



W.P.(C) No.34157 of 2022

1

2026:KER:83112

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISANKAR V. MENON

FRIDAY, THE 30TH DAY OF OCTOBER 2026 / 8TH KARTHIKA, 1948

WP(C) NO. 34157 OF 2022

PETITIONERS:

- 1 NIRMALA JOHNY, AGED 49 YEARS,
D/O.AMBROSE, T/C 34/1623, PUTHUVAL
PURAYIDOM, VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM - 695
008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT NEAR FCI GODOWN,
KOCHUTHOP.
- 2 FATHIMA, AGED 64 YEARS,
D/O.ROLUDON TC 34/1096, PUTHUVAL PURAYIDOM,
VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM - 695 008.
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT PORT GODOWN,
VALIYATHURA.
- 3 MABLE JUSTIN, AGED 62 YEARS,
D/O. JOSEPH FERNANDEZ, TC 78/1433, CHEKKADI
VILAKOM HOUSE, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT SREECHITHRA NAGAR, VALLAKKADAVU
P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
- 4 JESMAL VICTOR, AGED 74 YEARS,
D/O. ROLUDON, TC 78/1292, PUTHUVAL
PURAYIDOM, KOCHUTHOPE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM -
695 008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT PORT GODOWN,
VALIYATHURA.
- 5 SHERLY JUSTIN, AGED 45 YEARS,
D/O. NAZRETH, TC 78/1423, CHEKKADIVILAKOM,
KOCHUTHOPE, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY



RESIDING AT PORT GODOWN, VALIYATHURA.

- 6 MAGLIN IGNATIUS, AGED 54 YEARS,
S/O. AMBROSE, TC 34/106, CHEKKADIVILAKOM,
KOCHUTHOPE, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT PORT GODOWN, VALIYATHURA.
- 7 MEENA PETER, AGED 42 YEARS,
D/O. NELSON, T/C 34/1209, PUTHUVAL
PURAYIDOM, VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM
695008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT VARVILAKOM
PURAYIDOM, KOCHUTHOP, VALLAKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008.
- 8 ROBERT SILVA, AGED 53 YEARS,
S/O. MARKOSE TC 78/1150, PUTHUVAL PURAYIDOM,
VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM - 695 008;
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT T/C 33/821, PUTHUVAL
PURAYIDOM, VALLAKADAVU P.O,
TRIVANDRUM - 695 008.
- 9 BINDHU ALOSIOUS, AGED 38 YEARS,
W/O. ALOSIOUS, VARUVILAKOM PURAYIDOM,
VALLAKKADAVU P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695
008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT GOVT. UPS
VALIYATHURA.
- 10 ALPHONSA, AGED 62 YEARS,
D/O.FRANCIS, TC 87/1295, VARUVILAKOM
PURAYIDOM, KOCHUTHOPE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM -
695 008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT NEAR FCI
GODOWN, KOCHUTHOP, VALLAKADAVU P.O.,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008.
- 11 KOCHU THRESIA, AGED 41 YEARS,
D/O.LAWRENCE, TC 78/1204, PUTHUVAL
PURAYIDOM, KOCHUTHOPE, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT T/C 34/1523, KOCHUTHOP,
VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM - 695 008.



- 12 STELLA, AGED 79 YEARS,
D/O.NICHOLAS, TC 34/1728, VARUVILAKOM
PURAYIDOM, KOCHUTHOPE, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT GOV UPS VALIYATHURA,
TRIVANDRUM - 695 008
- 13 REJINA BABU, AGED 50 YEARS,
D/O.MARKOSE, T/C 34/1676, VARVILAKOM
PURAYIDOM, VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM 695
008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT GOV: UPS,
VALIYATHURA, TRIVANDRUM - 695 008.
- 14 KUNJAMMA MANIYAN, AGED 68 YEARS,
D/O.SEBASTIAN ANTHONY TC 34/1677, PUTHUVAL
PURAYIDOM, VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM - 695
008 CURRENTLY RESIDING AT PUTHUVAL
PURAYIDOM, VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM 695
008.
- 15 MARY JOY, AGED 49 YEARS,
D/O.NAZRETH, T/C 34/1729, KOCHUTHOP,
VALLAKKADAVU P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695
008, CURRENTLY RESIDING AT KOCHUTHOP,
VALLAKADAVU P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695
008.
- 6 MARY MICHELE, AGED 75 YEARS,
D/O.VAREETH, T/C 87/1047 PUTHUVAL PURAYIDOM,
KOCHUTHOPE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008;
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT NEAR KOCHUTHOPE,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008.
- 17 MARIYAM RAJU, AGED 56 YEARS,
D/O.FRANCIS ANTONY, TC 78/1076, PUTHUVAL
PURAYIDOM, KOCHUTHOPE, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT KANNANTHURA, BEACH P.O,
TRIVANDRUM.
- 18 GEORGINA, AGED 56 YEARS,
D/O.ROBERT, TC 34/1154, PUTHUVAL PURAYIDOM,
KOCHUTHOPE, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,



THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT LISY ROAD, MARY HOUSE,
KOCHUTHOP, VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM - 695
008.

- 19 MARIYAMMA ANTONY, AGED 58 YEARS,
D/O.ANTONY, T/C 34/1682, VARVILAKOM
PURAYIDOM, VALLAKADAVU P.O., TRIVANDRUM -
695 008;
- 20 DENSON ADOLPHUS, AGED 53 YEARS,
S/O.ADOLPHUS TC 34/1034, VARVILAKOM
PURAYIDOM, VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM - 695
008. CURRENTLY RESIDING AT NADUTHURA,
POONTHURA P.O., TRIVANDRUM.
- 21 SISILY ANTONY, AGED 65 YEARS,
D/O. JOSEPH, T/C 34/1154, KOCHUTHOP,
VALLAKKADAVU P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695
008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT T/C 34/1590,
KOCHUTHOP, VALLAKADAVU P.O.
- 22 YESUDAS SOLOMON, AGED 55 YEARS,
S/O.SOLOMON, T/C 34/1245 PUTHUVAL PURAYIDOM,
KOCHUTHOPE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008;
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT NEAR KOCHUTHOPE,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
- 23 BABU AROGYAM, AGED 68 YEARS,
S/O.AROGYAM, TC 34/1242, PUTHUVAL PURAYIDOM,
KOCHUTHOPE, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT KOCHUTHOPE, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
- 24 LITTLE ANTONY, AGED 47 YEARS,
D/O. SOLOMON, TC 34/1215, PUTHUVAL
PURAYIDOM, KOCHUTHOPE, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT KOCHUTHOP, VALLAKADAVU P.O,
TRIVANDRUM,



- 25 SUSAMMA ASKAR, AGED 48 YEARS,
D/O. BERNARD, T/C 87/1448, PUTHUVAL
PURAYIDOM, VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM, PIN
- 695008.
- 26 SILVESTER VICTOR, AGED 55 YEARS,
S/O. VICTOR FERNANDEZ TC 34/1223, PUTHUVAL
PURAYIDOM, VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM,
PIN - 695008.
- 27 MERRY LORENCE, AGED 60 YEARS,
D/O. KUNJAMMA, TC 87/1173, VARVILAKOM
PURAYIDOM VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695008.
- 28 SHINY SOLAMAN, AGED 40 YEARS,
D/O. JERMY, TC 87/1171, VARUVILAKOM
PURAYIDOM, KOCHUTHOPE, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695008.
- 29 PETRISHA PATHROSS, AGED 55 YEARS,
D/O. PHILOMINA, TC 87/1180, VARUVILAKOM
PURAYIDOM, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695008.
- 30 RENJU SHAIJU, AGED 33 YEARS,
S/O. THRESSY, TC 87/1174, VARVILAKOM
PURAYIDOM KOCHUTHOPE, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695008.
- 31 LEELA NELSON, AGED 70 YEARS,
W/O. NELSON, T/C 34/1208, PUTHUVAL
PURAYIDOM, VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM - 695
008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT KOCHUTHOP,
VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM.
- 32 CELINE BABU, AGED 45 YEARS,
D/O. SUNNY, TC 34/1292, PUTHUVAL PURAYIDOM,
VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM 695 008;
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT KOCHUTHOP, FISHERMAN
COLONY, VALLAKADAVU P.O., TRIVANDRUM.



- 33 JESIOLDA, AGED 64 YEARS,
D/O. DEVADAS, TC 78/1106, CHEKKADI VILAKOM
HOUSE, VALLAKKADAVU P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
- 695 008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT KOCHUTHOP,
VALLAKKADAVU P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
- 34 AJITHA VARGHESE, AGED 43 YEARS,
D/O. AJITH, TC 78/1461, VARVILAKOM
PURAYIDOM, KOCHUTHOPE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM -
695 008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT KOCHUTHOP,
VALLAKKADAVU P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
- 35 MINI JOSE, AGED 45 YEARS,
D/O. MANIYAN, TC 34/1674, VARUVILAKOM
PURAYIDOM, KOCHUTHOPE, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT KOCHUTHOP, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
- 36 VINCY BABU, AGED 36 YEARS,
D/O. VINCENT, TC 87/65, KOCHUTHOPE,
VALLAKKADAVU P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695
008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT KOCHUTHOP,
VALLAKKADAVU P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
- 37 SELVI, AGED 58 YEARS,
W/O. ALIAS, T/C 44/62, PUTHUVAL PURAYIDOM,
VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM - 695 008;
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT BUDS SCHOOL,
VALIYATHURA.
- 38 SARITHA, AGED 42 YEARS,
D/O. JOHN TC 87/19, PUTHUVAL PURAYIDOM,
VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM 695 008
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT KARUPPAYA ROAD,
VALIYATHURA, VALLAKADAVU P.O.
- 39 SEBASTIAN, AGED 45 YEARS,
S/O. SYRUS FERNANDEZ, TC 44/145,
VALLAKKADAVU P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695
008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT BUDS SCHOOL,
VALIYATHURA.



- 40 FRANCIS, AGED 69 YEARS,
S/O. MICHEL, TC 34/1305, PUTHUVAL PURAYIDOM,
KOCHUTHOPE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008;
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT PORT GODOWN,
VALIYATHURA.
- 41 JAYARANI WILFRED, AGED 25 YEARS,
D/O. WILFRED, TC 71/298, PUTHUVAL PURAYIDOM,
KUZHIVILAKOM, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT KUZHIVILAKOM, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
- 42 BRIJIT THOMAS, AGED 70 YEARS,
D/O CLEMENT, TC 44/33, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT UPS GOV SCHOOL VALIYATHURA.
- 43 BENEDICT MARY, AGED 52 YEARS,
W/O. MICHEL, T/C 71/406, PUTHUVAL PURAYIDOM,
VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM - 695 008;
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT PORT GODOWN,
VALIYATHURA.
- 44 PHILOMINA GEORGE, AGED 45 YEARS,
D/O. MARIYADAS TC 71/236, PUTHUVAL
PURAYIDOM, VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM - 695
008 CURRENTLY RESIDING AT GOV UPS,
VALIYATHURA.
- 45 MARGRET ALBERT, AGED 70 YEARS,
D/O. SIMON, TC 44/134, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT GOVT. UP SCHOOL, VALIYATHURA.
- 46 JESINTHA GEORGE, AGED 67 YEARS,
D/O. GEORGE, TC 87/130, PUTHUVAL PURAYIDOM,
VALLAKADAVU, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008;
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT GOV UP SCHOOL,
VALIYATHURA.
- 47 STELLA EDWIN, AGED 59 YEARS,
D/O. VASTHIAN ANDREW, TC 44/112, PUTHUVAL



PURAYIDOM, ALBY ROAD, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT PORT GODOWN, VALIYATHURA.

- 48 FREDY SINDHU, AGED 57 YEARS,
S/O. ANTONY, TC 78/1860, KOCHUTHOP,
VALLAKKADAVU P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695
008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT PORT GODOWN,
VALIYATHURA.
- 49 STEPHEN, AGED 61 YEARS,
T/C 44/211, THUNDUVILAKOM PURAYIDOM,
VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM - 695 008;
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT GOV BUDS SCHOOL,
VALIYATHURA.
- 50 MARY PRINCY, AGED 50 YEARS,
W/O. MARIYA ANTHONY TC 87/106, FCI ROAD,
KOCHUTHOP, VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM - 695
008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT KARUPPAYI ROAD,
VALLAKADAVU P.O.
- 51 VASANTHA BENEDICT, AGED 50 YEARS,
D/O ATHINAS, TC 44/105, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT BUDS SCHOOL, VALIYATHURA.
- 52 SELVA RANI, AGED 43 YEARS,
D/O. AMBROSE, TC 77/279, PUTHUVAL PURAYIDOM,
VALLAKADAVU, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008;
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT BUDS SCHOOL,
VALIYATHURA.
- 53 LIBORI, AGED 72 YEARS,
S/O. JOSEPH AGUSTIAN, TC 71/362,
VALLAKKADAVU P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695
008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT PORT GODOWN,
VALIYATHURA.
- 54 GEORGE JOOSA, AGED 61 YEARS,
S/O. JOOSA, TC 44/135, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY



RESIDING AT GOV UPS, VALIYATHURA.

- 55 KUMARI, AGED 65 YEARS,
D/O. PRONY, T/C 87/180, PUTHUVAL PURAYIDOM,
VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM 695 008;
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT GOV BUDS SCHOOL,
VALIYATHURA.
- 56 JENOVA, AGED 70 YEARS,
D/O. LUSINJU TC 87/213, NEDUVILAKOM
PURAYIDOM, VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM - 695
008 CURRENTLY RESIDING AT BUDS SCHOOL,
VALIYATHURA.
- 57 JESSY JOSEPH, AGED 59 YEARS,
D/O. RAJU, TC 88/264, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT BUDS SCHOOL, VALIYATHURA.
- 58 REETA, AGED 63 YEARS,
D/O FRANCIS, TC 88/110, PUTHUVAL PURAYIDOM,
VALLAKADAVU, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008;
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT BUDS SCHOOL,
VALIYATHURA.
- 59 MARY, AGED 78 YEARS,
D/O. JOOSA, TC 87/141, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT UPS GOV SCHOOL, VALIYATHURA.
- 60 JOSWIN, AGED 58 YEARS,
D/O. JOSEPH, TC 87/1847, KOCHUTHOP,
VALLAKKADAVU P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695
008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT BUDS SCHOOL,
VALIYATHURA.
- 61 LEELA MARKOSE, AGED 66 YEARS,
D/O. MICHEL CHRISTIN, T/C 71/318, PUTHUVAL
PURAYIDOM, VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM - 695
008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT GOV BUDS SCHOOL,
VALIYATHURA.



- 62 OUSEP, AGED 58 YEARS,
S/O. BERNARD TC 78/1661, PUTHUVAL PURAYIDOM,
VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM - 695 008
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT NEAR OUSHADI,
VALIYATHURA.
- 63 THRESI MARKOSE, AGED 65 YEARS,
D/O. MARKOSE, TC 78/1843, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING NEAR AIRPORT, VALIYATHURA.
- 64 CARMEL JEYA SESAYYA, AGED 50 YEARS,
D/O. JOOSA, TC 44/135, THUNDUVILAKOM
PURAYIDOM, VALLAKADAVU, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM -
695 008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT GOV UP
SCHOOL, VALIYATHURA.
- 65 LILLY MANIYAN, AGED 47 YEARS,
D/O. BENNY ABRAHAM, TC 87/258,
THUNDUVILAKAM, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT BUDS SCHOOL, VALIYATHURA.
- 66 NANCY, AGED 77 YEARS,
W/O. BERNARD, TC 87/1418, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT NEAR KUZHIVILAKOM, VALIYATHURA.
- 67 VARGHESE, AGED 55 YEARS,
S/O. OUSEPH, T/C 34/1303, KOCHUTHOP,
VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM - 695 008;
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT VALIYATHURA.
- 68 BEROMA EDWIN, AGED 40 YEARS,
W/O. EDWIN TC 44/103, PUTHUVAL PURAYIDOM,
VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM - 695 008
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT NEAR THOPP,
VALIYATHURA.
- 69 ISABEL, AGED 67 YEARS,
D/O. SEBASTIAN, TC 87/67, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT NEAR KARUPPAYA ROAD,



VALIYATHURA.

- 70 JESSY, AGED 49 YEARS,
D/O. MOHANAN, TC 34/1218, PUTHUVAL
PURAYIDOM, KOCHUTHOP, VALLAKADAVU,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT PORT GODOWN, VALIYATHURA.
- 71 REETHA, AGED 60 YEARS,
D/O. ANTONY, TC 51/495, THUNDUVILAKAM,
VALLAKKADAVU P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695
008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT PORT GODOWN,
VALIYATHURA.
- 72 RABIL ARULAPPAN, AGED 53 YEARS,
W/O. ARULAPPAN, TC 87/165,, VALLAKKADAVU
P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT NEAR KARUPPAYA ROAD,
VALIYATHURA.
- 73 XAVIER M J., AGED 61 YEARS,
D/O. JOHN DORAS MORAIS, T/C 71/1200,
NEDUVILAKAM HOUSE VALLAKADAVU P.O,
VALIYATHURA, TRIVANDRUM - 695 008.
- 74 RAJI, AGED 41 YEARS,
D/O. MARIYADASAN M TC 44/142, VALIYATHURA,
VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM - 695 008.
- 75 ACHAMMA, AGED 52 YEARS,
D/O. MERRY TC 44/141, THUNDUVILAKAM
PURAYIDOM, VALIYATHURA VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695008.
- 76 JACOB ALEX, AGED 56 YEARS,
S/O. ALEX, TC 71/385, VALIYATHURA,
VALLAKKADAVU P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695
008;
- 77 GELI, AGED 58 YEARS,
D/O. PANIYADIMA, TC 71/665, VALIYATHURA
PUTHUVAL PURAYIDOM, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,



THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695008.

- 78 FLORY, AGED 66 YEARS,
D/O. KARUMAM, TC 71/700, VALIATHURA,
VALLAKKADAVU P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,
PIN - 695008.
- 79 FRANCIS, AGED 55 YEARS,
S/O. LAWRENCE, T/C 78/1310, PUTHUVAL
PURAYIDOM, VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM 695
008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT PORT GODOWN,
VALIYATHURA.
- 80 JESINTHA, AGED 66 YEARS,
D/O. STANSILAS TC 44/245/5, VALLAKADAVU P.O,
TRIVANDRUM - 695 008 CURRENTLY RESIDING AT
GOV UP SCHOOL, VALIYATHURA.
- 81 GRACY, AGED 70 YEARS,
D/O. DEVASY, TC 45/19, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT PORT GODOWN, VALIYATHURA.
- 82 MICHEAL, AGED 65 YEARS,
S/O. ANTONY, TC 71/218, PUTHUVAL PURAYIDOM,
VALLAKADAVU, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695008;
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT NEAR KUZHIVILAKOM,
VALIYATHURA.
- 83 ROSEMARY, AGED 67 YEARS,
D/O. ARULAPPAN, TC 71/695, VALIYATHURA,
VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008.
- 84 SAMSON, AGED 34 YEARS,
S/O. SHAMMICHAEL, TC 87/251/1, VALLAKKADAVU
P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT PORT GODOWN, VALIYATHURA.
- 85 GILBERT CARLOSE, AGED 62 YEARS,
S/O. CARLOSE, T/C 87/656, VALIYATHOP,
VALLAKADAVU P.O TRIVANDRUM - 695 008;



CURRENTLY RESIDING AT OPPOSITE LENA ROAD,
VALIYATHOP, VALLAKADAVU P.O.

- 86 MAGLIN JERON, AGED 56 YEARS,
D/O. CARLOSE TC 87/790, VALIYATHOP,
VALLAKADAVU P.O., TRIVANDRUM - 695 008;
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT KARIKKAKAM,
TRIVANDRUM.
- 87 MARGERAT, AGED 57 YEARS,
D/O. ANTONY TC 34/1419, VALIYATHOP,
VALLAKADAVU P.O TRIVANDRUM - 695 008;
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT JOOSA ROAD,
VALIYATHOP, VALLAKADAVU P.O.
- 88 JOSEPH JOHNSON, AGED 46 YEARS,
S/O. JOHNSON, TC 34/899, VALIYATHOP,
VALLAKKADAVU P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695
008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT NEAR CHURCH,
VALIYATHOP, TRIVANDRUM.
- 89 MERCY JULIAN, AGED 40 YEARS,
W/O. JULIAN, TC 34/1430, KOCHUTHOP,
VALLAKKADAVU P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM -
695008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT LENA ROAD,
VALIYATHOP, VALLAKADAVU P.O.
- 90 BARBARA, AGED 75 YEARS,
D/O. ANTHONY, TC 87/780, KOCHUTHOP,
VALLAKKADAVU P.O., THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695
008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT JOOSA ROAD,
VALLAKADAVU P.O.
- 91 ACHAMMA, AGED 54 YEARS,
D/O. JOHN, T/C 87/692, VALIYATHOP,
VALLAKADAVU P.O TRIVANDRUM - 695 008,
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT LENA ROAD,
VALIYATHOPE.
- 92 PHILOMINA DUBICK, AGED 51 YEARS,
D/O. STANCILAS TC 34/728, VALIYATHOP,
VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM - 695 008;
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT SREE CHITHRA NAGAR



KOCHUTHOPE VALLAKKADAVU P.O.,
TRIVANDRUM - 695 008.

- 93 SHALLET VIMAL, AGED 67 YEARS,
D/O. JOSEPH TC 78/901, LENA ROAD VALIYATHOPE
VALLAKKADAVU PO, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695
008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT LENA ROAD
VALIYATHOPE VALLAKKADAVU P.O.,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
- 94 CARMEL JOMON, AGED 51 YEARS,
D/O. ALIAS, TC 78/1050, JUSA ROAD,
KOCHUTHOPE VALLAKKADAVU P.O.,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT JUSA ROAD, KOCHUTHOPE
VALLAKKADAVU P.O., THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
- 95 ANNIE ANTONY, AGED 52 YEARS
D/O. EDWIN TC 78/902, VALIYATHOPE,
VALLAKKADAVU P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695
008; CURRENTLY RESIDING LENA ROAD
VALIYATHOPE. VALLAKKADAVU P.O.,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
- 96 MARIYA GORETTY PANCRAS, AGED 64 YEARS,
D/O. RAJAPPAN, TC 78/906, KOCHUTHOPE,
VALLAKKADAVU P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695
008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT JUSA ROAD
KOCHUTHOPE VALLAKKADAVU P.O.
- 97 PATRIC MICHEAL, AGED 46 YEARS,
S/O. R MICHEAL, T/C 34/881, JOOSA ROAD ,
KOCHUTHOP, VALLAKADAVU P.O TRIVANDRUM - 695
008; CURRENTLY RESIDING T/C 87/457, FERNNY
VILLA, USC ROAD, KOCHUTHOP, VALLAKADAVU P.O,
TRIVANDRUM.
- 98 JERSITA ROCKY, AGED 49 YEARS,
D/O. MARTIN JOHN, TC 34/1341, VALIYATHOP,
VALLAKADAVU P.O, TRIVANDRUM 695008;
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT JOOSA ROAD,
KOCHUTHOPE, VALLAKKADAVU P.O., TRIVANDRUM.



- 99 MINI ROCKY, AGED 36 YEARS
D/O. JOSEPH TC 34/787, THYVILAKOM PURAYIDOM,
VALIYATHOPE VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT JOOSA ROAD, KOCHUTHOPE
VALLAKKADAVU P.O., TRIVANDRUM.
- 100 BRIJIT GEORGE, AGED 58 YEARS,
D/O. ALPHONSE AROGYAM, TC 34/1501,
KOCHUTHOPE, PUTHUVAL PURAYIDOM VALLAKKADAVU
P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT JOOSA ROAD, KOCHUTHOP,
VALLAKADAVU P.O.
- 101 GERLI BASIL, AGED 68 YEARS,
D/O ALPHONSE AROGYAM, TC 87/773, KOCHUTHOPE,
VALLAKKADAVU P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695
008; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT JOOSA ROAD,
KOCHUTHOPE. VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
- 102 SHEELA POLSON, AGED 50 YEARS,
D/O. AVARACHAN, TC 34/783, THYVILAKOM
PURAYIDOM, VALIYATHOPE, VALLAKKADAVU P.O,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 008; CURRENTLY
RESIDING AT FATHIMA ROAD, VALIYATHURA
VALLAKKADAVU P.O.
- 103 CELINE VINCENT, AGED 75 YEARS,
W/O. VINCENT, T/C 80/847, PANANKAL
PURAYIDOM, TITANIUM P.O, TRIVANDRUM - 695
021. CURRENTLY RESIDING AT THYVILAKOM HOUSE,
VETTUCAUD, TITANIUM P.O, TRIVANDRUM, PIN -
695008.
- 104 SARA BABU, AGED 59 YEARS,
D/O. SYRIL, TC 80/200, MUKKOTTUPLAKAM,
SHANGUMUGOM P.O, TRIVANDRUM 695007;
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT NEAR MUKKOTTUPLAKAM,
SHANGUMUGOM P.O , TRIVANDRUM, PIN - 695008.
- 105 ANITHA, AGED 39 YEARS,
D/O. OUSEPH TC 90/1097, TITANIUM P.O.,



- TRIVANDRUM - 695 021; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT
MINI CORTERS, T/C 80/921, TITANIUM P.O.,
TRIVANDRUM, PIN - 695008.
- 106 ROCKY VAREETH, AGED 74 YEARS,
 S/O. VAREETH, TC 80/916, TITANIUM P.O
 TRIVANDRUM - 695 021; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT
 THYVILAKOM HOUSE, T/C 80/916, TITANIUM P.O
 TRIVANDRUM, PIN - 695008.
- 107 PAULIN FRANCIS, AGED 63 YEARS
 D/O. VAGHESE PREKORE, TC 33/668, SHANGUMUGOM
 P.O, TRIVANDRUM 695007, CURRENTLY RESIDING
 AT NEAR TITANIUM, TITANIUM P.O, TRIVANDRUM,
 PIN - 695008.
- 108 OUSEP, AGED 67 YEARS,
 S/O. ANTONY, TC 90/911, THYVILAKOM
 PURAYIDOM, TITANIUM P.O TRIVANDRUM 695021;
 CURRENTLY RESIDING AT MINI COTERS, TITANIUM
 P.O, TRIVANDRUM, PIN - 695008.
- 109 PHILOMINA, AGED 85 YEARS
 W/O. NICHOLAS, T 15659, VARVILAKOM HOUSE,
 SHANGUMUGOM P.O, TRIVANDRUM - 695 007,
 CURRENTLY RESIDING AT T/C 78/68, VARUVILAKOM
 HOUSE, SHANGUMUGOM P.O, TRIVANDRUM.
- 110 TRESA BABY, AGED 50 YEARS,
 D/O. VINCENT, TC 78/56, VARVILAKOM VEEDU,
 SHANGUMUGOM P.O, TRIVANDRUM 695007;
 CURRENTLY RESIDING AT T/C 33/293(2) NEAR
 VETTUCAUD CHURCH, TITANIUM P.O, TRIVANDRUM,
 PIN - 695012.
- 111 HELEN KUMARI, AGED 52 YEARS,
 D/O. RAJAN TC 80/1216, SHANGUMUGOM P.O,
 TRIVANDRUM, PIN - 695007.
- 112 FLORENCE MARY, AGED 33 YEARS,
 D/O. VINCENT, TC 90/412, TITANIUM P.O
 TRIVANDRUM 695021; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT

**MARIYA HOUSE, TITANIUM P.O TRIVANDRUM.**

- 113 SUSAN MARY, AGED 90 YEARS,
W/O. MARIYADASAN, TC 90/2855, PANANGAL
PURAYIDOM, TITANIUM P.O, TRIVANDRUM - 695
021, CURRENTLY RESIDING AT T/C 90/2855,
TITANIUM P.O., TRIVANDRUM.
- 114 MARY STELLA, AGED 39 YEARS,
D/O. MARIYADASAN, TC 90/2754, PANANKAL
PURAYIDOM, TITANIUM P.O, TRIVANDRUM - 695
021; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT TC 90/2855,
PANANGAL PURAYIDOM, TITANIUM P.O,
TRIVANDRUM.
- 115 SUNNY, AGED 52 YEARS,
S/O. CLEMENT, T/C 80/1213, MUKKONI VILKAM,
VETTUCAUD P.O TRIVANDRUM - 695 007,
CURRENTLY RESIDING AT VADAKKEI VILKAM
MUDUMBIL VEEDU TC-31/255 CHAKKA ITI.
- 116 FABIYOLA ERNESTA, AGED 68 YEARS,
D/O. SIMON, TC 80/1287, LIYA HOUSE
THYIVILKOM VETTUCAUD, SHANGUMUGHOM P.O,
TRIVANDRUM - 695 007; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT
JOSE VILLA HOUSE, TC-33/634 THYIVILKOM
VETTUCAUD, SHANGUMUGHOM P.O., TRIVANDRUM.
- 117 JENOVA MARY, AGED 52 YEARS,
D/O. ANTONY TC 80/1290, THYIVILKOM
VETTUCAUD, SHANGUMUGHOM P.O, TRIVANDRUM,
PIN - 695007.
- 118 JESPIN BERNARD, AGED 54 YEARS,
D/O. VARGHESE, TC 80/1288, THYIVILKOM
VETTUCAUD, SHANGUMUGHOM P.O, TRIVANDRUM,
PIN - 695007.
- 119 MILIKIYAS, AGED 53 YEARS,
S/O. STANCILAS, TC 90/3008, THYIVILKOM
VETTUCAUD TITANIUM P.O, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,
PIN - 695021.



- 120 VINEETHA, AGED 32 YEARS,
D/O GERALD, TC 89/204, THYIVILKOM VETTUCAUD,
SHANGUMUGHOM P.O, TRIVANDRUM, PIN - 695007.
- 121 PAULIN STEPHEN, AGED 57 YEARS,
W/O STEPHEN, T/C 33/236, MUKKUNPLAKOM,
VETTUCAUD, SHANGUMUGOM P.O, TRIVANDRUM 695
007, CURRENTLY RESIDING AT T/C 27/786,
PALAYAM, KUNNUKUZHI.
- 122 ROSA STELLUS, AGED 58 YEARS,
D/O MANUEL FERNANDEZ, TC 80/166, THYIVILKOM
VETTUCAUD, SHANGUMUGHOM P.O., TRIVANDRUM -
695 007; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT KANNANTHURA,
SHANGUMUGHOM P.O., TRIVANDRUM.
- 123 VINCENT, AGED 65 YEARS,
S/O VAREETH TC 80/879, THYIVILKOM,
VETTUCAUD, SHANGUMUGHOM P.O, TRIVANDRUM -
695 007. CURRENTLY RESIDING AT BALANAGAR,
VETTUCAUD, TITANIUM P.O., PIN - 695021.
- 124 STEPHEN MARTIN, AGED 55 YEARS,
S/O MARTIN, TC 89/213, MUKKODUVILKOM
VETTUCAUD, SHANGUMUGHOM P.O, TRIVANDRUM,
PIN - 695007.
- 125 MARYKUTTY ROBIN, AGED 46 YEARS,
D/O AMALAS, TC 90/1002, PUTHUVILKOM
VETTUCAUD TITANIUM PO, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM -
695 021; CURRENTLY RESIDING AT PUTHUVILKOM
VETTUCAUD TITANIUM P.O., THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
- 126 HILDA, AGED 62 YEARS,
D/O M THOMAS, TC 90/993, PUTHUVILKOM
VETTUCAUD, TITANIUM P.O, TRIVANDRUM,
PIN - 695021.
- 127 MIHAD, AGED 60 YEARS,
S/O MAJID, TC 45/421, NEDUVILAKOM PURAYIDOM,
BEEMAPALLI, VALLAKADAVU P.O.
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695008.



128 NABEESA, AGED 63 YEARS,
W/O MUBARAK, TC 70/3200, VALIYAVILAKOM
PURAYIDOM, BEEMAPALLI, VALLAKADAVU P.O.
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695008.

BY ADVS.
SRI.AJIT JOY
SMT.SAYUJYA RADHAKRISHNAN
SRI.ANEESH JAMES
SRI.PRASHANT BHUSHAN

RESPONDENTS :

- 1 STATE OF KERALA,
PORTS DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, REPRESENTED BY PRINCIPAL
SECRETARY, PIN - 695001.
- 2 UNION OF INDIA,
MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS,
PARYAVARAN BHAWAN, CGO COMPLEX, LODHI ROAD,
NEW DELHI, REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
PIN - 110003.
- 3 KERALA STATE DISASTER MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY,
GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
PIN - 695001.
- 4 DISTRICT COLLECTOR, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
DISTRICT, CIVIL STATION ROAD,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695043.
- 5 KERALA COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY,
4TH FLOOR, KSRTC BUS TERMINAL COMPLEX,
THAMPANOR, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, REPRESENTED BY
ITS MEMBER SECRETARY, PIN - 695001.
- 6 VIZHINJAM INTERNATIONAL SEAPORT LIMITED (VISL)
9TH FLOOR, KSRTC BUS TERMINAL COMPLEX,
THAMPANOR, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, REPRESENTED BY
ITS CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, PIN - 695001.



W.P.(C) No.34157 of 2022

20

2026:KER:83112

7 ADANI VIZHINJAM PORT PVT. LTD. (AVPL) ,
ADANI CORPORATE HOUSE, SHANTIGRAM, NEAR
VAISHNO DEVI CIRCLE, S.G.HIGHWAY, KHODIYAR,
AHMEDABAD, PIN - 382 421. WITH OFFICE AT
VIZHINJAM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, REPRESENTED BY
ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR, DIRECTOR,
PIN - 695521.

ADDL. THE VICTIM RIGHTS CENTRE UNDER KELSA
R8 REPRESENTED BY ITS CO-ORDINATOR

[ADDL.R8 IS SUO MOTU IMPEADED AS PER ORDER
DATED 15/12/2022 IN WP(C)NO.34157/2022]

BY ADVS.

SRI.VIPIN.P.VARGHESE, SC, VIZHINJAM
INTERNATIONAL SEAPORT LIMITED
SRI.ROSHEN.D.ALEXANDER
SHRI.N.MANOJ KUMAR, STATE ATTORNEY
SHRI.K.R.RANJITH, GOVERNMENT PLEADER WITH
STATE ATTORNEY
SHRI.ADARSH MATHEW
SHRI.KEVIN MATHEW GEORGE
SMT.MEERA ELSA GEORGE
SMT.MERLINE MATHEW
SMT.TINA ALEX THOMAS
SHRI.HARIMOHAN
SRI.VIPIN P.VARGHESE
SRI.V.J.MATHEW (SR.)
SRI.K.S.BHARATHAN
SRI.ANOOP V.NAIR, STATE ATTORNEY

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON
08.10.2026, THE COURT ON 30.10.2026 DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

**"C.R."****J U D G M E N T**

This writ petition has been instituted by the petitioners, stated to be residents of fishing villages located within 20 kms North of Vizhinjam, where the International Deepwater Multipurpose Seaport is being implemented. The petitioners contend that on account of the construction of the Seaport as above by the 6th and 7th respondents, substantial erosion of the coast has taken place on the Northern side of the Seaport construction - more particularly the breakwater construction and accretion on the Southern side of the Seaport. They would invite the attention of this Court to the Expert Committee constituted by the 1st respondent - State pursuant to Ext.P11 Government Order dated 06.10.2022, and state that the said report is to be ignored, since the Committee members were tainted with conflict of interest due to personal reasons. Therefore, they also seek setting up of an independent Committee by this Court with reference to Ext.P11 and the terms fixed therein.



2. Ext.P11 Government Order has been issued also with reference to certain directions issued by the National Green Tribunal (NGT), produced along with this writ petition as Ext.P9. For convenience, the operative portion of Ext.P11 is extracted as under:-

"4. However, certain sections representing the people residing in the coastal region have submitted that the construction of the Vizhinjam International Multipurpose Seaport project has caused coastal erosion around the port. The request was also raised before the Cabinet Sub Committee by the representatives of the local people during discussions.

5. In the circumstances, Government are pleased to constitute an Expert Committee to examine whether there has been any such coastal erosion consequent to the work done for constructing the port at Vizhinjam and to identify specific measures to address the coastal erosion if any, observed in the zone of influence of construction. The committee shall hear the views of the representatives of the local population before finalising the report. The committee shall have the following members.

1	Shri. M.D.Kudale, Former Additional Director, Central Water and Power Research Station (CWPRS), Pune (B-303, Panchavati Housing Society, Chavan Nagar, Dhankawadi, Pune 411043, Maharashtra)	Chairman
2	Dr. Riji John, Vice Chancellor, Kerala University of Fisheries and Ocean Studies, Kochi.	Member



3	Dr. Tejal Kanitkar, Associate Professor, School of Natural Sciences & Engineering, National Institute of Advanced Studies (NIAS), Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore	Member
4	Dr. P K Chandramohan, Former Chief Engineer, Kandla Port Trust. (Gowri Sadan, Azad Road, Kaloore, Kochi, 682 017	Member

6. The Terms of Reference for the Expert Committee will be issued separately."

3. The petitioners, as noticed earlier, contend that the members of the Committee constituted pursuant to Ext.P11 are having conflict of interest as alleged in the writ petition. Therefore, the petitioners contend that an independent Committee requires to be constituted, as noticed earlier.

4. However, noticing that pursuant to Ext.P9 judgment of the NGT, another Committee has already been constituted for monitoring the "shoreline changes", the reports of the afore Committee constituted by the NGT were directed to be placed before this Court pursuant to the order dated 30.03.2026.

5. As directed, the reports of the afore Committee constituted pursuant to the judgment of the NGT are also placed



on record. Therefore, as of now, following sets of reports are available;

- i. Prepared by the Committee constituted by Ext.P11.
- ii. Prepared by the Committee constituted by the NGT.

6. Sri.Prashant Bhushan, learned counsel for the petitioners, would submit that:

- i. The petitioners, residents of fishing villages located within 20 kilometers to the North of Vizhinjam, have either lost their houses or the same has been heavily damaged on account of coastal erosion pursuant to the construction of the Seaport. In other words, the petitioners are stated to be facing an existential crisis.
- ii. Report of the Committee constituted as per Ext.P11 cannot be acted upon since the members of the Committee were having conflict of interest. In this regard, he sought to rely on the following grounds raised in the writ petition:

“U. The Expert Committee members are tainted by conflict of interest due to their personal interest and involvement in the project, and connections to the 6th and the 7th respondent. The Chairman of the Committee, Mr.MD Kudale, has been working as an expert member of ‘Technical Sub-committee for the Development of Vizhinjam Seaport Limited since 2012’



as seen in the ER Sheet (Employee Register) data entry form of Central Water and Power Research Station CWPRS, Pune from where he retired in 2017. Expert member Dr. PV Chandramohan, served as Chief Engineer of Kandla Port, Gujarat. However, from 2006 and till now he has been working as the President-Technical, Navayuga Engineering Company Ltd, Hyderabad. Navayuga Engineering Company Limited and Adani Enterprises incorporated a new company called Vijayawada Bypass Project. Another member, Dr Riji K John, though when his name was announced as a member of the committee was the Vice-Chancellor of KUFOS, this Hon'ble Court had quashed his appointment as VC. The 6th respondent VISL, the implementing agency of Vizhinjam Port, was officiating as secretary to the Committee for a majority of its duration.

V. The Chairman of the Committee Sri. MD Kudale, has taken in the report a dramatically opposite view to his findings in the paper on "Impact of port development on the coastline and the need for protection" published in Indian Journal of Geo-Marine Sciences in December 2010."

- iii. Without prejudice to the above, he would contend that, Sri.M.D.Kudale, the Chairman of the Committee, had, pursuant to Ext.P5(a), opined more or less in tune with the contentions raised in the writ petition. However, Sri. Bhushan would point out that the view expressed in the



report submitted pursuant to Ext.P11 Government Order was just the contrary. He also sought to rely on the Google pictures at Ext.P6 series in this regard.

- iv. The Kudale Committee had visited the site on one day alone - 23.05.2023, which itself is a pointer to show that no authoritative studies were conducted.
- v. Ext.P12 report by the "Janakeeya Padana Samithi" points to coastal erosion after the construction, dredging and reclamation in connection with the Seaport commenced.
- vi. As regards the report submitted pursuant to the judgment of the NGT, he would submit that those were prepared by the 7th respondent concessionaire, as is clear from a reading of the covering letter. He also relied on the various parts of the afore report to contend that the report has been prepared by the 7th respondent concessionaire, and that it is forwarded only for the purpose of vetting; therefore, he would state that there is a requirement for constituting a new Committee.
- vii. The Committee constituted pursuant to the NGT directions, though it carries out a field visit once in six months, only vets reports prepared by National Institute of Ocean Technology (NIOT) and such other private agencies hired and paid by 6th/7th respondent. Even the cell constituted within Kerala Coastal Zone Management Authority (CZMA) is a dummy for shoreline monitoring and acts only as a post box for forwarding reports prepared by the 7th respondent. In other words, right from the directions issued by the NGT,



it is the 7th respondent who is carrying out the monitoring, and the Committee is only endorsing the same.

- viii. The Government themselves were aware about the inadequacies of the study by the Committee constituted by the NGT, as is clear from the constitution of another Committee pursuant to Ext.P11 Government Order.
- ix. Therefore, he concludes the submissions, by pointing out that a new Committee of independent members requires to be appointed also proposing five members along with their brief profiles attached as Annexure I to a reply affidavit dated 30.05.2026 filed by the petitioners.

7. *Per contra*, Sri.Anoop V. Nair, the learned State Attorney, would contend that:

- i. The Vizhinjam Seaport is located on a beach between two rocky promontories, on account of which there is only minimal longshore sediment transport.
- ii. The erosion occurred as a result of high wave activities, cyclones (western coast), as has been reported by the Committee pursuant to Ext.P11 Government Order. In this regard, he sought to rely on Ext.P7 report of NIOT, which pointed out that the erosion, etc., are on account of the cyclone.
- iii. There is no requirement for constituting a fresh Committee under any circumstances.
- iv. The NGT had specifically directed the Committee constituted pursuant to Ext.P9 judgment to monitor whether the



conditions in the EC/CRZ clearance are being honored, for which periodic reports were directed to be filed. According to him, if the reports are not acceptable, it is for the parties to approach the NGT.

- v. The Government had provided various schemes for rehabilitation of those affected by the construction of the Seaport as seen from Ext.R1(a) to Ext.R1(e) and most of the petitioners have received the benefits pursuant to such schemes. Therefore, according to him, the petitioners ought not have approached this Court.

8. Smt.Merline Mathew, the learned counsel for the 6th respondent, would contend that:

- i. The project in question being a project having strategic national importance and having obtained all valid approvals, the writ petition is not to be entertained.
- ii. EC/CRZ clearance has already been upheld by the NGT pursuant to Ext.P9. However, the judgment of the NGT has not been challenged by anyone. It is further pointed out that most of the issues raised in this writ petition were already considered and rejected by the NGT.
- iii. The writ petition, complaining about the existential crisis from 2016 onwards, is presented after a delay of six years in 2022 and hence there is delay and laches. She relied on **Narmada Bachao Andolan v. Union of India and Others [(2000) 10 SCC 664]** in this regard.



- iv. There is no evidence in support of the contentions or even suggesting that the construction of the Seaport in question is the sole contributing factor for the erosion on the Northern side.
- v. Ext.P5(a) Article presented by Sri.Kudale only contains a general opinion, whereas the report subsequently presented pursuant to Ext.P11 Government Order is a specific one, in relation to the Seaport in question. Hence, Ext.P5(a), by itself, cannot be a ground for discrediting the subsequent report.
- vi. The Vizhinjam project has been undertaken and executed after extensive studies by experts on shoreline monitoring etc., and such monitoring continues as on date. The opinion expressed by an expert is not to be interfered with, as held by the Apex Court in **University of Mysore v. C.D.Govinda [AIR 1965 SC 491]**.
- vii. The allegation of bias against the report of the Kudale Committee is raised on hyper-technical reasons without any basis.

9. Sri.Roshen D. Alexander, the learned counsel for the 7th respondent, would contend that:

- i. The NGT in Ext.P9 judgment has considered the issue in *extenso*, with specific reference to the grant of EC/CRZ clearance. Paragraph 36 of the judgment refers to as many as 17 studies that were taken into account while preparing the



Comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment Report, which was considered by the Expert Appraisal Committee before granting EC/CRZ clearance.

- ii. Since the NGT has considered the question with reference to grant of EC/CRZ clearance in *extenso*, and the same having attained finality, the writ jurisdiction of this Court is not to be exercised.

10. I have considered the rival contentions as well as the connected records.

11. The first issue arising for consideration is with respect to the alleged delay and laches in institution of this writ petition, noticed earlier. According to the respondents, the crisis arose and is being experienced from 2016 onwards, and the writ petition is presented only in 2022, and hence the writ petition is highly belated. True, the petitioners contend that they have been facing an existential crisis from the beginning of the project. At the same time, it also requires to be noticed that the Government issued Ext.P11 order dated 06.10.2022 providing for the constitution of the Committee for addressing the alleged coastal erosion pursuant to the Seaport construction. It is with reference to the constitution



of the Committee as above that the petitioners have instituted the captioned writ petition seeking the following reliefs:

- "i. Issue a writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction to the 1st respondent to permit any further construction at Vizhinjam International Seaport only after consideration of the detailed report/findings by the Expert Committee constituted by the 1st respondent through Ext.P11 Govt. Order;
- ii. Call for the records leading to the Final Report of the Expert Committee, pursuant to Exhibit P-11 G.O. dated 06.10.2022 by issue of a Writ of Certiorari or any other appropriate writ, order or direction, and set up an independent committee under the aegis of this Hon'ble Court to report on the terms fixed by Exhibit P-11.
- iii. Issue a writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction to the 2nd and 5th respondents to study through the expert committee appointed by the Hon'ble NGT in OA 74 of 2014 whether the constructions pursuant to Ext.P1 clearance, has aggravated coastal erosion leading to negation of the object of the Coastal Regulation Zone Notification of 2011 and 2019 to, "ensure livelihood security to the fisher communities and other local communities, living in the coastal areas, to conserve and protect coastal stretches, its unique environment ...".



- iv. Issue a writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction to the 3rd and 4th respondent to comply with the provisions of Disaster Management Act, 2005 and carry out immediate assessment of the Vizhinjam International Seaport Project from the point of view of the State and District Disaster Management Plan.
- vi. Issue a writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction to the 1st and 4th respondents to ensure that the petitioners are provided suitable alternate housing in the seacoast with compensation assessed and paid for loss of livelihood from the time of loss of their houses;
- vii. Issue a writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate Writ, order or direction to the 1st respondent to ensure for Fishers among the petitioners and others who lost their livelihood as a result of sea erosion especially Shore seine fishermen and net owners, Mollusc collectors and women fish vendors-adequate financial compensation including compensation for loss of occupation during the period of 2016 to 2022.;
- vii. Issue a writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction to the 1st respondent to undertake a project for restoration of the eroded beaches of national importance like Kovalam and Sanghamugam and other beaches of Pannathura, Poonthura, Beemapalli, Kochu thopu, Valiathura and



Vettukad through regular sand bypassing and beach nourishment process.

viii. To dispense with the filing of the translation of vernacular documents;.

ix. To award to the petitioners the costs of these proceedings;”

12. Reading of Ext.P11 shows that even pursuant to the NGT decision, the affected parties were before the Government: seeking its indulgence in the matter, and the Government has also responded positively by constituting the Committee. This Court is of the opinion that in the light of the Government Order at Ext.P11 issued as above, the allegation of delay and laches raised by the respondents is only to be repelled.

13. Before proceeding to consider the various contentions raised in this writ petition, the principles laid down by the Apex Court in **Union of India v. Kushala Shetty [(2011) 12 SCC 69]** require to be referred as under:

“28. Here, it will be apposite to mention that NHAI is a professionally managed statutory body having expertise in the field of development and maintenance of national highways. The projects involving construction of new



highways and widening and development of the existing highways, which are vital for the development of infrastructure in the country, are entrusted to experts in the field of highways. It comprises of persons having vast knowledge and expertise in the field of highway development and maintenance. NHAI prepares and implements projects relating to development and maintenance of national highways after thorough study by experts in different fields. Detailed project reports are prepared keeping in view the relative factors including intensity of heavy vehicular traffic and larger public interest. The courts are not at all equipped to decide upon the viability and feasibility of the particular project and whether the particular alignment would subserve the larger public interest. In such matters, the scope of judicial review is very limited. The court can nullify the acquisition of land and, in the rarest of rare cases, the particular project, if it is found to be ex facie contrary to the mandate of law or tainted due to mala fides. In the case in hand, neither any violation of mandate of the 1956 Act has been established nor has the charge of malice in fact has been proved. Therefore, the order under challenge cannot be sustained.”

Again, in **National High Speed Rail Corporation Limited v. Montecarlo Limited and Another [(2022) 6 SCC 401]**, the Apex Court held as under:



"48. Even while entertaining the writ petition and/or granting the stay which ultimately may delay the execution of the Mega projects, it must be remembered that it may seriously impede the execution of the projects of public importance and disables the State and/or its agencies/instrumentalities from discharging the constitutional and legal obligation towards the citizens. Therefore, the High Courts should be extremely careful and circumspect in exercise of its discretion while entertaining such petitions and/or while granting stay in such matters. Even in a case where the High Court is of the prima facie opinion that the decision is as such perverse and/or arbitrary and/or suffers from mala fides and/or favouritism, while entertaining such writ petition and/or pass any appropriate interim order. High Court may put to the writ petitioner's notice that in case the petitioner loses and there is a delay in execution of the project due to such proceedings initiated by him/it, he/they may be saddled with the damages caused for delay in execution of such projects, which may be due to such frivolous litigations initiated by him/it. With these words of caution and advice, we rest the matter there and leave it to the wisdom of the Court(s) concerned, which ultimately may look to the larger public interest and the national interest involved."

Thus, the scope of judicial review in this writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is very limited. At the same time,



this Court notices that the project in question has proceeded ahead and the second phase is currently going on. The petitioners have also stated before this Court that they are not seeking any stay of the proceedings with respect to the implementation of the project and this has been recorded also on 22.07.2026. Therefore, this Court is called upon to consider only the challenge against the constitution of the Committee pursuant to Ext.P11 Government Order and the ultimate report presented by the said Committee.

14. The main contention raised by the petitioners is as regards the constitution of the Committee pursuant to Ext.P11 Government Order and the reports stated to have been filed by the Committee. The challenge in this regard is twofold. The first ground of challenge is against the constitution of the members of the Committee noticed as above, which, according to the petitioners, were illegal insofar as the members of the Committee were having conflict of interest due to personal reasons/involvement in the project. The second ground of challenge is with respect to the conclusions of the Committee in



its report, which, according to the petitioners, are highly influenced by the 7th respondent. They contend that the report has been prepared not pursuant to an independent evaluation, but only pursuant to a preconceived opinion prepared by the 7th respondent and portrayed through the Committee.

15. As regards the conflict of interest of the members of the Committee, it is pointed out that:

- i. Sri.Kudale was working as an expert member of the "Technical Sub-committee" for the development of Vizhinjam Seaport Limited since 2012, as seen in the employee register, data entry form of the Central Water and Power Research Station, Pune, from where he retired in 2017.
- ii. Dr.P.V.Chandramohan, another member of the Committee, served as a Chief Engineer of Kandla Port, Gujarat, and from 2006 onwards he has been the President – Technical, Navayuga Engineering Company Limited, Hyderabad, which company, along with M/s.Adani Enterprises, had incorporated a new company for the Vijayawada Bypass Project.
- iii. Dr.Riji K.John, who was the Vice Chancellor of KUFOS, has been unceremoniously sent out when his appointment as a Vice Chancellor was quashed by this Court.
- iv. With respect to Sri.Kudale, it is further contended that the final report of the Expert Committee constituted pursuant to



Ext.P11 runs diametrically opposite to the findings contained in the paper published by Sri.Kudale during 2010.

16. I have considered the contentions raised by the petitioners as above.

17. In the counter affidavit filed by respondents 1 and 6, there are averments refuting the alleged conflict of interest. It is stated in the afore affidavits that academicians and professionals being engaged in various projects by the Government institutions may also be members of different sub-committees of various projects. It is stated that this itself cannot be taken as a case of personal interest on the part of members of the Committee. The affidavits also contend that the professional involvement of Sri.Kudale in the project would have definitely helped him while functioning as the chairman of the Committee constituted pursuant to Ext.P11 Government order. With respect to Dr.Chandramohan, the afore affidavits, virtually admits that he was working in the company that incorporated a new company along with Adani Enterprises.



18. In this regard, the principles laid down by the Apex Court in **N.K. Bajpai v. Union of India and Another [(2012) 4 SCC 653]** requires to be taken note. The Apex Court was considering the constitutionality of the provisions of Section 129(6) of the Customs Act, 1962, which stipulated that on demitting office as a member of the Customs, Excise and Service Tax Appellate Tribunal, that person was not entitled to appear before the Tribunal. The Apex Court found as under:-

"42. The next contention raised on behalf of the appellants before us is that the entire restriction is based on an illogical presumption of likelihood of bias. The presumption of legal bias being without any basis and ill-founded, the amendment itself is liable to be declared ultra vires. This contention, again, does not carry any weight. This argument is misconceived on facts and law, both. It is not only the mischief of likelihood of bias which is sought to be prevented by the amendment but the amendment has a definite purpose and object to achieve which is in the larger public interest. Such legislative attempt, not only to adhere to but to enhance the values and dignity of the legal profession, would add to the confidence of the common litigant in the administration of justice and the performance of duties by the Tribunal.

.....



45. Having regard to the prevalent values and conditions of the profession, most of the legal practitioners would not stoop to unhealthy practices or tactics but the legislature, in its wisdom, has considered it desirable to eliminate any possibility of conflict between the interest and duty and aimed at achieving this object or purpose by prescribing the requisite restrictions. With the development of law, the courts are expected to consider, in contradistinction to private and public interests, the institutional interest and expectations of the public at large from an institution. These are the balancing tests which are applied by the courts even in the process of interpretation or examining of the constitutional validity of a provision.

46. Under the English law, the genesis of bias has been described as the perception that the court is free from bias, that it is objectively impartial stems from the overworked aphorism of Lord Hewart, C.J. in *R. v. Sussex JJ., ex p McCarthy* [(1924) 1 KB 256] , KB at p. 259 wherein he said:

‘... it is not merely of some importance but is of fundamental importance that justice should not only be done, but should manifestly and undoubtedly be seen to be done.’

However, later the courts there felt that too heavy a reliance upon the Hewart aphorism in instances of alleged bias produces the danger that the appearance of bias or injustice becomes more important than the absence of actual bias, the doing of justice itself. It is, therefore, of importance that



perceived bias is not too readily inferred, such as to negate the doing of justice.

47. In *Porter v. Magill* [(2002) 2 AC 357 : (2002) 2 WLR 37 : (2002) 1 All ER 465 (HL)] , the House of Lords finally decided the proper test for finding perceived or apparent bias, after judicial debate for over two decades, which displayed the welcome interplay of judicial pronouncements within the jurisdictions of the English common law, Scotland and Strasbourg jurisprudence. The test is now whether the fair-minded observer, having considered the facts, would consider that there was a reasonable possibility that the tribunal was biased. (See Sir Louis Blom, Q.C., "Bias, Malfunction in Judicial Decision-Making" [2009 Public Law 199] .)

48. Bias must be shown to be present. Probability of bias, possibility of bias and reasonable suspicion that bias might have affected the decision are terms of different connotations. They broadly fall under two categories i.e. suspicion of bias and likelihood of bias. Likelihood of bias would be the possibility of bias and bias which can be shown to be present, while suspicion of bias would be the probability or reasonable suspicion of bias. The former lead to vitiation of action, while the latter could hardly be the foundation for further examination of action with reference to the facts and circumstances of a given case. The correct test would be to examine whether there appears to be a real danger of bias or whether there is only a probability or even a preponderance of probability of such bias, in the circumstances of a given



case. If it falls in the prior category, the decision would attract judicial chastisement but if it falls in the latter, it would hardly affect the decision, much less adversely.

.....

50. The element of bias by itself may not always necessarily vitiate an action. The court would have to examine the facts of a given case. Reverting to the facts of the present case, despite their absence from the object and reasons for the amendment of Section 129(6) of the Customs Act it cannot be held that the element of bias was presumptuous or without any basis or object. It may be one of the relevant factors which probably would have weighed in the mind of the legislature. When you have been a member of a tribunal over a long period, and other members have been your co-members whether judicial or technical, it is difficult to hold that there would be no possibility of bias or no real danger of bias. Even if we rule out this possibility, still, it will always be better advised and in the institutional interest that restrictions are enforced. Then alone will the mind of the litigant be free from a lurking doubt of likelihood of bias and this would enhance the image of the tribunal. The restriction, as already discussed, leaves the entire field of legal profession wide open for the appellants and all persons situated alike except to practise before CESTAT.

51. Besides the possibility of bias, there is a legitimate expectation on the part of a litigant before the Tribunal that there shall not be any possibility of justice being denied or



being not done fairly. These are the concepts which are very difficult to be defined and demarcated with precision. Some element of uncertainty would be prevalent. There can be removal of doubts to the facts of a given case that would help in determining matters with somewhat greater uncertainty. The contention of the petitioners that there has to be empirical data to suggest their practise before the Tribunal resulted in instances of misdemeanour which would have propelled the respondents to insert such a provision in the enactment, has rightly been rejected by the High Court. It may not even be proper to introduce such amendments with reference to any data. Suffice it to note that these amendments are primarily based upon public perception and normal behaviour of an ordinary human being. It is difficult to define cases where element of bias would affect the decision and where it would not by a precise line of distinction. Even in a group, a person possessing a special knowledge may be in a position to influence the group and his bias may operate in a subtle manner.

52. The general principles of bias are equally applicable to our administrative and civil jurisprudence. The members of the tribunals called upon to try issues in judicial or quasi-judicial proceedings should act judicially. Reasonable apprehension is equatable to possible apprehension and, therefore, the test is whether the litigant reasonably apprehends that bias is attributable to a member of the tribunal."

(Underlining supplied)



Thus, the Apex Court held that the very apprehension regarding likelihood of bias requires judicial chastisement, which requires to be examined with the facts of the given case. It is further held by the Apex Court that it is better to impose restriction in such instances, in which circumstance alone “will the mind of the litigant be free from a lurking doubt of likelihood of bias”.

19. The observations made by the Apex Court in **A.K.Kraipak and Others v. Union of India and Others [(1969) 2 SCC 262]**, though with reference to the alleged bias which prevailed in the selection process carried out also require to be noted:-

“15.It is against all canons of justice to make a man judge in his own cause. It is true that he did not participate in the deliberations of the committee when his name was considered. But then the very fact that he was a member of the selection board must have had its own impact on the decision of the selection board. Further admittedly he participated in the deliberations of the selection board when the claims of his rivals particularly that of Basu was considered. He was also party to the preparation of the list of selected candidates in order of preference. At every stage of his participation in the deliberations of the selection board



there was a conflict between his interest and duty. Under those circumstances it is difficult to believe that he could have been impartial. The real question is not whether he was biased. It is difficult to prove the state of mind of a person. Therefore what we have to see is whether there is reasonable ground for believing that he was likely to have been biased. We agree with the learned Attorney General that a mere suspicion of bias is not sufficient. There must be a reasonable likelihood of bias. In deciding the question of bias we have to take into consideration human probabilities and ordinary course of human conduct....."

(Underlining supplied)

20. It is in the light of the afore, the contentions raised in the writ petition as regards the constitution of the Committee requires to be taken into account. As already noticed, Sri.Kudale is stated to have been working as an expert member of the sub-committee constituted for the development of Vizhinjam Seaport. If, as a matter of fact, he was so engaged, this Court is of the opinion that inclusion of Sri.Kudale in the Committee constituted pursuant to Ext.P11 Government Order ought to have been avoided. As already noticed, the earlier involvement of Sri.Kudale is not disputed by any of the respondents. They even go to the extent of stating that such involvement would have helped him,



when he functioned as the Chairman of the new Committee. Similarly, as regards Dr.Chandramohan also, there is an allegation that he has been working as the President-Technical of the Company, which has connection with the 7th respondent herein. The afore allegation is also not seen denied by respondents 6 and 7. The 6th respondent has only tried to explain the position with details. At the same time, this Court is not inclined to accept the challenge to the inclusion of Dr.Riji K. John in the Committee merely on the ground that his appointment as Vice-Chancellor of KUFOS was quashed by this Court, especially since there is no challenge as regards his qualification for inclusion in the Committee.

21. This Court is also of the opinion that the contention raised by the petitioners with respect to the study conducted by Sri.Kudale, as evident from Ext.P5(a), requires to be taken note of in the light of the uncontroverted allegations regarding the conflict of interest raised in the writ petition. In Ext.P5(a), an article titled "Impact of port development on the coastline and the



need for protection” by Sri.Kudale published in the Indian Journal of Geo-Marine Sciences, he has opined as under:

“The construction of breakwaters and dredging of navigation channels for port development interfere with the longshore Littoral drift. The main impact of the port development is accumulation on the updrift side of the longshore drift and erosion of the downdrift side. The impact is prominent on the coastline having high rate of longshore sediment transport.”

It is in stark contrast of the afore opinion, that the report of the Committee constituted pursuant to Ext.P11 Government Order has stated otherwise. Though this Court is not called upon to consider the acceptability or otherwise of the findings contained in the ultimate report of the Committee constituted pursuant to Ext.P11, this Court has made reference to the opinion of Sri.Kudale as above, contained in Ext.P5(a) only in the light of the uncontroverted allegation of conflict of interest raised by the petitioners herein.

22. In the light of the above discussions, this Court is of the opinion that the challenge against the constitution of the Committee pursuant to Ext.P11 Government Order and the



opinion of the Committee, raised by the petitioners is only to be accepted.

23. This is all the more so, since a perusal of the final report submitted by the Committee, as approved by the Government pursuant to its order dated 02.08.2024, shows that the Committee has carried out an inspection/meeting at Vizhinjam only on one occasion, 23.05.2023. After the said inspection, the Committee held meetings with the inhabitants of the locality on 24.05.2023, and later came up with the final report.

24. It is true that the NGT has constituted another Committee which is submitting periodical reports. The State has also contended that, in view of the said reports, there is no requirement for making reference to the report submitted by the Committee constituted pursuant to Ext.P11. However, the Government itself, having constituted the Committee pursuant to Ext.P11, cannot turn around and say that the 2nd Committee report may be ignored, in view of the Committee constituted by the NGT.



25. The next issue to be considered would be as regards the reconstitution of the Committee. The petitioners have sought to provide a list of proposed members who could be included in the Committee. However, the Government has not provided any such list of proposed members who could be included in the Committee. Therefore, this Court is not in a position to order reconstitution of the Committee. It will be for the Government to form a fresh Committee after taking into account the observations made as above and the views of the stakeholders in the matter.

26. On the whole, this Court is of the opinion that the challenge against the constitution of the Committee pursuant to Ext.P11 Government Order requires to be upheld.

Therefore, this writ petition would stand ordered as under:

- i. It is declared that the constitution of the Committee pursuant to Ext.P11 Government Order was flawed for the reasons noticed above.
- ii. The final report of the Committee so constituted is not to be acted upon.



iii. The Government is to constitute an independent Committee for carrying out the studies as stipulated in Ext.P11, ensuring that there is no conflict of interest as regards the proposed members.

Sd/-

HARISANKAR V. MENON
JUDGE

ln



APPENDIX OF WP(C) NO.34157 OF 2022

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| EXHIBIT P1 | A TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE ORDER F.NO.11-122/0211-IA-III DT.03.01.2014, ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT. |
| EXHIBIT P2 (A) | TRUE PHOTOCOPIES OF THE RELEVANT Q & A NAMELY STARRED QUESTION NO.1553 DATED 04.07.2022. |
| EXHIBIT P2 (B) | THE PROGRESS OF THE PROJECT SO FAR HAS BEEN ANSWERED THROUGH STARRED QUESTION NO.1552 DATED 04.07.2022. |
| EXHIBIT P3 | PHOTOGRAPHS TAKEN OF THE SEAPORT CONSTRUCTION AND THE DAMAGES ON THE SURROUNDING COAST. |
| EXHIBIT P4 | THE RELEVANT PAGES OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT GUIDANCE MANUAL FOR PORTS AND HARBOUR (2010). |
| EXHIBIT P5 (A) | AN ARTICLE TITLED 'IMPACT OF PORT DEVELOPMENT ON THE COASTLINE AND THE NEED FOR PROTECTION' BY M.D. KUDALE IN THE INDIAN JOURNAL OF GEO-MARINE SCIENCES 39 (4) : 597-604. |
| EXHIBIT P5 (B) | ANOTHER ARTICLE BY V. K. TSOUKALA ET AL, TITLED 'BEACH EROSION AND CONSEQUENTIAL IMPACTS DUE TO THE PRESENCE OF HARBOURS IN SANDY BEACHES IN GREECE AND CYPRUS,' PUBLISHED ONLINE DATED 01.08.2015 |
| EXHIBIT P6 | THE GOOGLE EARTH PICTURES FOR PERIODS FROM THE TIME OF THE BEGINNING OF THE |



W.P.(C) No.34157 of 2022

52

2026:KER:83112

SEAPORT PROJECT FROM THE END OF 2015 TILL 2022 FOR THE LOCATIONS OF SHANGHUMUGAM AND VALIATHURA.

- EXHIBIT P7 TRUE PHOTOCOPIES OF THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE ANNUAL SHORELINE CHANGE ANALYSIS OF VIZHINJAM COAST OCTOBER 2020 TO SEPTEMBER 2021 AVAILABLE AT ANNUAL SHORELINE CHANGE REPORT OCTOBER, 2020 TO SEPTEMBER, 2021 NIOT.PDF.
- EXHIBIT P8 A TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE NEWS ARTICLE DT.18.05.2016 BY NEW INDIAN EXPRESS.
- EXHIBIT P8 (A) A TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE NEWS ARTICLE DT.08.06.2017 BY DECCAN CHRONICLE.
- EXHIBIT P8 (B) A TRUE COPY OF NEWS WAS PUBLISHED IN TIMES OF INDIA, TRIVANDRUM EDITION DT.19.04.2018.
- EXHIBIT P8 (C) A TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF DECCAN CHRONICLE NEWSPAPER DT.23.07.2019.
- EXHIBIT P8 (D) A TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF REPORTED IN INDIAN EXPRESS DT.22.04.2020.
- EXHIBIT P9 A TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE JUDGMENT DT.02.09.2016 OF THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL.
- EXHIBIT P10 A TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER WAS ADDRESSED BY THE ARCHBISHOP ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS AND OTHERS. MOST OF THE PETITIONERS BELONG TO PARISHES OF THE LATIN CATHOLIC CHURCH. TO THIS THE 1ST RESPONDENT HAS REPLIED ON 04.08.2021.
- EXHIBIT P11 A TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF THE ORDER PASSED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT DT.06.10.2022.



W.P.(C) No.34157 of 2022

53

2026:KER:83112

EXHIBIT P12 REPORT OF THE JANAKEEYA PADANA SAMITHI
TITLED 'IMPACT OF THE VIZHINJAM
INTERNATIONAL SEAPORT ON THE BEACHES,
COASTAL SEA, BIODIVERSITY, AND THE
LIVELIHOODS OF FISHING COMMUNITIES IN
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DISTRICT.

EXHIBIT P13 SATELLITE IMAGES OF THE TRIVANDRUM COAST
NORTH OF VIZHINJAM.

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS:

EXHIBIT R1 EXPERT COMMITTEE REPORT SUBMITTED BY
GOVERNMENT PLEADER.

EXHIBIT R1 (A) A TRUE COPY OF G.O. (RT) NO.1009/2019/F
AND PD DATED 26.12.2019.

EXHIBIT R1 (B) A TRUE COPY OF G.O. (RT) NO.4132/2022/RD
DATED 12.10.2022.

EXHIBIT R1 (C) A TRUE COPY OF G.O. (MS) NO.7/2022/DMD
DATED 01.09.2022.

EXHIBIT R1 (D) A TRUE COPY OF G.O. (MS) NO.8/2022/DMD
DATED 05.09.2022.

EXHIBIT R1 (E) A TRUE COPY OF G.O. (RT) NO.665/2022/DMD
DATED 03.09.2022.

EXHIBIT R1 (F) A TRUE COPY OF G.O. (RT) NO.631/2022/F AND
PD DATED 06.10.2022.

EXHIBIT R1 (G) A TRUE COPY OF G.O. (RT) NO.29/2023/F AND
PD DATED 07.01.2023.

EXHIBIT R1 (H) TRUE COPY OF THE GOVERNMENT ORDER
G.O. (RT) NO. 48/2024 F AND P DATED
23.01.2024.

EXHIBIT R1 (I) TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGES OF THE
COMPREHENSIVE LONG-TERM SHORELINE
MONITORING PROGRAM NOVEMBER 2014.



EXHIBIT R6-A THE TRUE COPY OF THE HALF YEARLY COMPLIANCE REPORT TO THE NGT DIRECTION IN ORDER DATED 02.09.2016 FOR THE PERIOD APRIL 2023 TO SEPTEMBER 2023.

EXHIBIT R6-B TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGES OF THE HALF YEARLY COMPLIANCE REPORT (HYCR) ON CONDITIONS STIPULATED IN ENVIRONMENTAL AND CRZ CLEARANCE DATED 03.01.2014 FOR THE PERIOD APRIL 2023 TO SEPTEMBER 2023,

EXHIBIT R6-C TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGES OF THE NIOT ANNUAL-SHORELINE-CHANGE-ANALYSIS-REPORT OCTOBER-2021-TO-SEPTEMBER 2022

EXHIBIT R6 D TRUE COPY OF THE RELEVANT PAGES OF THE COMPREHENSIVE LONG-TERM SHORELINE MONITORING PROGRAM NOVEMBER 2014.

EXHIBIT R7 (A) TRUE COPY OF THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS DTD. 21.01.2015 IN CIVIL APPEAL NOS. 7884-7885/2014.

EXHIBIT R7 (B) TRUE COPY OF THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS DTD. 03.02.2016 IN CIVIL APPEAL NOS. 8550-8551/2014.

EXHIBIT R7 (C) TRUE COPY OF THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS DTD. 03.07.2017 IN CIVIL APPEALS NOS. 8550-8551/2014.

EXHIBIT R7 (D) TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DTD. 12.12.2022 IN W.P (C) NO. 27571/2022 AND W.P (C) NO. 27593/2022.

EXHIBIT R6 (a) A TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER/FILE NO 10/56/2023-IA.III DATED 10TH MARCH 2025 ISSUED BY MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT, FOREST AND CLIMATIC CHANGES EVIDENCING ENVIRONMENTAL AND CRZ CLEARANCE.



W.P.(C) No.34157 of 2022

55

2026:KER:83112

EXHIBIT R6 (b)	A TRUE COPY OF THE DETAILS OF PROJECT AFFECTED PERSONS (PAF) AND LIVELIHOOD COMPENSATION IDENTIFIED BY GOVERNMENT OF KERALA UP TO DATE 16.10.2025.
EXHIBIT R6 (c)	A TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER NO. DFTVM/3176/2022-S2PIU ISSUED BY DIRECTOR OF FISHERIES TO THE MANAGING DIRECTOR OF 6TH RESPONDENT ALONG WITH ANNEXED DOCUMENTS CONTAINING DETAILS OF FLATS ALLOTTED TO PETITIONER.
EXHIBIT R6 (d)	A TRUE COPY OF ARTICLE TITLED 'COASTAL SEDIMENT CELL A GUIDE FOR COASTAL MANAGERS' PUBLISHED BY DIRECTOR NCSCM, MOEF IN MAY 2013.
EXHIBIT R6 (e)	A TRUE COPY OF ARTICLE TITLED 'SUSPENDED SEDIMENTS CONCENTRATION ON SHORELINE CHANGE USING SATELLITE IMAGES FOR SOUTHERN KERALA COAST' PUBLISHED IN THE JOURNAL OF EARTH SYSTEM SCIENCE IN OCTOBER 2021.
EXHIBIT R6 (f)	TRUE COPY OF THE GOOGLE EARTH IMAGE OF THE VIZHINJAM PORT PROJECT AREA AND ITS NEARBY LOCATIONS.
EXHIBIT R6 (g)	A TRUE COPY OF THE GOOGLE EARTH IMAGES SHOWING THE GROYNES AND OTHER SHORE PROTECTION MEASURES UNDERTAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT OF KERALA AT VALIYATHURA AND POONTHURA REGION.
EXHIBIT R6 (h)	TRUE COPY OF THE CMFRI REPORT DATED JULY 2022.
REPORT 1	NGT COMPLIANCE REPORT FOR THE PERIOD OCTOBER 2023 TO MARCH 2024.
COVERING LETTER 1	COVERING LETTER NO. NO.5134/AL/2017/KCZMA DATED 27.11.2024



W.P.(C) No.34157 of 2022

56

2026:KER:83112

COVERING LETTER 2 COVERING LETTER NO. 5134/AL/2017/KCZMA
DATED 27.10.2025

REPORT 2 NGT COMPLIANCE REPORT FOR THE PERIOD
APRIL 2024 TO SEPTEMBER 2024.

COVERING LETTER 3 COVERING LETTER NO.5134/AL/2017/KCZMA
DATED 27.10.2025

REPORT 3 NGT COMPLIANCE REPORT FOR THE PERIOD
OCTOBER 2024 TO MARCH 2025.

REPORT 4 NGT COMPLIANCE REPORT FOR THE PERIOD
APRIL 2025 TO SEPTEMBER 2025