

KARN210010892014



M.V.C./575/2014

Presented on : 13-11-2014
Registered on : 13-11-2014
Decided on : 02-05-2026
Duration : 11 years, 05 months,
19 days

**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE & M.A.C.T, CHANNAPATNA**

:PRESENT:

SANDESHA.K., M.A., L.L.B.,
Addl. Senior Civil Judge & MACT
Channapatna

Dated, this the 02nd day of May 2026

M.V.C./575/2014

PETITIONER:

Sri.Nagaraju,
S/o Karigowda @ Kariyappa,
Aged about 51 years,
R/at Minakeredoddi,
Malur Hobli,
Channapatna Taluk,

(By Sri. M.K.N, Advocate)

-Versus-

RESPONDENTS:

1. Sri.Athamanand.H.M,
S/o Marigowda,
Hodike Hosahalli,



Kasaba Hobli,
Channapatna Taluk,

2. New India Assurance Co.Ltd.,
No.2241/4, Giriyamma,
Shambhugowda, Complex,
Church Road, Channapatna
Town,

(R2 By Sri.C.K.M., Advocate)
(R1 ex-parte)

-: J U D G M E N T:-

The petitioner has filed this petition under section 166 of the M.V. Act seeking compensation of Rs.30,00,000/- with interest at 18% p.a. from the date of accident till the date of payment for the injuries sustained by him in a road traffic accident.

2. The brief facts of petitioner case is that:

On 31.07.2014 at 2.00 P.M., when the petitioner was riding in his Hero Honda Motor Cycle bearing Reg.No.KA-



01-EH-6719 to go to Minakere Village and was traveling on the B.M.Road, Chikkamalur Village, at that time, the rider of the motor cycle bearing Reg.No.KA-42-J-4545 drove his vehicle in a rash and negligent manner and dashed against the petitioner's motor cycle due to which the petitioner sustained injuries on the right side of his head and shoulders, chest and other parts of the body. Later the petitioner was taken to Channapatna Government Hospital where he was given first aid and later he shifted to NIMHANS, Rajarajeshwari Hospital for further treatment, wherein he was inpatient for about 60 days and had undergone surgery also. Even after discharge from the hospital, the petitioner was advised to take a follow-up treatment, the petitioner has incurred Rs.5,00,000/- for his medical treatment. The petitioner further submits that the petitioner was hale and healthy prior to the accident and was an agriculturist and earning Rs.20,000/- per



month. Due to the accident, the petitioner is not able to do his work and he is still suffering from pain on his right leg and he is suffering from disability discomforts and also has suffered loss of earnings. Hence, this petition.

3. As against the petition filed by the petitioner, the respondent No.1 remained absent inspite of service of notice. Hence, the respondent No.1 was placed ex-parte. The respondent No.2 the insurance company has filed its written statement denying the petition averments and has stated that, the accident as alleged by the petitioner has not taken place and the respondent in collusion with the petitioner and the insurer of the vehicle have filed this case. There is a delay in lodging the complaint. The accident has occurred due to the rash and negligent driving by the petitioner himself and hence, there is contributory negligence on the part of the petitioner. This



petition is bad for non-joinder of necessary parties as the insured and the insurer of the Hero Honda bearing Reg.No.KA-01-EH-6719 was not made as parties to the petition. The petitioner was under the influence of alcohol as per the records of the NIMHANS and there is no negligence on the part of the rider of the Motor Cycle bearing Reg.No.KA-42-J-4545. Both the riders were not holding any valid and effective driving license and the 1st respondent has knowingly and willingly given his vehicle to a person who did not hold a valid and effective driving license, as such the respondent No.2 is not liable to indemnify the insure. The investigating officer has not intimated about the alleged accident to the Claims Tribunal as required U/s.158(6) of the Motor Vehicles Act and the hospital authority have also failed to intimate about the accident. Hence, 2nd respondent is not liable to



indemnify the insured. Therefore, the respondent No.2 has sought for dismissal of the petition.

4. On the basis of above pleadings, my learned Predecessor in office has framed the following issues :

- 1. Whether the petitioner proves that he met with an RTA that occurred on 31.07.2014 at about 2.00 P.M., Opp. Mutton Stall, Chikkamaluru, B.M. Road, Channapatna Town and the petitioner sustained injuries due to rash and negligent driving of Hero Honda two wheeler bearing No.KA-42-J-4545?**
- 2. Whether the petitioner is entitled to compensation? If so, how much and from whom?**
- 3. What order or award?**

ADDITIONAL ISSUES

- 1. Whether the 2nd respondent proves that the driver of the motor cycle bearing Reg.No.KA-42-J-4545 was not having valid driving license on the date of the accident?**



5. In order to substantiate the case, the petitioner has got been examined himself as PW-1 and also examine C.Ramanchandran, Srinivas, Dr.Sunil Malagi and R.Venkatesh has been examined as PW-2 to 5 and got produced -13- documents as Ex.P-1 and Ex.P-13.

6. The Respondent No.2 counsel submit no evidence on behalf respondent No.2.

7. Heard the argument of learned counsel for petitioner and respondent No.2.

8. I have perused the pleadings and material placed on record.

9. My findings to the above issues are as under:-

Issue No.1	:	In the AFFIRMATIVE
Issue No.2	:	In the PARTLY IN THE AFFIRMATIVE
Addl.Issue No.1:		NEGATIVE



Issue No.3 : **As per final order**
For the following:

-: R E A S O N S :-

10. ISSUE No.1 :- The petitioner has filed this petition claiming compensation of Rs.30,00,000/- with respect to injuries sustained by him in the road traffic accident.

11. The next moot question to be considered is with regard to the factum of negligence. It is a trite law that the factum of negligence has to be proved like any other fact in issue. Before dwelling into analyzing the factum of alleged negligence it is relevant to have the conceptual aspects pertaining to factum of negligence. There are four basic elements that a person has to fulfill in order to do a negligent act. These elements are as follows:



Duty: For committing a negligent act, there must be some duty on the part of the defendant. Here it is important to understand whether the defendant has taken legal duty of care towards the plaintiff.

Breach of Duty: After fulfilling the first criteria the plaintiff must prove that the defendant has breached the legal duty imposed on him/her. It talks about the breach of duty on the part of the defendant which he/she is expected to do as he/she has some legal duty towards the plaintiff.

The action of causing something: It means that the damage caused to the plaintiff is due to the act of the defendant. Here the defendant may do an act which is not expected from him/her or the defendant may be negligent in not doing an act which was expected from him/her.

Damages: At last what matters is, there must be some damage/injury that is caused to the plaintiff and this damages should be the direct consequence of the defendant's act.

Negligence means a breach of duty caused by omission to do something which has reasonable man guide by those consideration which ordinarily regulated conduct of human affairs would do which a prudent man would not do. In common prevalence negligence connoted to the want of



proper care and the rashness conveys the idea of recklessness or the doing of an act without due consideration.

12. In order to prove the accident and accident occurred due to sole negligence on part of the rider of the offending Motor Cycle bearing Reg.No.KA-42-J-4545, the petitioner has been examined himself as PW-1 and got marked -13- documents. The Ex.P-1 is the FIR, Ex.P-2 is the copy of charge sheet, Ex.P-3 is the IMV report, Ex.P-4 is the copy of wound certificate, Ex.P-5 is the copy of mahazar, Ex.P-6 is the 59 medical bills, Ex.P-7 is the 34 medical prescriptions and Authorization letter, Ex.P-8 is the Inpatient record, Ex.P-9 is the Authorization letter, Ex.P-10 is the one case file, Ex.P-11 is the City scan, Ex.P-12 is the patient case sheet, Ex.P13 is the Nero psychological Assessment extract. The erudite counsel for the respondent No.2 has cross-examined the PW-1. But



nothing has been elicited to disbelieve the ocular testimony of PW-1.

13. On careful perusal of ocular testimony of PW-1, it clearly reveals that, the respondent No.2 has contended that, the above said Motor Cycle bearing Reg.No.KA-42-J-4545 was falsely implicated by the petitioner colluding with the owner of the vehicle and the police to get the computation. The driver of the Motor Cycle bearing Reg. KA-01-EH-6719 was not holding a valid a effective driving licence. The counsel for the respondent No.2 has conducted the cross-examination of PW-1. However, on careful perusal of cross-examination of PW-1 and cross-examination of PW-5 it is clearly reveals that, the ocular testimony of PW-1 to 5 are not disputed with respect to alleged accident caused by the Motor Cycle Motor Cycle



bearing Reg.No.KA.42-J.4545. Therefore, ocular testimony of PW-1 to 5 would corroborate the case of the petitioner.

14. On perusal of Ex.P-1 and Ex.P-2, it appears that, on the next day after the incident, the complaint has been lodged against the driver of the Motor Cycle and accordingly the case has been registered against driver as per Ex.P-1. The Ex.P- 2 is the charge sheet. After conducting proper investigation PW-5 has filed charge sheet against the driver of the Motor Cycle bearing Reg. Reg.No.KA.42-J.4545. Ex.P3 is the IMV report, Ex.P4 is the wound certificate. Ex.P5 is the spot mahazar conduct by the PW-5. Ex.P3 and 5 are clearly reviles that the accident was happen due to the negligence on the part of the driver of the Motor Cycle bearing Reg.No.KA.42-J-4545. Ex.P4 is the medical certificate, Ex.P4 is clearly show that, due to the accident the petitioner was



hospitalized and take treatment from Channapatna Government Hospital. Ex.P4 is very important documents to prover case of the petitioner.

15. Respondent No.2 contended that, at the time of accident the petitioner influence of alcohol and drive the vehicle but in order to prove above said contention respondent No.2 has not produced single iota of documents. After the accident is happen, the petitioner take a treatment at Channapatna Government Hospital. If the petitioner influence by the alcohol, the Government Hospital Channapatna give a report and intimate the concerned Police Station. But Ex.P4 produced by the petitioner is clearly shows that, at the time of rider of Motor Cycle has not influence by alcohol. Hence, the contention taken by respondent No.2 cannot be consider. Mere taking contention is not sufficient to hold that, the



petitioner was influence by alcohol and riding a motor cycle. The respondent No.2 has not produced any document to prove his pleading, without document the contention taken by the respondent No.2 cannot be consider. petitioner is also produced bills, inpatient record, City Sean, Patient case sheet shows that after the accident the petitioner has take a treatment.

16. The Ex.P-2 is the charge sheet. On careful dissection of the charge sheet, it would clearly reveals that, the Investigating Officer conducted the investigation and filed the charge sheet against the driver of the Motor Cycle Reg.No.KA.42-J-4545. The contents of charge sheet also corroborate the case of the petitioners and reveals that, the incident occurred only due to fault on part of the driver of the Motor cycle Reg.No.KA.42-J.4545. Therefore, ocular and documentary evidence placed by the petitioner



would corroborate and establish that the petitioner has proved the factum of accident caused by the driver Motor cycle Reg.No.KA.42-J.4545 due to rash and negligent driving of the driver of Motor cycle Reg.No.KA.42-J.4545. Whereas, on the other hand, the respondent No.2 has failed to establish the rash and negligent act on part of the petitioner. Hence, I am answering Issue No.1 in the **AFFIRMATIVE.**

17. Addl. ISSUE No.1:- The another contention respondent No.2 that the driver of Motor cycle Reg.No.KA.42-J.4545 was not holding driving licence. But in order prove said contention respondent No.2 has not examined any witness. Ex.P2 produced by the petitioner i.e., charge sheet submitted by the PW-5 after conducting investigating clearly shows that due to the rash and negligence act on the part of ride of Motor cycle



Reg.No.KA.42-J.4545 accident is happened. If the driver of the offending vehicle was not having effective and valid driving licence PW-5 has filed charge sheet to that effective. But Ex.P2 produced by the petitioner i.e., charge sheet shows that, said section is not included in the charge sheet. At the stage it is a relevant to extract the cross-examination of PW-5, Upon perused of cross-examination of PW-5 he deposed that he produced copy of the D.L before the trial court. The evidence of the PW-5 is very clary that at the time of accident the driver of the Motor cycle bearing Reg.No.KA.42-G.4545 was having valid effective licence. In the cross-examination of PW-5 the counsel for the respondent No.2 put a question to the PW-5 that as per Ex.P12 the petitioner is influence by alcohol but Ex.P4 produced by the PW-1 shows that at the time of riding the motorcycle petitioner was not influence by alcohol. As already stated above after the incident the



petitioner take him to the Government Hospital Channapatna, if the petitioner was influence by the alcohol has it could be mentioned in the out petitioner record as well as the wound certificate and other documents. But no where it is found that the petitioner is influence by alcohol. Moreover, the respondent No.2 has to prove that the petitioner was influence by the alcohol at the time of riding of motorcycle. Respondent No.2 is failed to prove the above said aspect. Hence, I am answering Addl.Issue No.1 in the **Negative**.

18. ISSUE No.2:- As already discussed supra, this Tribunal has already held Issue No.1 in the affirmative which makes it more than obvious that the petitioner is entitled for compensation. Needless to state the quantum of compensation which is awarded has to be proportionate to the nature of the injuries and the compensation has to



be awarded by keeping in mind the pecuniary damages and non-pecuniary damages suffered by the injured-claimant. For pecuniary damages this Court is referring to the actual loss sustained by the petitioner, which can be determined in terms of money, by taking into account the oral or documentary evidence. Whereas for non-pecuniary damages this Court is referring to the losses that the claimant has though suffered, but will not be able to prove for the reason that it can neither be calculated in terms of the money nor can it be proved leading documentary evidence. Perhaps the non-pecuniary damages can be figured out by looking into the facts of each case by taking into account the nature of injuries and the aftermath. It is required to be reminded to oneself that compensation in a case arising out of injury can never be granted on mathematical precision and invariably a good amount of



guesswork is involved while determining the compensation in such cases.

19. Perhaps unlike in a fatal case, in a case involving bodily injury the victim is left to suffer throughout his life; and hence it becomes the bounden duty of the tribunal to award compensation to a victim of permanent disability so as to bring in sustainability and also to ensure that victim is not pushed to poverty.

20. The petitioner has contended that, he was aged about 51 years as on the date of accident and he was earning Rs.20,000/- p.m. However, in order to prove the factum of age of the petitioner, he has not produced any authenticated document to establish his age. But Ex.P9 report shows that he was aged about 51 years. The medical documents stand in a higher pedestal. Therefore, the age mentioned in the Ex.P-9 are to be taken into



consideration while awarding compensation. Therefore, the age of petitioner is considered as '51' years as on the date of incident.

21. It is specifically urged by the petitioner that he was earning Rs.20,000/- p.m. from his profession. In order substantiate the aforesaid income of the petitioner, he has not produced any document. Therefore, this Tribunal has to consider the income of the petitioner as notional income.

22. At this juncture, it is relevant to rely on a decision of Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka rendered by Division Bench in the case of **Ananda v/s Arjun and another** in **MFA.No.101144/2020 (MV) dated: 05.07.2023**. Wherein the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka has lay down the following principles in para No.8(b) are as here under :



“(b) The accident is of the year 2017. The Tribunal has assessed the income of the deceased at Rs.7,000/- per month as against the claim of Rs.2,50,000/- per annum. To substantiate the said claim, the injured claimant has not placed any material on record, it is for the Courts and Tribunals to assess the income notionally. The notional income fixed by the Karnataka State Legal Services Authority for the accident of the year 2017 is Rs.10,250/-. In the absence of any material produced by the claimant to prove his income, it is appropriate to assess the notional income of the injured claimant at Rs.10,250/- per month, and the same is assessed as the monthly income of the injured claimant.

23. As such this Tribunal is taking the notional income as prescribed by the Karnataka Legal Service Authority, Bengaluru. The accident was occurred on 31.07.2014. Therefore, in view of the above decision Rs.8,500/- has to be taken into consideration as monthly income of the petitioner.



24. The petitioner has contended that, he has sustained permanent disability due to injuries sustained in the accident. Therefore, he is not able to work as he was working before the accident. The petitioner also examined the Doctor by name Sunil Malagi as PW-4. During the course of his evidence, he has testified about injuries sustained by the petitioner. In the course of cross-examination, the PW-4 has testified that, the petitioner has not sustained any permanent disability.

25. ATTENDANT CHARGES, EXTRA NUTRITIOUS FOOD & CONVEYANCE CHARGES: The petitioner has produced inpatient admission record has Ex.P8 and medical bills Ex.P6. On perusal of Ex.P-8 it appears that, the petitioner was treated as inpatient in the Rajarajeshwari Medical Hospital from 11.08.2014 to 16.08.2014. The Ex.P-8 would reveals that, the petitioner



has taken treatment as inpatient in the same hospital from 11.08.2014 to 16.08.2014. Therefore, as per Ex.P-8, the petitioner has treated as inpatient in hospital for a period about 5 days. Considering the stay in the hospital, the petitioner would have incurred expenses towards attendant charges as some family member of the petitioner would have accompanied him to the hospital to take his care by leaving their duties. In the petition, the petitioner has contended that he has appointed an attendant to look after him in the hospital. But, no material evidence is placed on record to prove the aforesaid fact. Therefore, the said contention of the petitioner cannot be accepted. However, the time spent by the petitioner in the hospitals is not disproved by the other side. Therefore, it can infer that during the aforesaid period the petitioner might have also spent a considerable amount towards special diet, transportation and nutrition. In the fact and



circumstances of the case awarding computation amount of Rs.2,000/- towards attendants charge, Rs.2,000/- towards extra diet and nourishment and 2,000/- towards convenience would be just and reasonable in the are the petitioner entitle for compensation of Rs.6,000/- under this head.

26. PAIN AND SUFFERINGS: On going through the accidental injuries, the petitioner would have undergone pain and mental agony. As per the wound certificate and testimony of PW-4, the petitioner has sustained fracture of right clavicle feature GCS E2 M5 V3 bilateral pupils equal and reactive and moving all four limbs. Having regard to the fracture suffered by the petitioner and such other attending circumstances, this Tribunal is of the view that it is just and proper to award a sum of **Rs.20,000/-** under this head.



27. LOSS OF INCOME DURING LAID UP PERIOD:

Considering the nature of injuries and treatment given during the stay of petitioner in the hospital, it is quite natural that, the petitioner could not have carried out his avocation atleast for a period of three months. As already discussed supra, the notional income of the petitioner is considered as Rs.8,500/- p.m. Thus, by taking into account of the notional income of the petitioner, this Tribunal awards as sum of **Rs.1,370/- (Rs.274 x 5 days)** under this head.

28. MEDICAL EXPENSES: 59 medical bills are together got marked as Ex.P-6. In total the petitioner has spent Rs.24,144/-. The respondents have not disputed the said bills. There is no contra evidence to disbelieve the genuineness of these bills. Hence, a sum of Rs.24,144/-



which is rounded off to Rs.24,500/- is awarded under this head.

29. LOSS OF FUTURE INCOME DUE TO

DISABILITY: The age of the petitioner is considered as 51 years as on the date of accident. As per Sarla Verma's case, the multiplier '11' is to be applied. This Tribunal has already considered the notional income of the petitioner at Rs.8,500/- per month. Hence, the petitioner is entitled for a sum of **Rs.11,22,000/- (Rs.8,500 x 12 x 11)** under this head.

30. LOSS OF FUTURE AMENITIES AND

HAPPINESS: The disability referred above would have necessarily cause physical deformity with which the petitioner has to live the rest of his life. Hence a sum of **Rs.20,000/-** is awarded under this head.



31. The calculation table stands as follows:

1.	Attendant charges, extra nutritious food and conveyance charges	Rs.6,000-00
2.	Pain and sufferings	Rs.20,000-00
3.	Loss of Income during laid up period	Rs.1,370-00
4.	Medical expenses	Rs.24,500-00
5.	Loss of future income due to disability	Rs.11,22,000-00
6.	Loss of future amenities and happiness	Rs.20,000-00
	Total	Rs.11,93,870-00

32. REGARDING INTEREST & LIABILITY: The petitioner has claimed interest at the rate of 18% p.a. However, no material is placed on record to award such interest. Hence, as per the provision of law, it is proper to award interest at the rate of 6% p.a, to the petitioner, which would meet the ends of justice. However, the



petitioner not entitled any interest from the date of award dated 20.03.2020 till the disposal of the MFA No.345/2024 dated 06.01.2026.

33. The respondent No.2 has not produced the copy of insurance policy. On careful but respondent No.2 is admitted that, he issued insurance policy. As per Ex.P-1, the alleged accident took place on 31.07.2014. As such, it is clear that, the offending vehicle had valid insurance policy at the time of accident. Therefore, the respondent No.2 being the insurer of the offending vehicle and respondent No.1 being the owner thereof are jointly and severally liable to pay the aforesaid award amount to the petitioner. The petitioner preferred an appeal before the Hon'ble of High court of Kanataka miscellaneous first appeal 345/2024 wherein the Hon'ble Hight court Karnataka clearly held that the petitioner is not entitled



any inserted on compensation form the dated of award till the disposal of miscellaneous appeal therefore, petitioner entitled together with interest @ 6% per annum from the date of claim petition till the date of award dated 23.03.2020 and from the date of present award till the date realization of the entire amount. However, the petitioner not entitled any interest from the date of award dated 20.03.2020 till the disposal of the MFA No.345/2024 dated 06.01.2026. However, the respondent No.2 being the insurer is primarily liable to satisfy the award amount together with interest within 30 days from the date of this order. Hence, I am answering Issue No.2 **PARTLY IN THE AFFIRMATIVE.**

34. ISSUE No.3:- In view of my findings on the above issues, I proceed to pass the following;



-: O R D E R :-

The petition filed by the petitioner u/s 166 of Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 is hereby partly allowed with costs.

The Petitioner is entitled for compensation of Rs. 11,93,870 with interest at the rate of 6% p.a. from the date of petition till the date of award dated 20.03.2020 and till the date of passed in the present award till the realization of entire award amount.

However, The petitioner is not entitled any interest from the date of award dated 20.03.2020 till the dated of disposal of MFA No.345/2024 dated 06.01.2026.

The Respondent No.2 is directed to pay aforesaid amount together with interest to the petitioner within 30 days from the date of this order.

Out of the said compensation amount awarded to the petitioner, 90% of the



awarded amount with accrued interest shall be paid to the petitioner by NEFT/ RTGS or through e-payment on proper identification and on verification as per law. Further remaining 10% of the award amount shall be kept in F.D. in the name of petitioner in any Nationalized Bank/Scheduled Bank for a period of one year.

Advocate fee is fixed at Rs.1,000/-.

Draw award accordingly.

(Dictated to the stenographer, transcribed by him, transcript corrected by me and then pronounced in the Open Court on this the **02nd** day of May, **2026**).

(SANDESHA.K.)
Addl.Senior Civil Judge & MACT
Channapatna.

-: A N N E X U R E :-

List of witnesses examined for the petitioner:

PW-1 : Nagaraju



PW-2 : C.Ramachandran
PW-3 : Srinivas
PW-4 : Dr.Sunil Malagi

List of the documents marked for the petitioner:

Ex.P1 : Copy of FIR
Ex.P2 : Copy of Charge Sheet
Ex.P3 : Copy of IMV report
Ex.P4 : Copy of Wound Certificate
Ex.P5 : Copy of Mahazar
Ex.P6 : 59 Medical Bills
Ex.P7 : 34 Medical Prescriptions and
Authorization letter
Ex.P8 : Inpatient record
Ex.P9 : Authorization letter
Ex.P10 : One Case File
Ex.P11 : 4 City Scan
Ex.P12 : Patient Case Sheet
Ex.P13 : Neuro Psychological Assessment
Extract.

KARN210010892014



33

M.V.C./575/2014

List of witnesses examined for the respondents:

-NIL-

List of documents marked for the respondents:

-NIL-

(SANDESHA.K.)

Addl. Senior Civil Judge & MACT
Channapatna.



***(JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED IN THE OPEN COURT
(ON /02/05/2026)
(VIDE SEPARATE ORDER)***

O R D E R

The petition filed by the petitioner u/s 166 of Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 is hereby partly allowed with costs.

The Petitioner is entitled for compensation of Rs. 11,93,870 with interest at the rate of 6% p.a. from the date of petition till the date of award dated 20.03.2020 and till the date of passed in the present award till the realization of entire award amount.

However, The petitioner is not entitled any interest from the date of award dated 20.03.2020 till the dated of disposal of MFA No.345/2024 dated 06.01.2026.

The Respondent No.2 is directed to pay aforesaid amount together with interest to the petitioner within 30 days from the date of this order.



Out of the said compensation amount awarded to the petitioner, 90% of the awarded amount with accrued interest shall be paid to the petitioner by NEFT/ RTGS or through e-payment on proper identification and on verification as per law. Further remaining 10% of the award amount shall be kept in F.D. in the name of petitioner in any Nationalized Bank/Scheduled Bank for a period of one year.

Advocate fee is fixed at Rs.1,000/-.

Draw award accordingly.

**Addl. Senior Civil Judge and
MACT, Channapatna.**