

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

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

Wednesday, the 25th day of March, 2026.
4th day of Chaitra, 1948

OP. No.41/2024

Petitioner:-

Mr. Joseph Mathew, Aged 73 years,
S/o Mathai, residing at Madappatt,
Kulathurprayar, Kulathurprayar P.O,
Vellavoor, Kottayam -686541,

By Adv. K. Radhamani & Adv. Silpa Sutheeshan.

Respondent:-

The Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd,
400/200 KV Substation, 400/200 KV Station,
Pallippuram P.O, Thiruvananthapuram, 695316,
represented by its Chief Manager.

By Adv. A. Basheer.

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

This OP(Electricity) having been finally heard on 24.03.2026 and the court on 25.03.2026 passed the following :-

A W A R D

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

2. The petitioner's case in brief is as follows: Petitioner is the absolute owner of 39.13 ares of property comprised in survey No.117/10 of Vellavoor Village. To draw the Edamon - Kochi 400 KV electric line across the petitioner's property, the respondent 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 respondent was inadequate. By drawing the above-said line, the value of the said property got 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 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. Hence, the petitioner is not entitled to get any additional compensation as claimed in the petition.

4. On the side of the petitioner, Exts.A1 to A17 were marked. On the side of the respondent, Exts.B1 to B7 were marked. The commissioner's report and plan were marked as Exts.C1 and C1(a).

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

6. The issues that arise for consideration are:

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

7. **Issue Nos. 1 and 2**:- To establish the case of the petitioner, Exts.A1 to A17 were marked. Ext.A1 is the notice dated 26.03.2018, Ext.A2 is the notice dated 13.03.2018, Ext.A3 is the notice dated 29.07.2017, Ext.A4 is the copy of the certificate for compensation for tree clearance dated 30.10.2017, Ext.A5 is the copy of the certificate for compensation for tree clearance dated 28.07.2018 and Ext.A6 is the copy of the certificate for compensation for tree clearance dated 28.07.2018. Exts.B1, B3 and B5 are copies of the detailed valuation statements. As per Ext.A1 to A5 and Exts.B1, B3, B5 documents, the following trees were cut and removed from the petitioner's property.

Rubber	128 Nos.
Pepper	5 Nos.
Coconut	29 Nos.
Coconut (N.Y.)	2 Nos.
Coffee	10 Nos.
Arecanut	6 Nos.
Cocco	2 Nos.
Mango (N.Y.)	1 No.
Teak	25 Nos.
Anjili	6 Nos.
Mahagoni	14 Nos.
Vatta	6 Nos.

Jungle tree	4 Nos.
Vazha- (Njalipoovan)	12 Nos.
Vazha-nadan	68 Nos.

8. Coming to the compensation awarded for yielding trees, it is useful to refer to the judgments 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.

9. Coming to the compensation awarded for rubber trees, to draw electric line, the respondent cut and removed 128 yielding rubber trees. However, the respondent fixed compensation for the said rubber trees at ₹3,71,792.11.

10. In Sudevan v. KSEB (CRP No. 451/2012, decided on 16.09.2015), the Hon'ble High Court, after deducting expenditure on maintenance, upkeep, and tapping expenses, fixed the annual yield from a rubber tree at 15 kg. In the present case, after deducting the same expenditure, 15 kg can

be taken as the annual yield from each rubber tree. Ext.B1 would show that the 1st respondent took ₹126/- as the price of 1 kg of rubber for 81 rubber trees, as per Ext.B3, ₹120/- was taken as the price for 26 rubber trees, and as per Ext.B5, ₹110.3 was taken as the price for 21 rubber trees. Considering the dates of tree cutting, it is just and reasonable to fix ₹126/- as the price of 1 kg of rubber for the total number of trees. Accordingly, applying the multiplier 10, the compensation payable for 128 yielding rubber trees would come to ₹24,19,200/- (128x126x15x10). The compensation already given for yielding rubber trees is ₹3,71,792.11. The enhanced compensation payable is:

$$\mathbf{₹24,19,200 - ₹3,71,792.11 = ₹20,47,407.89}$$

11. Ext.B1 would show that 5 yielding pepper vines were cut down from the petitioner's property and an amount of ₹39,085.20 was awarded as compensation. The petitioner contended that the compensation awarded by the respondent was inadequate, and therefore, he is 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 petitioner has not produced any document to establish the price of 1 kg of pepper during 2017-2018. It is just and reasonable to fix ₹360/- as the price of 1 kg of pepper. Accordingly, by applying the multiplier 10, compensation payable for 5 pepper vines would come to ₹90,000/- (5x5x360x10). Compensation already given for the said pepper vines is ₹39,085.20. The enhanced compensation payable is:

$$\mathbf{₹90,000 - ₹39,085.20 = ₹50,914.80}$$

12. Coming to the compensation awarded for coconut trees, as per Ext.B1, 13 yielding coconut trees were cut down and an amount of ₹1,58,419.80 was awarded as compensation for the above-mentioned trees. As per Ext.B3, 4 yielding coconut trees and 2 non-yielding coconut trees were cut down, and an amount of ₹1,42,600/- was awarded as compensation for the above-mentioned trees. Ext.B5 shows that 12 yielding coconut trees were cut down, and an amount of ₹1,75,592.27 was awarded as compensation for the above-mentioned trees. With respect to the non-yielding coconut saplings, the learned counsel for the petitioner argued that if the said saplings were not cut down, they would become yielding trees after 2 to 3

years, and hence the petitioner is entitled to compensation by considering the expected yield of the said saplings. In support of her contention, she 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.”

13. In the present case, as per Ext.B3 detailed valuation statement, as on the date of cutting, the non-yielding coconut saplings were aged 3 years and if those coconut saplings were not cut down, after 3 to 4 years they would become yielding and yield income for many years. Therefore, the petitioner is entitled to compensation for the said 2 coconut saplings as well, with reference to their expected future yield. 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. 200 coconuts can be taken as the annual expected yield from the non-yielding coconut saplings also. Considering the date of tree cutting, it is just and reasonable to fix the price of each coconut as ₹21/-. Accordingly, by applying a multiplier of 10, compensation payable for 31 coconut trees would come to ₹13,02,000/- (31x200x21x10). Compensation already given for coconut trees is ₹4,76,612.07/-. The enhanced compensation payable is:

$$\mathbf{₹13,02,000 - ₹4,76,612.07 = ₹8,25,387.93}$$

14. Ext.B1 would show that 10 coffee plants aged 7 years were cut and removed from the petitioner's property, and an amount of ₹12,028.42 was awarded as compensation for the above-mentioned coffee plants. Considering the age of the said plants, it would be just and reasonable to fix 5 kg of Coffee as the annual yield from each Coffee plant after deducting the expenses for maintenance and upkeep of the said plant. The petitioner has not produced any document to establish the price of 1 kg of Coffee during 2017-2018. Therefore, ₹72/- as fixed by the respondent as per Ext.B1 can be taken as the price of 1 kg of Coffee. So, by applying a multiplier of 10, the compensation that would have been awarded for 10 Coffee plants is ₹36,000/- (10x5x72x10). Compensation already awarded is ₹12,028.42. The enhanced compensation payable is:

$$\mathbf{₹36,000 - ₹12,028.42 = ₹23,971.58}$$

15. Coming to the compensation awarded for arecanut, the respondent cut down 6 arecanut trees aged 12 years from the petitioner's property. As per Ext.B1 detailed valuation statement, ₹16,147.69 was awarded as total compensation by

fixing ₹1.5 as the price for one arecanut, and as per Ext.B3 detailed valuation statement, ₹2,906.58 was awarded as compensation by fixing ₹1.8 as the price for one arecanut. It would be just and reasonable to fix 400 arecanuts as the annual yield from each arecanut tree after deducting the expenses for maintenance and upkeep of the said tree. The price of each arecanut can be taken as ₹1.8 as shown in Ext.B3. So, the compensation payable for 6 arecanut trees is ₹43,200/- (400x6x1.8x10). Compensation already given for arecanut trees is ₹19,054.27. The enhanced compensation payable is:

$$\mathbf{₹43,200 - ₹19,054.27 = ₹24,145.73}$$

16. Coming to the compensation awarded for Cocco, Ext.B1 would show that 2 yielding Cocco trees were cut down from the petitioner's property. The respondent awarded a compensation of ₹8,500/- for the said trees. It would be just and reasonable to fix 20 kg of Cocco as the annual yield from one tree after deducting the expenses for maintenance and upkeep of the said tree. The price for 1 kg of Cocco can be taken as ₹50/- as shown in Ext.B1. So, the compensation

payable for 2 Cocco trees is ₹20,000/- (2x 50 x 20 x 10). Compensation already given for the Cocco trees is ₹8,500/-. The enhanced compensation payable is:

$$\mathbf{₹20,000 - ₹8,500 = ₹11,500}$$

17. Coming to the compensation awarded for the mango tree, Ext.B1 would show that 1 non-yielding mango tree was cut down from the petitioner's property. The respondent awarded a compensation of ₹240/- for the said tree. With respect to the non-yielding mango tree, the learned counsel for the petitioner argued that if the said tree was not cut down, it would become yielding tree after 2 to 3 years, and hence the petitioner is entitled to compensation by considering the expected yield of the said tree. In the present case, as per Ext.B1 detailed valuation statement, as on the date of cutting, the non-yielding mango tree was aged 4 years and if that mango tree was not cut down, after 3 to 4 years it would become yielding and yield income for many years. Therefore, the petitioner is entitled to compensation for the said mango tree as well, with reference to its expected yield. It would be just and reasonable to fix 50 kg of mangoes as the annual expected 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 1 mango tree is ₹25,000/- (50x 1 x 50 x 10). Compensation already given for the mango tree is ₹240/-. The enhanced compensation payable is:

$$\mathbf{₹25,000 - ₹240 = ₹24,760/-}$$

18. Coming to the compensation awarded for teak, Ext.B1 would show that 8 teak trees aged 40 years and 5 teak trees aged 30 years were cut down from the petitioner's property. Ext.B3 would show that 1 teak tree aged 5 years and 3 teak trees aged 3 years were cut down from the petitioner's property. Ext.B5 would show that 2 teak trees aged 30 years, 2 teak trees aged 15 years, 3 teak trees aged 25 years and 1 teak tree aged 10 years were cut down from the petitioner's property. The respondent awarded a total compensation of ₹52,720/- 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 ₹10,000/- for each teak tree aged 40 years, ₹7,000/- for each teak tree aged 30 years, ₹6,000/- for each teak tree aged 25 years, ₹3,000/- for the teak tree aged 15 years, ₹2,000/- for the teak tree aged 10 years and ₹1,500/- for each teak tree aged 5 years and 3 years. Accordingly, the compensation payable for 25 teak trees would come to ₹1,61,000/- [(10,000 x 8) + (7,000 x 7) + (6,000 x 3) + (3,000 x 2) + (2,000 x 1) + (1,500 x 4)]. Compensation already paid is ₹52,720/-. So, the enhanced compensation payable is calculated as:

$$\mathbf{₹1,61,000 - ₹52,720 = ₹1,08,280/-}$$

19. Coming to the compensation awarded for anjili trees, Ext.B1 would show that 2 anjili trees aged 40 years and 1 anjili tree aged 20 years were cut down from the petitioner's property. Ext.B3 would show that 1 anjili tree aged 5 years was cut down from the petitioner's property. Ext.B5 would show that 1 anjili tree aged 10 years and 1 anjili tree aged 7 years were cut down from the petitioner's property. The respondent awarded a total compensation of ₹9,760/- 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 ₹7,000/- for each anjili tree aged 40 years, ₹4,000/- for the anjili tree aged 20 years, ₹2,000/- for the anjili tree aged 10 years and ₹1,000/- for each anjili tree aged 5 years and 7 years. So, the compensation payable for 27 anjili trees would come to ₹22,000/- [(7,000 x 2)+(4,000 x 1)+ (2,000 x 1) + (1,000 x 2)]. Compensation already paid is ₹9,760/-. So, the enhanced compensation payable is calculated as:

$$\mathbf{₹22,000 - ₹9,760 = ₹12,240/-}$$

20. Coming to the compensation awarded for mahagoni trees, Ext.B1 would show that 3 mahagoni trees aged 30 years and 8 mahagoni trees aged 20 years were cut down from the petitioner's property. Ext.B3 would show that 1 mahagoni tree aged 5 years was cut down from the petitioner's property. Ext.B5 would show that 2 mahagoni trees aged 12 years were cut down from the petitioner's property. The respondent awarded a total compensation of ₹22,320/- for the aforesaid trees. Considering the utility and potentiality of the mahahgoni tree, it cannot be said that the compensation awarded is adequate. It would be just and reasonable to award ₹6,000/-

for each mahagoni tree aged 30 years, ₹4,000/- for each mahagoni tree aged 20 years, ₹3,000/- for each mahagoni tree aged 12 years and ₹1,500/- for the mahagoni tree aged 5 years. So, the compensation payable for 14 mahagoni trees would come to ₹57,500/- [(6,000 x 3)+(4,000 x 8)+ (3,000 x 2)+ (1,500 x 1)]. Compensation already paid is ₹22,320/-. So, the enhanced compensation payable is calculated as:

$$\mathbf{₹57,500 - ₹22,320 = ₹35,180/-}$$

21. Coming to the compensation awarded for vatta trees, Ext.B3 would show that 6 vatta trees aged 4 years were cut and removed from the petitioner's property and ₹840/- was awarded as total compensation. 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 4 years. So, the compensation payable for 6 vatta trees would come to ₹3,000/- (500 x 6). Compensation already paid is ₹840/-. Accordingly, the enhanced compensation payable is calculated as:

$$\mathbf{₹3,000 - ₹840 = ₹2,160/-}$$

22. Coming to the compensation awarded for Vazha-Njalipoovan, Vazha-Nadan, and the jungle tree, this court is of the considered opinion that the compensation awarded for the said trees is adequate. So, the petitioner is not entitled to enhanced compensation for the said trees.

23. **Issue No.3:-** Coming to the compensation for diminution of land value, according to the petitioner, 39.13 ares of property comprised in survey No.117/10 of Vellavoor Village absolutely belongs to him. To establish his title over the said property, the petitioner produced Ext.A7 tax receipt. According to the petitioner, the market value of the property at the relevant time was ₹2,00,000/- per cent, and by the drawing of 400 KV electric line across the said property, the land value has been diminished, and so he is entitled to compensation for the diminution of land value.

24. Ext.C1(a) plan submitted by the Commissioner would show that the electric line passes through the middle of the petitioner's property. The commissioner ascertained the extent of the total affected area as 39.13 ares. For the purpose of drawing an electric line, the respondent has installed a tower in the petitioner's property, and the commissioner

ascertained the total extent of the tower footing area as 6.76 ares. The petitioner is entitled to 100% of the value of the land where the tower has been erected as compensation, and the petitioner is also entitled to compensation for the diminution of land value of the remaining affected area. 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]*.

25. 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 thereover, 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.”

26. Coming to the case at hand, as per Ext.C1(a) plan the electric line pass through the middle of the petitioner's property, and the extent of the affected area due to the construction of the electric line is 39.13 ares. The extent of the tower footing area is 6.76 ares. So, the remaining affected

area is 32.37 ares (39.13 - 6.76). It is to be noted that the electric line passes through the middle of the petitioner's property, and for the purpose of drawing the electric line, a tower has been installed in the said property. Hence, the drawing of electric line through the petitioner's property has substantially diminished the market value of the petitioner's property. In the circumstances, it is just and reasonable to fix 50% as the diminution of land value for the affected area.

27. Coming to the market value of the petitioner's property, the petitioner has produced Ext.A12 sale deed, which is of the year 2023, to prove the market value of the petitioner's property. As per the said sale deed, 3.72 ares of property and the building therein comprised in resurvey No.202/7/4 of Vellavoor village was sold for ₹34,81,000/-. As per the said sale deed, the value of the land is ₹2,46,000/- and the value of the building is ₹32,35,000/-. The petitioner's property is also situated in Vellavoor village, but there is no material before the court to show that the property covered by Ext.A12 sale deed is similarly situated property. So, the market value of the petitioner's property cannot be fixed solely based

on Ext.A12 sale deed. As per Ext.C1 report, the petitioner's property has road access. As per Ext.C1 report and Ext.C1(a) plan, there is a PWD road on the adjacent eastern side of the petitioner's property. Considering the nature and lie of the petitioner's land, it is just and reasonable to fix the market value of the petitioner's land at ₹1,50,000/- per cent. Hence, compensation payable for the tower area is ₹25,03,500 (16.69 cents x ₹1,50,000). The petitioner is entitled to the aforesaid amount towards compensation for the tower area after deducting the amount of compensation received towards the tower area. The total extent of the remaining affected area, as reported by the commissioner, is 32.37 ares (39.13 - 6.76). Hence, compensation payable for the affected area is ₹59,96,250/- (79.95 cents x ₹1,50,000 x 50/100). The petitioner received ₹8,85,540/- towards land compensation. So, the enhanced compensation payable for diminution of land value is determined as follows:

$$\mathbf{₹59,96,250 - ₹8,85,540 = ₹51,10,710/-}$$

28. Coming to the interest to be awarded on the award amount, the petitioner produced Ext.A4 dated

30.10.2017, A5 dated 28.07.2018 and Ext.A6 certificate dated 28.07.2018 to establish the date of tree cutting. As per Ext.A4, the date of tree cutting is 30.10.2017. Hence, the petitioner is entitled to interest from 30.10.2017.

Table of Enhanced Compensation Awarded

Item	Enhanced amount awarded in Rupees
Rubber	20,47,407.89
Pepper	50,914.80
Coconut	8,25,387.93
Coffee	23,971.58
Arecanut	24,145.73
Cocco	11,500
Mango	24,760
Teak	1,08,280
Anjili	12,240
Mahagoni	35,180
Vatta	2160
Compensation for tower area	25,03,500
Compensation for diminution of land value	51,10,710
Grand Total	₹1,07,80,157.93

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

1. The petitioner is entitled to realise the sum of **₹1,07,80,158/- (Rupees One crore seven lakh eighty thousand one hundred and fifty**

eight only) as enhanced compensation from the respondent with interest @ 8% per annum.

2. The petitioner is entitled to realise 8% interest on the above amount from 30.10.2017.
3. The petitioner is allowed to realise the entire cost for the litigation from the respondent.

Dictated to the Confidential Assistant, transcribed and typed by her, revised and corrected by me, and pronounced in open court, on this the 25th day of March, 2026.

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

APPENDIX:

Exhibits marked for the Petitioner:-

Ext.A1	26.03.2018	Notice No. 10890 issued from Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.
Ext.A2	13.03.2018	Notice No. 10852 issued from Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.
Ext.A3	29.07.2017	Notice No. 6576 issued from Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.
Ext.A4	30.10.2017	Certificate for compensation for tree clearance C.C.T.C No. 2601 issued from Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.
Ext.A5	28.07.2018	Certificate for compensation for tree clearance C.C.T.C No. 3453 issued

		from Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.
Ext.A6	28.07.2018	Certificate for compensation for tree clearance C.C.T.C No. 3451 issued from Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.
Ext.A7	11.11.2023	True Copy of Tax receipt
Ext.A8	10.05.2010	Certificate Copy of deposition PW2 in OP (electric) No. 197/2006 Kollam District Court.
Ext.A9	16.09.2015	Copy of Order in CRP No. 451/2012 of Hon' High Court of Kerala.
Ext.A10	10.05.2010	Certified copy of deposition of PW3 in OP (electric) No. 197/2006 Kollam District Court.
Ext.A11	19.06.2001	Certified copy of Mahazar issued from KSEB Ltd.
Ext.A12	28.12.2023	True copy of Sale deed No. 2049/1/2023 of SRO Karukachal.
Ext.A13	30.07.2015	Copy of GO(ms) 29/2015/PD of Government of Kerala.
	31.08.2016	Copy of GO(ms) 19/2016/Power of Government of Kerala.
	05.12.2016	Copy of GO(ms) 25/2016/Power of Government of Kerala.
Ext.A14	14.06.2024	Copy of Guidelines for payment of compensation in regard to Right of Way (ROW) for transmission lines issued by Ministry of Power Government of India

Ext.A15	15.12.2022	True copy of sale deed No. 2118/1/2022 of SRO Karukachal.
Ext.A16	Nil	Copy of list farm retail price of agricultural commodities for the year 2017.
Ext.A17	Nil	Copy of list farm retail price of agricultural commodities for the year 2018.

Exhibits Marked for The Respondents:-

Ext.B1	06.11.2017	Copy of detailed valuation statement of damaged trees/crops under the construction of Edamon - Kochi power Transmission Line.
Ext.B2	30.10.2017	Copy of certificate for compensation for tree clearance C.C.T.C No.2601 issued from Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.
Ext.B3	11.04.2018	Copy of detailed valuation statement of damaged trees/crops under the construction of Edamon - Kochi power Transmission Line.
Ext.B4	28.01.2018	Copy of certificate for compensation for tree clearance C.C.T.C No.3451 issued from Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.
Ext.B5	05.10.2018	Copy of detailed valuation statement of damaged trees/crops under the construction of Edamon - Kochi power Transmission Line.
Ext.B6	28.07.2018	Copy of certificate for compensation for tree clearance

C.C.T.C No.3453 issued from Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.

Ext.B7 Nil

Copy of statement showing the land value and displacement allowance to the land owners

Court Exhibits:

Ext.C1 25.09.2025 Commission Report

Ext.C1(a) 25.09.2025 Plan

Witness Examined for the Petitioner: NIL

Witness Examined for the Respondents:NIL.

Id/-

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

//True Copy//

Copied By:

Compared By:

Sd/-

**Subash.S
Addl. District Judge -II (Spl.)
Kottayam.**