

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

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

**Tuesday, the 9<sup>th</sup> day of December 2014**

**O.P.Nos.6/2014, 7/2014, 8/2014 AND 9/2014**

**O.P.No.6/2013**

Petitioner : Abraham Abraham,  
S/o Varghese Abraham,  
Kuzhuvomannil, Kuriyanoor P.O.,  
Pathanamthitta District,  
PIN: 689 550.  
Member, Ward No.7(Nedumprayal),  
Thottapuzhassery Grama Panchayat.

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

Respondent : T.K.Ramachandran Nair,  
S/o Krishnapillai, Thanathethu,  
Kuriyanoor P.O.  
Pathanamthitta District,  
PIN: 689 550.  
Member, Ward No.3,(Maramkolli)  
Thottapuzhassery Grama Panchayat,

**(By Advs. Rajan Babu & R.S.Binukumar)**

**O.P.No7/2013**

Petitioner : Abraham Abraham,  
S/o Varghese Abraham,  
Kuzhuvomannil, Kuriyanoor P.O.,  
Pathanamthitta District,  
PIN: 689 550.  
Member, Ward No.7(Nedumprayal),  
Thottapuzhassery Grama Panchayat.

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

Respondent : K.R.Retnakumari Amma,  
W/o Narayanan Nair, Mullottil  
Vellangoor, Maramon P.O.  
Pathanamthitta District, Pin-689 549.  
Member, Ward No.9,  
Thottapuzhassery Grama Panchayat,

**(By Advs. Rajan Babu & R.S.Binukumar)**

**O.P.No.8/2013**

Petitioner : Abraham Abraham,  
S/o Varghese Abraham,  
Kuzhuvomannil, Kuriyannur P.O.,  
Pathanamthitta District,  
PIN: 689 550.  
Member, Ward No.7(Nedumprayal),  
Thottapuzhassery Grama Panchayat.

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

Respondent : Elsi Christopher,  
W/o Christopher, Palaparambil,  
Kuriyannur P.O.,  
Pathanamthitta District,  
PIN: 689 550.  
Member, Ward No.6,(Kattepuram)  
Thottapuzhassery Grama Panchayat,

**(By Advs. Rajan Babu & R.S.Binukumar)**

**O.P.No.9/2013**

Petitioner : Abraham Abraham,  
S/o Varghese Abraham,  
Kuzhuvomannil, Kuriyanoor P.O.,  
Pathanamthitta District,  
PIN: 689 550.  
Member, Ward No.7(Nedumprayal),  
Thottapuzhassery Grama Panchayat.

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

Respondent : Elsamma Johnson,  
W/o Johnson, Peedikayil,  
Chiryirambu P.O.  
Pathanamthitta District,  
PIN: 689 549.  
Member, Ward No.12,(Chiryirambu)  
Thottapuzhassery Grama Panchayat,

**(By Advs. Rajan Babu & R.S.Binukumar)**

These petitions having come up for hearing on the 25<sup>th</sup> day of October 2014, in the presence of Advs. **M.Hashim Babu & Sajitha.S** for the petitioner and Advs. **Rajan Babu & R.S.Binukumar** 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(1) of the Kerala Local Authorities (Prohibition of Defection) Act for declaring that the respective respondents have become subject to disqualification for being members of Thottapuzhassery Grama Panchayat. Since common questions of law and facts arise for consideration in all these cases, they have been taken up together and O.P.No.6/2014 is treated as the main case.

2. The common allegations raised in the petitions are in brief, as follows:-  
The petitioner and respondents are elected as members of Thottapuzhassery Grama Panchayat belonging to Congress party. Out of the 13 wards the Indian National Congress secured 5 seats, Kerala Congress (M) found victory in one seat, the CPI(M) won in 3 seats, CPI secured one seat, Kerala Congress (P.C.Thomas) found victory in one seat and two independent candidates also were elected. Thus the UDF secured 6 seats and the LDF secured 5 seats. The UDF coalition with the support of two independent members decided to form the Board. It was also decided to elect the respondent in O.P.6/2014 as president for a term of 2½ years and the remaining period was agreed to be allotted to the petitioner. Smt.Shiny Saju belonging to Kerala Congress (M) was elected as Vice President for the first term of 2½ years and the remaining period was decided to be allotted Smt.K.R.Renta Kumari Amma belonging to Congress

party. The respondent in O.P.No.6/2014 refused resign after 2½ years and upon the written direction of the DCC President, he resigned from that post in May 2013. The election to the post of President was scheduled on 03.06.2013. In the said election by Sri.P.G.Ramachandran Nair belonging to CPI(M) who contested against the petitioner was elected as President because of the change of stand by the independent members. Sri.P.G.Ramachandran Nair was removed by way of a no confidence motion mooted by UDF on 31.12.2013. Again the President election was scheduled on 23.01.2014. The Congress party decided the petitioner as the President candidate for that post. In the meeting held at the DCC office in the presence of DCC President and other Congress leaders, the petitioner and other Congress members attended the meeting. In the said meeting the respondent in O.P.No.7/2014 was directed to propose the name of the petitioner to the post of President and the respondent in O.P.No.8/2014 was directed to second the petitioner. Whip of the DCC President to vote in favour of the petitioner was served in the meeting and it was communicated to all the Congress members. In the election to the post of President the respondent in O.P.No.7/2014 did not propose the name of the petitioner and the respondent in O.P.No.8/2014 did not support the petitioner. However the name of the respondent in O.P.No.6/2014 was proposed and second by independent members and the other respondents took a stand to support him. The respondents had

violated the direction of the DCC President by not supporting the petitioner in the election to the post of President and as against the direction of the DCC President, the respondent in O.P.No.6/2014 contested and was elected as President with the support of all the respondents. To contest against the direction of the political party is nothing but disloyalty which constitute defection. The decision of the political party to elect the petitioner as President was disobeyed by the respondents and thereby they had voluntarily given up their membership from the party. Hence these petitions.

3. The respondents have raised common contentions which are in short as follows,- The petitions are not maintainable either in law or on facts. It is true that the respondents are elected as members of Thottapuzhassery Grama Panchayat belonging to Congress party. It is also true that there was an agreement regarding the sharing of President post in this Panchayat. On the direction of the DCC President the respondent in O.P.No.6/2014 resigned and after his resignation fresh election to the post of President was scheduled on 03.06.2013. The petitioner contested in that election. But he was defeated as two independent members did not give him support and the LDF candidate Sri.P.G.Ramachandran Nair was elected as President with their support. He was removed by way of a no confidence motion on 31.12.2013. Fresh election to the post of President was scheduled on 23.01.2014. In this regard the respondents

did not attend any discussions with the DCC President. In the election hall all the members were present. Before the election process started the petitioner requested the support of two independent members and as they denied him support he realized that he would not be elected even if all the UDF members had supported him and as he was not willing to be defeated again he walked out of the hall and boycotted that election. Thereafter the independent members proposed and seconded the name of the respondent in O.P.No.6/2014 and thus he was elected as President. There is no violation of any direction by these respondents. The District Congress Committee had never issued or served any whip to these respondents directing them to vote in favour of the petitioner. The respondents are loyal members belonging to Congress party and they had never violated the party's declared policies. It is true that this respondent had resigned for electing the petitioner as President. But he could not muster the support of two independent members and thus lost in that election. The independent members informed that they will never support the petitioner. Because of the non support from the independent members, the petitioner boycotted the election. The respondent in O.P.No.6/2014 was advised by the leaders of the Congress party that the party should not lose president post. The respondents have never committed defection and they have never defied the direction of the DCC President. Therefore this petitions deserves only dismissal.

4. The evidence consists of the oral depositions of PWs1 to 3, RWs1 and 2 and Exts.P1 to P8series and R1.

5. Both sides were heard

6. The following points arise for consideration;

- (i) Whether the petitions are not maintainable?
- (ii) Whether the respondents have voluntarily given up their membership from the Congress party as provided by Section 3(1)(a) of the Kerala Local Authorities (Prohibition of Defection) Act as alleged?
- (iii) Whether the respondents have become subject to disqualification for being members of Thottapuzhassery Grama Panchayat?
- (iv) Reliefs and costs?

7. **ISSUE No.(i)**: The petitions are filed under Section 4(1) of the Kerala Local Authorities (Prohibition of Defection) Act, for short the 'Act' alleging that the respondents have acted against the decision of the parliamentary party and the direction of the DCC President in respect of voting in the election to the post of Vice President held on 23.01.2014 and thereby they committed defection. The respondent would deny such allegations. Section 4(1) of the Act states that if any question arises as to whether a member of a local authority has become subject to disqualification under the provisions of this Act, a member of that local authority or the political party concerned or a person authorized by it in this behalf can file a petition before the State Election Commission for decision. Admittedly the



parties were elected as members belonging to Congress party. So Section 3(1)(a) of the Act applies. Section 3(1)(a) states that if a member of a local authority belonging to any political party voluntarily gives up his membership of such political party, or if he violates the direction in writing issued by the political party or by a person or authority authorized by it in this behalf, in an election to the post of President, Vice President, Standing Committee Chairman or members or on a no confidence motion moved against any one of them except a Standing Committee member, he shall be disqualified for being a member of that local authority. The petitions are filed by a member of the same Grama Panchayat of which the respondents also are members. So the petitioner is competent to file the petition as provided by Section 4(1) of the Act and Rule 4A(1) of the Kerala Local Authorities (Disqualification of Defected Members) Rules. No doubt in the present set of facts a question arises as to whether the respondents are disqualified on account of the alleged defection for being members of the Panchayat. The petitions are filed within the period prescribed under Rule 4A(2) of the Kerala Local Authorities (Disqualification of Defected Members) Rules. Apart from raising a vague contention that the petitions are not maintainable, no tenable grounds are stated to support such a contention. On a careful appreciation of all facts I find that the petitions are maintainable. The issue is answered accordingly.

8. **ISSUE Nos.(ii) to (iv)**: Since common questions of law and facts arise for consideration in all these points, they are taken up together for brevity and convenience. Certain facts are note in dispute. The petitioner and respondents were elected as members of Thottapuzhassery Grama Panchayat belonging to Indian National Congress. The petitioner as PW1 and the DCC President as PW3 have deposed that the respondents had contested in the General Election held in 2010 to the Thottapuzhassery Grama Panchayat as candidates of Indian National Congress and that PW3 had recommended the official symbol of Congress party to them for contesting in that election. The respondents also admit that they were elected as members belonging to Congress party. Ext.P1 which is the copy of the record maintained by the Secretary of the Panchayat relating to the political affiliations of the members of the Panchayat would further prove that the respondents were elected as members belonging to Congress party. Out of the total 13 members in the Panchayat, the UDF secured 6 seats out of which 5 seats were won by Congress party and one seat by Kerala Congress (M). LDF secured 5 seats and 2 independents also were elected. The UDF with the support of independents came to power and the respondent in O.P.No.6/2014 was elected as President. There was understanding to share the post of President and Vice President and after 2 ½ years the respondent in O.P.6/2014 was to vacate the office of the President to pave way for the petitioner to become the President.

The respondent in O.P.No.6/2014 resigned on 06.05.2013 and election to the post of President was scheduled to be held on 03.06.2013. In conformity with the original understanding, the petitioner was decided the official candidate and he contested for the post of President. But the two independent members did not support him and with their support are LDF member became the President. The UDF moved a no confidence motion against the President and it was passed on 31.12.2013. Subsequently the election to the post of President was scheduled to be held on 23.01.2014.

9. According to the petitioner the petitioner was decided as the candidate as per the original understanding and a meeting was held at DCC office in the presence of the DCC President and other Congress leaders in which the petitioner and other Congress members had attended and in that meeting it was decided that the respondent in O.P.No.7/2014 will propose the name of the petitioner and the respondent in O.P.No.8/2014 will second the petitioner as President candidate and the DCC President had served the whip directing the Congress members to vote in favour of the petitioner and that it was communicated to all Congress members. It is further alleged that when the election process started the respondent in O.P.Nos.7/2014 and 8/2014 did not proposed or a second the name of the petitioner and so he could not contest in the election and the name of the respondent in O.P.No.6/2014 was proposed and seconded by independent

members and thereupon he contested and became the President with the support all the respondents and the independent members and thereby they disobeyed the direction or decision of the Congress party and DCC President and thus committed defection. The contention of the respondents is that when the election process started the petitioner became fully aware that he will not get the support of two independent members and so he declared that he was not willing to be defeated again and walked out of the election hall and boycotted the said election and it was only thereafter that the independent members proposed and seconded the name of the respondent in O.P.No.6/2014 and he to accept the same or otherwise the UDF will lose the post of President. It is also contended that there was no meeting in the presence of DCC President and no whip was served by the DCC President to the respondents and so it cannot be said that they have disobeyed the direction of the DCC President or the party.

10. In the above set of facts the short question to be decided is whether the Congress party or the DCC President had issued any direction to the respondents to vote in favour of the petitioner to the post of President. In the election held on 23.01.2014. The fact that there was a former understanding to elect the petitioner as President after the first 2 ½ years is not in dispute. The further fact that all the respondents voted in favour of the petitioner in the election held on 03.06.2013 also is not in dispute. However in that election the LDF member

Sri.P.G.Ramachandran Nair became the President with the support of two independent members. Subsequently he was removed by way of a no confidence motion on 31.12.2013. It is in the next election to the post of President that a direction was said to have been given by the DCC President to all the Congress members to vote in favour of the petitioner. The petitioner as PW1 has deposed that a meeting was convened in the DCC office in which the petitioner was decided as the President candidate and the DCC President had served the whip to the respondents in O.P.Nos.7/2014 and 8/2014 at the said office itself and the copy of that whip is stated to be Ext.P3. PW1 would further depose that the DCC President had authorized the petitioner who was the parliamentary party leader to serve whip to the other respondents and accordingly he served whip to them and these whips are stated to be Ext.P4 series. The DCC President as PW3 has deposed that the petitioner was decided as the President candidate in the election held on 23.01.2014 in the meeting convened by him and the respondent in O.P.No.7/2014 was directed to propose the name of the petitioner and the respondent in O.P.No.8/2014 was directed to support him and accordingly he issued whip to the members and the petitioner was authorized to serve the said whip to the respondents. Ext.P3 is stated to be the whip issued by him and Ext.P4 series are stated as the directions served to the respondents as authorized by him. Ext.P3 is found to be the whip prepared by PW3 in original and there is

no mention that the said whip was served to any of the respondents. Ext.P3 is the whip dated 21.01.2014. The petitioner does not have a case that the respondents had received Ext.P3 whip and gave acknowledgment for the same. The version of the petitioner that Ext.P3 whip was served to the respondents in O.P.Nos.7/2014 and 8/2014 directly stands not proved. Rule 4(2) of the Local Authorities (Disqualification of Defected Members) Rules prescribes the manner in which a direction issued is to be served and it reads as follows,-

*“While issuing a direction under sub-rule (1) 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.[Copy of the direction in writing shall also be given to the Secretary.]”*

11. In the cases on hand there is no evidence to prove that Ext.P3 whip was served to the respondents in any of the manner provided under the above Rule. There is also no acceptable evidence to prove that a meeting was convened at the DCC office in which the DCC President had issued the whip to the members. Even the DCC President as PW3 would depose that he had authorized petitioner to serve the whip to the respondents and Ext.P4 series are stated to be

the said whips served by the petitioner to the respondents. Ext.P4 is in the letter head of the petitioner showing his capacity as the Congress Mandalam Committee President. The evidence indicates that the petitioner in his capacity as the Congress parliamentary party leader had issued this whip. On a perusal of Ext.P4 series it is found that they are only directions given by the petitioner in his capacity as the UDF parliamentary party leader to vote in his favour in the election to the post of President held on 23.01.2014 and the respondents in O.P.Nos.7/2014 to 9/2014 are found to have accepted the same. Ext.P4 series are dated 20.01.2014 whereas the date of Ext.P3 is 21.01.2014. So it cannot be held that Ext.P4 series was issued as authorized by the DCC President. Moreover according to PW3 he had authorized the petitioner to serve his whip to the respondents and that authorization was not to issue a direction by the petitioner in his capacity as the Congress parliamentary party leader. Exts.P4 series cannot be considered as a whip or direction as provided by law. Direction in writing which is popularly called as whip is defined in Clause (iva) of Section 2 of the Kerala Local Authorities (Prohibition of Defection) Act as amended by Act 6 of 2013, which came into force on 17.01.2012 and it reads as follows,-

*“(iva) direction in writing” means a direction in writing, signed with date, issued to a member belonging to, or having the support of, a political party, by the person*

*authorized by the political party from time to time recommend the symbol of the said political party for contesting in election, for exercising the vote favourably or unfavourably or to abstain from voting”*

12. Of course Ext.P3 could be considered as a direction in writing as provided by the above clause. But there is no evidence to show that Ext.P3 was served to the respondents. Ext.P4 is seen to have been issued by the petitioner in his capacity as the UDF parliamentary party leader. UDF Parliamentary party leader is not competent to issue any direction in writing to a member belonging to Congress party. Since the respondents are members belonging to Congress party. Section 3(1)(a) of the Act alone would apply and it reads as follows,-

*“3.(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.”*

13. As per the above provision a direction in writing is to be issued by the political party in which the member belongs or by a person or authority authorized by it in this behalf in the manner prescribed. The person competent to issue direction in writing as regards these respondents are concerned is definitely the DCC President because admittedly he had recommended symbol for the respondents for contesting in the election to the Panchayat. However there is no evidence to prove that PW3 had given any direction in writing to the respondents as provided by law. The parliamentary party leader of a coalition can issue direction only to an independent member belonging to the coalition as provided

by Rule 4(2) of the Local Authorities (Disqualification of Defected Members) Rules and not to a member belonging to a political party. Therefore I find that Exts.P3 and P4 and the evidence of PWs 1 to 3 do not in anyway support the case of the petitioner that the respondents had served with any direction in writing to vote in favour of the petitioner in the election to the post of President held on 23.01.2014 as alleged.

14. From the evidence and materials and record it is found that the Congress party nor the DCC President has not issued any direction in writing to the respondents to elect the petitioner as President. It appears to be true that in the election held on 23.01.2014 the petitioner could not contest as nobody had proposed and seconded his name. Ext.P6(b) minutes relating to the election meeting held on 23.01.2014 would reveal that none of the Congress members proposed the name of the petitioner. But an independent member proposed the name of the respondent in O.P.No.6/2014 and another independent member seconded his name and he was opposed by an LDF candidate and with the support of all the UDF members except the petitioner, the respondent in O.P.No.6/2014 became the President. The contention of the respondents that the petitioner, becoming aware that the two independent members will not support him, declared in the election meeting that he was not willing to be defeated again and boycotted the election cannot legally sustain. Ext.P6(b) would show that the

petitioner was present in the election meeting through out and after receiving the ballot paper he did not cast any vote, probably for the reason that his name was not proposed by anybody.

15. Even assuming that the respondents were aware that the petitioner was the official candidate, whether the conduct of the respondents in having elected the respondent in O.P.No.6/2014 as President would constitute defection deserves consideration. Admittedly the respondents had never aligned with the LDF in the said election. Nobody from the LDF voted in favour of the respondent in O.P.No.6/2014 and the fight was virtually between the UDF and LDF in the said election. Only the petitioner kept out. The respondent in O.P.No.6/2014 was elected as President only with the votes of the UDF and independent members. As it appears that the independent members were not willing to support the petitioner, the conduct of the respondents in getting RW1 elected cannot be viewed as an act of disloyalty. The fact that if the respondent in O.P.No.6/2014 had opted out from contest, an LDF candidate would have succeeded and these there would have been loss of power to the UDF. The conduct of the respondents in having elected in O.P.No.6/2014 and did not propose the name of the petitioner was only a shrewd decision to protect the interest of the Congress party and UDF. If the petitioner was again set up as a candidate, the independents would have only supported the LDF as was done earlier. It is all the more

important to point out that there was no specific written direction from the party or the DCC President to the respondents to propose the name of the petitioner or to vote in his favour in the said election. I have already found that Ext.P4 series cannot be considered as a direction given by the party or the DCC President. Even though the petitioner and DCC President as PWs1 and 3 would say that Ext.P4 series were issued by the petitioner as authorized by PW3 as noted in Ext.P7, that document is not proved to have been served to the respondents. As a matter of fact in Ext.P4 series alone was served to the respondents. There is no mention in Ext.P4 series that the said direction was given by the petitioner as authorized by the DCC President. Exts.P3 and P7 have not been served to the respondents. This would mean that there was practically no direction in writing served to the respondents as provided by law. There was also no direction in writing given by PW3 to propose or second the name of the petitioner or to elect him as President in the election meeting held on 23.01.2014. As already pointed out, there is nothing to show that the respondents had disobeyed the party direction or they have become disloyal to the party

16. On a consideration of all facts and evidence I am of the view that there is no acceptable evidence to prove that the respondents have become disloyal to the political party in which they belong so as to incur disqualification by

voluntarily giving up membership from the party and so the petitions are only to be dismissed. The points are answered accordingly.

In the result, the petitions are dismissed.

In the circumstances the parties shall bear their respective costs.

Pronounced before the Commission on this the 9<sup>th</sup> day of December 2014

Sd/-

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

**APPENDIX**

**Witnesses examined on the side of the petitioner**

- PW1 : Sri.Abraham Abraham, Kuzhivomannil,  
Kuriyannoor P.O.
- PW2 : Sri.Sham Kuruvila, Chellathu Joyvilla, Kumbanad P.O.  
Thiruvalla
- PW3 : Sri.Mohan Raj, Manazhi Keezhethil Veedu, Azhur,  
Pathanamthitta

**Witnesses examined on the side of the respondent**

- RW1 : Sri.T.K.Ramachandran Nair, Thanathethu,  
Kriyannur P.O. Thiruvalla
- RW2 : Sri.Madhusoodhana Panicker, Secretary,  
Thottappuzhassery Grama Panchayat

**Documents produced on the side of the petitioner**

- P1 : True copy of the register showing the politicalaffiliation  
of the members of Thottappuzhassery Grama Panchayat

- P2 : True Copy of the resignation letter dated 06.05.2013 in form No.3 submitted by Sri.Ramachandran Nair
- P3 : Copy of the whip dated 21.01.2014 issued by Sri.P.Mohanraj, President, DCC Congress (I) Committee, Pathanamthitta
- P4 : Whip dated 20.01.2014 issued by Sri.K.A.Abraham, President, Congress (I) Mandalam Committee, Thottapuzhassery
- P4(a) : Copy of the whip dated 20.01.2014 issued by Sri.K.A.Abraham, President, Congress (I) Mandalam Committee, Thottapuzhassery
- P4(b) : Whip dated 20.01.2014 issued by Sri.K.A.Abraham, President, Congress (I) Mandalam Committee, Thottapuzhassery
- P5 : Letter No.H.C.211/2014 dated 15.03.2014 of the Block Development Officer, Koyipram addressed to Sri.Mathew Abraham, Vellimala Veedu, Panackal
- P6 : Copy of the letter No.S2-296/2014 dated 15.02.2014 Of the Taluk Supply Officer, Thiruvalla
- P6(a) : Copy of the minutes of the meeting to elect President Thottapuzhassery Grama Panchayat held on 23.01.2014
- P6(b) : Copy of the minutes of the meeting of President election dated 23.01.2014, Thottapuzhassery Grama Panchayat
- P7 : Letter dated 21.01.2014 of Sri..P.Mohanraj, President, District Congress (I) Committee, Pathnamthitta addressed to Sri.K.A.Abraham, Congress Parliamentary party leader, Thottapuzhasseri
- P8 : Minutes Book of the Congress Parliamentary Party Thottapuzhasseri Grama Panchayat

P8(a) : Page No.13 of Ext.P8

**Document produced on the side of the respondent**

R1 : Letter dated 14/2.2014 of Sri.P.Mohanraj,  
President, District Congress (I) Committee,  
Pathanamthittaaddressedto Sri.T.K.Ramachandran Nair,  
Member, Thottapuzhasserri Grama Panchayat

Sd/-

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

//True Copy//