

**BEFORE THE KERALA STATE ELECTION COMMISSION,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM**

PRESENT: SHRI.K.SASIDHARAN NAIR, STATE ELECTION COMMISSIONER

Friday, the 14th day of March 2014

O.P.Nos.40/2013, 41/2013& 42/2013

O.P.40/2013

Petitioner : Muhammed Vettickal,
S/o Abdul Khader, Vettickal,
Perumpallychira P.O.,
Thodupuzha, Idukki District.,
Member, Ward No.11,
Kumaramangalam Grama Panchayat.

**(By Advs.Hashim Babu.M., Sajitha.S
& Rasiya Beevi)**

Respondent : Lissa Jins,
Member, Ward No.09,
Kumaramangalam Grama Panchayat,
Idukki District,
PIN: 685 597.

(By Advocate N.Madhusoodhanan Nair)

O.P.41/2013

Petitioner : Muhammed Vettickal,
S/o Abdul Khader, Vettickal,
Perumpallychira P.O.,
Thodupuzha, Idukki District.,
Member, Ward No.11,
Kumaramangalam Grama Panchayat.

**(By Advs.Hashim Babu.M., Sajitha.S
& Rasiya Beevi)**

Respondent : Shylaja Balakrishnan Nair,
Member, Ward No.11,
Kumaramangalam Grama Panchayat,
Idukki District,
PIN: 685 597.

(By Advocate N.Madhusoodhanan Nair)

O.P.42/2013

Petitioner : Muhammed Vettickal,
S/o Abdul Khader, Vettickal,
Perumpallychira P.O.,
Thodupuzha, Idukki District.,
Member, Ward No.11,
Kumaramangalam Grama Panchayat.

(By Advs.Hashim Babu.M., Sajitha.S
& Rasiya Beevi)

Respondent : Jessy Varghese,
Member, Ward No.05,
Kumaramangalam Grama Panchayat,
Idukki District,
PIN: 685 597.

(By Advocate N.Madhusoodhanan Nair)

These petitions having come up for hearing on the 26th day of February 2014, in the presence of Advocates Hashim Babu.M, Sajitha.S & Rasiya Beevi for the petitioner and Advocate N.Madhusoodhanan Nair for the respondents and having stood over for consideration to this day, the Commission passed the following,

COMMON ORDER

These are Petitions filed under Section 4 of the Kerala Local Authorities (Prohibition of Defection) Act for declaring that the respondents have become subject to disqualification for being members of the Kumaramangalam Grama Panchayat. The petitions are filed by a common petitioner and as common questions of law and facts arise for consideration in all these cases, they have been taken up together as per order on I.A No. 112/2013 and O.P. No.40/2013 is treated as the main case.

2. The common allegations raised by the petitioner in all these cases are, in short, as follows:- The petitioner is a member of Kumaramangalam Grama Panchayat belonging to Indian Union Muslim League under UDF Coalition. The respondents contested the election as candidates of Indian National Congress and were elected as members of this Panchayat. Out of the 13 wards, Indian National Congress secured 4 seats and Kerala Congress (M) and Muslim League found victory in one seat each. 3 seats were won by CPI(M) and one seat was won by BJP and 3 independents also found victory. The UDF consisting of Indian National Congress, Kerala Congress (M) and Muslim League along with the independents got majority and Smt. Celine Jerome belonging to Indian National Congress was elected as President and this petitioner was elected as Vice

President. A no confidence motion was moved against the President by the respondents along with certain other members and it was tabled for discussion on 23.05.2013. Specific instruction was given by the Congress party to the respondents to defeat the motion. The respondents along with some others moved the said motion without the knowledge of their political party. All the members of the Congress party including Smt.Celine Jerome supported the motion and thus it was carried. The explanation of the respondents that they voted in favour of the no confidence motion because the President Smt.Celine Jerome also supported the same is not sustainable. The voting was done by secret ballot. The conduct of the respondents in having moved and supported the no confidence motion was deliberate whereas Smt.Celine Jerome voted in favour of the motion accidentally and proper explanation was given to the party which the party accepted and disciplinary actions against her were dropped. In the subsequent election to the post of President scheduled on 17.06.2013, Indian National Congress nominated Smt.Celine Jerome as the official candidate and she was accepted by the UDF also. But the respondent in O.P.No.41/2013 contested against the official candidate of Indian National Congress and she was elected with the support of these respondents and LDF members. Now the respondents are sailing with LDF members and they have voluntarily abandoned their membership from the Congress party. Voting against the official candidates

of Indian National Congress is anti party activity on the part of the respondents and thus they have committed defection by voluntary giving up their membership from the party. Hence these petitions.

3. The respondents filed objections raising common contentions which are short as follows:- There were a number of complaints against the President Smt.Celine Jerome and she was misusing her office and power for personal benefits. The elected members belonging to Congress party requested the District Congress Committee and Kerala Pradesh Congress Committee through the Congress Mandalam Committee to take appropriate action against the President and there were also public meetings and protests against the President headed by the workers and members of Congress party and the respondents were informed that the President was directed to resign by the leaders of Mandalam Committee and District Congress Committee have directed the President to resign from the post. As Smt.Celine Jerome declined to resign a no confidence motion was moved against her so as to solve the crisis. Even the President supported the no confidence motion and also advised the other Congress members to vote in favour of the same. Thus 9 members of the Panchayat voted in support of the no confidence motion and it was carried. There was no direction from any authorized person to vote against the no confidence motion.

The respondents are still members of Congress party and they have not given up their membership from the party. Subsequently in the election to the Post of President, the respondents voted in favour of Smt. Shylaja Balakrishnan in the interest of Congress party. The party never intended that Smt.Celine Jerome was to be reelected as President. Smt.Shylaja Balakrishnan also is a continuing member belonging to Indian National Congress and voting in her favour will not incur disqualification. The respondents have not committed any defection as alleged. The petitions are filed without bonafides and the same are only to be dismissed.

4. The evidence consists of the oral depositions of PWs1 to 3, RW 1 and Exts.P1 to P8 series, R1series and X1series.

5. All parties were heard.

6. The following points arise for consideration;

- (i) Whether the respondents have voluntarily abandoned their membership from the Congress party by voting in favour of the respondent in O.P.No.41/2013 in the election held on 17.06.2013 to the post of President?
- (ii) Whether the respondents have become subject to disqualification for being members of Kumaramangalam Grama Panchayat as alleged?
- (iii) Reliefs and costs?

7. **POINT Nos.(i) to (iii)**: The common petitioner is a member of the Kumaramangalam Grama Panchayat belonging to Indian Union Muslim League and the respondents were elected as members belonging to Indian National Congress. Exts.P2 series are the declarations given by the members of the Kumaramangalam Grama Panchayat showing their political affiliation and Ext.P1 is the register prepared and maintained by the Panchayat on the basis of Exts.P2 series stating the political affiliations of all the members of this Panchayat. Admittedly the respondents contested the election in various wards of Kumaramangalam Grama Panchayat as candidates of Indian National Congress and were elected as members. According to the petitioner, the respondents along with some others moved a no confidence motion against the then President Smt.Celine Jerome and it was tabled for discussion on 23.05.2013. Ext.P3 is the copy of the notice on the no confidence motion moved against the then President by these respondents and certain others and Ext.P4 is the notice given by the authorized officer stating that the same is tabled for discussion on 23.05.2013. Ext.P5 is the copy of the minutes regarding the no confidence motion. Admittedly all the members of Congress party and five others including LDF members voted in favour of the no confidence motion and it was carried. In the subsequent election to the post of President, Smt. Celine Jerome who was ousted by way of the no confidence motion and another member belonging to Congress

party by name Smt. Shylaja Balakrishnan were the candidates for the post of President and in that election Smt.Shylaja Balakrishnan secured seven votes and Smt. Celine Jerome obtained five votes and thus Smt.Shylaja Balakrishnan was elected as President. Ext.P6 is the copy of the minutes regarding the election to the post of President.

8. The definite case of the common petitioner is that specific instructions were given by the Congress party to its members to defeat the no confidence motion and by disobeying that direction, all the members of the Congress party voted in favour of the no confidence motion and the then President Smt.Celine Jerome gave explanation stating that she happened to vote in favour of that motion by mistake and pleaded for pardon and her explanation was accepted. The explanations of the respondents were unsustainable and so disciplinary actions were initiated against them. It is further alleged that in the subsequent election to the post of President held on 17.06.2013, Smt.Celine Jerome was the official candidate of the Congress party and UDF and that Smt.Shylaja Balakrishnan, the respondent in O.P.No.41/2013 contested against her and with the support of LDF members she was elected as President and now she is sailing with LDF members and thus the respondents by voting against the official candidate have voluntarily given up their membership from the party. The respondents on the other hand would contend that they had moved the no

confidence motion with full knowledge and consent of the party leadership and that Smt.Celine Jerome also supported the said motion and that no directions were given by the Congress party to defeat the motion and that in the subsequent election to the post of President, they supported a member belonging to Congress party itself and that Smt.Celine Jerome was not an official candidate of Congress party or UDF and that the respondents have not committed any defection.

9. The petitioner has been examined as PW1. As already pointed out he being a member belonging to Indian Union Muslim League may not be able to speak of the internal politics of the Congress party and his evidence is not of much help to consider whether the respondents have voluntarily given up their membership from the Congress party. At the same time the documents produced by the petitioner along with other evidence require close scrutiny. The Idukki DCC President has been examined as PW2. He has deposed that four Congress members were elected in the Kumaramangalam Grama Panchayat and the UDF with the support of independents secured majority and Smt.Celine Jerome was elected as President and the petitioner as Vice President. A no confidence motion was moved by some members of the Congress party along with the LDF members and the DCC President convened a meeting of the Congress members and directed them to defeat the no confidence motion and also issued direction to them to vote against the motion and a copy of the whip so issued was given to the

Returning Officer also and the said copies of directions given to the Returning Officer as well as to the Congress members are marked as Exts.P7 series. PW2 has further deposed that all the Congress members, by disobeying his direction voted in favour of the no confidence motion and he sought explanation from the members and as the respondents had disobeyed the direction issued by him they have voluntarily abandoned their membership from the party and they were suspended from the party for having committed defection. PW2 has also deposed that in the subsequent election to the post of President, Smt.Celine Jerome was again nominated as the candidate and the respondent in O.P.No.41/2013 contested against her and with the support of all the respondents and LDF members, the respondent in O.P.No.41/2013 was elected as President. In cross-examination PW2 has admitted that there is no record relating to the meeting of the members to Congress party convened by him after receiving the notice on the no confidence motion and there is also no record showing the persons who had attended that meeting. PW2 has also admitted that there is no record relating to the decision taken in that meeting. According to PW2 his directions were served directly by the Block President at their houses. PW2 has further stated that no acknowledgments were received from the members while serving the directions. It was suggested to PW2 that Exts.P7 series were created subsequently which he denied. According to PW2, the suspension against Smt Celine Jerome was

cancelled by accepting her explanation that she voted in favour of the no confidence motion by mistake and she pleaded for pardon. It was again suggested to PW2 that no directions were given as stated by him to which he answered that such directions were given to the members. PW2 has further stated that the decision to again nominate Smt.Celine Jerome has not been produced before this Commission. He has asserted that there is record showing that Smt. Celine Jerome was decided as the official candidate for the post of President. To the further question as to whether the directions were given in the election to the post of President his answer is that whips could not be served to the Congress members as they were under suspension. According to PW2 these respondents were already under suspension and so they were not given whip in the election to the post of President. The Thodupuzha Block President has been examined as PW3. He has deposed that as authorized by the DCC President he went to the houses of the Congress members and gave the whips to them and as they refused to receive the whip, the same were left on the table in front of them and he returned. He has also deposed that a meeting of the members was convened by the DCC President on 21.05.2013 wherein it was decided to defeat the no confidence motion.

10. The respondent in O.P.No.42/2013 has been examined as RW1. He has deposed that no confidence motion was moved against the then President as

instructed by the Mandalam Congress Committee and the Mandalam Congress Committee had given such instructions as instructed by the Congress leadership and that no directions were given by the Congress party to defeat the no confidence motion and in the subsequent election to the post to the post of President. Smt.Shylaja Balakrishnan was the candidate decided by the Congress mandalam Committee and there was no direction from the District Congress Committee regarding the candidate for that post. It was suggested to RW1 in cross-examination that Ext.P7 series directions were given to defeat the no confidence motion which she denied. According to RW1 the respondents voted in favour of the no confidence motion as instructed by the then President also and that the then President also supported that motion. The show cause notices given by the DCC President after the voting on the no confidence motion and the explanations tendered by the then President and these respondents are marked as Exts.X1 series.

11. These petitions are filed under Section 4 of the Kerala Local Authorities (Prohibition of Defection) Act, for short the 'Act' to disqualify these respondents on the ground that they have voluntarily abandoned their membership from the party by voting in favour of the respondent in O.P.No.41/2013 who contested for the post of President against Smt.Celine Jerome the official candidate of Indian National Congress. Of course there are

allegations in the original petitions that these respondents have disobeyed the direction of the DCC President in having voted in favour of the no confidence motion moved against the then Panchayat President Smt.Celine Jerome. Section 3 of the Act deals with the disqualification on the ground of defection. Section 3(1)(a) of the Act is relevant in these cases and it reads as follows,-

“3. Disqualification on ground of Defection,-

1)Notwithstanding anything contained in the Kerala Panchayat Raj Act, 1994 (13 of 1994), or in the Kerala Municipality Act, 1994 (20 of 1994), or in any other law for the time being in force, subject to the other provisions of this Act.

(a)if a member of local authority belonging to any political party voluntarily gives up his membership of such political party, or if such member, contrary to any direction in writing issued by the political party to which he belongs or by a person or authority authorized by it in this behalf in the manner prescribed, votes or abstains from voting.

(i)in a meeting of Municipality, in an election of its Chairperson, Deputy Chairperson, a member of standing committee or the Chairman of a standing committee; or

(ii) in a meeting of a Panchayat, in an election of its President, Vice President, a member of a Standing Committee; or the Chairman of the Standing Committee; or in an voting on a no-confidence motion against any one of them except a member of a Standing Committee. he shall be disqualified for being a member of that local authority.”

These petitions are filed under **Section 4(1)** of the Act which reads as follows,-

“4.Decision on question as to disqualification on ground of defection, (1) if any question arises as to whether a member of the local authority has become subject to disqualification under the provisions of the Act a member of that local authority or the political party concerned or a person authorized by it in this behalf may file a petition before the State Election Commission for decision.”

12. Section 4A of the Kerala Local Authorities (Disqualification of Defected Members) Rules deals with petitions filed under Section 4(1) of the Act. As per Rule 4A(1) of the Rules when a question arises as to whether a

member of the local authority has become subject to disqualification any member of that local authority or a person who is competent to issue direction to the members can file a petition before this Commission and as per sub-Rule (2) of Rule 4A of the Rules, such a petition is to be filed within 15 days from the date on which the member is deemed to have become subject to disqualification. However as per its proviso, a petition filed beyond such period can be entertained by the Commission on satisfying sufficient grounds. In these petitions it is categorically stated that the cause of action has arisen on 17.06.2013, the date on which the respondents have voluntarily abandoned their membership from the party by voting in favour of Smt.Shylaja Balakrishnan to the post of President. So the short question to be considered is whether Smt. Celine Jerome was the official candidate of Indian National Congress in the election to the post of President held on 17.06.2013.

13. Admittedly Smt.Celine Jerome as well as Smt.Shylaja Balakrishnan contested the election held in October 2010 as candidates of Indian National Congress and were elected as members. It is also an admitted fact that these respondents had voted in favour of Shylaja Balakrishnan in the election held on 17.06.2013. PW2, the DCC President has deposed that Smt. Celine Jerome was the official candidate of Indian National Congress in the election to the post of

President held on 17.06.2013. But he has categorically admitted that there is no record to show that Smt.Celine Jerome was decided as the candidate for that post. PW2 has also admitted that no direction was given to these respondents to vote in favour of Smt. Celine Jerome in the election held on 17.06.2013. His further clarification in this regard is that the respondents were under suspension during the time of the election to the post of President and so he did not give any direction to them. So the fact that there is no acceptable evidence to prove that Smt.Celine Jerome was the official candidate of Indian National Congress in the election held on 17.06.2013 assumes importance. The oral version of PW2 that Smt.Celine Jerome was the official candidate of Congress party in the said election, without any supporting records, cannot be relied on to hold that Smt.Celine Jerome was decided as the official candidate for the post of President in the said election. Since no instructions were given to these respondents regarding the nomination of Smt.Celine Jerome as official candidate, it cannot be said that they were aware of such a decision or that they had disobeyed any decision of the party. Without a proper direction given to the members, it cannot be expected that the members will be aware of the decision of their political party in such an election. As per 3(1)(a) of the Act a direction is to be given in writing and without such a written direction it cannot be said that Smt.Celine Jerome was the official candidate of Congress party in the said election. Even though the

petitions are filed on the basis of a cause of action regarding the election to the post of President, the ingredients required to constitute defection as provided by Section 3(1)(a) of the Act are found to have been not proved in these cases.

14. Section 3(1)(a) of the Act consists of two limbs. The first limb is attracted when a member of the local authority belonging to any political party voluntarily gives up his membership of such political party and the second limb is attracted when such member violates the written direction of the political party or of the person authorized by it in this behalf in respect of the voting in an election to the post of President, Vice President, Standing Committee Members or Chairman or on a no confidence motion. It is stated that the respondents have not voted in favour of the official candidate of Congress party in the election to the post of President and they voted in favour of another candidate Smt.Shylaja Balakrishnan and thus voluntarily abandoned their membership from the party. I have already pointed out that the petitioner has completely failed in proving that Smt.Celine Jerome was decided as the official candidate of the Congress party. There is no acceptable evidence to prove that Smt.Celine Jerome was nominated by the party to that post. Admittedly there is no record showing that Smt.Celine Jerome was decided as the official candidate of the Congress party in the election to the post of President held on 17.06.2013. It is also an admitted fact that no communication or direction was given to these respondents stating that

Smt.Celine Jerome was the official candidate for the post of President and they were not directed to vote in her favour in the election held on 17.06.2013. In the absence of any such decision regarding the nomination of Smt.Celine Jerome as candidate for the post of President, it is futile to say that she was the official candidate of the Congress party. This is more so on account of the reason that Smt.Shylaja Balakrishnan also is a member belonging to Congress party. The fact that a no confidence motion was moved against Smt.Celine Jerome by the respondents cannot be mixed up with the subsequent election to the post of President for the reason that the cause of action in both these instances are entirely different. Since the specific cause of action in these cases is the election to the post of President held on 17.06.2013, the previous conduct of the respondents will not have any bearing on the question of defection based on the election to the post of President. The fact that Smt.Celine Jerome also voted in favour of the no confidence motion moved against her cannot be overlooked. As already pointed out the petitioner has completely failed in proving that Smt.Celine Jerome was decided as the official candidate of Congress party and also that the respondents were aware of such a decision, if any, of the Congress party before voting in favour of Smt.Shylaja Balakrishnan in the election to the post of President. Whether the LDF members had voted in favour of Smt.Shylaja Balakrishnan is not at all a relevant aspect in deciding the present allegation of

defection in respect of voting against the so called official candidate of the Congress party.

15. On a careful analysis of the entire facts and materials on record it is clearly found that the petitioner has completely failed in proving that Smt.Celine Jerome was decided as the official candidate of Indian National Congress in the election to the post of President held on 17.06.2013 and in the light of admitted fact that no communication was given to these respondents stating that Smt.Celine Jerome was the official candidate of Congress party or a direction to vote in her favour in that election, the conduct of the respondents in having voted in favour of Smt.Shylaja Balakrishnan, another member belonging to Congress party will not tantamount voluntarily giving up membership from the Congress party. It is significant note that according to PW2 himself no direction could have been given to the respondents to vote in favour of Smt.Celine Jerome for the reason that they were already under suspension for having moved and supported a no confidence motion against Smt. Celine Jerome. If that be the position, the voting against the official candidate of Congress party cannot be taken up as a ground at all for filing a petition under Section 4(1) of the Act. If by the conduct of the respondents in having moved and supported that no confidence motion against the then President had amounted to voluntary giving

up their membership from the party, petitions should have been filed on such a cause of action.

16. The learned Counsel for the petitioner would argue that the previous and subsequent conduct of the respondents will clearly indicate that they have defected from the Congress party. The petitioner has stated in detail regarding the no confidence motion moved against the Smt.Celine Jerome the then President and also supporting the said motion against the direction of the Congress party. As a matter of fact even Smt.Celine Jerome had supported that motion as seen from Ext.P5. No doubt PW2 has deposed that the no confidence motion was moved without the consent and knowledge of the Congress party and that directions were given to the Congress members to defeat the said motion. Ext.P7 series are stated to be directions given by PW2 to the members of the Congress party. However there is no acceptable evidence to prove that these directions were given to these respondents. According to PW2 the directions were served by the Block President. PW3, the Block President has deposed that he went to the houses of the respondents with these directions and when he tendered the same to these respondents they refused to receive and so the directions were placed on the table lying in front of them and he returned. The service of such directions as deposed by PW3 is totally unacceptable. At first there is no reliable evidence to prove that a meeting of the members was

convened by the DCC President before the no confidence motion was taken up for discussion. Secondly there is no acceptable evidence to prove that directions were given to the members belonging to Congress party to defeat the no confidence motion. As per sub-section 2 of Section 3 of the Act copy of the direction is to be given to the Secretary of the concerned local authority. The petitioner does not have a case that a copy of the direction was given to the Secretary of the local authority. PW2 also does not say that the copy of direction was given to the Secretary of the local authority. As per sub-rule 2 of Rule 4 of the Rules the direction in writing when given directly, the person who gives it shall obtain a receipt from the member and while sending it by registered post it shall be done along with acknowledgment due and while effecting it by affixing it shall be done in the presence of at least two witnesses. In the cases on hand none of these modes have been resorted to in respect of giving the directions. According to PW3 the service has been made by placing the directions on the table in the houses of the respondents and no acknowledgments have been received regarding receipt of the same from the respondents. Moreover PW3 states that the respondents have refused to receive the same. In such a case the directions should have been sent by registered post or should have been affixed in front of their houses in the presence of two witnesses. But PW3 has not followed any of the procedures prescribed under the Rules. On a careful analysis of the

entire facts it is clearly found that there is no acceptable evidence regarding service of the directions to the respondents. Of course the members belonging to a Congress party are not entitled to vote in favour of a no confidence motion moved against the President belonging to their own party without the consent and concurrence of the DCC President. But even the then President against whom the motion was moved voted in favour of the same. However no petitions were filed on the basis of the said cause of action. For this reason, Ext.X1 series also do not have any relevance in these cases. More obligations in the petition regarding the no confidence motion cannot create a cause of action. Only for completeness of the rival claims, I have discussed about these allegations also in this order. If the matter of no confidence motion was to be taken up as a ground for disqualification, then the petitions should have been filed within 15 days from the date on which the motion was passed and if the petitions were filed beyond that date on the same ground, the petitions should have been filed with delay condonation applications. In such a case the subsequent event of election of President will become irrelevant. In the same way as these petitions are filed on the ground of election of one of the respondent as President by violating the decision of DCC President, the previous conduct of the respondents in the no confidence motion become irrelevant. So the conduct of the respondents in having voted in favour of the no confidence motion cannot be considered as a

ground to disqualify them in these cases. Since no decision or direction of the DCC President to elect Smt.Celin Jerome as President was communicated to the respondents then also these respondents cannot be held as having committed defection.

17. From the discussion held above I hold that the petitioner has completely failed in proving that the respondents have voluntarily abandoned their membership from the party as alleged in these petitions. So the petitions are only to be dismissed. The points are answered accordingly.

Hence the petitions are dismissed.

The parties shall bear their respective costs.

Pronounced before the Commission on this the 14th day of March 2014

**K.SASIDHARAN NAIR,
STATE ELECTION COMMISSIONER.**

APPENDIX

Witnesses examined on the side of the petitioner

- PW1 : Sri. Muhammed Vettickal, Vettickal House,
Perumbillichira P.O., Thodupuzha
- PW2 : Sri.Roy K. Poulose, Konnanal, Thodupuzha
- PW3 : Sri.C.J.Joseph, Thyvil, Olamattam, Thodupuzha P.O.

Witnesses examined on the side of the respondent

RW1 : Smt. Jessy Varghese, Member, Kumaramangalam
Grama Panchayat

Documents produced on the side of the petitioner

- P1 : Copy of the register showing the party affiliation of the members of Kumaramangalam Grama Panchayat
- P2 : Copy of the Declaration in Form No.2 submitted by Smt.Jessy George, Member, Ward No.V
- P2(a) : Copy of the Declaration in Form No.2 submitted by Smt.Lissa Jins, Member, Ward No.IX
- P3 : Copy of the notice to no confidence motion against Smt.Salim George, President, Kumaramangalam Grama Panchayat
- P4 : Notice No.B2-1141/2013 of the Secretary, Thodupuzha Block Panchayat
- P5 : Copy of the minutes of the meeting to the discussion of no confidence motion against
- P6 : Copy of the minutes of the meeting to elect the President, Kumaramangalam Grama Panchayat
- P7 : Copy of the direction dated 22.05.2013 issued by the President, Idukki DCC, addressed to the Returning Officer, Kumaramangalam Grama Panchayat
- P7(a) : Copy of the direction dated 22.05.2013 issued by the President, Idukki DCC, addressed to Smt.Jessy Varghese, Kumaramangalam Grama Panchayat
- P7(b) : Copy of the direction dated 22.05.2013 issued by the President, Idukki DCC, addressed to Sri.Sinoy George, Kumaramangalam Grama Panchayat
- P7(c) : Copy of the direction dated 22.05.2013 issued by the

President, Idukki DCC, addressed to Smt.Lissa Jins,
Kumaramangalam Grama Panchayat

P7(d) : Copy of the direction dated 22.05.2013 issued by the
President, Idukki DCC, addressed to
Smt.Shylaja Balakrishnan, Kumaramangalam Grama
Panchayat

P8 : Letter dated 05.06.2013 of Smt.Jessy Varghese

P8 (a) : Letter dated 05.06.2013 of Smt.Shylaja Balakrishnan

Documents produced on the side of the Respondent

R1 : Greetings card of Sri.Roy K.Poulose, President,DCC Idukki

R1(a) : Envelop addressed to Smt.Jessy Varghese

Document produced on the side of the witness

X1 : Copy of the letter dated 28.05.2013 of Sri.T.J.Joseph,
President, Congress (I) Block Committee, Thodupuzha
addressed to Smt.Selin Jerome

X1(a) : Copy of the letter of Smt.Selin Jerome addressed to
Sri.T.J.Joseph

X1(b) : Copy of the letter dated 28.05.2013 of Sri.T.J.Joseph,
President, Congress (I) Block Committee, Thodupuzha
addressed to Smt.Shylaja Balakrishnan

X1(c) : Copy of the letter dated 28.05.2013 of Sri.T.J.Joseph,
President, Congress (I) Block Committee, Thodupuzha
addressed to Smt.Lissa Jins

X1(d) : Copy of the letter dated 28.05.2013 of Sri.T.J.Joseph,
President, Congress (I) Block Committee, Thodupuzha
addressed to Smt.Jessy Varghese

- X1(e) : Copy of the letter dated 14.06.2013 of Sri.T.J.Joseph, President, Congress (I) Block Committee, Thodupuzha addressed to Smt.Selin Jerome
- X1(f) : Copy of the letter dated 05.06.2013 of Smt.Shylaja Balakrishnan Nair, Chairman, Health Education Standing Committee, Kumaramangalam Grama Panchayat addressed to Sri.T.J.Joseph
- X1(g) : Copy of the letter dated 05.06.2013 of Smt.Jessy Varghese, Chairman, Development Standing Committee, Kumaramangalam Grama Panchayat addressed to Sri.T.J.Joseph
- X(h) : Copy of the letter dated 05.06.2013 of Sri.Sinoj Jose, Member, Kumaramangalam Grama Panchayat addressed to Sri.T.J.Joseph
- X(i) : Copy of the letter dated 05.06.2013 of Smt.Lissa Jins, Member, Ward No.9. Kumaramangalam Grama Panchayat addressed to Sri.T.J.Joseph

**K.SASIDHARAN NAIR,
STATE ELECTION COMMISSIONER.**