

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

PRESENT: SHRI.V.BHASKARAN, STATE ELECTION COMMISSIONER

Wednesday, the 17th day of July 2019

O.P.No.12/2018

Petitioner : K.K.Valsaraj,
S/o Kesavan,
Secretary, CPI,
Thrissur District Council,
K.K.WarriarSmarakaMandiram,
Thrissur District.

(By Adv. Viju V.R)

Respondent : T.M.Shafi,
S/o Muhammed Ali,
ThalikkalVeedu P.O.,
Kara Kadhiyalam,
Near Fisheries School,
Kodungalloor,
Thrissur- 680 671.

(By Adv. Sajitha. S)

This petition having come up for hearing on the 5th day of **July 2019**,
in the presence of Adv. **Viju V.R** for the petitioner and **Adv.Sajitha.S** for the
respondent and having stood over for consideration to this day, the
Commission passed the following.

ORDER

This is a petition filed under Section 4 of the Kerala Local Authorities (Prohibition of Defection) Act for declaring that the respondent committed defection and hence disqualified to continue as member of Edavilangu Grama Panchayat and also for declaring him as disqualified to contest as candidate in any election to the local body for a period of six years.

2. The petitioner's case in brief is as below:-Petitioner is the District Secretary of Communist Party of India, Thrissur District. Respondent is an elected member of Edavilangu Grama Panchayat in the election held in November 2015. He contested the election and was elected as a candidate of Communist Party of India (CPI). After the election the Left Democratic Front (LDF) formed the Panchayat board. The respondent was elected as the President of the Panchayat. There was an understanding in the Left Democratic Front (LDF) and as per that the first 2½ years the Presidentship would go to the nominee of CPI and the second half it would go to the nominee of CPI(M). Similar understanding was there regarding the post of Vice President. After 2½ years the respondent resigned from the post of President and the nominee of CPI(M) resigned from the post of Vice President as per the understanding. Fresh election to elect the new Vice President was scheduled to be held on 13.03.2018. Smt. Mini Thankappan was decided to be the candidate of the CPI for the post of Vice President. The meeting of the local committee of CPI was

held on 11.03.2018 under the Presidentship of the respondent and in the meeting it was decided to nominate Smt.MiniThankappan as the candidate for the post of Vice President. The petitioner was also present in that meeting. The petitioner being the District Secretary of CPI issued whip to all the elected members of CPI directing them to vote infavour of Smt.MiniThankappan in the Vice President election. The whip was handed over to the respondent directly. But he chose to disobey the direction of his party. Instead of voting infavour of his own party nominee Smt.MiniThankappan he cast his vote infavour of the candidate of the rival party. Besides, he made the vote of another CPI member Smt.SumaValsan as invalid. Smt.SumaValsan after casting her vote infavour of Smt.MiniThankappan has shown her ballot paper to the respondent and he took the ballot paper and voted infavour of the another candidate to make her vote invalid. The respondent defied and violated the direction of his party and acted against the interest of his party. By doing so the respondent has voluntarily abandoned his membership from CPI. By violating the whip issued by his party and acting against the interest of his party the respondent committed defection and thereby incurred disqualification under Section 3(1)(a) of the Kerala Local Authorities (Prohibition of Defection) Act. The petitioner thus seeks a declaration to that effect.

3. The respondent filed counter statement contending as below.- The petition is not maintainable. There was no understanding in LDF regarding

sharing of the post of President and Vice President. It is not correct to say that in the meeting of the local committee of CPI held on 11.03.2018 there was a decision to nominate Smt.MiniThankappan as the candidate for the post of Vice President. In the meeting majority of the members suggested the name of Smt.SumaValsan for the post. Two members suggested the name of Smt.MiniThankappan and demanded to nominate Smt.MiniThankappan for the post. There was hue and cry in the meeting. Even the MLA representing Kaippamangalam present in the meeting could not control the members. As a result of the pandemonium the meeting had to be disbursed without taking any decision. The respondent has recorded the minutes of the proceedings till the beginning of the tumult. When the meeting was disbursed the minutes book was forcibly taken away by the District committee member Smt.K.S.Jaya and local committee Secretary Shri.Thajudeen from the custody of the respondent. Thereafter they falsely recorded some decisions in the minutes book as the decision of the meeting and forged the signature of the respondent in the minutes. No decision was taken in that meeting to nominate Smt.MiniThankappan for the post of the Vice President. There was no whip issued in this case and no whip was given to any of the elected members of CPI as alleged. The allegation that the respondent made the vote of Smt.SumaValsan as invalid is false. There was no such incident and there was no such complaint also, before the Returning Officer or the Panchayat Secretary. The petitioner has filed this case making false allegations against

the respondent at the instance of the petitioner's supporters Smt.Jaya and Shri.Thajudeen with a view to tarnish the image of the respondent. The respondent has not defied the direction of the party and he did not do any act against the interest of his party. There is no merit in the petition and hence it is only to be dismissed.

4. The evidence in this case consists of the oral testimonies of PWs1toPW3, RW1, RW2 and Exts.A1to A9(a).

5. Both sides were heard.

6.The following points arise for consideration;

- (1) Whether the petition is maintainable?
- (2) Whether the respondent has disobeyed the direction of his political party as alleged?
- (3) Whether the respondent has committed defection as provided under Section 3(1)(a) of the Kerala Local Authorities (Prohibition of Defection) Act as alleged?
- (4) Whether the respondent has voluntarily given up his membership from Communist Party of India as alleged?
- (5) Whether the petitioner is entitled to the declaration prayed for?
- (6) Reliefs and costs?

7. **POINT No.1:** Petitioner is the District Secretary of Communist Party of India, Thrissur District and the respondent is an elected member

of Edavilagu Grama Panchayat in the election held in November 2015. He contested and was elected as the candidate of Communist Party of India (CPI). After the election the respondent was elected as the President of the Panchayat and the nominee of CPI(M) Smt. Ambika Asokan as the Vice President as per the understanding in the LDF regarding the sharing of the Presidentship and Vice Presidentship. Later they resigned from the post of President and Vice President. Fresh election to elect the new Vice President was held on 13.03.2018. It is stated that the Communist Party of India (CPI) decided to nominate Smt. Mini Thankappan from CPI for the post of Vice President and the petitioner being the District Secretary of CPI issued whip to all the elected members of CPI directing them to vote in favour of Smt. Mini Thankappan in the Vice President election to be held on 13.03.2018. The respondent disobeyed the whip and defying the direction of his party he cast his vote in favour of the nominee of the rival party Bharathiya Janata Party with a view to defeat the nominee of his own party. By doing so, the petitioner states, the respondent committed defection and incurred disqualification as provided under Section 3(1)(a) of the Kerala Local Authorities (Prohibition of Defection) Act. The respondent denied the allegations. According to him there was no whip from his party and there was no violation of the whip also. To him he did not commit any act of defection incurring disqualification. It is also his contention that the petition is not maintainable. But it is to be stated that though such a contention is raised in the counter statement he has no such case at the time of

evidence and hearing. Further, there nothing from his side to show that the petition is not maintainable.

8. It may be noted that the original petition is filed under Section 4(1) of the Kerala Local Authorities (Prohibition of Defection) Act. As per Section 4(1) of the Act, if any question arises as to whether a member of the local authority has become subject to disqualification under the provisions of the Act a member of that local authority or the political party concerned or a person authorized by it in this behalf may file a petition before the State Election Commission for decision.

9. Ongoing through the contentions of the parties it can be seen that a question arises as to whether the respondent has become subject to disqualification as provided by Section 3 (1)(a) of the Kerala Local Authorities (Prohibition of Defection) Act. The petitioner is the District Secretary of Communist Party of India, Thrissur District. As the District Secretary of the CPI party the petitioner is certainly entitled to file this petition under Section 4(1) of the Kerala Local Authorities (Prohibition of Defection) Act. The cause of action for this petition arose on 13.03.2018 and this petition was filed on 03.04.2018 ie., within the prescribed time of 30 days. As this petition is filed by a competent person within the time limit and a question arises as to whether the respondent has become subject to disqualification as provided by Section 3 (1) (a) of the Kerala

Local Authorities (Prohibition of Defection) Act, this petition is held to be maintainable. Point is answered accordingly.

10. **POINT Nos. 2 to 6:-** Case of the petitioner is that the respondent committed defection by acting against the interest of his political party and also by defying the direction of his party and thereby incurred disqualification under Section 3(1)(a) of the Act. Respondent is an elected member of EdavilanguGrama Panchayat and admittedly he contested and was elected as the candidate of CPI. Exts.A5 and A6 also would show the said fact. Ext.A5 is the copy of the declaration filed by the respondent before the Secretary of the Panchayat showing his party affiliation. Ext.A6 is the copy of the register showing the party affiliation of the respondent. Exts.A5 and A6 would show that he contested and was elected as the candidate of CPI. Anyway there is no dispute over those aspects.

11. There are 14 seats in EdavilanguGrama Panchayat. The details of the seats secured by each party are not stated in the petition. After the election the Left Democratic Front consisting CPI(M) and CPI formed the Panchayat board. The respondent a nominee of CPI and Smt.AmbikaAsokan of CPI(M) were elected as President and Vice President respectively. Later, after 2½ years they resigned from their respective posts as per the understanding in the LDF. Fresh election to elect the new Vice President was scheduled to be held on 13.03.2018. According to PW1 Smt.MiniThankappan from CPI was decided to be the candidate of LDF for the post and the decision to that effect was taken in the

meeting of the CPI Edavilangu local committee held on 11.03.2018. The said meeting was presided over by the respondent himself. PW1 was also present in that meeting. Ext.A2 is the minutes book of the meeting of local committee and Ext.A2(a) is the minutes of the meeting held on 11.03.2018. Following that PW1, the District Secretary issued whips to all the elected members of CPI including the respondent, directing them to vote infavour of Smt.MiniThankappan and Ext.A1 is the copy of the whip issued to the respondent. The whip, it is stated, was directly handed over to the respondent. Though the respondent received the whip and was aware of the whip he chose to disobey the whip and he cast his vote infavour of the candidate of BJP, the rival party with intent to defeat the nominee of his own party. To PW1 the respondent disobeyed and defied the whip of the party and acted against the interest of the party and thereby committed defection.

12. Evidence of PWs 2 and 3 is also on the same lines. PW2 is the Assistant Secretary of CPI Edavilangu local committee and PW3 Smt.SumaValsanis another member of Edavilangu Grama Panchayat. She is also a CPI member. Both PW's 2 and 3 clearly stated about the meeting of the local committee held on 11.03.2018 and the decision of the party taken in that meeting regarding the candidature of Smt.MiniThankappan. According to them it was the decision of the party to field Smt.MiniThankappan for the post of the Vice President. The issuance of whips to the members by the District Secretary to vote Smt.MiniThankappan was also stated by them. It is further stated by PW3 that when she cast her vote infavour of Smt.MiniThankappan the respondent forcibly

took the ballot paper from her and made her vote invalid by writing something on it. Though she filed a complaint before the Returning Office and the PanchayatSecretary they did not receive the complaint and she was directed to file complaint before the District Collector, Thrissur. Accordingly she filed a complaint regarding the incident before the District Collector, Thrissur. Ext.A3 is said to be a copy of the complaint and Ext.A4 is the receipt issued from the Collectorate for accepting the complaint, PW3 further states.

13. Case of RW1, the respondent is that he did not do any act of defection inviting disqualification. According to him there was no whip from his party and no whip was served on him. As there was no whip from his party the question of violation of the same does not arise. In the meeting held on 11.03.2018 majority of the members suggested the name of Smt.SumaValsan for the post of Vice President and only two members suggested the name of Smt.MiniThankappan. Members started raising their voice in support of their claims. There was hue and cry and due to the Pandemonium the respondent who was presiding over the meeting disbursed the meeting. No decision was taken regarding the candidate for the post of the Vice President. There was no decision of the party to field Smt.MiniThankappan as the candidate for the post of Vice President. As no decision was there from the party the respondent cast his name infavour of BJP candidate Smt.Sajitha. It was in the absence of any decision or direction from his party he cast his vote in that way and he did not abandon his membership from CPI, it is further stated.

14. RW2 is the witness examined on the side of the respondent. According to him he is a member of CPI Edavilangulocal committee. Presently he is under suspension. His evidence is that no decision regarding the candidature of Smt.MiniThankappan was taken in the meeting of the local committee held on 11.03.2018. To him majority of the members in the local committee suggested the name of PW3 Smt.SumaValsan for the post of Vice President and as there was dispute no decision was taken in that meeting. Here itself it is to be stated that even PW3 Smt.SumaValsan has no such case. As per her evidence there was no such suggestion of her name in the meeting and the decision of the party was to nominate Smt.MiniThankappan for the post of Vice President.

15. Submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the respondent committed defection by disobeying the direction of his party and acting against the interest of his party. In the Vice President election held on 13.03.2018 the respondent instead of voting infavour of the nominee of his own party, cast his vote infavour of the candidate of the rival party BJP. By doing so the respondent acted against the interest of his own political party and acting against the interest of his political party alone is sufficient to hold that the respondent has voluntarily given up his membership from the party and that he is disqualified, the counsel further submits. Contention of the learned counsel for the respondent on the other hand is that there was no decision to nominate Smt.MiniThankappan as the candidate for the post of Vice President and no whip was issued and served on him directing to vote infavour of Smt.MiniThankappan.

According to the counsel the respondent did not do any act attracting the provisions of defection.

16. The Kerala Local Authorities (Prohibition of Defection) Act was enacted to prohibit defection among members of local authorities in the state and to provide for disqualification of the defecting members of the local authorities. Section 3 of the Act deals with disqualification on the ground of defection. Section 3(1)(a) is the relevant provision in this case and it reads as below:- if a member of local authority belonging to any political party voluntarily gives up his membership of such political party, or if such member, contrary to any direction in writing issued by the political party to which he belongs or by a person or authority authorized by it in this behalf in the manner prescribed, votes or abstains from voting. (i) in a meeting of Municipality, in an election of its Chairperson, Deputy Chairperson, a member of standing committee or the Chairman of a standing committee; or (ii) in a meeting of a Panchayat, in an election of its President, Vice President, a member of a Standing Committee, or the Chairman of the Standing Committee; or in a voting on a no-confidence motion against any one of them except a member of a Standing Committee, he shall be disqualified for being a member of that local authority.

17. Section 3(1)(a) of the Act has two parts. The first part is attracted when a member belonging to any political party voluntarily gives up his membership of such political party and second part comes in to play when such member violates or disobeys the direction issued by the political party or a

person authorized by it in this behalf. As per clause (iva) of Section 2, a direction in writing means a direction in writing signed with date, issued to a member belonging to or having the support of a political party, by the person authorized by the political party from time to time to recommend the symbol of the said party for contesting in election, for exercising the vote favourably or unfavourably or to abstain from voting.

18. To attract the second part there must be a proper whip and the whip should be communicated and there must be violation of the whip. The District Secretary of Communist Party of India is the competent person to issue whips to all the elected members of CPI in Thrissur District and there is no dispute over that. PW1 is the District Secretary of CPI, Thrissur District and he himself filed this case. According to him he issued whip to the elected members of CPI in Edavilangu Grama Panchayat and Ext.A1 is the copy of the whip issued to the respondent. Whether the whip was properly served on the respondent is the question to be considered them. According to the petitioner the whip was directly handed over to the respondent. But there is absolutely no evidence to substantiate the said contention except the oral version of PW1. As per Rule 4(2) of the Kerala Local Authorities (Disqualification of Defected Members) Rules the whip/direction can be served by three modes – (1) directly (2) sending by registered post and (3) by affixture. Admittedly the whip was not sent by registered post to the respondent or service was effected by affixture. According to the petitioner the whip was served on the respondent

directly. While issuing directly the person who gives it shall obtain a receipt from the member. Admittedly no such receipt was obtained from the member. So it cannot be said that the whip issued in this case was served on the respondent. Only on the basis of the oral version it cannot be said that the whip was served on the respondent as alleged. As the whip was not properly served on the respondent as contemplated under Rule 4(2) of the Kerala Local Authorities (Disqualification of Defected Members) Rule it cannot be said that there is violation of whip. So the second limb of Section 3(1)(a) of the Act is not attracted in this case. Of course, that is not the case with regard to the first limb.

19. It is the settled law that the disqualification for voluntarily giving up the membership of the political party to which he belongs is not dependent on any violation of the whip. It is not necessary to hold that the member has violated the whip in order to conclude that he has voluntarily given up the membership of the political party to which he belongs. The grounds for disqualification under the first and second limbs of Section 3(1)(a) of the Act are distinct and are not interlinked as held in the decisions reported in **2009(2) KHC 839 (Biju R.S. and others V. Kerala State Election Commission and others)**, **2015 KHC 454 (Suryaprakash and others V. State Election Commission, Thiruvananthapuram and others)** **2015 KHC 7086 (Chenthamara K. and others V. Kerala State Election Commission, Thiruvananthapuram and others)** and **2018 (5) KHC 964**

(Eruthavoor Chandranand another V.Kerala State Election Commission and others). From the conduct of a member an inference can be drawn that he has voluntarily given up his membership from his party.

20. It is a fact that the respondent was elected as a member of CPI and he is bound by the decision of his party. He must be loyal to the party and he cannot act against the interest of his party. It is in evidence that a meeting of CPI Edavilangu local committee was convened on 11.03.2018 and said meeting was presided over by the respondent himself. Ext.A2(a) is the minutes of the said meeting. PW1, the District Secretary of CPI also attended the said meeting. It was the decision of the party to nominate Smt.MiniThankappan as the candidate for the post of Vice President. Ext.A2(a) minutes and evidence of PWs 1 to 3 would reveal the said fact. It is admitted by RW1 that there was a discussion in the meeting on that day regarding the candidate for the post of Vice President. According to him majority of the members present in the meeting suggested the name of PW3 Smt.SumaValsan for the post of Vice President and only two members suggested the name of Smt.MiniThankappan. When they raised voice and insisted to elect Smt.MiniThankappan as Vice President there was hue and cry. Following that the respondent disbursed the meeting. But there was no such incident as per Ext.A2(a) minutes. Even PW3 Smt.SumaValsan has no such case. Evidence of PW3 Smt.SumaValsan would show that there was no dispute regarding the candidature of

Smt.MiniThankappan and it was the decision of the party to field Smt.MiniThankappan as a candidate for the post of the Vice President.

21. The respondent has a contention that only a portion of the minutes was recorded by him on that date and the decision regarding the candidature of Smt.MiniThankappan was falsely incorporated in the minutes subsequently. The signature found at the end of Ext.A2(a) minutes is a forged one and it is not his signature. But the respondent has not filed any complaint regarding that before any authority even though a grave offence of forgery is alleged. There is no explanation also for that. Further on a mere comparison of the disputed signature with his admitted signatures in thevakalath, counter statement and deposition it can be seen that the disputed signature is similar to that of his admitted signature. Moreover there is no necessity for the District Secretary of the CPI to come before the Commission and say falsehood against the respondent. Evidence of PWs 1 to 3 would clearly show that the party has decided to field Smt.MiniThankappan as a candidate for the post of Vice President and I do not find anything to discard their evidence. Further, the evidence of the respondent's own witness RW2 also would give an indication that Smt.MiniThankappan was the candidate of CPI for the post of Vice President and the respondent's act of voting infavour of BJP candidate is against the decision of his party. In the cross-examination his evidence is to that effect.

22. It may be noted that the respondent is a responsible elected member of Edavilangu Grama Panchayat and he cannot act according to his whims and fancies. He is bound by the decision of his party. Acting against the interest of the party is nothing but disloyalty. The respondent was very well aware of the decision of the party to elect Smt. Mini Thankappan as the Vice President. Admittedly the respondent cast his vote in favour of Smt. Sajitha, the candidate of BJP, the rival party in the Vice President election held on 13.03.2018. By voting in favour of Smt. Sajitha, he ensured the victory of the candidate of the rival party and the defeat of his own party nominee. He acted against the interest of his own party and on account of that his party CPI lost the Vice Presidency of the Panchayat. RW2, his own witness, also stated that the act of voting in favour of the BJP candidate is against the decision of the party. It may also be noted that the respondent was against the candidature of Smt. Mini Thankappan throughout. The act of the respondent is to be considered in that background also.

23. The object sought to be achieved by the Act is to prohibit defection among members of the Local Authorities and to provide disqualification for the defecting members. What is ultimately sought to be prevented is the evil of political defection motivated by lure of office or other similar considerations which endanger the foundations of our democracy. It is settled law that if a member or a group of elected members of a political party takes a different stand from that of the political party as such and acts against the policies of the

political party in which they are members, it is nothing but disloyalty. The moment one becomes disloyal by his conduct to the political party, the inevitable inference is that he has voluntarily given up his membership. The **Kerala Local Authorities (Prohibition of defection) Act**, derived its source from the *10th schedule to the Constitution of India*. While upholding the Constitutional validity of 10th schedule, the *Apex Court in KihotoHollohan Vs.Zachillhu (1992) Supp.2 SCC 651*” observed as follows:-

“A political party goes before the electorate with a particular programme and it sets up candidates at the election on the basis of such programme. A person who gets elected as a candidate set up by a political party is so elected on the basis of the programme of that political party.If a member while remaining a member of the political party which had set him up as a candidate at the election votes or abstains from voting contrary to any ‘direction’ issued by the political party to which he belongs or by any person or authority authorized by it in this behalf, he incurs disqualification. A political party functions on the strength of shared beliefs. Its own political stability and social utility depends on such shared beliefs and concerted action of its members in

furtherance of those commonly held principles. Any freedom of its members to vote as they please independently of the political party's declared politics will not only embarrass its public image and popularity but also undermine public confidence in it which, in the ultimate analysis, is its source of sustenance-nay indeed its survival.To vote against the party is disloyalty. To join with others in abstention or voting with other side smacks of conspiracy.”

24. In the decision reported in 2008 (3) KHC 267 in (Faisal P.A. Vs. K.A.AbdullaKunhi) it was held as follows,-

“Since the words voluntarily giving up membership of his political party is not to be equated with ceasing to be a member of his party by resignation, from the conduct of the petitioner if an inference can be drawn that he has voluntarily given up his membership of his political party, he is liable to be disqualified. From the facts noticed by the second respondent, it is evident that the petitioner had acted against the directions of his party leadership and that he was arraying himself with the rival coalition. These facts

certainly justify the inference that the petitioner had voluntarily given up his membership in Indian Union Muslim League, although he had not tendered his resignation.”

25. A member belonging to a political party has to be loyal to his party and the moment he becomes disloyal he would become subject to disqualification on the ground of voluntarily giving up his membership from the party. The conduct of the respondent in voting infavour of the rival candidate instead of voting his own party nominee would clearly demonstrate that he became disloyal to the political party which elected him as a member of Edavilangu Grama Panchayat. The above acts would amount to defection inviting disqualification and the case put forward by the petitioner against the respondent is clearly established. According to Father of Nation Mahatma Gandhi politics without principle is one of the grave vices in that group. The menace of defection certainly, is to be curbed. The evil of political defections has been a matter of national concern. If it is not combated, it is likely to undermine the very foundations of our democracy and the principles which sustain it.

26. From the above facts and circumstances it can be seen safely concluded that the respondent has committed defection and he has voluntarily given up his membership from the party which elected him as member, as provided by Section 3(1)(a) of the Act and therefore he became

subject to disqualification for being a member of EdavilanguGrama Panchayat. Points are answered accordingly.

In the result, the petition is allowed and the respondent is declared as disqualified for being member of EdavilanguGrama Panchayat as provided by Section 3(1)(a) of the Kerala Local Authorities (Prohibition of Defection) Act. The respondent is further declared as disqualified from contesting as a candidate in an election to any local authorities for a period of 6 years from this date, as provided by Section 4(3) of the Act.

Considering the circumstances of the case the parties are directed to bear their respective costs.

Pronounced before the Commission on this the 17th day of July 2019

Sd/-
V.BHASKARAN,
STATE ELECTION COMMISSIONER

APPENDIX

Witnesses examined on the side of the petitioner

PW1 : Shri.K.K.Valsaraj
 PW2 : Shri.Ajayakumar
 PW3 : Smt.SumaValsan

Witnesses examined on the side of the respondent

RW1 : Shri.Shafi T.M.
 RW2 : Smt.Khadeeja.B

Documents produced on the side of the petitioner

- A1 : Copy of the whip issued by the Secretary of CPI, Thrissur District to Shri.T.M.Shafi
- A2 : Minutes book of the meeting of CPI Edavilangu local committee in Thrissur District.
- A2(a) : Minutes of the meeting of CPI Edavilangu Local Committee held on 11.03.2018
- A3 : Copy of the complaint submitted by Smt.SumaValsan,Chairperson to the District Collector,Thrissur District dated 14.03.2018
- A4 : Copy of the receipt issued from the collectorate
- A5 : Copy of the declaration in form No.2 submitted byShri.T.M.Shafi, Member, Edavilangu Grama Panchayat
- A6 : Copy of the register showing the party affiliation of the members of Edavilangu Grama Panchayat.
- A7 : Letter No.149/18/TSOK dated 24.03.2018 from the Returning Officer, Edavilangu Grama Panchayat to Shri.Thajudeen (RTI reply)
- A8 : MalayalaManorama daily dated 14.03.2018
- A8(a) : News report in MalayalaManorama daily dated 14.03.2018(relevant page No.3)
- A9 : Mathrubhoomi daily dated 14.03.2018
- A9(a) : News report in Mathrubhoomi daily dated 14.03.2018(relevant page No.4)

Sd/-

V.BHASKARAN

STATE ELECTION COMMISSIONER

//True Copy//