#### IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

#### PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE T.R.RAVI

MONDAY, THE 10<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JULY 2023 / 19TH ASHADHA, 1945

#### EX.SA NO. 2 OF 2023

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT DATED 21-01-2023 IN AS 156/2022 OF III ADDITIONAL DISTRICT COURT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 30-03-2022 IN EA 187/2019 OF PRINCIPAL MUNSIFF

COURT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

#### APPELLANTS/APPELLANTS/PETITIONERS-CLAIM PETITIONERS:

- SIBI S. NAIR
  AGED 41 YEARS
  SON OF INDIRA SREEDHARAN NAIR, RESIDING AT PAZHAYA AMMA VEEDU,
  T.C.36/1373(3), VALLAKKADAVU P.O., PETTAH VILLAGE, PERUMTHANNI
  MURI, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN 695008.
- 2 MADHAVE
  AGED 11 YEARS (MINOR),
  REPRESENTED BY HIS FATHER 1ST APPELLANT SIBI S.NAIR, AGED 41
  YEARS, S/O INDIRA SREEDHARAN NAIR, RESIDING AT PAZHAYA AMMA
  VEEDU, T.C.36/1373(3), VALLAKKADAVU P.O., PETTAH VILLAGE,
  PERUMTHANNI MURI, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,
  PIN 695008.

BY ADVS. T.N MANOJ T N ABHILASH M.J.(K/122/2021)

### RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS/DECREE HOLDER AND JUDGMENT DEBTOR:

- 1 N.S. SAJITHA, AGED 57 YEARS
  D/O NALINAKSHY AND WIFE OF SANAL KUMAR, RESIDING AT
  KARIKOTHIL, V.P.1/1197, PALLIMUKKU, PEYADU,
  THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN 695573.
- 2 INDIRA SREEDHARAN NAIR, AGED 65 YEARS
  W/O SREEDHARAN NAIR, RESIDING AT PAZHAYAMMA VEEDU,
  T.C.36/1737(1), VALLAKKADAVU, PETTAH VILLAGE, PERUMTHANNI,
  THIRUVANANTHAPURAM., PIN 695008.

BY ADV V.SURESH- R1

THIS EXECUTION SECOND APPEAL HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 10.07.2023, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

# T.R. RAVI, J.

EX.SA. No.2 of 2023

Dated this the 10<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2023

## **JUDGMENT**

The appeal has been preferred by the claim petitioners. Admittedly, the claim petitioners are the son and grandson of the judgment debtor-2<sup>nd</sup> respondent. Respondent No.1 is the decree holder. The 1<sup>st</sup> respondent had initiated steps for eviction of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent which culminated in the judgment in RCP No.54 of 2009. The order of eviction was confirmed in appeal and thereafter in revision before this Court. In execution, the son and grandson of the judgment debtor filed a claim petition contending that they are joint owners of the property and they also have Kudikidappu right in the property. The contentions were rejected by the execution court as well as the first appellate court.

2. While hearing the appeal, the counsel for the appellants confined his arguments to the contention that the property scheduled to the rent control petition is a building

bearing No.TC 36/1373 (2) in Perunthanni Ward in the Corporation of Thiruvananthapuram and the attempt in the execution petition is to get delivery of property in excess of what is scheduled.

3. The counsel for the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent submitted that what is scheduled alone is sought to be executed and as a matter of fact, what is scheduled has been identified by an Advocate Commissioner, who was appointed by the rent control court and the order regarding the identification of the petition scheduled building has already become final.

In the above circumstances, no substantial questions of law arise to be decided by this Court. The second appeal fails and is dismissed. However, it is made clear that the execution court shall confine the delivery, to the property that has been scheduled in the rent control petition, and as decided in the judgment in the rent control petition, confirmed till revision by this Court.

Sd/-T.R.RAVI JUDGE

mpm