

**IN THE COURT OF ADDL. DISTRICT JUDGE-1
KOTTAYAM**

Present: Smt. Lilly .K Addl. District Judge -I, Kottayam

Saturday the 23rd day of May, 2026
2nd Jyeshtha, 1948

OP 252 /2019

Petitioner

- : 1. Sebastian V J,**
Aged 62,
S/o. Late Devasia Ouseph
(Joseph)
Valliyamtharayil House
Kuravilangadu P O.,
Kuravilangadu Village,
Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam.
- 2. Varkey V O.,** Aged 58 yrs,
S/o Late Devasia Ouseph
(Joseph)
Valliyamtharayil H Ouse,
Kuravilangadu P. O.,
Kuravilangadu Village,
Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam.
- 3. Kurian V.O.,** aged 55 yrs,
S/o Late Devasia Ouseph
(Joseph)
Valliyamtharayil House,
Kuravilangadu P. O.,
Kuravilangadu Village,
Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam.
- 4. Mary Ouseph,** aged 57 yrs,
D/o Late Devasia Ouseph
(Joseph)
Valliyamtharayil House,
Kuravilangadu P O.,
Kuravilangadu Village,
Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam.
Represented by Power of
Attorney Holder

Ulahannan Ouseph, aged 48 ,
S/o Devasia Ouseph
(Joseph), Valliyamtharayil
House, Kuravilangadu P O.,
Kuravilangadu Village,
Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam.

5. Ulahannan Ouseph

Aged 48,
S/o Late Devasia Ouseph
(Joseph)
Valliyamtharayil House,
Kuravilangadu P O.,
Kuravilangadu Village,
Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam.

By Adv. Thomas Joseph
Adv. Arun K,
Adv. Vimalkumar T.G.,
Adv. Nimesh M.T
Adv. V.S.Suresh

**Respondents 1,2 and
Additional respondents
3 &4**

**1. Power Grid Corporation of
India Ltd.,** Vadavathoor P.O.,
Kottayam, Pin- 686010.

2. Special Tahsildar(LA)

Power Grid Corporation of
India Ltd., Chavittuvari P.O.,
Kottayam, Pin- 686006.

3. State of Kerala

represented by
District Collector Kottayam,
Collectorate P.O.,
Kottayam- 2

4. Kerala State Electricity

Board, represented by the
Secretary, KSEB,
Vydyuthi Bhavan, Pattom,
Thiruvananthapuram,
Pin- 695004.

Addl.R3 & R4 are impleaded
as per order in IA 1/2021
dated 14.07.2021.

***R1 by Adv. Sunny George
Chathukulam***

***R2 & R3 by Adv. Meera S.S
Addl.Govt. Pleader***

***R4 by Adv. Deepthy S Nath
&Adv. Malavika Suresh***

This Petition filed u/s. 10 and 16 of Indian Telegraph Act 1885, Under Section 151 of the electricity Act 1910 and S.42 of the Electricity(Supply) Act 1948.

This petition having been finally heard on 16.05.2026 and court on 23.05.2026 passed the following.

ORDER

Petition filed under Section 10 and 16 of Indian Telegraph Act 1885, Section 151 of Electricity Act 1910 and Section 42 of Electricity (Supply) Act 1948.

2. Petitioners are the owners of 44.82 ares of property in Survey No.409/3 and 410/3 of Kuravilangad Village. The first respondent felled trees and crops in property for drawing 400 KV electric transmission line from Edamon to Cochin. 39 pepper vines, 36 rubber trees, 2 coconut trees, 11 arecanut

trees, 4 coffee and 1 jack tree were cut and removed and a sum of ₹4,23,897/- was given as compensation which was received under protest on 03.08.2018 and 28.03.2019. Due to the construction of the transmission line, there was diminution in the value of the land. Out of the total extent of 44.82 ares, one acre became completely waste. Petitioner is entitled to get full land value as compensation, along with value of improvements as the entire property became useless. The property has a market value of ₹5,00,000/- per cent and the property has road access. Petitioner claimed ₹18,60,460/- as enhanced compensation for trees cut and removed; Rs.5,00,000/- as additional compensation for other improvements cut and removed. Petitioner sought Rs.5,00,00,000/- as compensation for diminution in land value, (total Rs.5,23,60,460/-) with interest at the rate of 12% from the date of tree cutting with solatium.

3. First respondent filed objection contending that sufficient compensation has been awarded to the petitioners for the trees cut and removed from the property. Power Grid Corporation was entrusted with the construction of Edamon-Kochi 400 KV transmission line. The description of the trees and yield claimed by the petitioners are false. Respondent paid

₹1,46,767/- as compensation for the trees cut and removed as per notice dated 05.12.2017, vide CCTC 4212 dated 07.09.2018, a sum of ₹44,545/- was paid towards the trees cut and removed as per Notice No.9212 dated 26.06.2017, vide CCTC No. 2356 dated 02.01.2018, a sum of ₹2,32,585/- was paid as compensation for trees cut and removed, as per Notice No. 9661 dated 05.12.2017 vide CCTC No. 4211 dated 07.09.2018. A sum of ₹15,65,132/- was paid for compensation for the right of way in respect of an affected area of 24.20 ares of dry land. Thus, a total sum of ₹19,89,029/- was released to the petitioners towards value of trees and crops cut and removed and for diminution of land value. Petitioners received ₹1,58,153/- for tower standing area in respect of an affected area of 0.53 ares of dry land. The total amount received till date was ₹5,82,050/- towards trees, crops and diminution in land value. Petitioners are not entitled to get any enhanced compensation. The claim for interest at the rate of 12% is unsustainable. Petitioners are not entitled to claim any additional amount as compensation for value of trees cut or damages towards diminution in land value. Petitioners claim is exorbitant. Respondent sought for dismissal of the petition.

4. Fourth respondent filed objection, contending that the execution of the work was undertaken by the first respondent. Special compensation package was announced by the Government. The petition is bad for mis-joinder of respondent No.4. Respondent No.4 is not liable to pay any amount to the petitioners. Respondent No. 4 sought for dismissal of the petition.

5. During trial, PW1 was examined and Exhibits A1 to A6 were marked for the petitioners. Exhibits B1 to B3 were marked for the respondents. Exts.C1 and C1(a) were also marked.

6. Heard both sides. Counsel for petitioners and 4th respondent filed argument notes also.

7. In view of their respective contentions, the following points arise for consideration.

- (1) Whether the petitioners are entitled to get compensation for diminution of land value and if so, what shall be the quantum?
- (2) Whether the petitioners are entitled to get enhanced compensation for the trees cut and removed and if so, what shall be the quantum?
- (3) Reliefs and costs?

Arguments

8. According to the learned counsel for petitioner, an extent 8.46 ares, equivalent to 20.904 cents of property was completely affected and the petitioner was entitled to get 50% of the market value for the affected area as compensation for diminution in land value, with interest at the rate of 12%. Learned counsel also sought 100% of market value for the tower area. It was also claimed that the market value in Ext.A4 Sale deed was Rs.1,47,500/cent. The property in Exhibit A4 was in Block No.9 of Kuravilangadu Village, near the petitioner's property. Learned counsel relied on the decision in **Shaik Imambi v. The Special Deputy Collector (Land Acquisition), Telugu Ganga Project** [2011 (11) SCC 639], in support of the argument that petitioner was entitled to get compensation by applying multiplier of 10 years in respect of the yielding trees. It was argued that 36 rubber trees, 39 pepper vines, 2 coconut trees, 11 arecanut trees, 4 coffee trees and 4 jack trees were cut and removed. Petitioner was entitled to get enhanced compensation of ₹18,60,460/- for the trees cut and removed. Learned counsel also relied on the decision in **Sudevan v. KSEB** (CRP No.451/2012 dated 16.09.2015), in support of the argument that the annual yield from the rubber

tree can be considered as 15kg after deducting expenses. It was argued that 200 coconuts can be accepted as annual yield from each coconut tree after deducting expenses for maintenance and upkeep and ₹20 was the price of a coconut. It was submitted that there is also no scope for any future constructions in the property. Learned counsel relied on the decision in **KSEB v. Kalyaniamma** [2008 (1) KLT 1038] with respect to the claim for interest.

9. According to the learned counsel for respondent No.1, there was no evidence regarding the market value of the property and sufficient compensation has been granted to the petitioner. Exorbitant amount has been claimed without any basis. It was argued that as per the commissioner's report, the affected area was 8.46 ares and as per the DVS, the affected area was only 3.65 ares. Petitioner claimed compensation only in respect of 3.65 ares and sufficient compensation was given for the trees cut and removed. No sale deed of the relevant period was produced to prove the market value and learned counsel sought for dismissal of the petition.

10. Learned counsel for respondent No.4 submitted that KSEBL had no liability to compensate the petitioner and

respondent No.1 was the Telegraph Authority under Section 10(d) of the Telegraph Act.

11. Point No.1:- The petitioner adduced oral evidence as PW1. According to petitioner, the right of way was having a width of 46 metres as revealed from Ext.C1 and Ext.A5. Exhibit A6 is the tax receipt in respect of the property. The extent of the property as per Exhibit A6 was 44.82 ares in Survey 410/3 and 409/3 in Block No.9. The properties belonged to Rosa. Exhibit A1 is the death certificate of Rosa Joseph. Exhibit A2 is the legal heirship certificate revealing the names of the petitioners. Exhibit A3 is the power of attorney executed by the other owners in favour of PW1. Exhibit A2 revealed that petitioners are the legal heirs of Rosa Joseph. Ext.A6 tax receipt is in the name of Rosa Joseph, PW1's mother showing an extent of 44.82 ares of dry land in Survey 409/3 and 410/3 in Block No.9 of Kuravilangadu. There is no dispute regarding the title to the petitioners' property. Exhibit A5 was produced to show that the right of way has to be considered as 46 meters wide portion in respect of 400 KV lines drawn.

12. During cross-examination, PW1 stated that the property in Exhibit A4 sale deed had a value of ₹1.40 lakh per cent and his

property situated at a distance of 100 metres from the property in Ext.A4. It was admitted that the line was drawn at a height of 45 metres from the property. It was suggested to him that only 1.34 ares was the affected area. He admitted that the re-survey plan was not shown to the commissioner. He is not aware of the re-survey numbers of the property mentioned in Exhibit A4.

13. As per Exhibit B3, the property of Rosa, having an extent of 1.76 ares, situated in Survey No.410/3-4 and 0.58 ares, situated in Survey No.410/3 and 1.31 ares, situated in Survey No.409/3/2, 410/3/4 and 410/3/3. As per Exhibit B3, the total affected area was 3.65 ares. The written statement would reveal that the above 3.65 ares was within the 16 metre wide right of way. As per Exhibit A5, the right of way in respect of 400 metre 400 KV electric line has to be considered as 46 metres wide portion. As per Ext.C1(a) plan, the area coming within the 46 metres wide portion outside the 16 metre wide right of way has been assessed as 4.81 ares. The area coming within 16 meter wide line corridor was 3.65 ares. Thus the total affected area as per C1(a) plan was 8.46 ares, equivalent to 20.89 cents. The respondent filed objection, contending that the right of way as assessed by the commissioner was not

correct. No steps was taken by respondent No.1 to examine the commissioner. As the right of way has to be accepted as 46 metres, the argument of the learned counsel for respondent No.1 that the affected area calculated in Exhibit C1 was not correct, cannot be accepted.

14. The available records reveal that the property having a total extent of 20.89 cents forming the eastern portion of Survey 409/3 and 410/3 was affected by the drawing of line. No constructions can be done beneath the portion coming within a width of 46 metres. Hence there is diminution in land value of the property. But it has come in evidence that the line was drawn at a height of 28 to 44 metres and cultivations can be done subject to the height limit, even though building construction is not possible. Hence, the contention of petitioner that the entire property has become valueless cannot be accepted. The petitioner is having a large extent of property; 110.70 cents, as per the tax receipt and only the eastern 20.89 cents was the affected area.

15. As per Exhibit B3 FVR of land, fair value was ₹47,190/- in respect of Survey 409/3/2 and the fair value was Rs.65,340/- in respect of Survey 410/3 and 4. Both the survey numbers were not separately shown in Exhibit C1(a) plan. As per the petition,

the total extent was 44.82 ares in Survey 409/3 and 410/3. As per the commissioner's report, the property was situated near Thuruthipadi-Water tank road and the property was at a distance of 600 metres from MC road. As per Ext.C1, local enquiry was conducted and it was reported that the property had a value of ₹3,00,000/- per cent. But the commissioner did not verify any documents. Exhibit A4 Sale deed of 2019 was produced, where the sale consideration was ₹1,47,500/- and Rs.1,12,000/- per cent for two different survey numbers. Both the properties were in the same block of the petitioner and petitioner claimed that the property in Ext.A4 was at a distance of 100 meters from his property. As per Ext.C1, there were no buildings in the property. As per the commissioner's report, there was bus stand, police station, school, petrol pump, hotel and place of worship within a radius of 5 km from the property. It was a residential plot and due to the drawing of the line, the affected area of property cannot be used for commercial purpose and construction cannot be done.

16. The contention in the written statement of first respondent revealed that the right of way was considered only as 16 metre wide portion. 400 KV line has been drawn and the right-of-way and the trees in the property coming within a

width of 46 metres were cut and removed. Even though the right-of-way was considered by respondent as the 16 meter wide portion, through which the line passes, the affected area has to be considered as 46 meters wide corridor ROW in view of Government Order No.3/7/2015 - Trans. Government of India, Ministry of Power dated 15.10.2015 in respective 400 KV lines. Thus 15 meter wide portion on the sides of the 16m ROW line is also affected area.

17. The property of petitioner had access to panchayath pathway as per the evidence of PW1. Even though it was contended in the objection filed to the commissioner's report by the respondents that the property had only footpath access, no documents were produced by the first respondent to prove the same. It is true that the petitioner did not produce the copy of the title deed or the survey plan showing the road access. Even though there is no evidence regarding the width of the pathway, it can be found that the line was drawn through the eastern portion of the petitioner's property which affects the further construction and thereby diminishing the value of the property permanently due to the drawing of 400 KV line. At the same time, the overhead line is at a height of 28 to 44 metres as revealed from Exhibit B3 DVS, cultivations can be done in

respect of seasonal crops, and there is no scope for the contention that no cultivation is possible in the property.

18. No documents were produced by the petitioner to prove the market value of the property in the year 2018. The trees were cut and removed during 2018. In the petition, it was claimed that the market value of the property in 2018 was ₹5,00,000/- per cent. During evidence, PW1 claimed that the market value was ₹3,00,000. Exhibit A4 revealed that the property purchased by KSEB had no access to public road. But the commissioner's report revealed that the property of petitioner has access to panchayath road. In the argument note, the petitioner claimed that the market value of the property was ₹1,47,500/- per cent. The fair value fixed by the Government can never be the market value of the property in 2018. The property was a dry land having direct access to panchayath road.

19. Adequacy regarding the compensation paid under Section 10(d) of Telegraph Act can be determined by the District Court under Section 16(3) of Telegraph Act. Person who suffers damage to property's value and standing trees due to drawing of transmission line across his property is entitled to get "full

compensation” under Section 10(d) which is understood as equivalent to what the property owner has been deprived of, including any diminution in the land’s value due to the installation of an overhead power line across the property.

20. In the decision in **KSEB v. Livisha**, reported in 2007(3) KLT 1, it was held that *“The situs of 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 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 further more, 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.”* The same view was followed in **KSEB v. Sree Kumari** [(2008)5 SCC 398].

21. There is no serious dispute regarding title and possession to the property as revealed from Ext.A6. It was already found that the 46m right-of-way (ROW) passes through the entire eastern portion of property which substantially affects value of

property of the petitioner. No person would come forward to purchase the property for a price offered to a similar adjacent property, in view of the drawing of line affecting future constructions, if any, in the property. No sufficient compensation was paid by the respondent towards the diminution in the value and utility of the land. Petitioner claimed 5 crores towards the diminution in land value of property. The entire eastern portion of the property comes under 46 metre wide right of way and 20.89 cents coming within 46 meter wide portion is the affected area.

22. Considering the entire facts and circumstances and the fair value of land, which is Rs.65,340/- and Rs.47,180/- per are and evidence on record, it is found that the market value of the petitioners' property which has road access can be fixed as 2 lakh per cent. The petitioner is entitled to get 50% of market value as compensation for diminution in land value for the affected area.

In the said circumstance, it is found that a sum of ₹20,89,000/- (2,00,000/- x 20.89 x 50/100) can be granted as compensation for the diminution in land value with respect to the area due to drawing of 400 KV line through the property. Respondent had given a compensation of ₹3,00,596/- as per Exhibit B3 DVS for the diminution in land value. In view of Exhibit B3, it is found that

the petitioner is entitled to get a sum of ₹17,88,404/- (₹20,89,000 - ₹3,00,596) as enhanced compensation for the diminution in land value. Point No.1 is answered accordingly in favour of the petitioners.

23. Point No.2:- Petitioners claimed a sum of ₹18,60,460/- as enhanced compensation for trees cut and removed. Respondents granted a total compensation of Rs.4,23,897/- as compensation towards the trees cut and removed as per paragraph 2 of petition. As per Ext.B2, a total compensation of Rs.2,32,584.99 was paid as compensation for trees cut and removed. There is no documentary evidence regarding the income derived by petitioners from the trees. The methodology for calculating compensation for fruit bearing trees cut and removed was reiterated by the Apex Court in **Livisha's** case. It was held that *“so far as compensation in relation to fruit bearing trees are concerned, the same would also depend upon the facts and circumstances of each case.”* In **Land Acquisition Officer, A.P. v. Kamadana Ramakrishna Rao and Another**, reported in 2007 KHC 3124, the claim on yield basis has been held to be relevant for determining the amount of compensation payable under Land Acquisition Act. The

records reveal that tree clearance certificate was issued on 02.01.2018 and 07.09.2018. Hence the yield of trees as of 07.09.2018, the last date, has to be ascertained. Taking into consideration the ratio of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in **KSEB v. Livisha** (supra) and **Shaik Imambi v. Special Deputy Collector (LA), Telegu Ganga Project** [(2011)11 SCC 639], it would be just and reasonable to adopt the multiplier at 10.

24. Even though petitioner claimed a sum of ₹5,00,000/- as additional compensation for the value of improvements cut and removed, no evidence was adduced to that effect and the enhanced compensation claimed for any specific item was not stated in the petition. Hence the petitioner is not entitled to get compensation of ₹500,000/- as claimed in the petition, for value of other improvements cut and removed.

25. Petitioner has claimed a compensation of ₹2,92,500/- in respect of 39 pepper vines aged 3 which were yielding. As per the DVS, there were only 23 yielding pepper vines having the age of 10 years. The gross yield was considered as 35 kilogram and future age was assessed as 20 and a compensation of ₹41867.59 was paid. Petitioner claimed that 2.5 kilograms of

pepper was obtained from a pepper vine. After deducting the expenses for maintenance and upkeep of the pepper vines, the annual yield can be fixed as 2.5 kilogram per pepper vine. ₹300/- was the price of 1 kilogram of pepper during 2018. The multiplier of 10 can be adopted and the compensation payable for 23 yielding pepper vines would come to Rs.1,72,500/- (2.5kg x 23n x 10m x 300). Respondent had paid ₹41867.59 and the enhanced compensation payable to the petitioner is Rs.130632.41 (1,72,500/- - 41867.59).

26. According to the petitioner, there were 36 rubber trees in the property, having the age of 10. As per the DVS, the number of rubber trees was only 16, aged 12 years. It was claimed that petitioner used to get 13 kilogram per year. According to the petitioner, ₹150/- was the price of rubber during 2017. No document was produced to prove the rate. Respondent considered the net rate 117/-. As per the rate published by the Rubber Board, the value of rubber was ₹135/kg. Considering the number of trees and the future age, 20 years noted in Ext.B2 DVS, it is found that the petitioner is entitled to get a compensation of ₹2,80,800/- (16n x 13kg x 10m x Rs.135). Respondent had given a sum of ₹52,153.36 as compensation.

Thus, the enhanced compensation receivable by the petitioner is ₹2,28,646.64(₹280800-₹ 52,153.36).

27. Petitioner has claimed compensation for 2 coconut trees aged 10 years and a sum of ₹ 78,800/- was claimed as enhanced compensation. As per the DVS, there were two coconut trees aged 14. No evidence was adduced regarding the income from the coconut trees. It is found that respondent had given a compensation of ₹48,325.78 for the two coconut trees. It is found that sufficient compensation has been given by the respondent for the two coconut trees, and the petitioner is not entitled to get any enhanced compensation for the coconut trees.

28. Petitioner has claimed compensation for 11 arecanut trees aged 12 and a compensation of ₹1,16,160 has been claimed. As per the DVS, there were only 7 arecanut trees aged 14 and there were 4 non-yielding 4 year-old arecanut trees. Respondent had given compensation of ₹200 was given for the non-yielding four-year-old arecanut trees and ₹32,098.26 for the 7 arecanut trees. No evidence was adduced by the petitioner regarding the actual income from the arecanut trees. In the said circumstance, petitioner is not entitled to claim any

enhanced amount towards compensation for the arecanut trees.

29. Petitioner has claimed a compensation of ₹80,000/- for 4 coffee trees, having age of 14. As per the DVS, there were no coffee trees as claimed by the petitioner. Exhibit B1 and B2 does not reveal any details of coffee trees and as such petitioner is not entitled to any compensation as claimed for the coffee trees.

30. Petitioner claimed compensation of ₹2,40,000/- for 4 jack trees aged 10 years. No evidence has been adduced with respect to the income or yield from the jack trees. As per Exhibit B1, there were two jack fruit trees. One jack tree was aged 20 years and a compensation of ₹ 30,000/- was given. It had a height of only 12 metres and girth of 70 cm. It was yielding as per Exhibit B2. It is found that sufficient compensation has been given for the jack tree which was yielding and as such, the petitioner is not entitled to get any enhanced compensation for the same. As per the DVS, another jack tree aged only 5 years. It was non yielding and a compensation of ₹250 was given. It is found that sufficient compensation has been given in respect of the non yielding

jack fruit tree. Hence, the petitioner is not entitled to get any enhanced compensation for the same.

31. Thus, the total enhanced compensation receivable by the petitioner for trees cut and removed would be ₹3,59,279.05. (₹1,30,632.41 + ₹2,28,646.64), rounded off to ₹3,59,279/-. In view of the above discussion, the petitioner is entitled to the following compensation for the trees that were cut down from her property as referred to in Ext.B3.

Sl. No	Name of Trees	No.of trees	Present age	Compensation claimed	Compensation already awarded	Enhanced compensation
1	Pepper	39	3	292500	41867.59	130632.41
2	Rubber	36	10	1053000	52153.36	228646.64
3	Coconut	2	10	78800	48325.78	Nil
4	Arecanut	11	12	116160	32098.26+ 200	Nil
5	Coffee	4	14	80,000	Nil	Nil
6	Jackfruit	4	10	240000 -	30000+ 250	Nil
	Total			18,60,460/-		3,59,279.05 Rounded off to ₹3,59,279/-

32. The petitioner has claimed interest at the rate of 12% for the enhanced compensation amount. The Hon'ble High Court in **KSEB v. Maranchi Matha** [2008(1) KLT 1038] held that, the

person whose trees are cut and removed is entitled to get interest from the date of cutting trees. In view of the settled legal principles and Section 34 of CPC, the court is equipped to grant interest beyond 6% per annum to the principal sum adjudged through the litigation from the date of order till payment. No document has been produced by petitioner revealing the date of tree clearance. The tree clearance certificate was dated 07.09.2018 as per objection filed by first respondent. Hence it is found that petitioners are entitled to get interest for the amount awarded from the date of cutting and clearing of trees ie, 07.09.2018 till realization, at the rate of 7% per annum with cost.

33. Point No.3:- In view of the findings in Point Nos.1 and 2, the petition is allowed.

In the result, the petition is allowed.

- (1) Respondents are directed to pay a sum of ₹17,88,404/- (Rupees Seventeen lakhs eighty eight thousand four hundred and four only) towards the diminution in land value, to the petitioner. The amount, if any, paid by respondents towards diminution in land value shall be set off against the above amount.

- (2) Respondents are directed to pay a sum of ₹3,59,279/- (Rupees Three lakhs fifty nine thousand two hundred and seventy nine only) towards enhanced compensation for the trees cut and removed, to the petitioner.
- (3) Petitioner is entitled to realise the above amounts with interest @ 7% per annum from 07.09.2018, till realisation, with cost of the petition.

Dictated to and typed by the Dictation Software, corrected and pronounced by me in open Court, on this the 23rd day of May, 2026.

Sd/-
Lilly K.
Addl. District Judge-I,
Kottayam.

APPENDIX

Exhibits Marked For The Petitioner:-

A1	:	19.03.2015	Death Certificate of Rosa Joseph issued
		13.04.2015	issued by Kuravilangadu Grama Panchayath
A2	:	10.05.2018	Legal Heirship Certificate
A3	:	12.01.2018	Special Power of Attorney
A4	:	06.09.2019	True Copy of Sale Deed No 1363/19 of SRO Kuravilangadu
A5	:	11.11.2019	Letter of Power grid Corporation Limited
A6	:	12.05.2023	True copy of Tax Receipt

**Copy of Order in
OP(Electricity)No.252/2019
Dated : 23.05.2026**

Exhibits marked for the respondents:

- B1 : 05.12.2017 True copy of Notice under Indian Telegraph Act of 1885
- B2 : 06.11.2018 True copy of DVS of damaged trees
- B3 : 18.02.2020 Copy of DVS showing the land value and displacement allowance

Court Exhibits:-

- C1 : 13.11.2023 Commission Report prepared by Adv.Alex P Raju
- C1(a) : 13.11.2023 Survey plan filed by Surveyor Sasikumar C.K

Witness examined for the petitioner :-

- PW1 : 05.02.2024 Ulahannan Ouseph

Witness examined for the Respondent :- Nil

Id/-
Addl. District Judge-I

//True Copy//

Copied by:
Compared by:

Sd/-
Lilly K.
Addl. District Judge-I,
Kottayam.