

KACD410013322020



Presented on : 27-10-2020
Registered on : 27-10-2020
Decided on : 29-01-2022
Duration : 1 years, 3 months, 2 days

**IN THE COURT OF THE SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE & M.A.C.T.
AT: HOLALKERE.**

Dated this, the 29th day of January 2022

//PRESENT//

PRESENT: SRI. SARAVANAN .S
B.B.M., LL.B.
Senior Civil Judge & JMFC.,
Holalkere.

M.V.C No.607/2020

1. Chandrashekharaiiah K.H.
S/o Late H.M. Halaiah,
Aged about 58 years,
2. M. Yashodha W/o K.H. Chandrashekharaiiah,
Aged about 54 years,
3. M.C. Jyothi D/o Chandrashekharaiiah,
Aged about 34 years,
4. Jagadeesh M.C. S/o Chandrashekharaiiah,
Aged about 32 years,

R/o Vidhyanagara, Gurupura,
Shimoga City,
Now R/o Holalkere Town.

---- Petitioners

(By Sri. L.K.S., Advocate)

V/S

1. Manjunath S/o S.C. Rajappa,
Major, R/o Annapura Village,
Davanagere Taluk,
Driver of the tractor bearing
Reg.No.KA-16/T-761-762.
2. Channabasappa S/o Siddappa,
Major, R/o Bahaddurghatta Village and post,
Chitradurga Taluk, Owner of the tractor
trailer bearing No.KA-16/T-761-762.

----Respondents

(R.1 – by Sri. S.S., Advocate., R.2 - Ex-parte)

Date of Institution of petition	: 07-10-2020
Nature of Petition	: Claim for compensation
Date of commencement of Recording of evidence	: 29-12-2021
Date of pronouncement o the Judgment	: 29-01-2022
Total Duration	: Year/s Month/s Day/s 01 03 22

**Senior Civil Judge & M.A.C.T.,
Holalkere.**

J U D G M E N T

This claim petition is filed by the petitioners U/s 166 of Motor Vehicle Act, 1988, claiming compensation of Rs.87,50,000/- with interest at the rate of 18% p.a., for the accidental death of Sri. M.C.Manjunatha S/o Chandrashekharaiiah in a motor vehicle accident.

2. **Case of the petitioners in brief is as follows:-**

On 20-11-2019 at about 8-15 p.m., deceased M.C. Manjunath S/o Chandrashekharaiiah was going on his Bullet En-field motor cycle

bearing Reg.No.KA-14/ES-5907 from Haveri to Holalkere Town as a traveler, when he reached at Kodaganuru Tank Bund, near Annapura Village, Davanagere Taluk, at that time one Tractor-Trailer bearing Reg. No.KA-16/T-761-762 drove his vehicle with high speed in a rash and negligent manner without observing the traffic rules and regulations and endanger to human life and hit the said M.C.Manjunatha and caused accident, as a result he was died on the spot due to the accidental injuries.

3. The dead body of the deceased shifted to Mortuary of C.G. District Hospital, Davanagere and PM was conducted and thereafter the petitioners and their relatives performed funeral and other traditional ceremonies. The deceased M.C. Manjunatha was unmarried and he was permanently, working as a Reporter in Prajavani Daily Newspaper at Shimoga city and getting income of Rs.80,000/- per month and contributed same towards his family and he is having old age parents, brother and sister. Due to the sudden demise of the deceased, the petitioners are being the class one heirs and dependents on the earnings of the deceased have suffered great mental shock and agony and suffering great financial difficulties. Petitioners have lost their love, affection and support of the deceased permanently.

4. That this accident was occurred solely due to the rash and negligent driving of the driver of the Tractor-Trailer bearing its Reg.No.KA-16/T-761-762, the respondent No.1 is the driver and respondent No.2 is the owner of the said vehicle. As such both the respondents are jointly and severally liable to pay the compensation to the petitioners with interest at the rate of 18% p.a..

5. After service of notice to the respondents, the respondent No.1 has appeared through his counsel, but not filed any objection

statements and respondent No.2 has not appeared before the Court and placed ex parte.

6. On the basis of the above pleadings of the parties the following points are arises:-

POINTS

- 1) Whether the petitioners prove that, the M.C.Manjunath S/o Chandrashekharaiyah was died, due to accidental injuries caused in the accident on 20-11-2019 at about 8.15 p.m., at Kodaganuru Tank bund, near Annapura Village, Davanagere Taluk, due to rash & negligent driving of driver of the Tractor-Trailer bearing its Reg.No.KA-16/T-761-762?
- 2) Whether the petitioners prove that, they are the dependents of the deceased M.C. Manjunath S/o Chandrashekharaiyah?
- 3) Whether the petitioners are entitled to claim compensation as prayed for? If so, from whom and at what rate?
- 4) What order or award?

7. During trail, the 1st petitioner himself is examined before the court as PW-1 and produced 20 documents which are marked as Ex.P1 to Ex.P20. The respondents have not examined and not produced any documents.

8. On hearing of both parties and on perusal of the relevant materials on record, my findings on the above issues are as under:-

- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| Point No. 1 | : In the partly affirmative |
| Point No. 2 | : In the affirmative |
| Point No. 3 | : Partly in the affirmative |
| Point No. 4 | : As per final order for the following reasons; |

REASONS

9. **Point No.1:** - It is according to the PW-1 as stated in his affidavit filed in lieu of examination in chief that he being the 1st petitioner herein, on 20-11-2019 at about 8.15 p.m., his son who is the deceased M.C. Manjunatha was traveling from Haveri to Holalkere Town on his Bullet En-field motor cycle bearing Reg.No.KA-14/ES-5907, at that time near Annapura village at Kodaganuru Tank bund area, one Tractor-Trailer bearing its Reg.No.KA-14/ES-5907 drove with high speed in a rash and negligent manner without observing the traffic rules and regulations and endanger to human life and hit to the above said motor cycle in which the deceased M.C.Manjunath was traveling and caused accident, as a result, he was succumbed on the spot due to accidental injuries.

10. The PW-1 in support of his such oral evidence has relied on the Ex.P1 FIR, Ex.P2 Complaint, Ex.P3 Spot panchanama, Ex.P4 vehicle seizure mahazar, Ex.P5 & Ex.P6 P.F's, Ex.P7 IMV reports, Ex.P8 Inquest panchanama, Ex.P9 PM report, Ex.P10 Genealogical Tree, Ex.P11 to Ex.P13 Self attested Aadhar Cards, Ex.P14 Charge sheet filed by the IO, as against the driver of the Tractor-Trailer and deceased M.C. Manjunath for offences punishable U/Sec.283 of IPC and U/Sec.3 R/w 181 of IMV Act, and U/s.279 & 304(A) of IPC and R/w Sec.187 of IMV Act, Ex.P15 to Ex.P17 University Certificates, Ex.P18 Appointment letter, Salary Details Annexure and Memorandum of understanding letter given by The Printers (Mysore) Pvt. Ltd., Bengaluru, Ex.P19 Pay-slip for the month of September-2019 and Ex.P20 Training completion certificate of deceased M.C. Manjunath.

11. It is to note that though respondent No.1 even though appeared through his advocate, he failed to contest the case. Not filed

objection statement. So that, he indirectly admitted his fault as per the Ex.P14 charge-sheet, in which alleged against both respondent No.1 and the deceased for the cause of accident. For causing the accident therefore, the charge sheet is filed against respondent No.1 and deceased M.C. Manjunath as per Ex.P14 charge sheet produced by the petitioners indicates that even the deceased was also responsible for the cause of the accident. Thus, it is clear that there was charge sheet against both the driver and rider of the offending vehicles. This charge sheet has not been challenged by both the driver & petitioner being the legal-heirs of the deceased rider. Thus, it could be safely held that in the absence of any challenge to these charge sheet, it is to be concluded that the accident in question was the outcome of the contributory negligence of both respondent as well as the deceased rider of the insured vehicle, and also since the respondent No.2 has remained absent and he was placed exparte. Thus, the rash & negligent of the respondent No.1 and deceased M.C. Manjunatha is manifest from the available evidence on record. Therefore, I hold that the accident in question was occurred due to the contributory negligence of both driver and rider. **Hence, point No.1 is answered in the partly affirmative.**

12. **Point No.2:-** Relationship of the petitioners with deceased, as per petition, that the relation between the deceased M.C. Manjunath and the petitioners, as deposed by the PW-1 in his examination-in-chief, that, petitioner No.1 is the father, petitioner No. 2 is the mother, petitioner No.3 is the sister and petitioner No.4 is the brother of the deceased M.C. Manjunath. Whether they are legal-heirs of the deceased or not is to be proved, when the persons who are herein as claimants are to be treated as the dependents subject to the appreciation of evidence in that regard for the entitlement of monetary

benefits to be awarded for the death of the M.C. Manjunath arising out of the accident.

13. In this regard, when the persons are not shown any Aadhar cards has not challenged by the respondent, since he has neither cross examined the witnesses nor contested the matter throughout. Furthermore, question whether the claimants can maintain the petition under section 166 of MV Act or not is the only question to be dealt with. In this regard, any claimants who are dependents of the deceased and his income as contemplated u/s 2(1) of CPC and u/s 144 of the Motor Vehicles Accident Claim Act, 1988 are to be read with while deciding such issue.

14. As per the above provisions, the Petitioner No.1 to 4 are being dependents of the deceased M.C. Manjunath can maintain the petition and as per the Ex.11 to Ex.P13 Aadhar Cards produced by the petitioners and they are also produced the G-Tree issued by the Deputy Tahasildar, Nidhige Hobli, Shivamogga Taluk & District which is marked as Ex.P10. Accordingly, this evidence clearly indicates that, the petitioners are the legal heirs of the deceased M.C. Manjunath.

15. That after having carefully gone through the oral and documentary evidence that placed on record, and also, placing reliance upon the ruling of our own Hon'ble High Court (supra), all the claimants are held to be the legal representatives to claim the compensation under different heads. **Accordingly, I answer this point No.2 in the affirmative.**

16. **Point No.3:-** Petitioner has claimed total compensation of Rs.87,50,000/- under the heads of both pecuniary and non-pecuniary damages. So that, the entitlement is assessed and determined under

the following heads.

17. **Towards loss of dependency:**

Petitioners contended that, they are the dependents on the earnings of the deceased. Petitioner No.1 is the father of the deceased, Petitioner No.2 is the mother and petitioner No.3 and 4 are the sister and brother of the deceased. They have an individual source of income they are not completely dependent on the earnings of the deceased M.C.Manjunath. In this regard they have produced self attested Aadhar cards as per Ex.P11 to Ex.P13 and also produced the G-Tree as per Ex.P10. As such the petitioners have proved that they are the legal heirs of the deceased M.C. Manjunath.

18. **Earnings of the deceased:-** It is stated that, during his lifetime deceased was hale and healthy and he was working as a Sub-Editor/Reporter in Prajavani Daily News paper and getting income of Rs.89,108/- as per Ex.P19 and drawn the net salary of Rs.86,505/- in the month of September-2019 pay slip. To prove the said contention the petitioners have produced salary slip of the deceased, the document to show his actual source of earnings or source of income. The salary slip is taken into consideration. So that, the Reporter in Prajavani Daily News paper work income of the deceased has to be considered. The age of the deceased as per Ex.P9 i.e., P.M. report is shown as 30 years and the accident was occurred in the year 2019. Considering these facts and circumstances of the case the notional income of the deceased can be considered at **Rs.89,108/-**.

19. It can be seen that deceased had old aged parents and sister and brother. Therefore, the family of the deceased consisted of 04 members. As per the ratio laid down in **Sarala Varma's case** 50% of the income of the deceased has to be deducted towards his personal

expenses.

20. As per the ratio laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in case of ***National Insurance com.Ltd Vs. Prany sethi*** reported in **2017 ACJ 2700**, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has observed that;

I. "Quantum – Fatal accident- Principles of assessment – Further prospectus- Whether legal representatives of the deceased who was on fixed salary or self employed or aged between 50 and 60 would be entitled to benefit of future prospectus for the purpose of computation of compensation – Held : yes: case – law discussed [2009 ACJ 1298 (SC) and 2013 ACJ 1253 (SC) modified] while determining the income, an addition of 50 percent of actual salary to the income of the deceased towards future prospectus, where the deceased had a permanent job and was below the age of 40 years should be made. The addition should be 30 per cent, if the age of the deceased was between 40 and 50 years. In case the deceased was between the age of 50 and 60 years, the addition should be 15 percent. Actual salary should be read as actual salary less tax.

II.

a. In case the deceased was self employed or on a fixed salary, an addition of 40 per cent of the established income should be the warrant where the deceased was below the age of 40 years. An addition of 25 per cent where the deceased between the age of 40 and 50 years and 10 per cent where the deceased between the age of 50 and 60 years should be regarded as the necessary method of computation. The established income means the income minus the tax component."

b. As per the ratio laid down by The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in case of National Insurance Company Limited V/s. Birender and Ors. Reported in CIVIL APPEAL NOS.242243 OF 2020. Wherein it has been held that-

21. In view of the above, while keeping the income assessed at Rs.89,108/- per month as we assessed by the Tribunal 50% should be

deducted towards personal expenses. Accordingly, the loss of dependency to the claimants is assessed at Rs.89,108/- -Rs.44,554/- (89,108/- X 50%) = Rs.44,554/- per month. Annually, the same would come to Rs.44,554 X 12 = Rs.5,34,648/-. On this amount the claimant shall be entitled to 40% increase on account of future prospects. Hence, the loss of dependency comes to Rs.5,34,648/- + Rs.2,13,859/- (5,34,648/- X40%) = Rs.7,48,507/- per annum. Multiplier of 17 is held to be applicable in the case. So the total loss of dependency to the claimant come to Rs.7,48,507/- X 17= Rs.1,27,24,619/-. As such petitioners are entitled **for an amount of Rs.1,27,24,619/- under the head of loss of dependency. However, the 50% of the contributory negligence of the deceased Manjunath, the claimants are entitled to 50% of this total amount as calculated and the extent of the liability of the respondents No.1 and 2 will be decided later.**

[ii] Towards transportation & funeral expenses:-

The petitioners have prayed for compensation of Rs.1,00,000/- towards funeral expenses and transportation expenses. But the petitioners have not produced any documents to prove the exact amount spent by them for conducting funeral and death ceremony of the deceased, and for expenses incurred by them for the transportation purpose. As such, as per the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in case ***Reshmakumari which has been reaffirmed by the Ho'ble Apex Court in recent ruling in case of National Insurance Co., Ltd., Vs. Pranay Sethi and others (supra)***, which is referred above, I am of the view that, that sum of Rs.10,000/- can be awarded to the petitioners under the heading of funeral expenses and Rs.5,000/- can be awarded under the heading of transportation of dead body since the place of death and to their native place.

22. As per the ratio laid down in the Sarala Verma's case (Supra) the formula/principals laid down in Pranay Sethi's case. Accordingly, the reasonable figures on conventional heads, namely, loss of estate, loss of consortium and funeral expenses should be Rs.15,000/-, Rs.40,000/- and Rs.15,000/- respectively and this quantified amount should be enhanced on percentage basis once in every three years and enhancement should be at the rate of 10% in a span of three years. The said enhanced rate of 10% should be applicable from 08.02.2020. **Accordingly, sum of Rs.16,500/- is awarded under the heading of funeral and death ceremony expenses & conveyance expenses of the dead body.**

[iii] Towards loss of Parental Consortium:-

The petitioner No.1 & 2 are the parents of the deceased as a result of accident they lost love & affection and lost future settlement in their life, it cannot be compensated in terms of money, the son who stands as a backbone throughout the life of their parents. So, it is very hard for them.

As per the ratio laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **The Magama General Insurance Co.Ltd. V/s Nanuram @ Chuhru Ram & Others reported in AIR 2018 SC 892, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court** had held that only in cases where the parents have lost their minor child, or unmarried son or daughter, the parents are entitled to be awarded loss of consortium under the head of filial consortium, this principle also has been laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the recent decision in the case of **The New India Assurance Co.Ltd Vs. Smt.Somwati & Ors. Dtd.07.09.2020. (Civil appeal No.3093 of 2020) Arising out of SLP(C) No.23478 of 2019. It has been held that:**

"87. Insofar as the conventional heads are

concerned, the deceased Satpal Singh left behind a widow and three children as his dependants. On the basis of the judgments in Pranay Sethi (supra) and Magma General (supra), the following amounts are awarded under the conventional heads:-

i) Loss of Estate: --

ii) Loss of Consortium:--

a) Spousal Consortium:--

b) Parental Consortium: 40,000 x 2 = Rs. 80,000

iii) Funeral Expenses: --

38. Learned counsel for the appellant has submitted that Pranay Sethi has only referred to spousal consortium and no other consortium was referred to in the judgment of Pranay Sethi, hence, there is no justification for allowing the parental consortium and filial consortium. The Constitution Bench in Pranay Sethi has referred to amount of Rs.40,000/- to the loss of consortium but the Constitution Bench had not addressed the issue as to whether consortium of Rs.40,000/- is only payable as spousal consortium. The judgment of Pranay Sethi cannot be read to mean that it lays down the proposition that the consortium is payable only to the wife.

39. The Three-Judge Bench in United India Insurance Company Ltd. (Supra) has categorically laid down that apart from spousal consortium, parental and filial consortium is payable. We feel ourselves bound by the above judgment of Three Judge Bench. We, thus, cannot accept the submission of the learned counsel for the appellant that the amount of consortium awarded to each of the claimants is not sustainable.

40. We, thus, found the impugned judgments of the High Court awarding consortium to each of the claimants in accordance with law which does not warrant any interference in this appeal. We, however, accept the submissions of learned counsel

for the appellant that there is no justification for award of compensation under separate head loss of love and affection. The appeal filed by the appellant deserves to be allowed insofar as the award of compensation under the head loss of love and affection.”

[iv] Towards loss of estate:-

23. Considering the notional income of the deceased, it can be inferred that, if he would have been alive, he must have acquired some estate. Petitioners have lost this estate as a result of fatal accident.

As per the ratio laid down in the Sarala Varma's case (Supra) the formula/principals laid down in Pranay Sethi's case. Accordingly, the reasonable figures on conventional heads, namely, loss of estate, loss of consortium and funeral expenses should be Rs.15,000/-, Rs.40,000/- and Rs.15,000/- respectively and this quantified amount should be enhanced on percentage basis once in every three years and enhancement should be at the rate of 10% in a span of three years. The said enhanced rate of 10% should be applicable from 08.02.2020. Hence, it is just and proper to award a sum of **Rs. 16,500/-** under this head as just and reasonable.

24. ***In the light the ratio laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of New India Assurance Co.Ltd Vs. Smt.Somwati & Ors' case, it has been held that; we, thus, found the impugned judgments of the High Court awarding consortium to each of the claimants in accordance with law which does not warrant any interference in this appeal. We, however, accept the submissions of learned counsel for the appellant that there is no justification for award of compensation under separate head loss of love and affection. The appeal filed by the appellant deserves to be allowed***

insofar as the award of compensation under the head loss of love and affection.” hence no award under the head of loss of love and affection.

25. Thus Petitioners can be awarded the compensation amount under the following heads as follows:-

1.	Towards loss of dependency	Rs.1,27,24,619/-
2.	Towards funeral expenses & transportation expenses	Rs. 16,500/-
3.	Towards Loss of estate	Rs. 16,500/-
4.	Towards parental consortium (P1 & 2)	Rs. 80,000/-
	Total	Rs.1,28,37,619/-

Petitioners are awarded total compensation of **Rs.1,28,37,619/-** along with costs of along with costs of the petition and interest at the rate of 6% PA from the date of petition till realization. Respondents are held liable to compensate the petitioners.

26. So far as the apportionment is concerned, petitioner No.1 & 2 are the parents of the deceased. Petitioner No.2 is the mother of the deceased, she is entitled to get some major share therein and the petitioner No.1 is the father and petitioner No.3 is the major sister and petitioner No.4 is the major brother of deceased. So that, there is so much to do for their future some portion is to be apportioned from the above amount. Respondents are jointly & severally liable to compensation to the petitioners.

27. **With regard to liability:-** As regards the liability of the respondent No.2 who is the owner of the Tractor-Trailer, he had not filed any objection to contest the case and not even appeared before the Court, and placed ex parte and not pleaded his discharge from the

liability on the grounds that as on the date of accident, and respondent No.2 has not insured his vehicle and who had entrusted the offending vehicle to its driver who was not possessing a valid and effective DL to drive it. In this regard my attention has been invited to Ex.P14 charge sheet which reveals that on the date of accident 2nd respondent had entrusted the vehicle to the driver of Tractor-Trailer without having insured the vehicle and not holding any DL to drive the said vehicle and also deceased M.C. Manjunatha who was not holding any DL to drive the said motor cycle on the date of the accident.

28. The 1st respondent was also charge sheeted for the grounds that the 2nd respondent had also allowed the driver to without insured to drive in his vehicle which is admittedly a Tractor-Trailer and accordingly the third respondent was charge sheeted for both these offences. To dispute this aspect admittedly he has not contested the matter nor he has led his evidence. Under such circumstances in the absence of his specific denial in this regard this charge sheet will have to be relied on. Therefore for the liability of 1st and 2nd respondent is concerned, these respondents will have to compensate the petitioners to the extent of their liability. Hence, respondent No.1 and 2 are to be liable. **Accordingly, I answer this point No.3 in the Partly Affirmative.**

29. **Point No.4:** In the light of above observations and findings, I proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

The claim petition filed by the petitioner U/s.166 of Motor vehicle Act, 1988 is allowed in part with costs.

The petitioners are entitled for **Rs.64,18,809/-** of the compensation along with interest at the rate of 6% PA from

the date of petition till its realization.

The respondent No.1 and 2 are jointly and severally liable to compensate the petitioners. However the respondent No.1 & 2 are hereby directed to deposit 50% of the awarded amount as stated above along with interest at the rate of 6% p.a. from the date of petition till the date of realization of the award amount before the Court within the period of 30 days from the date of this order.

On deposit, out of the compensation awarded in favour of petitioners, 30% is awarded to the petitioner No.1, 50% is awarded to the petitioner No.2 and 10% each is awarded to the petitioner No.3 and 4. Out of the total compensation awarded to the petitioner No.2, 50% is ordered to be deposited in any nationalized bank of her choice with liberty to draw interest periodically for a period of 03 years. Rest of the 50% shall be transferred to the A/c of the petitioner No.2 through RTGS/NEFT in favour of petitioner No.2 on proper identification and after collecting copy of Bank Pass book which compulsorily have the photograph of the petitioner No.2 duly attested by the Banker and self attested Adhaar card of the petitioner No.2.

Out of the total compensation awarded to the petitioner No.1, 3 and 4, 50% each is ordered to be deposited in any nationalized bank of their choice with liberty to draw interest periodically for a period of 03 years. Rest of the 50% shall be transferred to the A/c of the petitioner No.1, 3 and 4 through RTGS/NEFT in

favour of petitioner No.1, 3 and 4 on proper identification and after collecting copy of Bank Pass book which compulsorily have the photographs of the petitioner No.1, 3 and 4 duly attested by the Banker and self attested Adhaar card of the petitioners.

The advocate fee is fixed at Rs. 1,000/-.

Draw award accordingly.

[Directly dictated to the Steno on computer, typed by him and same is corrected and then pronounced by me in the open court on this 29th day of January 2022.]

(SARAVANAN. S)
Senior Civil Judge,
& AMACT., Holalkere.

ANNEXURE

I. Witness examined on behalf of Petitioner/s:

PW-1 : Chandrashekharaiiah

II. Witnesses Examined on behalf of Respondent/s:

-Nil-

III. Documents marked on behalf of the petitioner/s:

Ex.P1 : True copy of FIR
Ex.P2 : True copy of Complaint
Ex.P3 : True copy of spot mahazar
Ex.P4 : True copy of Vehicle mahazar
Ex.P5 & 6: True copy of P.F.s
Ex.P7 : True copy of IMV report
Ex.P8 : True copy of Inquest mahazar
Ex.P9 : True copy of PM report
Ex.P10 : True copy of G-Tree
Ex.P11 to 13: True copy of Aadhar Cards
Ex.P14 : True copy of Charge-sheet
Ex.P15 to 17: Original University Certificates
Ex.P18 : Original Appointment letter, Salary Details

Annexure, Memorandum of Understanding &
Confirmation letter issued by the Printers
(Mysore) Private Limited, Bangalore.

Ex.P19 : Payslip for the month of Sept-2019

Ex.P20 : Completion of Training letter & Certificate

IV. Documents marked on behalf of the Respondent/s:

-Nil-

Dictated on : 29-01-2022

Transcribed on :29-01-2022

checked on : 29-01-2022

Signed on :29-01-2022

Senior Civil Judge,
& AMACT., Holalkere.

Visit ecourts.gov.in for updates or download mobile app “**eCourts Services**” from Android or iOS.