

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

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

Wednesday, the 8th day of January 2014

O.P.No.12/2012

Petitioner : Ramakrishnan,
S/o Kunjulekshmi Amma,
Chaithanya, Killikurisi,
Lakkidi Peroor,
Palakkad District .

**(By Advs. Cherunniyoor P.Sasidharan Nair
& Kallambalam S.Sreekumar)**

Respondent : Sreevalsan,
President, (Member, Ward No.2),
Lakkidi Peroor Grama Panchayat,
Palakkad, 'Sreevalsam', Lakkidi,
Ottappalam, Palakkad District -679 301,

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

This petition having come up for hearing on the 4th day of December 2013, in the presence of **Advs.Cherunniyoor P.Sasidharan Nair & Kallambalam S.Sreekumar** for the petitioner and **Advs. M.Hashim Babu & Sajitha. S** for the respondent and having stood over for consideration to this day, the Commission passed the following

ORDER

Petition filed under Section 35 (l) and 35(o) of the Kerala Panchayat Raj Act for declaring that the respondent has ceased to hold office as a member of the Lakkidi Peroor Grama Panchayat.

2. The short facts are as follows:- The petitioner is a voter of ward No.2 of Lakkidi Peroor Grama panchayat and his name is included as serial No.543 in Part 2 of the voters list of Killikurissimangalam ward. The respondent is the elected member of this ward and subsequently to his election as member, he was elected as President of the panchayat. The respondent is working as a Teacher in a Government Aided School at Parli, Palakkad Taluk. After election as the President, the respondent did not apply for any leave from the school and he is working as a teacher and drawing salary from the school till date. The respondent is attending the school and marking his attendance in the register of the school and getting salary and at the same time. The respondent is attending the Panchayat meetings and conducting travel and receiving sitting fees and traveling allowances on the same date on which he is marking his attendance in the school. As per Section 35(l) of the Kerala Panchayat Raj Act, a member shall be disqualified if he is disqualified under any provisions of the constitution or under any law for time being in force for the purpose of

elections to the legislature of the State. The respondent is holding two posts having office of profit which is prohibited under section 35(1) of the Kerala Panchayat Raj Act. The Government has clarified that the teachers working in Aided School are entitled to avail special leave and eligible casual leave while attending the functions of the Panchayat and can receive the leave salary during such period. But the respondent has not availed such leave and he is drawing full salary and at the same time he is receiving the sitting fee and Travelling Allowances from the Panchayat. The respondent has caused monetary loss to the Panchayat by accepting sitting fee for attending the committees convened on 21.03.2011, 22.03.2011, 24.06.2011, 18.08.2011, 19.08.2011 and 26.08.2011 and also drawn salary from the school on the same dates. The respondent has also caused loss to the Panchayat by unauthorisedly receiving traveling allowances on different dates and on such dates he had drawn full salary by marking attendance in the school. The respondent who is the President of the panchayat is a full time officer and as he has caused loss to the panchayat, he is liable to be disqualified under Section 35(o) of the Kerala Panchayat Raj Act. Hence this petition.

3. The respondent has filed objection and also objection to the amendment made to the original petition raising the following contentions;

The petition is not maintainable either in law or on facts. It is true that the respondent is an elected member of ward No,2 and he is also the President of the Panchayat. He is working as teacher in the Government Aided School at Parli. This respondent has attended the meetings of the Panchayat on 21.03.2011, 22.03.2011, 24.06.2011, 07.06.2011, 18.08.2011, 19.08.2011 and 26.08.2011 after obtaining permission from the Headmistress of the school and during March 2011 there was S.S.L.C. Examination and the respondent was not having any duty on such days so that there was no need to obtain permission of the Headmistress during the examination period. It is necessary for teachers to avail leave for functioning as a member of the Grama Panchayat. The respondent has not obtained any amounts by way of allowance while he was on duty at school. Section 35(1) of the Kerala Panchayat Raj Act is not applicable in this case and the commission is not empowered to entertain the challenge with respect to the provisions of the Kerala Panchayat Raj Act for the orders issued by the Government under the same and it can be challenged only by initiating proper proceedings before the appropriate court. This respondent had attended the school on 11.11.2010 and on the same date went to Thiruvananthapuram for attended a meeting only 10.30 pm and on the next day it was holiday. On 19.11.2010 the respondent went to the office of the Deputy Director of Panchayat in the

evening after school hours and on 25.11.2010 also, he attended the District Panchayat office after school hours. On 26.11.2010 he attended the meeting in the Block Panchayat after taking leave from the school. On 13.12.2010 the respondent attended the meeting of the disaster management based on an intimation from the Panchayat office and on that day he marked his attendance and attended the meeting as it was an emergent one. On 11.01.2011 the respondent attended the Palakkad DPC meeting though he marked in the attendance school register as it was on a discussion regarding amendment of the projects. On 10.02.2011 he attended the ICDS meeting after school hours and on 24.02.2011 he went to meet the Railway Divisional Manager only after school hours. On 16.03.2011, 21.03.2011, 22.03.2011 and 24.03.2011 the S.S.L.C examinations were going on and the specific instruction was that the teachers who were not having examination duty are to mark their attendance and leave the school. The respondent left the school after marking attendance as per the said instructions and therefore he attended the meetings of the Panchayat on those days. 09.05.2011, 20.05.2011 and 30.05.2011 were mid summer holidays and teachers were not required to attend the school and so he did not mark his attendance on the above days. The dispute regarding the leave on 24.06.2011, 18.08.2011, 19.08.2011 and 26.08.2011 has already been adjudicated by the Hon'ble

Ombudsman for Local Self Government Institutions and these days were allowed to be treated as leave. The respondent has not received any undue benefit from the Panchayat and he never caused any loss to the Panchayat. So the petition is liable to be dismissed.

4. The evidence consists of the oral deposition of PW1 and Exts.P1 to P4 series for the petitioner and the oral evidence of RWs 1 and 2 and Exts.R1 and X1 series for the respondent.

5. Both sides were heard.

6. The following points arise for consideration.

- (i) Whether the petition is not maintainable?
- (ii) Whether the respondent has caused loss to the Panchayat by receiving sitting fee and traveling allowances for the same days on which he received salary from the school as alleged?
- (iii) Whether the respondent being a teacher of Government Aided Parli School would cease to hold office as a member, if he functions as President or member without availing leave from the school?
- (iv) Whether the respondent has ceased to hold office as a member of the Lakkidi Peroor Grama Panchayat as provided by Section 35(1) and Section 35(o) of the Kerala Panchayat Raj Act?
- (v) Reliefs and costs?

7. **POINT No.(i)**: The petition is filed under Sections 35(1) and 35(o) of the Kerala Panchayat Raj Act (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act'), r/w Section 36(1) of the Act. According to the petitioner the respondent who is a teacher of Government Aided School should have availed special leave or eligible leave for functioning as member and President of the Panchayat and so he has become disqualified to continue as a member under Section 35 (1) of the Act and also that he has caused loss to the Panchayat and thus became disqualified under section 35(o) of the Act. The respondent would contend that the question whether the respondent should avail leave while functioning as Panchayat member or President while working as teacher cannot be deciding by this Commission and that he has not caused any loss to the Panchayat as alleged and so the petition is not maintainable. Section 35(1)(l) of the Act states that a member shall cease to hold office as such if he is disqualified under any provisions of the Constitution or under any other law for the time being in force for the purpose of elections to the Legislature of the State and Section 35(1)(o) of the Act states that a member shall cease to hold office as such if he is liable, for the loss, waste or misuse caused to the Panchayat. The petition is filed under Section 36(1) of the Act and it reads as follows:-

“36. Determination of subsequent disqualification of a member,- (1) Whenever a question arises as to whether a member has become disqualified under Section 30 [or Section 35 except clause (n)] thereof after having been elected as a member, any member of the panchayat concerned or any other person entitled to vote at the election in which the member was elected, may file a petition before the State Election Commission, for decision.”

8. The petitioner would allege that the respondent has ceased to hold offices member under Section 35(1)(l) and Section 35(1)(o) of the Act. The question as to the competency of the Commission to consider the alleged disqualification for performing the function as President or member without availing leave in the case of a Teacher of an Aided School can be considered by the Commission if it comes under any of the provisions of Section 35 of the Act. However the petitioner has specifically alleged that the respondent has caused loss to the Panchayat as provided by Section 35(1)(o) of the Act and also became disqualified under Section 35(1)(l) of the Act. Whether the respondent has ceased to function as member as provided by Sections 35(1)(o) or Section 35(1)(l) of the Act arises for consideration in this case as

provided by Section 36(1) of the Act. So I find that the petition is maintainable. The point is answered accordingly.

9. POINT No.(ii) to (v): The definite case of the petitioner is that the respondent who is a teacher of the Government Aided High School, Parli has caused loss to the Panchayat by accepting sitting fee for attending the committee meetings of the panchayat held on 21.03.2011, 22.03.2011, 24.06.2011, 18.08.2011, 19.08.2011 and 26.08.2011 and also by receiving the Traveling Allowances from the Panchayat on 11.11.2010, 19.11.2010, 25.11.2010, 26.11.2010, 30.12.2010, 11.01.2011, 10.02.2011, 24.02.2011, 16.03.2011, 24.03.2011, 09.05.2011, 20.05.2011 and 30.05.2011 on which dates he marked his attendance in the school register and received salary from the school. The contention of the respondent on the above allegations is relevant and he states at **Para 6** of the objection as follows:-

“This respondent is a teacher at Parli Higher Secondary School and marking attendance as when he attend the school is admitted. It is necessary for teachers to avail leave to function as member of Grama Panchayat. This respondent has not obtained amounts by way of allowance while he is on duty at School. On 24.06.2011, 18.08.2011, 19.08.2011, 20.08.2011, he got permission from

the Headmistress to attend the meetings in Panchayat and 21.03.2011, 22/03/2011 is the S.S.L.C duty leave to this respondent.”

10. It is in the amended petition that the allegations regarding loss to the Panchayat by receiving traveling allowances on various days are mentioned and the defence set up by the respondent to the above allegations are contained in **Paras 3 to 11** which reads as follows:-

3. It is submitted that on 11.11.2010 this respondent attended the school. This respondent went to Thiruvananthapuram for attending a meeting on the same day only at 10.30 pm after the school hours. The next day ie 12.11.2010 was a holiday for the school.

4. On 19.11.2010 this respondent went to the office of the Deputy Director of Panchayat only in the evening of 19.11.2010 after the school hours.

5. On 25.11.2010 this respondent attended District Panchayat after school hours and on 26.11.2010 this respondent attended the meeting in the Block Panchayat, Ottapalam after taking leave from the

school. He has not put his signature in the attendance register of the school.

6. *On 13.12.2010 this respondent attended the meeting in respect of the disaster management. On that day this respondent marked attendance in the school register, in the morning session but based on an intimation from the Panchayat office that the meeting on 13.12.2010 is an emergent meeting which cannot be avoided and hence went to attend the meeting on that day.*
7. *On 11.01.2011 this respondent attended the meeting in the Palakkad, since the meeting was a discussion regarding amendment of the projects, and it is intimated from the Panchayat office that the presence of the President in the meeting will be very beneficial and as such this respondent attended the meeting though he marked attendance in the school register.*
8. *It is submitted that on 10.02.2011 this respondent attended the ICDS meeting in the evening only after school hours.*

9. *On 24.02.2011 this respondent went to meet the Divisional Railway Manager only after school hours.*
10. *It is submitted that 16.03.2011, 21.03.2011, 22.03.2011 and 24.03.2011 are the dates on which S.S.L.C examinations were going on. It is specifically instructed by the superiors of the school that the teachers who are not in S.S.L.C Examination duty are required to reach the school and put the signature in the morning and leave the school. This respondent left the school after marking attendance only according to the above said instruction and therefore attended the meetings of the Panchayat on those days.*
11. *The days 09.05.2011, 20.05.2011 and 30.05.2011 are mid summer holidays and the teacher are not required to attend the school and sign the attendance register. On those days this respondent had not put the signature in the attendance register also.”*

11. The petitioner has been examined as PW1. He has given a consistent version in terms of his allegations contained in the petition. In cross-examination the suggestive question put to PW1 is that on 11.11.2010,

the respondent had attended the school and then went for the meeting in the evening and the answer of PW1 is that the records would reveal otherwise. It was also suggested to PW1 in cross-examination that the respondent had gone for the meeting after obtaining permission from the Headmistress which PW1 denied. It was then suggested to PW1 in cross-examination that on 30.12.2010, the respondent while attending the school got an urgent message from the Panchayat office that he should participate in the meeting of the Disaster Management and with the permission of the Headmistress, he went for that meeting and PW1 has denied the same. Again it was suggested to PW1 that on 11.01.2011 the respondent went for the DPC meeting after attending the school on the basis of an intimation and PW1 has answered that the respondent received the said intimation quite early. It was again suggested to PW1 in cross-examination that the respondent attended the meetings on 10.02.2011 and 24.02.2011 after school hours and so he received the Bata and PW1 has answered that the said meetings were from 10 am to 5 pm. It was also suggested to PW1 in cross-examination that on 16.03.2011, 21.03.2011, 22.03.2011 and 24.03.2011 the S.S.L.C.Examinations were going on and so the teachers who were not having examination duty were to mark their attendance and leave the school and thus the respondent had marked his attendance and PW1 has answered

that he has produced the records relating to the receipt of traveling allowances by the respondent on such dates. PW1 has again deposed that the respondent has received Traveling Allowance of more than ₹20,000/- which he was not entitled and thus caused loss to the Panchayat.

12. The respondent has been examined as RW1. His chief-examination is by way of an affidavit wherein it is stated that he in his capacity as a member is entitled to get sitting fees and traveling allowances from the Panchayat. He has admitted that he is functioning as the President of the Panchayat and also working as teacher of the Parli Aided High School. The distance from the school to the Panchayat office is stated to be 13 kms. He has further deposed that he had attended the meetings of the Panchayat after obtaining permission from the Headmistress. He has also stated in his deposition that on 11.11.2010 he attended the school and in the evening went to Thiruvananthapuram for a meeting and on 19.11.2010, he went to the office of DDP after school hours and on 30.12.2010 he went for disaster management meeting as per an intimation from the Panchayat office with the permission of the Headmistress and on 10.02.2011 he went for the ICDS meeting after school hours and he met the Divisional Railway Manager on 24.02.2011 after school hours. At Para 7 of his affidavit it is

stated that he had marked his attendance on various days in March 2011 and as he was not having examination duty he went for performing his function as President of the Panchayat after marking his attendance in the school. In cross-examination he has reiterated his version as alleged in his affidavit. He has admitted that the committees of the Panchayat are being held between 10 am and 5pm and the school time is from 10 am to 4 pm. He has further admitted that on 11.11.2010 he marked his attendance in the school and also received Traveling Allowance of ₹526/- for performing travel for the Panchayat. Ext.P4 series are the relevant records regarding the Traveling Allowances received by the respondent. On 19.11.2010 he has received salary as well as traveling allowance for attending the DD Office and that is marked as Ext.P4(b). In the Travelling Allowance record the time is mentioned as from 10 am to 5 pm. On 25.11.2010 also he received Travelling Allowance, the time of such travel seen stated in Ext.P4(c) is 9.30 am to 4.30 pm whereas he had received salary also for that day. Ext.P4(d) is the Traveling Allowances record for his travel to Block Panchayat Office on 26.11.2010. Ext.P4 series are records showing the receipt of travel allowances on various days on which the respondent is found to have marked his attendance in the school and availed salary for the same days in which he received Traveling Allowances. RW2 is the present Headmistress

of the school. Even though she was not called upon to produce any records Ext.X1 series are marked as brought by her and these are duty service certificate and attendance details. None of these records are relevant for deciding this case as they are in respect of different dates in 2012.

13. Ext.P2 series are the attendance register of the members maintained by the Panchayat and it is clearly found from this record that the respondent had attended the meetings of the Panchayat on different dates on which he had marked his attendance in the school. Ext.P4 series as already pointed out are the traveling allowance records in respect of the respondent on the various dates mentioned in the petition. Ext.P5 is the copy of the attendance register of the school for the year 2010-2011 and from this record it is found that the respondent had marked his attendance in the school on the same dates on which he attended the meetings of the Panchayat as well as conducted travel as president of the Panchayat. Exts.P2series, P3series, P4series and P5 along with the admissions made by the respondent would categorically prove that the respondent had received sitting fee for various days by attending the meeting of the Panchayat and also received Travelling Allowances for various days by conducting travel in connection with his duty as a member and President of the Panchayat and also received salary

from the school by marking attendance in the school attendance register for the very same days. It is not necessary to repeat the days on which the respondent had received the sitting fee and traveling allowances and received salary from the school. His contention that he went to different offices in connection with his work as Panchayat member and President after the school hours is totally untenable and on the face of the records it is clearly found that he went to such offices during school hours itself. Another contention raised by the respondent that he went to attend the meeting of the Panchayat after obtaining permission from the Headmistress of the school also cannot stand to legal scrutiny. A mere permission from the Headmistress of the school will not be sufficient for his attendance in the committee meetings of the panchayat and also for under taking journeys connected with his work as President of the Panchayat. From the admitted facts itself, it is found that the respondent had received sitting fee for attending the meetings of the panchayat on 24.06.2011, 18.08.2011, 19.08.2011 and 26.08.2011 as reveled by Exts.P2 series and P3 series. It is also found that he received the salary for above days from the school after marking his attendance in the school attendance register. It is further found that he marked his attendance in the attendance register of the school on 21.03.2011 and 22.03.2011 whereas he also attended the meetings of the

Panchayat on those days and his contention that there was S.S.L.C. Examination on those days and as he had no examination duty he attended such meetings and received sitting fee is unsustainable in law. He has marked his attendance in the school attendance register and received his salary for those days and so he could not have received the sitting fee for attending the meetings of the Panchayat on those days. It is further found that he received Travelling Allowance for having performed journeys in connection with his work as President of the Panchayat on various days as stated in Para 8 of the petition. His contention that he undertook such journey after school hours is totally untenable. The records also contradict the above contention. Ext.P4 series would amply demonstrate that the respondent had received traveling allowances on various days on which he had marked his attendance in the attendance register of the school and received salary for those days. So I have no hesitation in holding that the respondent has caused loss to the Panchayat by receiving the sitting fee and traveling allowances from the Panchayat by attending the meetings and performing journeys in relation to his work as President of the panchayat and on the same days he received salary by marking attendance in the school register.

14. The respondent is admittedly functioning as the President of the Panchayat. In Sub Section (1) of Section 153 of the Act, it is stated that the President shall be a full time functionary of the Panchayat. The petitioner would allege that the respondent who is working as a Teacher in a Government School has not applied for leave after being elected as President and that he is working as Teacher and drawing salary from the Government till date. It is further alleged that his attending the School and marking attendance in the attendance register for drawing salary on the very same dates in which he is attending the panchayat meetings and also availing sitting fees and Traveling Allowances. The petition is mainly under Section 35(1)(o) of the Kerala Panchayat Raj Act. The respondent has no case that he has availed leave during the period in which he has been working as President. In the G.O.(MS)No.81/08/LSGD, dated 15.03.2008, it has been clarified that the Panchayat President being a full time functionary of the Panchayat will have to avail leave for functioning as President During the entire period in which he is functioning as President and he is entitled to only leave salary along with honorarium during such period. However the respondent has no case that he is availing only leave salary or that he has availed leave during the period in which he has been functioning as President. In the above circumstances also the respondent is found to have

received two benefits simultaneously, that is salary from the School and honorarium from the Panchayat which he was not entitled to receive. Thus the respondent is found to have caused loss to the Panchayat as provided by Section 35(o) of the Act.

15. The petitioner would also allege that the respondent has ceased to hold office as provided by Section 35(1) of the Act also. Section 35(1) of the Act reads as follows:-

“35. Disqualifications of members,- (1) Subject to the provisions of Section 36 or Section 102, a member shall cease to hold office as such, if he-

(1) is disqualified under any provisions of the Constitution or under any law for the time being in force for the purpose of elections to the Legislature of the State.”

The petitioner would allege that the respondent being a school Teacher of an Aided School is not entitled to be chosen for being a member of a local body as he is holding two posts having office of profit and so he is not entitled to continue as a member of the Panchayat. The respondent would contend that this Commission is not competent to consider the correctness of the Provisions of Kerala Panchayat Raj Act and the orders

issued by the Government and that Section 35(1) of the Act has no applicability in this case. The petitioner has failed to disclose sufficient materials as to why the respondent has become disqualified to continue as a member as provided by Section 35(1)(1) of the Act. Disqualification of Officers and employees of Government and local authorities is contained in **Section 30 of the Act** and it reads as follows:-

30. Disqualification of officers and employees of Government, local authorities, etc,- (1) No officer or employees in the service of Central Government or of a local authority or a corporation controlled by the State or Central Government or of a local authority or any company in which the State or Central Government or a local authority "[not less than fifty one percent share] or of a Statutory Board or of any University in the State shall be qualified for election or for holding office as a member of a Panchayat at any level.

16. The respondent is working as Teacher in Aided School. Only the employees in the service of State or Central Government or of a local authority or a company or corporation in which the State or Central

Government State Government or a local authority has not less than fifty one percent share is disqualified under the above provision. The service in Aided School cannot be considered as service of the State Government. Of course the Teacher of aided school is getting salary from government. However that does not appear to be the criteria to determine regarding the disqualification of officers and employees as provided by Section 30 of the Act. As of now the larger question as to whether the service of an Aided School Teacher could be treated as at Par with the service of a Teacher in the Government School does not arise for consideration and it cannot be considered by this Commission. Rule 56 under Chapter 40 A of the Kerala Education Rules allows a School Teacher to avail leave for functioning as the President of a Panchayat either up to one year or for the full term in which he is thus functioning as President. So I do not find any merit in the claim of the petitioner that the respondent is disqualified as provided by Section 35(1) of the Act.

17. From the discussion held above, I hold that the respondent has caused loss to the Panchayat as provided by Section 35(1)(o) of the Kerala Panchayat Raj Act. The points are answered accordingly.

In the result, the petition is allowed and the respondent is declared as disqualified to hold office as a member of the Lakkidi Peroor Grama Panchayat as provided by Section 35(1)(o) read with Section 36 of the Kerala Panchayat Raj Act.

The parties shall bear their respective costs.

Pronounced before the Commission on this the 8th day of January 2014

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

APPENDIX

Witness examined on the side of the petitioner

PW1 : Sri.Ramakrishnan, 'Chaithanya',
Lakkidi.P.O., Ottappalam.

Witnesses examined on the side of the respondent

RW1 : Sri.Sreevalsan, 'Sreevalsam', Lakkidi,Palakkad-679 301

RW2 : Smt.P.Girija, Headmistress, Parli High School,
Parli, Palakkad

Documents produced on the side of the Petitioner

P1 : Voters list of Ward No.15, Lakkidi Peroor Grama
Panchayat

P2 : True copy of Attendance Register of members dated
22.03.2011

- P2 (a) : True copy of Attendance Register of members dated 19.08.2011
- P2(b) : True copy of Attendance Register of members dated 26.08.2011
- P3 : True copy of Attendance Register of members dated 21.03.2011
- P3(a) : True copy of Attendance Register of members dated 21.03.2011
- P3(b) : True copy of Attendance Register of members dated 24.06.2011
- P3(c) : True copy of Attendance Register of members dated 24.06.2011
- P3(d) : True copy of Attendance Register of members dated 18.08.2011
- P3(e) : True copy of Attendance Register of members dated 19.08.2011
- P4 : True copy of Travelling Allowance of Sri.K.Sreevalsan, President, Lakkidi Peroor Grama Panchayat
- P4(a) : Entry of the journey dated 11.11.2010 from Ottapalam to Thiruvananthapuram in Ext.P4 T.A.Bill
- P4(b) : Entry of the Journey dated 19.11.10 to the office of the Deputy Director of Panchayats, Palakkad in Ext.P4 TA Bill
- P4(c) : Entry of the Journey dated 25.11.2010 to District Panchayat, Palakkad in Ext.P4 TA Bill
- P4(d) : Entry of the Journey dtd 26.11.2010 to Block Panchayat, Palakkad in Ext.P4 TA Bill

- P4(e) : Entry of the Journey dtd 13.12.2010 to Mankara Grama Panchayat, in Ext.P4 TA Bill
- P4(f) : Entry of the Journey dtd 11.01.2011 to District Planning Committee, Palakkad in Ext.P4 TA Bill
- P4(g) : Entry of the Journey dtd 10.02.2011 to Block Panchayat, Palakkad in Ext.P4 TA Bill
- P4(h) : Entry of the Journey dtd 24.02.2011 to Railway Division Office, Palakkad in Ext.P4 TA Bill
- P4(i) : Entry of the Journey dtd 16.03.2011 to Ottapalam Block Panchayat, in Ext.P4 TA Bill
- P4(j) : Entry of the Journey dtd 24.03.2011 to Ottapalam Block Panchayat, in Ext.P4 TA Bill
- P5 : True copy of the Attendance Register of Parli High School, Parli, Palakkad

Document produced on the side of the respondent

- R1 : Copy of the order dated 16.10.2012 before the Ombudsman for LSG Institutions.

Documents produced on the side of the witness:

- X1 : Duty Certificate of Sri.Sreevalsan.K., H.S.A., Parli High School issued by AEO, Ottapalam
- X1(a) to
X1(bu) : Copy of the order dated 16.10.2012 before the Ombudsman, for LSG Institutions

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