IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.M.MANOJ

MONDAY, THE 24TH DAY OF MARCH 2025 / 3RD CHAITHRA, 1947

WP(C) NO. 32764 OF 2015

PETITIONER :

VALSALA VIJAYAKUMAR
AGED 55 YEARS
W/O.K P VIJAYAKUMAR, R/A, 1717,COMBOURNE CIRCLE, HIGH GATE, DAIN FERN GOLF ESTATE, BOARD ACRES ROAD, FOURWAYS, JOHANESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA HAVING PERMANENT ADDRESS AT 10,B2, KGL MARINA MAJESTIC, MARINE DRIVE, ERNAKULAM , KOCHI 682018

BY ADVS. SRI.B.N.SHIVSANKAR
SMT.DHANYA PALAN
SRI.T.KRISHNANUNNI (SR.)(K/280/1973)

RESPONDENTS :

1 **KOCHU TRESA**
AGED 55 YEARS
D/O.CATHERINE LASER, R/A, 8/630, MANGOLIA BHAVAN, ATTINKUZHI, KAZHAKOOTAM P O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

2 **DR GABRIEL MAR GREGORIOUS METRAPOLITA BISHOP**
MALANKARA ORTHODOX SURIYANI SABHE, ORTHODOX CHURCH CENTRE, ULLOOR, MEDICAL COLLEGE P O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM 695011

3 **DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE**
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM ,KERALA

4 **SUB INSPECTOR OF P OLICE**
KAZHAKKOTTAM POLICE SATION, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

5 **DIRECTOR OF VIGILANCE AND ANTI-CORRUPTION**
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,

6 REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER
CIVIL STATION BUILDING,
KUDAPPANAKUNNU,THIRUVANANTHPAURAM 695043

7 VILLAGE OFFICER
PANGAPPARA VILLAGE,KAZHAKKUTTAM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM 695017

8 SUB REGISTRAR
KAZHAKKUTTAM P O, KAZHAKKUTTAM ,THIRUVANANTHPAURAM DISTRICT, KERALA 695582

9 DISTRICT COLLECTOR
LMS COMPOUND , PALAYAM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM 695034

10 STATE OF KERALA
REP BY CHIEF SECRETARY, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

BY ADV R.T.PRADEEP

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 24.03.2025, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

C.R.

P.M. MANOJ, J

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

WP(C) No. 32764 of 2015

- -

Dated this the 24th day of March, 2025

JUDGMENT

The writ petition is preferred by third persons seeking issuance of a writ of certiorari for setting aside the judgment and decree in O.S. No.247/2013 of the First Additional Sub Court, Thiruvananthapuram. The question to be answered in the writ petition is whether the jurisdiction under Article 226 can be invoked to set aside the judgment on the alleged grounds of fraud and impersonation.

2. The writ petition is preferred challenging the judgment and decree dated 05.11.2014 in O.S. No.247 of 2013 of the First Additional Sub Court, Thiruvananthapuram. The petitioner and her husband had been residing with their family in South Africa for 17 years at the time of filing the writ petition. She purchased 10.80 Ares of property in Old Survey No.1821/1 and Re-survey No.274/10 of Pangappara Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk. This property was assigned to her and her husband by one P.Y. Thomas as per Ext.P1

dated 17.07.2006. Sri.P.Y. Thomas obtained the property from the deceased Bishop of Malankara Orthodox Suriyani Sabha, Geevarghese Mardiascoras Episcopa Thirumeni as per Ext.P2 dated 13.10.1983. The Bishop obtained the property from one Mr.Paul Thomas as per Ext.P3 dated 30.04.1980.

3. After the purchase of the property as per Ext.P1 the property tax and the encumbrance certificates were handed over by the assigner to the petitioner and her husband. Thereafter, the petitioner constructed a compound wall to secure the property, and they remained in South Africa as her husband was employed in Botswana, and the petitioners visited the property occasionally. Later, they were informed by a friend of her husband that a news item relating to their property was published in the Malayala Manorama daily dated 15.12.2010. The news item was that the first respondent had got someone to impersonate the deceased Bishop, and the present Bishop, Dr.Grabriel Mar Gregorius Metrapolita (2nd respondent), had filed a complaint before the 3rd respondent – DGP.

4. The complaint is with respect to the creation of the Ext.P7 document dated 31.03.2010, which is stated to be created by the first respondent for transferring the land owned by the petitioner as

it is directly assigned by the assigner in Ext.P2, i.e. Late Bishop Geevarghese Mardiascoras Episcopa. The crucial aspect is that Bishop Geevarghese Mardiascoras Episcopa passed away on 23.07.1999. Under such circumstances, the police started an investigation and Ext.P8 Final Report was filed by the Sub Inspector of Police, Kazhakkoottam, before the Judicial First Class Magistrate Court-II, Attingal, on 10.07.2011 as CC No. 589/2011. In the Final Report the first respondent herein is the second accused. Later she was released on bail.

5. The officers involved in the alleged fraudulent transaction were also arrayed as witnesses in the FIR, and a Vigilance Inquiry was ordered against those officers. As a result, the 5th respondent Director General of Vigilance and Anti Corruption Bureau obtained sanction from the Government to proceed against the Government Officials.

6. While all these proceedings were in motion, the 1st respondent approached the Sub Court and filed a Suit as OS No.247/2013 wherein the Late Bishop was the second defendant and the predecessor in interest of the Bishop was the first defendant. As there was no appearance on the part of the defendant, an *ex parte*

order was passed against the defendants therein on 05.11.2024, especially against the 2nd defendant, Bishop, who passed away on 23.07.1999. It is the case of the petitioner that the Suit was filed suppressing all the facts of initiation and pendency of criminal proceedings against the plaintiff/ 1st respondent herein as stated above.

7. In the meanwhile, the petitioner and her husband obtained an order from the jurisdictional RDO as per Ext.P13 for cancelling the mutation effected in the name of the 1st respondent as per Ext.P13 dated 22.12.2013 on the basis of the complaint preferred by petitioner and her husband. Ext.P10 judgment was obtained concealing even these facts. The Tax receipts produced along with the writ petition show that the petitioner and her husband were paying the tax between 2011 and 2015. But the possession certificates issued on 19.04.2012 and 03.01.2013 will go to show that the petitioner and her husband were in possession of the property even at the time of issuance of Ext.P10 judgment. Even the encumbrance certificate produced along with the writ petition also shows that the petitioner and husband were in possession from 2006. However, an entry is evident in one of the encumbrance

certificates that the 1st respondent obtained the property with effect from 01.03.2010 from the deceased Bishop.

8. In order to substantiate her case, the petitioner has produced the FIR filed before the Court of Enquiry Commission and Special Judge, Thiruvananthapuram as per Ext.P14 and the order of rejection of Bail Application of the 1st accused as per Exts.P15 and 16. Finally, by Ext.P16 C, the 1st respondent was released on bail. The petitioner has also produced the latest extracts of the BTR, possession certificate and encumbrance certificate. In the latest encumbrance certificate, which is produced as Ext.P24, it is shown that after Ext.P1 transaction, another transaction was recorded in the year 2010 in the light of Ext.P7. Later a further entry was made in the year 2012 whereby entire property has been transferred to the petitioner herein as per Ext.P4.

9. The petitioner has also produced certain documents such as Ext.P25, a letter stated to be issued by the deceased Bishop to the Joint Director in the year 2009 whereby he has entrusted one Joseph for carrying out survey activities. This person is one of the accused in the criminal case and by Ext.P26(a), P26(b) and P26(c) death certificates and Ext.P27 election identity cards allegedly forged by

the 1st respondent and her allies. Later, during the pendency of the writ petition, the petitioner also produced additional documents such as FIR, a charge sheet filed before the Court of Enquiry Commission and Special Judge, Vigilance, Thiruvananthapuram, latest tax receipts, possession certificate, thandaper and the encumbrance certificate of the year 2019.

10. In the meanwhile, in the year 2016 the 1st respondent preferred a counter affidavit whereby she tried to establish that she had purchased the property from one Geevarghese Mardiascoras Episcopa as per Ext.R1(a) sale deed (Ext.P7 in the writ petition) who obtained the sale deed from one Paul Thomas in the year 1980, i.e. Ext.P3 in the writ petition. She further contended that she was in absolute possession and enjoyment and effected mutation, paid land tax, and obtained thandaper Number 25623 of Pangappara Village.

11. It is further stated that one P.Y. Thomas, the assignor to the petitioner, had purchased the same property as per sale deed number 2583/1983, (i.e. Ext.P2 in the writ petition). In that regard, she had preferred a complaint before the Police as well as revenue authorities against that.

12. It is further stated in the said counter affidavit that her vendor Geevarghese Mardiascoras Episcopa had never executed Ext.R1(b), i.e. Ext.P2 in favour of Sri.P.Y. Thomas. The signature available in Ext.R1(b) document will show that one Dioscorus had subscribed to the signature of her vendor and executed the said document. She also stated that the document evidenced that the Geevarghese Mardiascoras Episcopa, the head of the Malankara Orthodox Suriyani Sabha, Thiruvananthapuram was for some reasons stripped from the title and later Mar Dioscorus of Malankara Orthodox Syrian Church was succeeded by Geevarghese Mardiascoras Episcopa and the former assumed that the 30 cents of property in Re-survey No.274/9 of Pangappara Village belonged to the Sabha. However, in fact, Geevarghese Mardiascoras Episcopa who was the owner and in possession of the property in his individual capacity, may have sold the property to P.Y. Thomas. But in reality the Mar Discorous had no title or possession over the property. Thereby Sri.P.Y. Thomas cannot claim title over the property. On such assumption, it is stated that Sale deed No.2582/1983 is a void document or, for that matter, fraudulently executed.

13. It is further stated, under the afore circumstances, as an abundant caution, she had preferred O.S. No.247/2013 before the Sub Court, Thiruvananthapuram, whereby P.Y. Thomas and her vendor Geevarghese Mardiascoras Episcopapa were defendants 1 and 2, respectively. Despite receipt of the summons, they never chose to appear before the Court. Accordingly, on 05.11.2014, the suit was decreed, declaring that sale deed No.2582/1983 of Kazhakkoottam Registrar Office is null and void, which is produced as Ext.R1(c). This is the order impugned in this writ petition. On the strength of the said judgment, as the respondents had not challenged the same, the sale deed no.2582/1983 is non-existent.

14. It is also stated that prior to the institution of the suit, the first respondent has served notice on various office bearers of the Malankara Syrian Orthodox Badrasanam. Thereby sought to withdraw the allegations levelled against her to the effect that she had forged the identity cards and photo of the Metrapolita and executed the document by impersonation. Since such allegations are false and baseless, they required them to make a press release of the actual facts and appealed to them to withdraw the criminal case against her. In the said counter affidavit, she also explained

the history of the Sabha and tried to establish that Geevarghese Mar Diascoras Episcopa had left the Sabha in 1982 and purchased the property in his personal capacity and he had every right to sell the property. Therefore, the Metrapolita Geevarghese Mar Diascoras Episcopa have no authority to execute the document in favour of Sri.P.Y. Thomas as per deed No.2582/1983. She also stated by producing the death certificate that the Metrapolita Geevarghese Mardiascoras Episcopa passed away on 23.07.1999. She had purchased the property from Metrapolita Geevarghese Mardiascoras Episcopa.

15. On the basis of these arguments, the sale deed executed between the petitioner and her assigner is illegal, and it is an attempt to grab her property, resorting to certain false allegations and preferring false complaints against her. The petitioner has approached this Court by swearing false averments with distorted facts and seeking to dismiss the writ petition with costs to the 1st respondent.

16. The counter affidavit filed by the 1st respondent was refuted by the petitioner by filing a reply affidavit, which stated that the sale deed No.1029/2010, i.e. Ext.P7/R1(a), is a forged

document. The said document is created by impersonating late Bishop Geevarghese Mardiascoras Episcopa. This fact is evident from the complaint preferred by the present Bishop before the 3rd respondent State Police Chief and the Ext.P8 Final Report. The 1st respondent is the second accused in that case. A parallel enquiry was conducted by the Vigilance and Anti Corruption Department against the Government Officials. An FIR was filed vide FIR No.VC 03/2016/SRT dated 13.06.2016 before the Court of Enquiry Commissioner and Special Judge, Vigilance,Thiruvananthapuram. In the original FIR, one Karunakaran S/o.Cheriyan Nadar, was the first accused, and Kochuthresia, the 1st respondent herein, is the second accused. Joseph alias Monvila Joseph is the third accused. She is attempting to confuse by using the names in various manner by changing the spelling and spacing between the words in the name of the Bishop. That amounts to fraud and perjury. The name, which is differently spelt in the counter affidavit, is one and the same person whose death certificate is produced by the 1st respondent as per Ext.R1(e). The same death certificate is produced by the petitioner as well as the 2nd respondent as per Ext.P26 series and Ext.R2(c) respectively.

17. Police, as well as the Revenue Authorities, conducted enquiries with respect to the impugned title deed. On the basis of the same, the 1st respondent claims title over the petitioner's property. Finally, RDO has cancelled the mutation in the name of the 1st accused and mutated back to P.Y. Thomas, the original assignee to the petitioner, and simultaneously mutated in the name of the petitioner and her husband, who were the then original co-owners. Later, in year 2012, the entire property was conveyed to the name of the petitioner as per Ext.P4.

18. The petitioner also explains the sequence of events of the transfer of property from Paul Thomas in the year 1980 to the late Bishop. Then Late Bishop to P.Y. Thomas in the year 1983. Thereafter P.Y. Thomas, in the year 2006, to the petitioner and her husband. In the year 2010, the first accused fraudulently created a deed showing that the property was transferred to her name by the late Bishop. The same happened by impersonation of Late Geevarghese Mardiascoras Episcopa by Mr.Karunakaran, the accused in Crime 874/10 in CC 587/2011. He registered a sale deed No.1029/10 presenting the fake election ID card to the Sub Registrar, Kazhakkuttam in favour of the 1st respondent. Thereafter the 1st

respondent, with the fake and fraudulently registered document and faked encumbrance certificate, managed to mutate the property in her favour and obtained thandaper No.25623, and paid property tax for the year 2010-11.

19. Knowing the aforementioned fraud, the thandaper No.25623 was cancelled on the basis of the complaint preferred by the petitioner and her husband as per Ext.P13. Accordingly, new thandaper No.27138 was assigned in the name of K.P.Vijayakumar and Valsala Vijayakumar, the husband and wife. Later by Ext.P4, the portion of the husband was transferred to the name of the wife, who is the petitioner herein and obtained new TP No.28246.

20. The contention raised by the 1st respondent that P.Y. Thomas has approached the police raising certain false complaints was also refuted. In fact, it was the present Bishop who had raised the complaint before the then Director General of Police as is evident from Ext.P5. Neither P.Y.Thomas nor the petitioner and her husband ever approached the Police. The petitioner came to know about the fraudulent transaction from the information given on the news item published in the vernacular newspaper published in the locality while the petitioner's husband was in visit to Kerala. The news items

published on those days were produced along with the writ petition. Ext.P7 sale deed was created by affixing the photographs of a fraudster Karunakaran and creating a letter to the resurvey superintendent, i.e. Ext.P25. The signatures available in Ext.P7 and Ext.P25 appear to be grossly different.

21. The petitioner also elucidated the history of the Sabha stating that the Thiruvananthapuram Diocese of Malankara Orthodox Syrian Sabha was commissioned on 01.01.1979. Late Bishop Geevarghese Mardiascoras Episcopa was the first Episcopa/Metrapolita from its inception on 01.01.1979, and he was in the capacity till 1999. On 23.07.1999, he passed away. No other person headed the Sabha with a similar name to that of the Late Bishop, as confirmed by the present Bishop, who preferred the complaint before the Police.

22. It is also contended in the reply affidavit that 1st respondent's version with respect to service of notice is a mere impossibility as he is living in Botswana and he became a foreign citizen and the address provided in the suit with respect to the Bishop is also not in existence. Without providing sufficient details and suppressing certain material facts, the 1st respondent managed to

obtain the impugned Ext.P7 judgment. It is also stated that, the 1st respondent, who is an ordinary daily worker, could not have committed such fraud without the help of some able brains who are behind the curtain. In the enquiry, those persons came to light, and they are facing prosecution. The petitioner was never made a party to the suit before the Sub Court. On this background the counter affidavit preferred by the 1st respondent is sought to be rejected.

23. Later, in the year 2016, the 2nd respondent who had preferred a complaint for the first time before the police had preferred a counter affidavit. The 2nd respondent is straight away supporting the contentions raised in the writ petition while meticulously refuting the contentions raised in the counter affidavit filed by the first respondent.

24. For that purpose, the 2nd respondent has brought some facts with respect to the Sabha and also the appointment of the first Bishop, etc. The counter affidavit also provides the name of the Bishops till 2016 and tried to establish that no other person similar to the name of the first Bishop i.e. Geevarghese Mardiascoras Episcopa was in existence in Sabha. In order to prove the identity of the first Bishop, the 2nd respondent has brought some biographical

notes with respect to the parents, maiden name, his consecration etc. upto his death on 23.07.1999 and the counter affidavit denies the story rendered by the 1st respondent that the first Bishop once left the church in 1982. He also tried to explain the way the first accused tried to confuse the court by spelling the name of late Geevarghese Mardiascoras Episcopa in various documents in Malayalam and English. He also reiterated the stand of the petitioner that the 1st respondent is bringing distorted contention and is trying to project that two different persons were in existence with similar names, and both of them were the Bishops of the Malankara Orthodox Syrian Church. In order to establish that the 2nd respondent has produced literature marked as Ext.R2(i) and also explained the history of the transaction of the property in survey Number 182/1/1 and resurvey No.272/10 of Pangappara Village, Thiruvananthapurm Taluk which is in consonance with the contention raised by the petitioner in the writ petition and also stated with respect to the criminal case and filing of charge sheet as well as the proceedings under the Vigilance Department etc.

25. On the strength of the contentions raised in the writ petition as well as in the counter affidavit filed by the 2nd respondent the

petitioner seeks to issue writ of certiorari to quash Ext.P7 judgment of the Sub Court, Thiruvananthapuram.

26. I have heard Sri.T.Krishnanunni, Senior Counsel, instructed by Adv.P.N. Sivasankar, Adv.J. Harikumar for the 2nd respondent and Sri.Binoy Davis, learned Government Pleader. However, there was no appearance for the 1st respondent. Initially a Vakalath was filed on behalf of the 1st respondent and a counter affidavit was filed. Later, the counsel has relinquished his vakalath. A new counsel was engaged by the 1st respondent. However, he has also relinquished the vakalat. Later, notice was sent to the 1st respondent by a special messenger that was returned, reporting that the addressee was not in place. In order to complete the service, petitioner was permitted to take out notice by paper publication to the 1st respondent. Accordingly, paper publication was effected and produced the evidence in the paper book. Thereafter, on multiple occasions, the matter was posted before this Court; however, there was no response from the 1st respondent. Under the said circumstances, I decided to hear the matter and dispose of it finally.

27. Having considered the contentions raised across the Bar, it appears that this is a matter of substantial question of law, whether

this Court can invoke jurisdiction under Article 226 to quash a judgment of the trial court in an Original Suit in the case of a challenge raised by a third person to the said suit.

28. The said challenge is raised on the background of the alleged fraud raised in the aforementioned paragraphs. A criminal case registered in that case is under trial before the competent court having jurisdiction. Unless and until final verdict comes out in that case, this Court cannot come to a conclusion that there is a substantial fraud as alleged in the writ petition.

29. On the basis of the alleged fraud, the learned Senior Counsel tried to substantiate that the judgment obtained by the 1st respondent is liable to be interfered with by invoking the jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution. In support of his contentions, learned Senior Counsel brought to my attention the following decisions:

"**Hamza Haji v. State of Kerala and others** [AIR 2006 SC 3028], **Vishal Garg and Others v. Union of India and Others** [2015 SCC OnLine P&H 5343], **P. Subramani v. A.Periyasamy** [2013 SCC OnLine Mad 3132], **The Koushik Mutually Aided Co-**

operative Housing Society v. Ameena Begum and Another [2023 SCC OnLine SC 1662] and **Reghu B and Another v. State Bank of Travancore, Tvm and Another** [2015 (4) KHC 270]"

30. Per contra, the learned Government Pleader has argued that this Court cannot invoke jurisdiction under Article 226 to unsettle the impugned judgment. The learned Government Pleader has brought to my notice the following decisions :

"**Jacky v. Tiny @ Antony and Others** [2014 (2) KHC 290], **Radhey Shyam and Another v. Chhabi Nath and Others** [2015 KHC 4152], **My Palace Mutually Aided Co-operative Society v. B. Mahesh and Others** [2022 KHC 6834] and **Hardevinder Singh v. Paramjit Singh and Others** [2013 KHC 4017]"

31. In order to ascertain the capability of this Court while exercising jurisdiction under Article 226, one of such decisions is also considered by this Court which is as follows :

"**CISF v. Santhosh Kumar Pandey** [2022 KHC 7289]"

32. On analysing the aforementioned decisions, in the absence of finality of criminal proceedings initiated against the first respondent, this Court cannot hold a view that there is substantial

fraud. If such a view is taken, that will affect the pending trial before the competent court having jurisdiction. Rather, it would be premature to jump to such a conclusion. Moreover, the writ jurisdiction is meant for lining justice between the parties where it cannot be done in any other forum. Moreover, where there is an express provision available under the Civil Procedure Code, 1908 or any Statute under which an appeal is maintainable bypassing the appellate jurisdiction, writ jurisdiction cannot be invoked. Only in the absence of a statutory appeal alone, writ jurisdiction can be invoked under Article 226. Here in the case on hand, a specific provision under CPC is available. Challenging the impugned judgment, the argument of the petitioner is that the petitioner, being a third party, cannot directly challenge the said judgment. Moreover, according to the petitioner, the writ petition is preferred for expeditious disposal by invoking the extraordinary jurisdiction.

33. Unfortunately, in the light of judgments **Jacky**,**Radhey Shyam** , **My Palace Mutually Aided Co-operative Society** and **Hardevinder Singh** supra, I cannot hold a different view. The remedy available to the petitioner is to approach the trial court to get herself impleaded in the party array, and thereafter, they can

approach the same court for reviewing the judgment which is stated to be obtained by fraud. Whereas the apprehension voiced by the petitioner is with respect to the delay in approaching the said trial court or other appellate forum and also the delay that would take in the final disposal. There is no point in such apprehension as the period of delay in approaching the appropriate forum can be condoned in the light that the writ petition is preferred immediately on the knowledge of the impugned judgment. Therefore, the period in which the writ petition was pending before this Court can be excluded for the application of limitation prescribed under the Limitation Act. Hence, the question with respect to invoking the jurisdiction of Article 226 against the impugned judgment is answered in negative.

Writ Petition is dismissed accordingly.

Sd/-
P.M.MANOJ
JUDGE

ttb

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 32764/2015

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

P1:-TRUE COPY OF SALE DEED BEARING DOC NO 2935/2006

P2:-TRUE COPY OF SALE DEED BEARING DOC NO 2582/1983

P3:-TRUE COPY OF SALE DEED BEARING DOC NO 1549/1980

P4:-TRUE COPY OF SETTLEMENT DEED NO 4069/2012

P5;-TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER OF TE BISHOP DTD 13/12/2010

P6:_TRUE COPIES OF NEWS ITEMS BETWEEN DECEMBER 2010 AND MARCH 2011

P7:-TRUE COPY OF THE SALE DEED BEARING DOC NO 1029/2010

P8:-TRUE COPY OF FIR NO 874/2010 & CHARGE SHEET

P9:-TRUE COPY OF LETTER DTD 10/2/2015

P10:-TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT OF THE ADDL SUB COURT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM IN OS NO 247/2013 DTD 5/11/2014

P11:-TRUE COPY OF THE LAND TAX RECEIPTS DTD 14/7/2006,19/4/2012,3/1/2013,24/8/2013,19/5/2014, 20/10/2015 POSSESSION CERTIFICATE DTD 19/4/2012 & 3/1/2013 , ABSTRAACT OF THANDAPER REGISTER,ENCUMBARANCE CERTIFICATE DTD 15/12/10,20/1/13,21/10/15

P12:-TRUE COPIES OF LETTERS DTD 10/6/2010,27/10/2011,19/12/2011

P13:-TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER OF THE RDO DTD 23/12/2011