kg. can be taken as the annual yield from each rubber tree. In the case of nonyielding rubber trees also, 15 kg can be taken as the expected annual future yield. Ext.A7 would show that the 1st respondent took ₹118/- as the price of 1 kg of rubber for 31 rubber trees. Hence, ₹118/- as fixed by the 1st respondent as per Ext.A7 can be taken as the price of 1 kg of rubber. So, by applying the multiplier 10, compensation payable for 51 rubber trees would come to ₹9,02,700/-(51x118x15x10). Compensation already given for rubber trees is ₹1,68,676.20. So, the enhanced compensation payable is:

$$\mathbf{₹9,02,700 - ₹1,68,676.20 = ₹7,34,023.80}$$

13. Ext.A7 would show that 21 yielding pepper vines were cut down from the petitioners' property. Ext.A7 show that the 1st respondent fixed the price for 1 kg of pepper as ₹352.50, and an amount of ₹31,672.12 was awarded as compensation. However, the petitioners contended that the compensation fixed by the 1st respondent was inadequate, and therefore, they are

entitled to receive enhanced compensation for pepper vines. Considering the age of pepper vines, it would be just and reasonable to fix 5 kg of pepper as the annual yield from one vine after deducting the expenses for maintenance and upkeep of the said plant. The petitioners have not produced any document to establish the price of 1 kg of pepper during 2018-2019. Ext.A7 would show that the 1st respondent fixed ₹352.50 as the price of 1 kg of pepper. Hence, ₹352.50 as fixed by the 1st respondent as per Ext.A7 can be taken as the price of 1 kg of pepper. Accordingly, by applying the multiplier 10, compensation payable for 21 pepper vines would come to ₹3,70,125/- (21x5x352.50x10). Compensation already given for the said pepper vines is ₹31,672.12. The enhanced compensation payable is:

$$\mathbf{₹3,70,125 - ₹31,672.12 = ₹3,38,452.88}$$

14. Coming to the compensation awarded for mango trees, Ext.A7 would show that 3 non-yielding mango saplings were cut down from the petitioners' property. The 1st respondent awarded a compensation of ₹720/- for the said saplings. As per Ext.A7 detailed valuation statement, as on the date of cutting,

the non-yielding mango saplings were aged 3 years, and if those saplings were not cut down, after 3 to 4 years they would become yielding and yield income for many years. So, the petitioners are entitled to compensation for the said saplings with reference to their expected future yield. It would be just and reasonable to fix 50 kg of mangoes as the annual expected future yield from one tree after deducting the expenses for maintenance and upkeep of the said tree. There is no material before the court to show the price of 1 kg of mangoes. Considering the date of tree cutting, it would be just and reasonable to fix ₹50/- as the price of 1 kg of mangoes. Accordingly, the compensation payable for 3 mango saplings is ₹75,000/- (50x 3 x 50 x 10). Compensation already given for mango saplings is ₹720/-. The enhanced compensation payable is:

$$\mathbf{₹45,000 - ₹720 = ₹74,280/-}$$

15. Coming to the compensation awarded for coconut trees, Ext.A7 shows that 2 yielding coconut trees were cut down and an amount of ₹23,660.86 was awarded as compensation for the above-mentioned trees. Considering the age of the coconut

trees, it would be just and reasonable to fix 200 coconuts as the annual yield from the coconut tree after deducting the expenses for maintenance and upkeep of the said tree. The price of each coconut can be taken as ₹17/- as fixed by the 1st respondent as per Ext.A7. Accordingly, by applying a multiplier of 10, compensation payable for 2 coconut trees would come to ₹68,000/- (2x200x17x10). Compensation already given for coconut trees is ₹23,660.86. The enhanced compensation payable is:

$$\mathbf{₹68,000 - ₹23,660.86 = ₹44,339.14}$$

16. Coming to the compensation awarded for Cocco, Ext.A7 would show that 7 non-yielding Cocco saplings were cut down from the petitioners' property. The 1st respondent awarded a compensation of ₹1,260/- for the said saplings. As per Ext.A7 detailed valuation statement, as on the date of cutting, the non-yielding Cocco saplings were aged 3 years. Had they not been cut, they would have become yielding trees within 2 to 3 years and continued to generate income for many years thereafter. Therefore, the petitioners are entitled to compensation for the said saplings with reference to their expected future yield. It

would be just and reasonable to fix 20 kg of Cocco as the annual expected future yield from one tree after deducting the expenses for maintenance and upkeep of the said tree. Considering the date of tree cutting, it would be just and reasonable to fix ₹40/- for 1 kg of Cocco. So, the compensation payable for 7 Cocco saplings is ₹56,000/- (7 x 40 x 20 x 10). Compensation already given for the Cocco saplings is ₹1,260/-. The enhanced compensation payable is:

$$\mathbf{₹56,000 - ₹1,260 = ₹54,740}$$

17. Coming to the compensation awarded for the arecanut tree, Ext.A7 shows that 1 yielding arecanut tree was cut down, and an amount of ₹1,856.27 was awarded as compensation for the above-mentioned tree. However, the petitioners contended that the compensation fixed by the 1st respondent was inadequate, and therefore, they are entitled to receive enhanced compensation for the arecanut tree. It would be just and reasonable to fix 400 arecanuts as the annual yield from the arecanut tree after deducting the expenses for maintenance and upkeep of the said tree. The price of each arecanut can be taken as ₹1.7 as shown in Ext.A7. So the

compensation payable for the arecanut tree is ₹6,800/- (400x1x1.7x10). Compensation already given for arecanut trees is ₹1,856.27. The enhanced compensation payable is:

$$\mathbf{₹6,800 - ₹1,856.27 = ₹4,943.73}$$

18. Coming to the compensation awarded for the jackfruit tree, Ext.A7 would show that 3 yielding jackfruit trees were cut down from the property of the petitioners. As per Ext.A7 detailed valuation statement, the jackfruit trees were aged 30 years and 20 years, and the 1st respondent awarded compensation of ₹11,250/-. Considering the age of the jackfruit trees, it would be just and reasonable to fix 100 jackfruits as the annual yield from the said trees after deducting the expenses for maintenance and upkeep of the said trees. Considering the date of tree cutting, it is just and reasonable to fix ₹50/- as the price of each jackfruit. So, by applying the multiplier 10, compensation payable for 3 jackfruit trees would come to ₹1,50,000/- (100 x 3 x 50 x 10). Compensation already given for the jackfruit tree is ₹11,250/-. The enhanced compensation payable is:

$$\mathbf{₹1,50,000 - ₹11,250 = ₹1,38,750/-}$$

19. Coming to the compensation awarded for teak trees, Ext.A7 would show that 4 teak trees aged 6 years were cut down from the petitioners' property. The 1st respondent awarded a total compensation of ₹1,920/- for the aforesaid trees. Considering the utility and potentiality of the teak tree, it cannot be said that the compensation awarded is adequate. It would be just and reasonable to award ₹1,500/- for each teak tree aged 6 years. Accordingly, the compensation payable for 4 teak trees would come to ₹6,000/- (1,500 x 4). Compensation already paid is ₹1,920/-. So, the enhanced compensation payable is calculated as:

$$\mathbf{₹6,000 - ₹1,920 = ₹4,080/-}$$

20. Coming to the compensation awarded for Anjili tree, Ext.A7 would show that 1 anjili tree aged 45 years, 7 anjili trees aged 35 years, 5 anjili trees aged 10 years, 2 anjili trees aged 20 years, 1 anjili tree aged 25 years and 3 anjili trees aged 30 years were cut down from the petitioners' property. The 1st respondent awarded compensation of ₹39,600/- for the aforesaid trees. Considering the utility and potentiality of the anjili tree, it cannot be said that the compensation awarded is adequate. It would be

just and reasonable to award ₹8,000/- for the anjili tree aged 45 years, ₹7,000/- for each anjili tree aged 35 years, ₹6,000/- for each anjili tree aged 30 years, ₹5,000/- for the anjili tree aged 25 years, ₹4,000/- for each anjili tree aged 20 years and ₹2,000/- for each anjili tree aged 10 years. So, the compensation payable for 19 anjili trees would come to ₹98,000/- [(8,000 x 1) + (7,000 x 7) + (6,000 x 3) + (5,000 x 1) + (4000 x 2) + (2,000 x 5)]. Compensation already paid is ₹39,600/-. So, the enhanced compensation payable is calculated as:

$$\mathbf{₹98,000 - ₹39,600 = ₹58,400/-}$$

21. Coming to the compensation awarded for mahagoni tree, Ext.A7 would show that 2 mahagoni trees aged 22 years, 4 mahagoni trees aged 16 years and 3 mahagoni trees aged 7 years were cut down from the petitioners' property. The 1st respondent awarded compensation of ₹10,320/- for the aforesaid trees. Considering the utility and potentiality of the mahagoni tree, it cannot be said that the compensation awarded is adequate. It would be just and reasonable to award ₹4,000/- for each mahagoni tree aged 22 years, ₹3,000/- for each mahagoni tree aged 16 years and ₹1,500/- for each mahagoni tree aged 7

years. So, the compensation payable for 9 mahagoni trees would come to ₹24,500/-[(4,000 x 2)+ (3,000 x 4)+(1,500 x 3). Compensation already paid is ₹10,320/-. So, the enhanced compensation payable is calculated as:

$$\mathbf{₹24,500 - ₹10,320 = ₹14,180/-}$$

22. Coming to the compensation awarded for vatta trees, Ext.A7 would show that 2 vatta trees aged 8 years were cut down from the petitioners' property. The 1st respondent awarded a total compensation of ₹560/- for the aforesaid trees. Considering the utility and potentiality of vatta trees, it cannot be said that the compensation awarded is sufficient. So, it would be just and reasonable to award ₹500/- for each vatta tree aged 8 years. So, the compensation payable for 2 vatta trees would come to ₹1,000/-. Accordingly, the enhanced compensation payable is calculated as:

$$\mathbf{₹1,000 - ₹560 = ₹440/-}$$

23. Coming to the compensation awarded for Pana, Chundapana and pappaya this court is of the considered opinion that the compensation awarded for the said tree is adequate. So, the petitioner is not entitled to enhanced compensation for the said trees.

24. **Issue No.3:-** Coming to the compensation for diminution of land value, according to the petitioners, 3.3 ares of property comprised in survey No.218/9/2, 22.50 ares of property comprised in resurvey No.218/19 and 17.20 ares of property comprised in resurvey No.218/18 of Kangazha village absolutely belong to the 1st and 2nd petitioners. To establish their title over the said property, the petitioners produced Exts.A1 to A3 tax receipts pertaining to their property. As per Exts.A1 and A3 tax receipts, 3.3 ares of property comprised in re-survey No.218/9/2 and 17.20 ares of property comprised in resurvey No.218/18 belong to the 1st petitioner. As per Ext.A2 tax receipt, 22.50 ares of property comprised in resurvey No.218/19 belong to the petitioners. According to the petitioners, the market value of the property at the relevant time was ₹1,50,000/- per cent, and by the drawing of 400 KV electric line across the said property, the land value has been diminished, and so they are entitled to compensation for the diminution of land value.

25. Ext.C1(b) plan submitted by the Commissioner would show that the electric line passes through the middle portion of the property comprised in survey No.218/9/2, through

the south-western corner of the property comprised in survey No.218/19 and through the south-western portion of the property comprised in survey No.218/18, and the total extent of the affected area due to the drawing of the electric line is 2.82 ares in resurvey No.218/9-2, 5.48 ares in resurvey No.218/19 and 13.08 ares in resurvey No.218/18. So, the above extent of property can be taken as the area of the petitioners' property affected by the drawing of the electric line. In this context, it is useful to refer to the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in *K.S.E.B. V Livisha and others [2007 KLT(3) 1]*.

26. In the said case, the Hon'ble Apex court held as follows:

“ The situs of the land, the distance between the high voltage electricity line laid there over, the extent of the line thereon, as also the fact as to whether the high voltage line passes over a small track of land or through the middle of the land and other similar relevant factors in our opinion would be determinative. The value of the land would also be a relevant factor. The owner of the land furthermore, in a given situation may lose his substantive right to use the property for the purpose for which the same was meant to be used.”

27. Coming to the case at hand, as per Ext.C1(b) plan the

electric line passes through the middle portion of the property comprised in survey No.218/9/2, through the south-western corner of the property comprised in survey No.218/19 and through the south-western portion of the property comprised in survey No.218/18; the total extent of the affected area due to the drawing of the electric line is 2.82 ares in resurvey No.218/9-2, 5.48 ares in resurvey No.218/19 and 13.08 ares in resurvey No.218/18. The said area cannot be used for any purpose for which it was meant for, and due to the drawing of electric line, the market value of the petitioners' property has been diminished. As the electric line passes through the middle portion of the property comprised in resurvey No.218/9-2, it is just and reasonable to fix 50% as the diminution of land value for the said property. For the remaining affected area comprised in survey No.218/19 and 218/18, it is just and reasonable to fix 40% as the diminution of land value.

28. Coming to the market value of the petitioners' property, the petitioners have not produced any document to prove the market value of the petitioners' property. As per Ext.C1 report, the Petitioners' property is situated at a distance

of 1 km from the Ashupathripadi bus stop in Koveli - Kangazha road. The said property is a residential plot lying 50 metres away from panchayath road. Ext.C1(a) sketch would show that the said properties are lying contiguously, and it has road access on its southern side. As per Ext.C1 report, the petitioners' property is situated at a distance of 900 metres away from St. George Chappel, 650 metres away from St. Jame's CSI Church, Srayippally, 550 metres away from Theophilus College of Nursing, 700 metres away from PGM College, Kangazha, 950 metres away from Devagiri Post Office, Kangazha, 1.2 km away from MGDM Hospital, 1.1 km away from Central Bank of India and 1.2 km away from Nedumkunnam Service Co-operative Bank. Considering the nature and lie of the said property, it is just and reasonable to fix ₹1,00,000/- per cent as the market value of the petitioners' property. Hence, the compensation payable for the affected area in survey No.218/9-2 is ₹3,48,000/- ($6.96 \times 100000 \times 50/100$). The 1st petitioner received ₹2,64,316/- towards land compensation. So, the 1st petitioner is entitled to ₹83,684/- (₹3,48,000-₹2,64,316) towards enhanced compensation payable for diminution of land value in respect of the property

comprised in survey No.218/9-2. The compensation payable for the affected area in survey No.218/19 is ₹5,41,200/- (13.53 x 100000 x 40/100). Petitioners received ₹19,788/- towards land compensation. So, the petitioners are entitled to ₹5,21,412/- (₹5,41,200 - ₹19,788) towards enhanced compensation payable for diminution of land value in respect of the property comprised in survey No.218/19. The compensation payable for the affected area in survey No.218/18 is ₹12,92,000/- (32.30 x 100000 x 40/100). 1st petitioner received ₹4,73,817/- towards land compensation. So, the 1st petitioner is entitled to ₹8,18,183/- (₹12,92,000-₹4,73,817) towards enhanced compensation payable for diminution of land value in respect of the property comprised in survey No.218/18.

29. Coming to the interest to be awarded on the award amount, it is just and reasonable to award interest @ 8 % per annum on the award amount from the date of tree cutting. Ext. A6 certificate for compensation for tree clearance is dated 06.04.2019. So, the petitioners are entitled to interest on the award amount from 06.04.2019.

Table of Enhanced Compensation Awarded

Item	Enhanced amount awarded in Rupees
Rubber	7,34,023.80
Pepper	3,38,452.88
Mango	74,280.00
Coconut	44,339.14
Cocco	54,740.00
Arecanut	4,943.73
Jackfruit	1,38,750.00
Teak	4,080.00
Anjili	58,400.00
Mahagoni	14,180.00
Vatta	440.00
Compensation for diminution of land value to the 1 st petitioner	9,01,867.00
Compensation for diminution of land value to the 1 st and 2 nd petitioners	5,21,412.00
Grand Total	₹28,89,908.55

30. **Issue No.4**:- In the result,

1. The petitioners together are entitled to realise the sum of **₹19,88,042/- (Rupees nineteen lakh eighty eight thousand and forty two only)** as enhanced compensation from the 1st respondent with interest @ 8% per annum.
2. The 1st petitioner is entitled to realise **₹9,01,867/- (Rupees nine lakh one thousand eight hundred and sixty seven only)** as enhanced compensation for the

diminution of land value in respect of the property comprised in survey No.218/9-2 and 218/18 of Kangazha Village from the 1st respondent.

2. The petitioners are entitled to realise 8% interest on the above amount from 06.04.2019.
3. The petitioners are allowed to realise the entire cost for the litigation from the 1st respondent.

Dictated to the Confidential Assistant, transcribed and typed by her, revised and corrected by me, and pronounced in open court, on this the 16th day of March, 2026.

Sd/-
Subash. S
Addl. Sessions Judge-II(Spl.),
Kottayam

A P P E N D I X

Exhibits marked for the Petitioner:-

Ext.A1	23.05.2025	Copy of Tax Receipt.
Ext.A2	23.05.2025	Copy of Tax Receipt
Ext.A3	23.05.2025	Copy of Tax Receipt
Ext.A4	29.12.2025	Valuation certificate submitted before the Sub Registrar issued by Arun.K.K. Registered Licensy.
Ext.A5	08.10.2018	Notice No. 2017/10356 issued from Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.
ExtA6	06.04.2019	Certificate for compensation for Tree Clearance CCTC No. 7284 issued from Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.

**Copy of Award in
O.P.No.18/2023
Dated 16.03.2026**

Ext.A7 28.06.2019 Copy of detailed valuation statement of damaged trees/crops under the construction of Edamon Kochi Power Transmission Line.

Exhibits Marked for The Respondents:-

Ext.B1 28.06.2019 Copy of Detailed valuation statement of Damaged trees/crops under the construction of Edmon-Kochi Power Transmission Line.

Ext.B2 16.04.2019 Copy of certificate for compensation for Tree Clearance CCTC No. 7284 issued from Power Grid Coporation of India Ltd.

Ext.B3 03.12.2021 Copy of detailed valuation statement showing the land value and displacement allowance to the land owners.

Court Exhibits:

Ext.C1 24.11.2025 Commission Report
Ext.C1(a) 24.11.2025 Survey Plan
Ext.C1(b) 24.11.2025 Plan.

Witness Examined for the Petitioner: NIL.

Witness Examined for the Respondents:NIL.

Id/-
**Addl.District Judge -II (Spl.)
Kottayam.**

Copied by: //True Copy//
Compared bY:

Sd/-
**Subash. S
Addl. Sessions Judge-II(Spl.),
Kottayam**