



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. SOUMEN SEN

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SYAM KUMAR V.M.

TUESDAY, THE 17<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF FEBRUARY 2026 / 28TH MAGHA, 1947

WP(PIL) NO. 4 OF 2026

PETITIONER:

MUBAS M.H., AGED 28 YEARS,  
SON OF HASSAN M.K., MULADAN HOUSE,  
ASHAMANNOOR P.O, ODAKALY,  
ERNAKULAM DISTRICT, PIN – 683549.

BY ADVS. SRI. YESHWANTH SHENOY,  
SRI. ANOOP V. NAIR  
SMT. SHARANNYA P.  
SRI. ATHUL P.  
SMT. C.A. BEEMA BEEVI  
SMT. FERRA A. THANKAM

RESPONDENTS:

- 1 THE STATE OF KERALA,  
THE STATE OF KERALA REPRESENTED BY CHIEF SECRETARY,  
GOVT. SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DISTRICT,  
PIN – 695001.
- 2 THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,  
KERALA FINANCE DEPARTMENT, MAIN BLOCK,  
FIRST FLOOR, ROOM NO. 373, GOVT. SECRETARIAT,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DISTRICT, PIN – 695001.
- 3 THE SPECIAL SECRETARY,  
PUBLIC RELATIONS DEPARTMENT (I & PRD),  
SOUTH BLOCK, GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DISTRICT, PIN – 695001.



4 THE SECRETARY,  
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT,  
GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN – 695001.

5 PRINCIPAL ACCOUNTANT GENERAL (A & E AUDIT)  
AG'S OFFICE COMPLEX, CANTONMENT STATION RD, STATUE,  
PALAYAM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DISTRICT-, PIN – 695001.

\* 6 M. V. GOVINDAN, S/O. K. KUNJAMBU,  
SECRETARY OF COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA (MARXIST),  
THE KERALA STATE COMMITTEE, STATE COMMITTEE OFFICE,  
AKG CENTRE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DISTRICT.

\* [IS IMPLEADED AS ADDL.R6 AS PER ORDER DATED 31/01/2026  
IN I.A 1/26 IN WP(PIL)]

BY SRI. K. GOPALAKRISHNA KURUP, ADVOCATE GENERAL  
ASSISTED BY SENIOR GOVT. PLEADER SMT. VINITHA B.,  
SRI. N. MANOJ KUMAR, STATE ATTORNEY.

R6 BY ADV. SRI. T.B. HOOD,  
BY ADVS. SMT. M. ISHA,  
SMT. SHIYON BIJU.

THIS WRIT PETITION (PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION) HAVING COME UP  
FOR ADMISSION ON 11.02.2026, ALONG WITH WP(PIL). NO.8/2026, THE COURT  
ON 17.02.2026 DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. SOUMEN SEN

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SYAM KUMAR V.M.

TUESDAY, THE 17<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF FEBRUARY 2026 / 28TH MAGHA, 1947

WP(PIL) NO. 8 OF 2026

PETITIONER:

ALOSHIOUS XAVIER, AGED 30 YEARS,  
S/. K.S. XAVIER, KANNATTU HOUSE, VALARA. P.O,  
12TH MILE, IDUKKI DISTRICT, PIN – 685561.

BY ADVS. SMT. TISSY ROSE K CHERIYAN  
SMT. ASHIKA JOSHY  
SMT. AMRUTHA SELVARAJ  
SRI. JAIN JAISON MATHEW

RESPONDENTS:

- 1 STATE OF KERALA,  
REPRESENTED BY THE CHIEF SECRETARY,  
GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN – 695001.
- 2 CONTROLLER AND AUDITOR GENERAL OF KERALA  
GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,  
PIN – 695001.
- 3 THE SECRETARY,  
FINANCE DEPARTMENT, STATE OF KERALA,  
GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN – 695001.
- 4 THE SECRETARY, SOCIAL WELFARE DEPARTMENT,  
STATE OF KERALA, GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN – 695001.



5 THE SECRETARY,  
LOCAL SELF GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN – 695001.

\*6 THE SECRETARY, KERALA STATE COMMITTEE,  
COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA (MARXIST), AKG CENTRE,  
A.RAGHAVAN ROAD, THIRUVAVANTHAPURAM.

\* [IS IMPLEADED AS ADDL.R6 AS PER ORDER DATED 31/01/2026  
IN I.A 1/26 IN WP(PIL)]

BY BY SRI. K. GOPALAKRISHNA KURUP, ADVOCATE GENERAL,  
ASSISTED BY SENIOR GOVT. PLEADER SMT. VINITHA B.,  
SRI. N. MANOJ KUMAR, STATE ATTORNEY.

R6 BY ADV. SRI. T. B. HOOD  
BY ADVS. SMT. M. ISHA  
SMT. SHIYON BIJU

THIS WRIT PETITION (PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION) HAVING COME UP  
FOR ADMISSION ON 11.02.2026, ALONG WITH WP(PIL). NO.4/2026, THE COURT  
ON 17.02.2026 DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

**JUDGMENT**

Dated this the 17<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2026

**Soumen Sen, C.J.**

Whether a political party should be the face of the Government and influence the Government in designing its events to suit the political needs of the party, and whether, in the process of implementing such policies, the utilisation of the public exchequer without sanction under the Rules of Business can be justified, are the issues raised in this Public Interest Litigation (PIL).

2. Since common questions concerning the '*Nava Keralam* 'New Kerala' - Citizen Response Programme' (herein after referred to as the '*Nava Keralam* Programme'), implemented by the State through its Information and Public Relations Department, arise for consideration in both these Public Interest litigations, they are heard and disposed of together.

3. Petitioners allege that the *Nava Keralam* Programme, for which an amount of around ₹20 Crores has been earmarked for



expenditure, is a political campaign of the ruling party/political front, masquerading as a Government Programme and that it had been launched with the singular objective of furthering the political interests of the ruling political party/Front utilising public funds at a time when State is in doldrums and the Legislative Assembly Elections, 2026, are on the anvil.

4. The State, on the other hand, maintains that the *Nava Keralam* Programme is a development and welfare study intended to obtain development suggestions and ideas from the people, to seek their opinions on welfare projects, to understand development needs locally, and to plan and collect opinions from the public. The said programme, according to the State, is an essential welfare study intended to augment and facilitate the development measures already undertaken, and thus being a 'Policy matter', is beyond the scope of consideration by this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

5. While W.P(PIL) No.4 of 2026 principally seeks to quash Exhibit P1 order dated 10.10.2025, issued by the Department of Information and Public Relations, launching the *Nava Keralam*



Programme, the prayer in W.P(PIL) No.8 of 2026, *inter alia*, is to restrain the respondents from 'misusing public funds for personal and political gain of the ruling party/front' under the garb of the selfsame programme. Interim prayers seeking to direct the Government to keep in abeyance all further proceedings pursuant to Exhibit P1 order and not to release funds from the public exchequer/Government treasury to pursue the *Nava Keralam* Programme have also been sought.

6. Respondents entered in appearance and filed counter-affidavits in both the Writ Petitions. The State has also filed an additional counter-affidavit in response to the petitioners' reply affidavit. Noting that one among the contentions put forth to challenge Exhibit P1 order covering the *Nava Keralam* Programme was Exhibit P2 letter dated 23.09.2025 issued by the Secretary of the Communist Party of India (Marxist), Kerala State Committee, and since neither the author of the said document nor the political party on whose behalf it had been issued had been arrayed as a party in either of the Writ Petitions, this Court vide order dated 31.01.2026 permitted the petitioners to carry out



necessary impleadment. Pursuant thereto, the additional 6<sup>th</sup> respondent was impleaded, and he entered in appearance through counsel. A counter affidavit dated 10.02.2026 has also been filed by the 6<sup>th</sup> respondent.

7. We heard Sri. Yeshwanth Shenoy, learned counsel and Mr. Jain Jaison Mathew, learned counsel on behalf of the petitioners, Sri. K. Gopalakrishna Kurup, learned Advocate General assisted by Smt. Vinitha B., learned Senior Government Pleader appearing for the State respondents and Sri. T.B. Hood, learned counsel appearing for the additional 6<sup>th</sup> respondent.

8. Sri.Yeshwanth Shenoy, the learned counsel for the petitioner in W.P.(PIL) No.4 of 2026, assails Exhibit P1 order concerning *Nava Keralam* Programme on more than one count. Firstly, he contends that the additional 6<sup>th</sup> respondent – party secretary had issued Exhibit P2 letter on 23.09.2025, i.e, much prior to the issuance of Exhibit P1 order dated 10.10.2025 by the Government. Thus, according to him, the ruling party/front had an “insider knowledge” of the *Nava Keralam* Programme and had been preparing its members/supporters beforehand to flood the



'Volunteer force', thereby turning the said programme into a party political campaign for the Assembly elections that are on the anvil.

9. Secondly, Sri. Shenoy submits the use of the '*Samoohya Sannadha Sena Portal*' for selecting volunteers for the implementation of the *Navam Keralam* Programme is illegal, as the said Portal had been established through a Government Order issued in the year 2020 for the specific purpose of forming a Social Volunteer force to provide assistance in natural disasters in the State and to help in any local crisis. The registration of volunteers by the said online portal launched by the Kerala State Disaster Management Authority, according to the learned counsel, was made in the context of the Okhi Cyclone, the floods and torrential rains and is not intended to create a force to conduct a door-to-door feedback collection programme for policy refinement or to advertise the so-called achievements of the Government as prelude to elections. The same according to the learned counsel, is an arbitrary and colourable exercise of power to score political brownie points.



10. Thirdly, the learned counsel challenges Exhibit P1 order as violative of the Rules of Business evolved by the Government of Kerala and thus contradicting the mandates of Article 166 (3) of the Constitution. The conduct of the Programme under the Head “Special PR Campaign”, he submits, runs contrary to the Rules of Business of the Government of Kerala. The Programme, according to the learned counsel, by its very nature and scope, falls within the purview of the Planning and Economic Affairs Department and not under the Department of Information and Public Relations. In Exhibit P1 order, the *Nava Keralam* Programme has been evolved as one to be undertaken with the said Department as Nodal agency authorising the said Department to utilise ₹20 Crores from the title 2220-01-001-96 under the ‘Special PR Campaign’. The learned counsel relied upon the dictum laid down by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in ***MRF Ltd. v. Manohar Parrikar and Others***<sup>1</sup> and terms such inclusion overlooking the Rules of Business Manual as illegal and done with oblique motives.

11. The fourth and final contention put forth by Sri. Shenoy

---

<sup>1</sup> (2010) 11 SCC 374



concerns the Budgetary allocation made in Exhibit P1 order. It is submitted that such allocation violates Articles 204 and 205 of the Constitution, as it does not comply with the mandates therein that all fund allocation requires prior authorisation from the Legislature. Insofar as no legislative sanction had been accorded on the non-budgetary expenditure to be incurred for the *Nava Keralam* Programme, it is contended that there has been a gross violation of the constitutional provisions.

12. Thus, according to Sri. Shenoy, Exhibit P1 order unequivocally points to the hidden agenda to orchestrate a large-scale, state-sponsored access of households by officially implanting the cadres of the ruling party under the legitimising label of a "social volunteer force" under the garb of implementing a welfare Programme. The five-tier structure of the Programme, headed by an official designated by the Government, and comprising volunteers selected from the Social Volunteer Force Web Portal, who as per Exhibit P2 shall be LDF supporters is, according to the learned counsel, a tailor-made mechanism to disseminate party propaganda on behalf of the ruling party/ front



and contradicts the Rules of Business of the Government of Kerala. The design and implementation of the Programme, which, according to the learned counsel, further has the propensity to invade the citizens' right to privacy guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution, are also put forth. The Programme is thus termed by the learned counsel as a pre-electoral data harvesting and voter outreach conducted by the ruling political party at the expense of public funds. He thus seeks to quash Exhibit P1 order and pray for a direction to keep in abeyance all further proceedings pursuant to Exhibit P1 order and not to release funds from the public exchequer/Government treasury to pursue the Programme.

13. The learned Advocate General Sri. Gopalakrishna Kurup vehemently refuted the contentions of the petitioners based on the affidavits filed and, at the threshold, raised a maintainability question, pointing out that the locus *standi* of the petitioners is non-existent or precarious. As regards the contentions based on Exhibit P2 letter issued by the Secretary of a political party, it is submitted by the learned Advocate General that the letter and its



contents are totally inconsequential and irrelevant while challenging a Government Order or programme, and that the Government cannot be called upon to explain its programmes, basing on a circular issued by a Political party to its own cadres.

14. As regards the allegation that the '*Samoohya Sannadha Sena Portal*' used for selecting volunteers for the implementation of Exhibit P1 Programme, being not suited for implementation of the *Nava Keralam* Programme, it is submitted by the learned Advocate General that the said portal was established as early as 2021 onwards by the Government through Exhibit R1(c) Government Order dated 01.01.2020. The volunteers registered therein are called in for various activities like disaster management, epidemic management, house door service delivery and palliative care. The portal is not intended exclusively for the *Nava Keralam* Programme, and people register on the said portal for many similar activities. It is for the volunteers to decide whether to participate therein or not, and the portal is a continuing mechanism for the development of the State of Kerala. No volunteers are excluded, and all enrolled volunteers continue



to be retained and recognised within the platform. Not even an allegation has been put forth in the Writ Petitions that any person had been denied registration in the portal or that he or she had been refused permission to participate as a volunteer in the *Nava Keralam* Programme after registration in the portal. The volunteers have been requested to indicate whether they are interested in the activity as part of *Nava Keralam* Programme, and if so inclined, they are permitted to participate without any remuneration. The contention that the Programme envisaged vide Exhibit P1 order cannot be implemented through volunteers registered under 'Samoohya Sannadha Sena Portal' is thus unsustainable, submits the learned Advocate General.

15. As regards the alleged violation of the mandates in Article 166(3) of the Constitution, it is submitted by the learned Advocate General that the business of the Government of a State is to be transacted in conformity with the Rules of Business framed in the said respect and matters requiring Cabinet decisions are specifically enumerated in Schedule II of the Rules of Business of the Government of Kerala. Exhibit P1 *Nava*



*Keralam* Programme has on 08.10.2025 duly received the approval of the Cabinet and the contention that there has been a violation of Article 166(3) it is submitted, is thus unsustainable.

16. With respect to budgetary allocation, it is submitted by the learned Advocate General that the procedure relating thereto, as well as regarding additional authorisation and control of expenditure are governed by the Kerala Budget Manual. Reliance is placed on paragraphs 69, 70, 71 and 72 of the Kerala Budget Manual and it is submitted that the proposal for additional authorization was moved with the concurrence of the Finance Department and expenditure has been incurred only and when funds are made available by the Finance Department. It is submitted that the *Nava Keralam* Programme, having received duly envisaged cabinet approval, administrative sanction as well as financial sanction and since all procedures under the Budget Manual and Financial Code have been followed, there has been no illegality or financial impropriety either in the program or in its approval or implementation.

17. The learned Advocate General further proceeds to justify



the need and necessity of the *Nava Keralam* Programme and submits that as per Exhibit P1 order, it has been decided to be organised from 1<sup>st</sup> January to 28<sup>th</sup> February 2026 with the objective of collating ideas/recommendations for development, seeking opinion about development/welfare programs, conducting planning for realising development by understanding development needs and gathering suggestions to make welfare measures more effective. After receiving cabinet approval for the programme, Government Orders dated 10.10.2025 (Exhibit P1) and 25.10.2025 [Exhibit R1(a)] had been issued, granting administrative approval to the same. The Government had also issued Exhibit R1(b) Proceedings dated 06.11.2025 detailing the tentative budgets under various heads, which are not challenged in the Writ Petitions. The Programme it is submitted, was being implemented transparently, utilising the service of members of the 'Social Volunteer Force' from the web portal constituted as per Exhibit R1(c) dated 01.01.2020 to assist in natural disasters in the state and to help any local crisis. There is no political interference in the state-wide study, and the Writ Petitions lack even a *prima facie* allegation or material to substantiate that the



recruitment of volunteers is politically coloured. The call for registration as volunteers was and is open to all, and no selection is made on any party affiliation basis. The programme is to collect opinions and suggestions for the development of Kerala, and no campaign is intended. No political party messages are given, and no mention of any political party is made. Hence, it is submitted by the learned Advocate General that there is no violation of the rights of citizens under Articles 14 and 21. The learned Advocate General places reliance upon the dictum laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***State of Himachal Pradesh & Anr. v. Umed Ram Sharma & Ors.***<sup>2</sup>, wherein the question whether, in view of the provisions of Articles 202 to 207 of the Constitution, the High Court had power to issue prerogative writs under Article 226 of the Constitution to direct the State Government either to allot any particular sum for expenditure on account of particular project or to allot amounts in addition which have already been allotted under the current financial budget of the State Government and thus to regulate even the procedure in financial matters of State, which according



to the Government were the exclusive domain of the Legislature as contained in Articles 202 to 207 of the Constitution was answered pointing out that the Court must know its limitations in these fields. In the said case, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had directed that the High Court may not take any further action and leave it to the judgment of the priorities and initiative of the Executive and the Legislature to pursue the matter. It is thus prayed by the learned Advocate General that the Writ Petitions are only to be dismissed

18. On behalf of the Party Secretary, ie., the addl. 6<sup>th</sup> respondent, it is submitted by Sri.T.B. Hood, the learned counsel, that the involvement of the sympathizers of a political party in the execution of a programme conceived by the Government is not illegal or prohibited, and that the strategy planned unveiled by the Information and Public Relations Department for the period from August 2025 to February 2026, *inter alia* included feedback survey by Public Relations Information Service Management (PRISM) and that the said information was in the public domain. It is also submitted that there is a substantial



difference in the nomenclature of the Programme mentioned in Exhibit P1 order and Exhibit P2 letter issued by the Party Secretary, and that this fact belies the allegation that the program was conceptualised, coordinated and operationalised in direct consultation and collaboration with the political party and is not one carried out independently by the State. He thus prays that the Writ Petitions may be dismissed with costs.

19. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for both sides in detail and have considered the contentions put forth.

20. We note that in these Writ Petitions, the petitioners seek to analyse the decision of the Government through the prism of certain communications made by the respondent-political party, which culminated in the introduction of Nava Kerala – citizen response program – Program for Development and welfare studies, ostensibly to ascertain the conditions of the people and the implementation of welfare measures. We were persuaded to open the can and examine the truth behind the introduction of such a scheme.

21. At the outset, we place on record our initial reluctance



to enter into the business of the Government and into matters concerning the allocations of funds by the Government to achieve the object of its various development schemes unless the same are starkly arbitrary, unreasonable and violative of constitutional or legal mandates. The facts and circumstances under which the present W.Ps are filed, the timing and chronology of the events, as well as the fact that the matter involves crores of rupees from the public exchequer, lead us to believe that a closer scrutiny of the allegations made is necessitated.

22. As regards the *locus standi* of the Petitioners, we note that a general public cause of importance has been raised by the petitioners who are citizens, and that the mandates with respect to locus are sufficiently met, rendering the cause put forth fit to be raised by the petitioners. As regards the contention that the subject matter falls within the policy realm and is thus beyond the jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226, we note that though generally economic policy matters are seldom subjected to writs, it is open to this Court to examine at the threshold whether the subject matter falls within the said realm and even if it is



found so, whether the same is affected by the vice of arbitrariness, unreasonableness, violation of fundamental rights and/or violation of statutory provisions. Since it is the specific case of the petitioners that Exhibit P1 order has been issued to expend ₹20 Crores of public funds in violation of law and relevant norms, especially the rules of the Business of Government of Kerala, at a time when elections are knocking at the door, we deem it proper to entertain these Writ Petitions and to examine the contentions put forth.

23. The State justifies its actions based on a cabinet decision taken for allotment of ₹20 Crores ostensibly to undertake development and welfare study intended to collect information and suggestions from the public relating to the development and welfare initiatives. It has been strenuously argued on behalf of the State that participation in a programme is totally voluntary, no remuneration is being paid or no personal data is collected. The assertion that the programme is connected with the electoral activities is without factual or legal basis. Since the foundational basis of the Writ Petitions appears to be the



alleged disclosure of inside information by the Cabinet to the concerned political party—namely, that the State Government would be organising a survey to gather detailed opinions on development and welfare schemes, and that the “New Kerala Karma Sena” was being formed to organise the said service, titled the *Nava Keralam Vikasana Survey* (New Kerala Development and Welfare Survey)—supporters of the said political party who were willing to work on a voluntary basis, either officially or unofficially, were to be recruited for the Karma Sena from 1 October 2025 to 1 March 2026.

24. We had impleaded the said political party to enable it to file an affidavit stating as to whether the newspaper reports and other documents produced by the petitioner, which preceded the announcement of the scheme, were true and correct. The affidavit filed by the addl. 6<sup>th</sup> respondent party Secretary, we note is sketchy, in which the veracity and authenticity of the contents of the documents, admittedly preceding the announcement of the scheme, have been intentionally overlooked or evasively denied. The statements made therein are by and large only repetitions of



the stand taken by the State Government in its various affidavits.

25. The Writ Petition has disclosed a letter (Exhibit P2) which, inter alia, calls on party affiliates to participate in the Programme to be launched by the Government and to ensure that the LDF supporters who are willing to work voluntarily, either officially or unofficially, are recruited to the 'Karma Sena' (Volunteer force) from October 1, 2025 to March 31, 2026. The said letter also instructs the party members to urgently register on the 'Social Volunteer Force' web portal and to coordinate with the Programme and states that the party's own list of volunteers was to be finalised by 30.09.2025. It stands unrefuted that even before Exhibit P1 order dated 10.10.2025, laying out the schedule, conduct and objectives of the Programme had been issued, the party had issued Exhibit P2 letter on 23.09.2025.

26. The order Exhibit P1 has been issued by the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent, Special Secretary to the Information and Public Relations Department, stating that the said Department has been authorised to utilise ₹20 Crores from the title 2220-01-001-96 'Special PR Campaign' for implementation of the Programme. The



Programme, as contended by the State in its counter affidavit and reply, is primarily intended as a welfare study for data collection to ascertain the effectiveness of development and welfare schemes. In the reply affidavit, it has been further contended that the Department of Information and Public Relations, having been specifically allocated with matters relating to Public communication, Public outreach, Feedback mechanisms, Community listening and Citizen Management, the Programme squarely falls within such allocated business, and the said Department is, therefore, fully competent to implement the program.

27. The Government, in a welfare State, undoubtedly has the power to undertake welfare measures and to devise programmes to reach out to the people in order to gather the responses of citizens with regard to the welfare measures undertaken. One cannot find out any fault with the exercise of such power. The Rules of Business, insofar as the budgetary allocation is concerned, would also demonstrate that the Government under the Document No.23 – Information and



Publicity, is entitled to spend about ₹4.60 Crores under the sub-major and minor heads “Special Public Relations Campaign”. It assumes relevance to examine the relevant entries in the Rules of the Business of Government of Kerala to appreciate the *inter se* contentions put forth by the parties.

28. The Rules of the Business of Government of Kerala (Amended as on 31.01.2025), in its Schedule, enumerates the following businesses as assigned to the Information and Public Relations Department:

- “1. *Advertisement policy and issue of government advertisements?*
- 2. Community listening scheme.**
- 3. *Establishment papers relating to Public Relations Department and District Information Officers.*
- 4. *Issue of press releases.*
- 5. *Organisation and control of radio rural forums.*
- 6. *Organisation of and participation of exhibitions.*
- 7. *Participation in Republic Day celebrations at New Delhi.*
- 8. *Repress and registration of POCSO Act.*
- 9. *Production and distribution of pamphlets and other publicity materials?* 10. *Publication of monthly journal Janabatham.*
- 11. *Publication and photographic coverage.*



12. *Running of information Center at State Capital and supply of general information to public.*
13. *Scrutiny of newspapers and periodicals.*
14. *Tagore Theatre, Kerala media Academy.*
15. *Journalist Accreditation, Health Insurance Schemes for Journalists and Non Journalist Pension and Membership, Internship”*

[Emphasis added]

29. Similarly, as regards the Planning and Economic Affairs Department, the Schedule to the Rules of the Business of Government of Kerala enumerates the following business under the sub-title 'Planning':

- "A. *Planning*
  1. *Department of Economics and Statistics*
  2. *Database and digitisation of data for Planning*
  3. *Computerisation for planning, plan monitoring and computer based data system including State and District Informatic Centres*
  4. *Economic and financial policy issues including Centre State financial relations*
  5. *Economic Survey and studies for preparing the Survey including study of the State and Central budget and preparation of yearly review on the level of taxation and related matters*
  6. *N.D.C. and its committees*
  7. *Formulation of Development Plans, Perspective Plans, Five Year Plans and Annual Plans*
  8. *Integration of physical, economic, social and environmental planning*
  9. *Examination of schemes/projects to be included in the plans*



10. Plan resources and mobilisation
11. Monitoring and evaluation of plan programmes
12. Multilevel Planning State, District, Block and local levels
13. Manpower and Employment Planning
14. District Development Council
15. Projects, measures for improving projects formulation, project analysis and appraisal
16. State Planning Board
17. Western Ghats and Special Area Programme - Co-ordination of work and scrutinising of schemes and projects
18. State Land Use Board and Centre for Land Use and Environment Studies
19. Monitoring and evaluation of Special Component Plan and Tribal Sub Plan
20. Co-ordination, implementation and monitoring of all NITI Ayog initiatives.
21. Design and incorporation of State of art methods and processes into the planning and its Implementation.
22. District Development Council and monitoring projects through District Development Commissioners.
23. Vision Varkala Infrastructure Development (VIVIVD) Corporation Ltd.
24. Keala Development and Innovation Strategic Council (K-DISCI)"

30. As regards the Programme Implementation, Evaluation and Monitoring Department, the Schedule to the Rules of the Business of Government of Kerala enumerates the following business:

- “1. Monitoring and evaluation of all infrastructure projects PPP and non-PPP including priority projects.
2. Implementation and monitoring of Sustainable Development Goals SDGs.



**3. *Monitoring of all missions of Nava Keralam Karma Padthathi and such missions announced by the Government.***

4. *Preparation of performance indices of various departments, Government agencies and district offices based on effectiveness of programme and project implementation.*
5. *Designing incentives for encouraging performance in programme and project implementation of departments, government agencies and district offices.*
6. *Inducting professional management services and resources for programme and project implementation.*
7. *District Development Commissioners.”*

31. It is thus discernible from the Rules of allocation of Business to various Departments that the matters like, Database for Planning, Formulation of Development Plans, Perspective Plans, Monitoring and Evaluation of Planned Programs, Project Measures for Improving Projects, Project analysis and appraisal, etc., most of which could be related to the purpose of Exhibit P1 order falls squarely within the allocated business of the Department for Planning and Economic Affairs and the monitoring of all missions of Nava Keralam Karma Padthathi and such missions announced by the Government fall within the allocated business of the Programme Implementation, Evaluation and Monitoring Department. Even as per the counter-affidavit of



the State, the objective of Exhibit P1 order is to collect ideas, opinions and suggestions, to study the opinions to make welfare schemes efficient, and to form public opinion on employment and development projects and all of the same, fall squarely within the scope of the business of the Planning and Economic Affairs Department or Programme Implementation, Evaluation and Monitoring Department and not within the business of the Department of Information, Public Relations to which ₹20 Crores is found to have been allocated.

32. Exhibit P1 order which *inter alia* stipulates the approving of the Information and Public Relations Department as the Nodal Office of the program and to allot ₹20 Crores for the conduct of the Programme under the Head “Special PR Campaign” thus runs contrary to the Rules of Business of the Government of Kerala. The Nava Keralam Programme, the proclaimed object of which is to collect ideas, opinions, and suggestions from the people to realise the goal of ‘Nava Keralam’, to study the opinions on making the development and welfare schemes presently implemented more effective, to seek opinions



on whether the development and welfare schemes are available in all areas as per the requirements, and to form public opinion on new employment opportunities/development schemes, thus ought to have been a programme under the Planning and Economic Affairs Department/the Programme Implementation, Evaluation and Monitoring Department. However, the same had been brought under a sub-head of Information & Public Relations Department by putting it under the 'Community listening Scheme' apparently to enable an easy allocation under the convenient Special PR Campaign head.

33. Though a contention has been put forth on behalf of the State that '*Community listening scheme*' is a business that falls within the Department of Information Public Relations, and that the Programme covered vide Exhibit P1 order would thus fall within the ambit of the said business, the said argument cannot be countenanced in view of the very evident and express businesses set apart for the 'Planning and Economic Affairs Department'/Programme implementation, Evaluation & Monitoring Department, within which the purported mandates of



Exhibit P1 squarely fall. It is trite, as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***MRF Ltd.* (supra)**, that compliance with the rules of business framed under Article 166(3), especially where public finance is involved, is mandatory and goes to the root of executive decision-making.

34. ***M.R.F. Ltd.* (supra)** had also considered the earlier decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***R. Chitralekha v. State of Mysore***<sup>3</sup> and observed that the said decision cannot be relied upon to support the contention that the Rules of Business framed under clause (3) of Article 166 of the Constitution of India are merely directory. The decision in ***R. Chitralekha (supra)*** was rendered in the context of interpretation of Articles 166(1) and 166(2) and, therefore, would not be applicable.

35. The debate as to whether the decision of the Chief Minister constitutes the decision of the Cabinet and that there can be no Cabinet *de hors* the Chief Minister and whether Article 166(3) of the Constitution is merely an enabling provision incapable of being mandatory, has been set at rest by the decision in ***M.R.F. Ltd. (supra)***.

---

<sup>3</sup> AIR 1964 SC 1823



36. In a subsequent decision in ***Narmada Bachao Andolan v. State of Madhya Pradesh***<sup>4</sup>, the views expressed in ***R. Chitralekha*** (*supra*) and ***M.R.F. Ltd.*** (*supra*) were considered and it was observed as follows:

*"We have considered the larger Bench judgment of this Court in R. Chitralekha (*supra*) and taken note of the fact that MRF Ltd. (*supra*) is distinguishable from the case at hand since that case dealt with rules pertaining to financial implications for which there were no provisions in the Appropriation Act, and so the rules required mandatory compliance. Here, there is no issue of financial repercussions. The issue here is whether the Council of Ministers is permitted to delegate the power to amend its decision to a Committee of Ministers consisting of the Ministers in charge of the Departments concerned and the Chief Minister, and whether such amendment needs to be consistent with the Rules of Business framed under Art.166 of the Constitution of India. The case law provides that delegation is permissible and that Rules of Business are directory in nature."*

(Emphasis supplied)

37. The contention that Cabinet Approval had been received on 08.10.2025 pursuant to which Exhibit P1 and subsequently



Exhibits R1(a) and (b) orders dated 25.10.2025 and 06.11.2025 had been issued, setting apart ₹20 Crores and detailing the tentative budgets under various heads for meeting the expenses of the Program, are not explanations sufficient to validate the incurable lack of authority and jurisdiction. As laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **M.R.F. Ltd.** (*supra*) compliance with the rules of business framed under Article 166(3), especially where public finance is involved, is mandatory and prior approval of the cabinet or post facto justification, administrative explanation or executive endorsement, as seen vide Exhibit R1(b) order, will not cure the inherent defect. Exhibit P1 order to the extent it authorises the Information and Public Relations Department to utilise ₹20 Crores under the relevant title and head 'Special PR campaign for implementation of the Nava Kerala Citizens Response Programme' is inherently flawed and unsustainable for the very evident violations of the Rules of allocation of Business and concomitant Budget allocation.

38. In the instant case, before we hold us back to the arguments as to whether the Cabinet was justified in approving an amount far in excess of the funds earmarked in the budget,



the larger issue seems to be the purpose for which the State fund is sought to be utilised. Admittedly, this exercise was not undertaken earlier and issued near to the declaration of assembly elections. Moreover, the portal through which the applications are invited for the selection of Karma Sena was not intended for the purpose for which the present exercise is sought to be carried out. The portal was created on 1 January 2020 by the General Administration Department for the purpose of forming a social volunteer force to provide assistance during national disasters in the State and to extend help in any local crisis. The relevant portion of the order which forms the basis of creating the said portal are as follows:

*“In the last 3 years, Kerala has faced repeated natural disasters. Cyclone Okki, the 2018 floods, the 2019 torrential rains and widespread landslides have resulted in the loss of many precious lives, livelihoods of the people, and the loss of infrastructure across the country. We have to find ways to reduce the severity of disasters and survive. In this regard, along with the opinions of experts and measures to identify and implement environmentally friendly lifestyles, an effective disaster response system needs to be organised. As part of this, in addition to providing assistance in natural disasters, a social volunteer force will be formed to help in any local crisis, as follows.”*



39. Presently, the State is not faced with any such natural disaster or any local crises. It is in the nature of a survey for the collection of the data by a procedure which has already indicated in several communications and circulars issued by the political party concerned to all the district committees for information. The existence of the said circular, much before the introduction of the New Kerala Scheme, cannot be disputed.

40. As regards Budgetary allocation, the learned Advocate General had submitted that an additional allocation of around ₹14 Crores made to the Information and Public Relations Department in excess of ₹4.6 Crores already allotted to the same Department, does not require prior sanction of the Legislature and it would suffice if in the course of the current financial year, the same is brought to the notice of the Legislature and an approval post expenditure is obtained. In this context, it is relevant to note that Article 203 of the Constitution relating to procedure in Legislature with respect to estimates in Sub-Article (2) stipulates that so much of the said estimates as relate to other expenditure shall be submitted in the form of demands of grants



to the Legislative Assembly, and the Legislative Assembly shall have power to assent or refuse to assent to any demand or to assent to any demand subject to a reduction of the amount specified therein. It is also relevant to note that Article 204 relating to appropriation of bills in Sub-Article (3) stipulates that, subject to the provisions of Articles 205 and 206, no money shall be withdrawn from the Consolidated Fund of the State, except under appropriation made by law passed in accordance with the provisions of the said Article. It is also relevant to note that Article 205 of the Constitution relating to Supplementary, Additional or Excess Grants in Sub Article (1) mandates that,-

*“The Governor shall,*

*(a) if the amount authorized by any law made in accordance with the provisions of Article 204 to be expended for a particular service for the current financial year is found to be insufficient for the purpose of that year, or when a need has arisen during the current financial year for supplementary or additional expenditure upon some **new service** not contemplated in the annual financial statement for that year, or*

*(b) If any money has been spent on any service during a financial year in excess of the amount granted for that service and for that year, caused to be laid before the House or the House of the Legislature of the State Another statement showing*



*the estimated amount of that expenditure or caused to be presented to the Legislative Assembly of the State demand for such excess, as the case may be."*

41. It is relevant to note here that the Kerala Budget Manual issued by the Government of Kerala on 15.09.1999 elaborates the criteria to be adopted in the matter of treating any item of expenditure as '**new service**', which is determined based on the recommendation of the Public Accounts Committee. It reads as follows:

*"If any new proposal involving expenditure during the course of a year arises, an important question to be considered is whether the expenditure has been contemplated in the annual financial statement or whether it forms part of a grant voted. If the proposal is outside the scope of the grants, or if it has been contemplated in the annual financial statement presented to the legislature, it is clearly a new service for which a demand for funds has to be placed before the legislature. It may in some cases be that extra expenditure on the new item can be met by savings within the demand. Still expenditure cannot be incurred on the item as it will constitute a new service. And it is necessary that a supplementary demand for a token sum should be presented before the legislature. The essence of this requirement is that without a vote the legislature, money shall not be spent beyond the scope of the grant sanctioned by the legislature."*

(Emphasis supplied)



42. When confronted with the fact that the Manual evolved by the State Government to govern its fiscal affairs itself mandates that without a vote of the Legislature, no money be spent beyond the scope of the grant sanctioned by the Legislature, the learned Advocate General had responded that the Manual does not have the force of law and its strict compliance cannot be insisted on.

43. The facts and circumstances as discernible from the documents produced and the stand taken by the State when confronted with the apparent violations of norms in force, lead us to conclude that much is left to be desired when it comes to fiscal discipline that is expected to be followed by the Government while handling public funds.

44. In addition to the fact that amounts are being allotted to departments overlooking the Rules of Business, we note with concern that budgetary allocations to Departments are also not being scrupulously adhered to, and even Rules/norms voluntarily made to enforce self discipline in fiscal matters, are being given a go by with alacrity.



45. In addition to the above, we note that the Volunteers for the Programme are to be chosen from the 'Karma Sena- Social Volunteer Force' from the web portal constituted as per Exhibit R1(c) dated 01.01.2020, which was constituted for meeting a different purpose. The object and purpose of the Nava Keralam Programme being totally different from that which was intended to be performed and undertaken by the 'Karma Sena Volunteers' under Exhibit R1(c) dated 01.01.2020, it was incumbent on the Government to clarify the same and give wide publicity to the enlistment of Volunteers specifically for the purpose of carrying out the object of the said programme under Exhibit P1 order. The counter affidavit and reply filed by the State do not reveal any steps taken in the said direction towards facilitating wide publicity for the volunteer enlisting process under Exhibit P1 order, whereas the alleged selective leaking of information to the party cadre based on Exhibit P2 letter gives apparent credence to the allegations of oblique motives.

46. As regards the Budget allocation, we find merit in the contention put forth by the learned counsel for the petitioners



that such allocation generally cannot supersede or override, the specific Rules of Business and that funds cannot be allocated to a Department for a purpose specifically assigned under the Rules of Business to another Department, as the same would entail and violation of the established administrative framework. Read along with the mandatory Rules of business as explained above, the allocation of ₹20 Crores under the head 'Special PR campaign' to the Department of Information, Public Relations, for a business that essentially falls within the business of the Planning and Economic Affairs Department. Programme Implementation, Evaluation and Monitoring Department does indeed point to a colourable exercise of executive power as alleged by the petitioners.

47. The learned Advocate General, in relying upon the decision in ***Umed Ram Sharma*** (*supra*), possibly wants to remind us that, in the Indian Constitution, the Council of Ministers is "a hyphen which joins, a buckle which fastens, the legislative part of the State to the executive part". It is contended that the decision of the Cabinet to spend on any service,



including a new service not contemplated in the annual financial statement for that year, is entirely in the domain of the Cabinet and that the Court should draw inspiration from “consecrated principles” of not entering into the wisdom of the Cabinet to incur additional expenditure for the service for Special PR (Public Relations) Programme. The Cabinet knows best the needs of the people.

48. In the instant case, the purported decision of the Cabinet was neither placed before the Legislature, though the Legislature was in session at the relevant time, nor it was even placed subsequently for its consideration. The Cabinet cannot proceed on the assumption that its decision involving additional expenditure would ultimately be approved by the Legislature. The procedure to be followed in financial matters have been discussed in Articles 202 to 207 of the Constitution of India. The Ministers constituting the Cabinet act on the principle of collective responsibility and the most important questions of policy are all formulated by them under Article 202 of the Constitution of India.



49. The sums required for carrying on the business are entered in the annual financial statement which the Ministry has to lay before the House or Houses of Legislature in respect of every financial year under Article 202 of the Constitution. So much of the estimates as relate to expenditure other than those charged on the Consolidated Fund are submitted in the form of demands for grants to the Legislature and the Legislature has the power to assent or refuse to assent to any such demand or assent to a demand subject to reduction of the amount (Article 203). After the grant is sanctioned, an Appropriation Bill is introduced to provide for the appropriation out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of all moneys required to meet the grants thus made by the Assembly (Article 204). As soon as the Appropriation Act is passed, the expenditure made under the heads covered by it would be deemed to be properly authorised by law under Article 266 (3) of the Constitution.

50. We deem it relevant also to note that the proclaimed objective of Exhibit P1 order and the Programme being one in the nature of a welfare study for data collection to ascertain the



effectiveness of the various development and welfare schemes undertaken by the Government over the past nearly a decade, most of which have specific targets and objectives, it begs the question whether such a complex exercise could have been carried out by the *Karma Sena* Volunteers under Exhibit R1(c) dated 01.01.2020 constituted for a different purpose of meeting the need of volunteer hands during natural disasters. Prudence and professionalism may require entrusting such a niche activity to competent, qualified persons from a specialised governmental or non-governmental agency that possesses the specialised knowledge and expertise for assessing the implementation of development and welfare schemes.

51. We note that the contentions put forth by the Petitioners based on the Exhibit P2 letter issued by the additional 6<sup>th</sup> respondent Party Secretary cannot be totally brushed aside. The evasive and non-responsive counter-affidavit filed by the addl. 6<sup>th</sup> respondent, without any tenable explanation as to how the Exhibit P2 letter came to be issued to its cadres, much before Exhibit P1 order or even before the cabinet decision



approving the *Nava Keralam* Programme on 08.10.2025 gives credence to the allegation that there has been a concerted effort to covertly use the said programme by enabling the party cadres to flood the portal while not giving adequate publicity to the fact that the portal, though created for a different purpose and requiring a different commitment would be used for the *Nava Keralam* Programme.

52. The Government is not debarred from taking any welfare measures or undertake any development or welfare study programme like Exhibit P1, however, any expenditure incurred must have a financial sanction and pass muster the financial rules. We are not questioning the wisdom of the Cabinet to undertake such study, but for executing and implementing such study, funds *de hors* the financial rules are utilized and such irregularities if are brought on record, the court has a duty to declare such utilisation of funds as illegal. This is in addition to the reservation we expressed in the manner and mode in which such studies have been undertaken by the Government.

53. Since Exhibit P1 order has been put forth to be carried



out during a narrow window that was available between two Model codes of conduct, viz., one which preceded the Local Self Government Department (LSGD) elections of 2025 and the other soon to be in force as the Legislative elections for 2026 are around the corner, it is a moot question whether the Government would have the time at its disposal to collate, compare, study and implement the lessons which are to be drawn from the data collected from the Response Programme envisaged under Exhibit P1 order carried out, expending multi crore rupees.

54. In view of the above, we find sufficient cause has been made out to direct the respondents to keep in abeyance all steps and proceedings initiated pursuant to Exhibit P1 order and not to proceed any further with the implementation of the *Nava Keralam* Programme envisaged under Exhibit P1 order. The expenditure incurred in implementation of such programme is in violation of the rules of business. The said amount neither could have been allocated nor utilised under the special PR campaign head being not permitted under the rules of business. Consequently, Exhibit P1 order dated 10.10.2025 to the extent it



authorises the Information and Public Relations Department to utilise ₹20 Crores from the title 2220-01-001-96 'Special PR Campaign' is hereby set aside. Exhibits R1(a) and R1(b) orders issued in furtherance of Exhibit P1 are also set aside.

The Writ Petitions (PIL) are allowed.

Sd/-

**SOUMEN SEN,  
CHIEF JUSTICE**

Sd/-

**SYAM KUMAR V.M.,  
JUDGE**

APPENDIX OF WP(PIL) NO. 4 OF 2026PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:-

EXHIBIT P1 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER BEARING NO. S.U (K) NO. 13/2025/I&PD DATED 10.10.2025, ISSUED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION PUBLIC RELATIONS (C), ALONG WITH TRANSLATION.

EXHIBIT P2 TRUE COPY OF THE COMMUNICATION BEARING P.C.P CHIT NUMBER 63/2025, DATED 23.09.2025, AND ISSUED BY THE STATE COMMITTEE OF COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA (MARXIST), ALONG WITH TRANSLATION.

EXHIBIT P3 TRUE COPY OF THE NEWSPAPER REPORT DATED 09.11.2025 PUBLISHED IN MANORAMA ONLINE AT 9:46 AM BY SUJITH NAIR.

EXHIBIT P4 TRUE COPY OF THE REPORT DATED 20.12.2024 BY KUMAR SAMBHAV PUBLISHED IN ALJAZEERA.COM.

EXHIBIT P5 TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 01.12.2023 IN WP(C) NO. 39668/2023 PASSED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT.

EXHIBIT P6 TRUE COPY OF THE RULES OF BUSINESS OF GOVERNMENT OF KERALA PART II FIRST SCHEDULE OBTAINED FROM THE OFFICIAL SITE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF KERALA.

EXHIBIT P7 TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGES OF THE BUDGETARY SPEECH 2025-26 BY THE HON'BLE MINISTER OF FINANCE DATED 07.02.2025.

EXHIBIT P8 TRUE COPY OF THE OFFICIAL BROCHURE OF THE NAVA KERALA CITIZEN RESPONSE PROGRAMME, RETRIEVED FROM THE OFFICIAL WEBSITE, ALONG WITH ITS ENGLISH TRANSLATION.

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS:-

EXHIBIT R1(A) TRUE COPY OF G.O.(MS) NO.167/2025/I AND PRD DATED 25.10.2025 ALONG WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATION.

EXHIBIT R1(B) TRUE COPY OF PROCEEDINGS NO. C1/412/2025/1 AND PR, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DATED 06.11.2025 ALONG WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATION.

W.P(PIL)s. 4 & 8/2026

-:48:-



2026:KER:13939

EXHIBIT R1(C) TRUE COPY OF G.O NO. 01/2020/GAD DATED 1.1.2020,  
ALONG WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATION.

APPENDIX OF WP(PIL) NO. 8 OF 2026

## PETITIONER EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT P1 TRUE COPY OF THE NEWS REPORT PUBLISHED BY ASIANET NEWS ONLINE PORTAL DATED 07.10.2025.

EXHIBIT P2 TRUE COPY OF THE NEWS REPORT IN KAUMUDI ONLINE.

EXHIBIT P2(A) TRUE COPY OF THE NEWS REPORT IN INDIAN VARTHA.

EXHIBIT P2(B) TRUE COPY OF THE NEWS REPORT IN MADHYAMAM ONLINE ALONG WITH ITS ENGLISH TRANSLATION.

EXHIBIT P2(C) TRUE COPY OF THE NEWS REPORT IN DECCAN CHRONICLES ONLINE.

EXHIBIT P3 TRUE COPY OF NEWS REPORT IN MANORAMA BY JOURNALIST SUJITH NAIR DATED 09.11.2025.

EXHIBIT P4 TRUE COPY OF NEWS REPORTS OF CRITICISM TOWARDS THE SURVEY IN NEW INDIAN EXPRESS DATED 10.11.2025.

EXHIBIT P4(A) TRUE COPY OF NEWS REPORTS OF CRITICISM TOWARDS THE SURVEY IN THE WEEK DAILY DATED 1.1.2026.

EXHIBIT P4(B) TRUE COPY OF NEWS REPORTS OF CRITICISM TOWARDS THE SURVEY IN THE WEEK DAILY DATED 1.1.2026.

EXHIBIT P5 TRUE COPY OF CABINET DECISION OF THE CABINET OF MINISTER AS AVAILABLE ON THE OFFICIAL WEBSITE OF THE CHIEF MINISTER OF THE STATE.

EXHIBIT P6 TRUE COPY OF 'ECONOMIC REVIEW 2024' BY THE KERALA STATE PLANNING BOARD.

EXHIBIT P7 TRUE COPY OF OVERVIEW OF THE REPORT OF WORKING GROUP ON SOCIAL SECURITY AND WELFARE UNDER THE SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISION OF THE KERALA STATE PLANNING BOARD OF THE STATE AS AVAILABLE ON THE OFFICIAL WEBSITE OF THE KERALA STATE PLANNING BOARD.

EXHIBIT P8 TRUE COPY OF GOVERNMENT ORDER NUMBERED G.O(M.S) NO. 145/2021/LSGD AND DATED 16.07.2021 ALONG WITH



ITS ENGLISH TRANSLATION.

EXHIBIT P9      TRUE COPY OF THE RECORDS OF THE 11TH SESSION OF THE 15TH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF KERALA, UPON THE NON-STARRED QUESTION NO. 4194 RAISED BY SHRI. P. K. BASHEER MLA, AND ANSWERED BY SHRI. M. B RAJESH, RESPECTED MINISTER OF LOCAL SELF GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT AND EXCISE ALONG WITH ITS ENGLISH TRANSLATION.

EXHIBIT P10     TRUE COPY OF JUDGEMENT OF THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA IN MC MEHTA V. KAMAL NATH DATED 13.12.1996 AND REPORTED IN (1997) 1 SCC 388.

EXHIBIT P11     TRUE COPY OF JUDGEMENT OF THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA IN COMMON CAUSE V. UNION OF INDIA DATED 23.04.2014 IN WP(C) NO.13 OF 2003 AND REPORTED IN (2014) 6 SCC 552.

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS:-

EXHIBIT R1(B)    TRUE COPY OF PROCEEDINGS NO. C1/412/2025/I AND PR, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DATED 06.11.2025 ALONG WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATION.

EXHIBIT R1(A)    TRUE COPY OF G.O.(MS) NO. 167/2025/I AND PRD DATED 25.10.2025 ALONG WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATION.

EXHIBIT R1(C)    TRUE COPY OF G.O NO. 01/2020/GAD DATED 1.1.2020 ALONG WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATION.

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO C.J.