



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE SYAM KUMAR V.M.

THURSDAY, THE 14TH DAY OF NOVEMBER 2024/23RD KARTHIKA, 1946

WP(C)NO.32149 OF 2015

PETITIONER:

K K DAMODARAN & CO.
INDIAN OIL DEALER, RIVER ROAD, KOCHI - 682 001,
REPRESENTED BY ITS PARTNER MR.RAJESH GOPAL,
AGED 43 YEARS, S/O.V.K.GOPALAN,
RESIDING AT VELIMPARAMBIL HOUSE, EROOR P.O.,
THRIPUNITHURA, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.

BY ADVS.
SRI.K.RAMAKUMAR (SR.)
SMT.ASHA BABU
SRI.S.M.PRASANTH
SRI.G.RENJITH

RESPONDENTS:

- 1 UNION OF INDIA
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY TO THE MINISTRY OF
SURFACE TRANSPORT, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,
NEW DELHI - 110 001.
- 2 THE COCHIN PORT TRUST
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
COCHIN - 682 009.
- 3 THE CHAIRMAN
COCHIN PORT TRUST, COCHIN - 682 009.
- 4 THE DEPUTY CONSERVATOR
COCHIN PORT TRUST, COCHIN - 682 009.



2024:KER:84873

5 ADDL.R5

THE INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LIMITED
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHIEF DIVISIONAL MANAGER,
PANAMPILLY NAGAR, KOCHI-682 036.

IMPLEADED VIDE ORDER DATED 07.12.2015 IN
I.A.NO.17674/2015

6 ADDL.R6

CAPT. GOURI PRASAD BISWAL
DEPUTY CONSERVATOR, COCHIN PORT TRUST,
COCHIN-682009.

IMPLEADED VIDE ORDER DATED 10.06.2016 IN
I.A.NO.2857/2016

ADDL. R7

7 M.MAJEED
AGED 48 YEARS
S/O.LATE MUHAMMED, SUHANA MANZIL,
THOPPUMPADY, FORT COCHIN.

IMPLEADED VIDE ORDER DATED 10.06.2016 IN
I.A.NO.3215/2016

BY ADVS.
SRI.V.S.ANILKUMAR, CGC
NITHIN GEORGE, R5
SRI.K.ANAND SR.
SRI.P.BENNY THOMAS
SRI.M.GOPIKRISHNAN NAMBIAR
SRI.K.JOHN MATHAI
SMT.LATHA ANAND
SRI.SAIBY JOSE KIDANGOOR, R7
RITHU JOSE (K/2314/2023)
S.VISHNU, R2-R4

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD
ON 04.11.2024, THE COURT ON 14.11.2024 DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:



C.R.

JUDGMENT

Dated this the 14th day of November, 2024

This Writ Petition is filed by the petitioner seeking the following reliefs:

- “(i) To call for the records leading upto Exts.P4 and P7 and quash the same by the issuance of a writ of certiorari or any other appropriate writ, order or direction ;
- (ii) To call for the records leading upto Ext.P8 and quash the same by the issuance of a writ of certiorari or any other appropriate writ, order or direction ;
- (iii) To declare that the orders Exts.P4 and P7 are violative of Articles 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India ;
- (iv) To issue a writ of mandamus commanding the respondents to permit the petitioner to continue to carry on his business as before irrespective of the issuance of Ext.P4 order ; and
- (v) To issue such other writs, orders or directions as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.”

Brief facts:

2. Petitioner had been issued with a jetty licence by the Cochin Port Trust on a piece of land owned by it alongside the port waters close to the Junkar Jetty at Fort Kochi. Petitioner holds a dealership licence issued by the Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. (IOCL) to run a fuel station from the above-mentioned jetty and the said facility, which comprises the jetty, slipway/ boat shed has been catering to the fuel needs of the fishing boats since



decades. Petitioner claims to have been assiduously meeting the mandates of the jetty licence issued by the Port Trust. Fishing boats would traverse the backwaters and arrive at the petitioner's facility to fill in diesel and thereafter proceed to the sea. While so, on 26.08.2015, at around 13.40 hours, a collision occurred between a fishing boat and a passenger boat in the backwaters. Eleven human lives were lost in the tragic incident. The collision point was around 90 meters from the fuel bunk jetty. Soon thereafter, an Order dated 31.08.2015 (Ext.P4) was issued to the petitioner by the Deputy Conservator (R4) of the Cochin Port Trust directing the petitioner to *"immediately cease functioning of the jetty and any operation that may be conducted through the jetty"*. The reason stated in the Order for directing such closure was that *"apart from the reckless navigation of the fishing boat, a factor that may have contributed to the accident is the location of a fuel station in the close vicinity of the junkar, ferry boat and tourist jetties in Fort Kochi."* The petitioner was not heard or put on notice before issuing such an Order for immediate closure of the fuel bunk jetty. Aggrieved by the said Order, the petitioner moved this Court filing W.P.(C) No.26565 of 2015 *inter alia* alleging violation of natural justice and bias on the part of the 4th respondent. This Court vide Ext.P5 judgment in the said W.P.(C) concluded that an opportunity of being heard ought to have been afforded



to the petitioner before issuance of Ext.P4 Order and it was directed that Ext.P4 ought to be treated only as a notice and the petitioner shall be afforded a hearing before a final decision is taken on the matter. Taking specific note of the allegation of bias raised by the petitioner against the 4th respondent (Deputy Conservator), this Court in Ext.P5 judgment directed that the 3rd respondent (Chairman of the Port Trust) shall hear the petitioner and shall pass final orders. In furtherance of the said judgment, a hearing was held by the 3rd respondent pursuant to which Ext.P7 dated 16.10.2015 was issued confirming Ext.P4 Order. In Ext.P7, the petitioner was directed to immediately close down the jetty *inter alia* on the ground that “*facts do compel a reassessment of the potential for harm of the jetty*”. The 3rd respondent had issued Ext.P7 based on Ext.P8 Inquiry Report submitted by the 4th respondent Deputy Conservator, about which the petitioner had no knowledge or information. Hence this Writ Petition was filed by the petitioner *inter alia* seeking to quash Ext.P7.

3. A counter affidavit was filed by respondents 2 to 4 defending Ext.P7. It was *inter alia* contended therein that the jetty licence of the petitioner had long expired on 31.03.2014, ie., much prior to the accident. Hence the petitioner had been running the jetty without a valid licence from 01.04.2014 onwards which was an act posing serious safety hazard to the life of passengers and to the navigation in the port waters.



Relying on Cochin Port Trust (Licensing of Jetties, Piers and Slip Ways) Amendment Regulations, 2013, it was contended that the petitioner had not chosen to apply for a renewal of licence. Though certain other jetty operators had challenged the increase of licence fee and had obtained interim orders from this Court in their favour to continue operations, the petitioner had not done the same. Hence, the petitioner who had no licence has no right to maintain the W.P.(C) on any of the grounds seen averred therein. In addition thereto, based on the Inquiry Report said to have been submitted by the 4th respondent after the accident, it was contended that the jetty of the petitioner was precariously placed jeopardizing the safety of the tourist boat jetty and the ferry boat jetty which is adjacent to the petitioner's premises. The Port Trust in its counter affidavit thus sought a dismissal of the W.P.(C).

4. The additional 5th respondent (IOCL) filed a counter affidavit *inter alia* pointing out that the petroleum outlet of the petitioner was commissioned as early as 29.11.1963 and had been functioning since then without any untoward incident. All statutory norms and safety procedures were being followed by the petitioner and the accident in question did not happen while fuelling at the outlet and hence the accident cannot be attributed to the functioning of the petitioner's outlet. It was also submitted that the fuelling of boats and vessels at the outlet



does not pose any risk whatsoever. The IOCL in its counter affidavit also sought that the Port Trust should renew the licence and allow the petitioner to operate the facility in the waterfront area as is being done now and stated that cancelling the waterfront side will adversely affect the IOCL in terms of loss of revenue and reputation. It was also pointed out by the IOCL that marine outlets are few and far between and the loss of each outlet would adversely affect the interest of owners/ operators of boats and vessels who depend on the outlet in question for fuel.

5. Since the Port Trust had not produced the Inquiry Report of the 4th respondent based on which Ext.P7 had been issued, this Court had vide Order dated 01.12.2015 directed the Cochin Port Trust to make available a copy of the said report. Pursuant to the said direction, a copy of the Inquiry Report of the 4th respondent dated nil was produced along with a memo dated 08.12.2015. The same was taken on record as Ext.P8. The petitioner upon receipt of the copy of the said report amended the W.P.(C) seeking to quash Ext.P8 to the extent the same affected the petitioner's interests.

6. An impleading petition was filed by the Gilnet Boat Buying Agents Association seeking to get impleaded in the W.P.(C) *inter alia* pointing out that the fuel outlet of the petitioner is the only source of supply of diesel to the entire boats of the locality including that of the



fishermen and therefore any closure of the said outlet lead to fisherfolk loosing their avocation and will be pushed into poverty. The said impleading petition was allowed and the association was impleaded as the additional 7th respondent. No counter-affidavit was filed by the said association.

Contentions advanced:

7. Heard Sri. K. Ramakumar, Senior Advocate, on behalf of the petitioner. Sri.S.Vishnu, the learned Standing Counsel for the Cochin Port Trust, Sri.Nithin George, appearing for the IOCL and Sri.Saiby Jose Kidangoor appearing for the additional 7th respondent Association was also heard.

8. The learned Senior Advocate appearing for the petitioner contended that Exts.P4, P7, and P8 suffer from the vice of arbitrariness and they violate the mandates of Articles 14, 19, and 21 of the Constitution of India. He submits that it was taking specific note of the allegation of bias put forth against the Deputy Conservator that this Court had directed the Chairman to hear and decide the matter. Though the Chairman did hear the petitioner as directed, Ext.P7 Order issued in pursuant thereof has been rendered solely based on Ext.P8 Inquiry Report submitted by the Deputy Conservator which in turn had been arrived at without hearing the petitioner or taking in any relevant inputs



from any other interested parties. The learned Senior Counsel thus contends that the impugned Order viz., Ext.P7 is rendered mechanically, is based on irrelevant considerations and without a proper application of mind. As regards Ext.P8 Inquiry Report, the learned Senior Counsel contends that there is no discussion or reasoning whatsoever in Ext.P8 as to why the recommendation was made to close down the fuelling jetty of the petitioner. Ext.P8 cannot hence, according to him, be relied on for the purpose of justifying the decision in Ext.P7 to close down the fuel station/ jetty. The same officer, who had issued, Ext.P8 had already determined the issue against the petitioner vide Ext.P4. The 3rd respondent erred in relying on Ext.P8 while issuing Ext.P7. The fuel jetty has been in operation since 1963 without any untoward incidents, and fairness, equity and reasonableness demanded that the petitioner be heard before drawing up Ext.P8 report wherein it had been recommended to close down the petitioner's fuel station/jetty. The learned Senior Advocate further assailed Ext.P7 on the ground that it had based itself on irrelevant considerations and had ignored relevant facts. Hence according to the learned Senior Counsel, Ext.P7 suffered from 'arbitrariness' in the 'Wednesbury' sense. He relied on the dictum laid down by the Supreme Court in **Rattan Lal Sharma v. Managing Committee, Dr. Hari Ram (Co-education) Higher Secondary School** (1993 KHC 971) and



Dinakaran P.D. (Justice) v. Hon'ble Judge's Inquiry Committee and others (2011 KHC 4574) and contended that the settled law laid down therein had been breached while issuing Exts.P7 and P8. The reasoning in Ext.P7 that the licence issued to the petitioner falls within the realm of contracts and hence once the period of licence expires, no notice or prior hearing need be afforded and that only the fuelling of fishing boats through the jetty had been prohibited and the supply of fuel to the vehicles plying on the road through the other side of the bunk facing the road has not been prohibited by the Port Trust are also assailed basing on the dictum that the additional reasons could not be added to buttress a decision already taken.

9. *Per contra*, the learned Standing Counsel for the Port Trust vehemently contended that the Writ Petition itself was not sustainable since the petitioner had no licence to run the fuel jetty during the relevant time. Licence fee had not been paid by the petitioner thus disentitling them to carry out any fuel-filling operations from the jetty. Petitioner was permitted to continue till date only based on the interim orders passed by this Court and as the licence had not been renewed by the Port Trust till date, the very operation of the fuel jetty during the relevant time was illegal. Thus the finding arrived at by the 3rd respondent in the said respect in Ext.P7 is both factually and legally correct and sustainable and



2024:KER:84873

no interference with Ext.P7 is called for. The learned Standing Counsel relies on the amendments brought into effect on 23.02.1970 to Cochin Port Trust (Licensing of Jetties, Slip Ways and Boat Pen) Regulations,1968 and contends that the licence fee payable by the petitioner had been duly amended and increased therein. Though it had been paid by the petitioner till the expiry of the licence on 31.03.2014, thereafter no payment had been effected. He further relies on the Cochin Port Trust (Licensing of Jetties, Piers and Slip Ways) Amendment Regulations, 2013, and contends that licence fee for jetties is fixed by the Port Trust based on the provisions therein. A batch of Writ Petitions are pending before this Court wherein the recent enhancement has been challenged by various licensees, however, the petitioner is not one among the said licensees and hence the petitioner does not have the right to continue operation on the premise that the subject matter of licence fee is pending consideration. He submits that the petitioner is bound to pay a licence fee based on the prevailing TAMP (Tariff Authority for Major Port) rates and that the petitioner has been continuing operations on the strength of the interim order in this W.P.(C) without paying any amounts whatsoever towards the licence fee. The learned counsel thus seeks a direction to the petitioner to pay the licensee fee, both past and present, as per the said rates fixed by the TAMP. The learned counsel further



places reliance on the judgment dated 26.06.2024 in W.P.(C) No.17700 of 2015 wherein it was *inter alia* held that private jetty operator's application for renewal of licence can be considered only upon meeting the conditions and mandates for issuance of such licence, which includes payment of fee. As regards Ext.P8 Inquiry Report, the learned Standing Counsel submits that the said report specifically concludes that the location of the petitioner's jetty was a contributory factor to the accident and hence the Port Authority being in charge of the port waters is not only competent, but is also duty-bound to take all steps to avert such accidents in the future. He points to the Regulations concerning '*Removal of Jetties*' and '*Cancellation of licence taking control of Jetties etc.*'. as empowering the 4th respondent to make the recommendation as seen in Ext.P8 Inquiry Report. The 4th respondent being the competent body/ authority has after due inquiry found that crisscrossing of the channel by the fishing boats to reach petitioner's jetty for fuelling is to be strictly avoided to avert collisions. Closure of the fuel jetty has thus been duly concluded as the most practical and necessary remedy to avert such collision incidents in the future. The petitioner and the additional 5th respondent cannot contend that their business interests should supersede the safety requirements of the passengers. The learned Standing Counsel thus prayed that the W.P.(C) be dismissed.



10. The learned counsel for the additional 5th and 7th respondents were also heard. They made submissions in line with the affidavits filed by them.

Discussion and finding:

11. The legal sustainability of Ext.P7 issued by the 3rd respondent directing the closure of the petitioner's jetty used for fuelling the fishing boats is the prime question that comes up for consideration in this WP (C). The reason stated for directing the closure of the jetty is its location across the channel close to the junkar, ferry boat and tourist jetties. The reasoning put forth is that the *situs* of the jetty necessitates the fishing boats to first traverse the channel to fill in fuel from the fuel jetty and then sail back. This allegedly puts them on a collision course with the passenger boats which too use the same channel. So as to avoid such a collision in the channel, petitioner's jetty for fuelling the fishing vessels has been directed to be closed down. Though the objective appears to be well-intentioned and the powers of the Port Authority in the said respect are not challenged, the procedure and method adopted by the Port for implementation of the same is the subject matter of dispute.

12. The accident that occurred on 26.08.2015 was tragic and avoidable. Precious human lives were lost and it is indeed necessary that steps are taken to ensure that such incidents are not repeated in the



future. Port Trust is the competent authority, as envisaged under the erstwhile Major Port Trusts Act, 1963, and under the Major Port Authorities Act, 2021 to take steps to regulate the movement of vessels, boats, and other watercrafts within the port waters. The Cochin Port Trust (Licensing of Jetties, Slip Ways and Boat Pen) Regulations, 1968, and its later amended versions, empower the Deputy Conservator to take steps in accordance with the norms therein especially Regulations 6 and 7 which specifically refer to the '*Removal of Jetties*' and '*Cancellation of licence taking control of Jetties etc.*'. Hence the invocation of powers by the Port Trust through its Deputy Conservator cannot as such, be found fault with. However, being a statutory authority bound by law, such steps taken by the authorities have to be in compliance with the mandates of fairness and reasonableness and in accordance with the principles of natural justice. Whether while issuing Ext.P7 the said mandates were actually complied with is the aspect that comes up for scrutiny.

13. Ext.P4 issued by the Deputy Conservator was the first decision towards closure of the fuel station/jetty rendered after the accident. This Court, while rendering Ext.P5 judgment, had held that Ext.P4 Order issued by the Deputy Conservator can only be treated as a notice prior to hearing and in order to allay the fear of alleged bias, directed that the hearing should be conducted by the Chairman instead of the Deputy



Conservator. It was thus incumbent on the Port Trust to be cautious and scrupulous towards adherence to natural justice and fairness while proceeding to comply with Ext.P5 judgment of this Court. A perusal of Ext.P7 issued by the 3rd respondent, however, reveals that this was not the case. Ext.P7 does not disclose an independent dispassionate appreciation of the issues and it relies heavily on Ext.P8 Inquiry Report submitted by the Deputy Conservator. A blind adherence to the findings of the Deputy Conservator in Ext.P8 Inquiry Report is seen followed by the 3rd respondent while arriving at the conclusions in Ext.P7. There is merit in the contention put forth by the learned Senior Advocate relying on the dictum laid down by the Supreme Court in ***Rattan Lal Sharma v. Managing Committee, Dr. Hari Ram (Co-education) Higher Secondary School*** (supra) and ***Dinakaran P.D. (Justice) v. Hon'ble Judge's Inquiry Committee and others*** (supra) that one among the three cardinal principles of natural justice, as recognized by the traditional English law, is 'Objectivity' and the said important criteria have been lost sight of while issuing Ext.P7. No objective analysis of the subject in issue has been attempted by the 3rd respondent while issuing Ext.P7. He had rather mechanically followed the findings in the Inquiry Report submitted by the 4th respondent, who had been mindfully kept out of the decision-making process by this Court, so as to allay the reasonable fear of bias



alleged against him by the petitioner. Thus in effect, the bias and prejudice alleged to have been harbored by the 4th respondent, which was sought to be specifically excluded and kept at bay happened to exert its influence on the decision-making process through a different route viz., the blind reliance placed on the very same Deputy Conservator's report by the Chairman. This is writ large on the reasoning seen stated in Ext.P7 and militates against the principles of fairness and objectivity which are imperatives insisted on by Article 14 of the Constitution. The irregularity does not end there. Even the reliance placed by the 3rd respondent on Ext.P8 itself suffers from the vice of unreasonableness. This is so because Ext.P8 does not enter into any discussion or finding regarding the inherent danger, emanating from the *situs* of the petitioner's jetty. It only makes a reference to the jetty towards the end of the report wherein it is seen recommended that *"The jetty close to tourist jetty should not be used for fuelling any fishing vessels. The licence issued by CopT in favour of the dealer may be cancelled with immediate effect."* The reasons that led to arriving at this conclusion are not discussed or discernable anywhere in Ext.P8 Inquiry Report. Even that part of the Inquiry Report wherein the *'Causes of the collision of the ferry boat with the fishing vessel'* are enumerated does not state the location of the petitioner's jetty as a contributing factor to the accident. In the absence of



any such specific finding in Ext.P8 report, there was no valid material before the 3rd respondent to arrive at the conclusion as seen arrived at in Ext.P7. When an authority takes a decision merely presuming the existence of certain facts, and without any independent, valid and cogent reasoning, the decision so arrived at cannot be termed as one reasonably or objectively arrived at. It is imperative that an independent examination and appreciation of the issue is conducted by the authority and a decision has to be arrived at untrammelled by any other opinions or considerations. Further, such a course adopted must also be reflected in the decision so rendered. It is also relevant to note that neither the petitioner nor the IOCL had been heard by the 4th respondent during the inquiry that led to Ext.P8 report making sole reliance on Ext.P8 to render Ext.P7 even more problematic. Thus the contention of the Senior Advocate that there has been a total non-application of mind by the 3rd respondent while rendering Ext.P7, merits acceptance.

14. It is noted that said jetty was commissioned as early as 29.11.1963 and had been functioning from the same location. If the change in circumstances over the years including the increase in the number of fishing boats and passenger boats, as well as the inherent danger of fishing boats crossing the channel necessitated actions to avert collision, it was well within the powers of the Port authorities to take steps



as envisaged under the Regulations mentioned above. However, while initiating such steps, all the affected interests ought to have been heard and the decision arrived at ought to reflect proper appreciation of material and relevant facts. Ext.P7 does not reveal compliance with such a course of action. Ext.P7 is unsustainable as it principally relies on the very same report authored by the Deputy Conservator whom the petitioner had alleged to be biased, which contention was duly taken note of by this Court leading to the direction that the matter should be considered by the Chairman. No independent application of mind by the 3rd respondent is reflected in Ext.P7. Thus Ext.P7 suffers from the very same vice of arbitrariness, if not a graver one, than that found earlier in Ext. P4 Order issued by the Deputy Conservator.

15. The Supreme Court has in **Dharampal Satyapal Ltd. v. Deputy Commissioner of Central Excise Gauhati and others** [(2015) SCC Online SC 489] held that the principles of natural justice and fairness extended even to those who have to take administrative decisions and who are not necessarily discharging judicial or quasi-judicial functions. They are a kind of code of fair administrative procedure and should be scrupulously adhered to. Adherence to the principles of natural justice and fairness has again been reiterated by the Supreme Court in **Madhyamam Broadcasting Limited. V. Union of India and**



others [(2023) SCC OnLine SC 366) wherein it was held that the principles of natural justice are to be read into the law and conduct of judicial and administrative proceedings with an aim of securing fairness. These principles seek to realise the four momentous purposes viz., fair outcome, inherent value in fair procedure, legitimacy of the decision and the decision-making authority, and the dignity of individuals. It has been affirmed therein by the Supreme Court that the principles of fairness, *'express the elementary idea that to be a person, rather than a thing, is at least to be consulted about what is done with one'*.

16. In view of the above, Ext.P7 proceedings bearing No.DC/Jetty No.1/KKD/2015 dated 16.10.2015 issued by the 3rd respondent is liable to be quashed and it is hereby ordered so. Ext.P8 Inquiry Report of the 4th respondent regarding the collision that occurred on 26.08.2015 is not interfered with. However, before proceeding to implement the recommendation in Ext.P8 concerning the jetty run by the petitioner, both the IOCL as well as the petitioner shall be afforded an effective opportunity of being heard by the 3rd respondent. An independent appreciation and analysis of the above-said recommendation in Ext.P8 shall be reflected in the decision to be taken by the 3rd respondent. The 3rd respondent shall take a decision as aforesaid within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment. It is clarified



2024:KER:84873

that the Port Authority shall be free to take a decision as empowered under the law and following the mandates of the Act and the Rules, keeping in mind the safety and security of the passengers and watercrafts that navigate through the port waters. The question of issuance/ renewal of the jetty licence of the petitioner as well as the fee, if any, to be imposed regarding the same are beyond the scope of this W.P.(C) and are hence left open.

This W.P.(C) is disposed of as above.

sd/-

**SYAM KUMAR V.M.
JUDGE**

csi



APPENDIX OF WP(C) 32149/2015

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS

- Exhibit P1 TRUE COPY OF THE RECEIPT DATED 16.04.2013
ISSUED BY THE COCHIN PORT TRUST
- Exhibit P2 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 22.04.2014
ISSUED TO THE PETITIONER BY THE COCHIN PORT
TRUST
- Exhibit P3 TRUE COPY OF THE LIST SUBMITTED BY THE
CONVENOR, JETTY OPERATORS' ASSOCIATION
BEFORE THE COCHIN PORT TRUST
- Exhibit P4 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 31.08.2015
ISSUED TO THE PETITIONER BY THE 3RD
RESPONDENT.
- Exhibit P5 TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 09.09.2015
IN WP(C)NO.26565 OF 2015.
- Exhibit P6 TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED
6.10.2015 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER
BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN, COCHIN PORT TRUST
- Exhibit P7 TRUE COPY OF THE PROCEEDINGS DATED
16.10.2015 OF THE CHAIRMAN, COCHIN PORT
TRUST.
- Exhibit P8 TRUE COPY OF THE INQUIRY REPORT OF
COLLISION BETWEEN FERRY BOAT BHARATH &
FISHING TRAWLER BASALEL ON 26.8.2015
PREPARED BY ADDL. 6TH RESPONDENT