

**IN THE RENT CONTROL COURT OF PONNANI**  
**Present:- Smt. Sowmya T.M., Presiding Officer (Munsiff- Magistrate), Ponnani**

**Tuesday, the 28<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2025**  
**the 6<sup>th</sup> day of Karthika, 1947**

**INTERLOCUTORY APPLICATION No.4/2025**  
**RENT CONTROL PETITION No. 22/2024**

**Between:-**

Subaidha, 58 years, D/o.Karuppam Veettil  
Moidunni and W/o.Thazhathethil Kunhan, : Petitioner/  
Kololambu amsom, Venginikkara desom, respondent  
P.O.Ayilakkadu, Ponnani Taluk, Pin 679 576

**And:-**

- Mechinath Valappil Moidu Haji's children
- 1 Sainudheen, 49 years, Represented by  
Power of Attorney Holder Sheheer,  
S/o.Mechinath Valappil Moidu Haji
  - 2 Salih, 45 years, Represented by Power of  
Attorney Holder Sheheer, S/o.Mechinath  
Valappil Moidu Haji
  - 3 Shahir, 43 years, Othalur amsom, Chiyanoor  
desom, P.O.Kokkooor. Pin 679 591 : Respondents/  
Petitioners
  - 4 Abdul Jishar, 37 years, Pallikkara amsom,  
desom, P.O.Nannamukku, Ponnani Taluk  
679 574. Represented by Power of Attorney  
Holder Shaheer, S/o.Mechinath Valappil  
Moidu Haji
  - 5 Shebeer, 34 years, Pallikkara amsom,  
desom, P.O.Nannamukku, Ponnani Taluk  
679 574. Represented by Power of Attorney  
Holder Shaheer, S/o.Mechinath Valappil  
Moidu Haji

Sd/-  
**Presiding Officer,  
Rent Control Court**

This petition coming on this day for final hearing before me in the presence of Sri.E.C.Suresh, Sri.Jison.P.Jose and Sri.Jayakrishnan.M, Advocates for the Petitioner/ Respondent Sri.P.Praveen, Sri.Shanavas.P and Sri.K.V.Sujeer, Advocates for the Respondents/Petitioners and this court passed the following:-

**ORDER**

This petition has been filed by the respondent in the Rent Control Proceedings under Order XVI, Rule 6 and Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, seeking a direction to the petitioners in the proceedings to produce documents related to the building's safety and maintenance.

2. The averments in the petition, in brief, are as follows: The petitioner contends that the petition schedule building, which is allegedly over 45 years old, suffers from a lack of maintenance and safety facilities. The petitioner asserts that the respondents claimed the building possesses fire safety protection and a valid license in their pleadings. Therefore, the petitioner requests that the respondents be directed to produce the relevant certificate or license from the Fire and Safety Department.

3. The respondents opposed the application, arguing that the

Sd/-  
**Presiding Officer,  
Rent Control Court**

petitioner's intention is to cause unnecessary hardship. They contended that while the Advocate Commissioner may have reported the building's compliance generally, no specific license regarding fire safety protection has been issued by the authorities, and therefore, the document cannot be produced.

**4. Point for Determination**

1. Is the petitioner entitled to an order directing the respondents to produce the Fire and Safety Protection Certificate or file an affidavit regarding its non-existence?

5. The Court has heard the counsel for both sides and considered the submissions.

6. The point: The rent Control petition involves the determination of fair rent or eviction, making the physical condition and statutory compliance of the building a highly relevant factor. The petitioner asserts that the building lacks safety facilities, while the respondents have allegedly claimed that the building has fire safety protection.

Sd/-  
**Presiding Officer,  
Rent Control Court**

7. The respondents' defence that a license cannot be produced because one has not been issued by the authorities effectively acknowledges that the document sought is either non-existent or not formally available. However, since the respondents may have relied on the building's *structural capability* or general features as a defense against the lack of maintenance, the precise status of official certification must be brought on record.

8. To ensure full disclosure and a fair adjudication of the building's condition, especially its safety features, which directly impacts the fixation of fair rent, the Court must intervene. Requiring the respondents to provide a clear statement regarding the status of the license is necessary to test the veracity of their own contentions and the findings in the commission report, if any, regarding building safety. Therefore, a direction must be issued to the respondents to clarify the licensing status, thereby avoiding any future ambiguity regarding the availability of public records. This point is answered accordingly.

**In the result, the petition is allowed.**

1. The respondents are hereby directed to produce before this Court

Sd/-  
**Presiding Officer,  
Rent Control Court**

the current Fire and Safety Protection Certificate or License issued by the competent authority in respect of the petition schedule building, or an Affidavit clearly stating that no such certificate or license has been issued by the competent authority or that the property does not require such certification under the prevailing rules.

2. The respondents shall comply with this direction within two weeks from the date of this Order.
3. No order as to costs in this application.

(Dictated to the Confl. Assist, transcribed by her, corrected by me and Pronounced in Open Court this the 28<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2025).

Sd/-

**Presiding Officer,  
Rent Control Court**

**Appendix: Nil**

**Presiding Officer,  
Rent Control Court**

*//True copy//*

**Presiding Officer,  
Rent Control Court**

Sd/-

**Presiding Officer,  
Rent Control Court**