

KAUK720012042023



**IN THE COURT OF THE SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE & PRL.
JMFC AND ADDL. M.A.C.T., KUMTA, AT: KUMTA,
UTTARA KANNADA.**

Dated this the 10th day of June, 2025

PRESENT

**Smt. B.S.Rayannawar, B.A., L.L.B.,
Senior Civil Judge
& Prl. JMFC, Kumta.**

MVC. No.554/2023

Petitioner:

Beby Ganapu Harikant
Aged about 50 years,
Occ: Household and fishing,
R/o: Haldipur, Near Toll,
Tq: Kumta.

(By Sri. V.R.B. - Advocate)

V/s

Respondents:

1. M.S Jadhon Enterprises,
Prop. Sabir Khan,
Owner of the vehicle
No.RJ25/GA 1898,
43, Gaddi Mohalla,
Gongor selu, Sawai Madhopur,
Rajasthan 322034.
2. The Divisional Manager,
The United India Insurance
Company Ltd., Radha Govind
Complex, Kaikini Road, Karwar.

3. Yogesh Devendra Naik,
Owner of the vehicle
KL27/D0704 Neharu Nagar,
Sagar, Dist: Shivmoga.
4. The Divisional Manager,
Oriental Insurance Co., Ltd.,
Near Court Complex, Udupi.

(R1 by Sri. R.G.N. - Advocate)
(R2 by Sri. S.M.B. - Advocate)
(R3 by Exparte)
(R4 by Sri. Y.V.S. - Advocate)

COMMON ORDERS ON I.A.Nos.I to III

The present I.A.No.I is filed by the applicant/
petitioner Under Section 166(3) R/w Section 5 of
Limitation Act with an prayer to condone the delay in
filing present petition.

2. I.A. No.II and III filed by respondent no.2 and
respondent no.4 company under order VII rule 11 (d) R/w
Sec.151 of CPC and R/w Sec 166(3) of Karnataka Motor
Vehicles Act with an prayer to dismiss the claim petition
which was filed beyond the period of limitation and the
petition is barred by the limitation.

3. I.A.No.I supported with Affidavit of applicant/petitioner stating that, she filed this case for seeking the compensation for the injuries sustained by her in the Motor Vehicle Accident that caused on 05-04-2023 near Davangere. After the accident she took treatment at various hospitals like chitagerei District hospital Davangere, Shridevi Multi Specialty Hospital Honnavar and Tejaswini Hospital Mangaluru. However she not able to walk properly, sitting on the floor and climbing the upstairs. She took the continuous treatment till today. She had no knowledge about the court proceedings or how to apply for the compensation before the court. After the due enquiry it is learnt that she has to engage an advocate to apply for the claiming compensation for the injuries sustained by her in Motor Vehicle Accident. Since she took the prolonged treatment now she has engaged an advocate and applied this application for compensation and she has no knowledge of the application has to be filed before the 6 months of accident. The police officials of Davangere Rural Police Station have also not intimated her at this regard. Hence

this case has been filed today after the elapse of 6 months. The delay in filing this case is bonafide one and there is no malafide intention. If this application is not allowed she will be put to great hardships and loss and no prejudice will be cause to the other side by allowing this application.

4. I.A.No.I opposed by the second respondent company by filing written objections contending that, the present application filed on behalf of the petitioner U/s. 5 of Limitation Act and Sec. 166(3) of M.V.Act is contrary to law and true facts of the case. The averments made either in the application or in the affidavit filed along with the application are not true and correct. Absolutly there are no genuine grounds made out either in the application or in the affidavit filed in support of the application to condone the delay.

5. The petitioner has clearly admitted that there is a delay in filling the petition. and stated that he has taken treatment in various hospitals and he has no knowledge about the court proceedings etc. Hence there is a delay in filling the instant petition. The grounds made for condoning

the delay are totally false and baseless. The petitioner has not produced any document in support of the grounds made out in the affidavit in order to substantiate his contention.

6. The petitioner has to take suitable orders at the earliest stage from Hon'ble Principal M.A.C.T to condone the delay and pressing the application at this belated stage is not maintainable. The petitioner has filed instant petition U/s.166 of M.V.Act against the respondents for compensation. The accident as alleged in the petition was occurred on 05-04-2023 and the present petition is filed on 18-12-2023 which is after the expiry of six months from the date of accident and there is inordinate delay in filing the present petition. The amendment to MV.Act came in to force on 01-04-2022 and as per Sec. 166(3) of amended M.V. Act "No application for compensation shall be entertained unless it is made within six months of the occurrence of the accident". Hence the present petition itself is not maintainable.

7. The petitioner has filed present application U/s. 5 of limitation Act and it is submitted that the General clauses Act is not applicable to the M.V.Act. Hence the present application is not maintainable and liable to be dismissed. If the present application is allowed, then this respondent Insurance Company will be put to great loss, injustice and inconvenience and on the other hand no injustice or inconvenience will be caused to the petitioner, hence prays to dismissed the application with costs.

8. Respondent No.4 company also filed objections contending that, the present application filed on behalf of the petitioner U/s. 5 of Limitation Act and Sec. 166(3) of M.V.aAct is contrary to law and true facts of the case and the same is therefore deserve to be dismissed in limine. The averments made either in the application or in the affidavit filed along with the application are not true and correct. and absolutely there are no genuine grounds made out either in the application or in the affidavit filed in support of the application to condone the delay.

9. The petitioner has clearly admitted that there is a delay in filling the petition and stated that he has taken treatment in various hospitals and he has no knowledge about the court proceedings etc. Hence there is a delay in filling the instant petition. The grounds made for condoning the delay are totally false and baseless. The petitioner has not produced any document in support of the grounds made out in the affidavit in order to substantiate his contention.

10. The petitioner has to take suitable orders at the earliest stage from Hon'ble Principal M.A.C.T to condone the delay and pressing the application at this belated stage is not maintainable and liable to be dismissed. The petitioner has filed instant petition U/s. 166 of M.V.Act against the respondents for compensation. The accident as alleged in the petition was occurred on 05-04-2023 and the present petition is filed on 18-12-2023 which is after the expiry of six months from the date of accident and there is inordinate delay in filing the preset petition. The amendment to MV.Act came in to force on 01-04-2022 and as per Sec. 166(3) of amended M.V. Act "No application for compensation shall be

entertained unless it is made within six months of the occurrence of the accident". Hence the present petition itself is not maintainable.

11. The petitioner has filed present application U/s. 5 of limitation Act and it is submitted that the General causes Act is not applicable to the M.V.Act. Hence the present application is not maintainable and liable to be dismissed. If the present application is allowed, then this respondent Insurance Company will be put to great loss, injustice and inconvenience and on the other hand no injustice or inconvenience will be caused to the petitioner if the present application is not allowed. Hence prays to dismiss the application with costs.

12. The petitioner has clearly admitted that there is a delay in filing the petition and stated that he has taken treatment in various hospitals and he is not in a position to walk properly and he is under continuous treatment and he has no knowledge about the court proceedings etc. Hence there is a delay in filing the instant petition. The grounds

made for condoning the delay are totally false and baseless. The petitioner has not produced any documents in support of the grounds made out in the affidavit in order to substantiate his contention.

13. The petitioner has to take suitable orders at the earliest stage from Hon'ble Principal M.A.C.T to condone the delay and pressing the application at this belated stage is not maintainable and liable to be dismissed. The petitioner has filed instant petition U/s. 166 of M.V. Act against the respondents for compensation. The accident as alleged in the petition was occurred on 05-04-2023 and the present petition is filed on 18-12-2023 which is after the expiry of six months from the date of accident and there is inordinate delay in filing the preset petition. The amendment to MV. Act came in to force on 01-04-2022 and as per Sec. 166(3) of amended M.V.Act "No application for compensation shall be entertained unless it is made within six months of the occurrence of the accident". Hence the present petition itself is not maintainable.

14. The petitioner has filed present application U/s. 5 of limitation Act and it is submitted that the General clauses Act is not applicable to the M.V.Act. Hence the present application is not maintainable and liable to be dismissed. If the present application is allowed, then the respondent Insurance Company will be put to great loss, injustice and inconvenience and on the other hand no injustice or inconvenience will be caused to the petitioner, if the present application is not allowed. Hence prays to dismissed the application with costs.

15. **I.A No.II** supported with Affidavit of Divisional Manager of Second respondent United India Insurance company stating that, he is well conversant with the facts and circumstances of the present case.

16. Further stated that the petitioner has filed present petition U/sec. 166 of M.V. Act against the respondents for compensation for the injuries sustained by her in an alleged Motor Accident took place 05-04-2023. This respondent is the insurer of vehicle bearing Reg.No. R.J-25/GA-1898

which was involved as alleged in the petition. As per the documents on record, the alleged accident was occurred on 05-04-2023. And claim the petition has been filed on 18-12-2023. i.e, after the expiry of 8 months 13 days from the date of alleged accident and there is an inordinate delay on the part of claimant in filing the claim petition and it has not been filed within time limit as specified under provisions of M.V.Act. Hence the claim petition filed by the petitioner is barred by limitation and therefore it cannot be entertained and hence the petition may be dismissed.

17. In view of the provisions of M.V. Act 1988 (amended as in 2019) the section 166(3) has come in to effect from 1st April 2022 by Central Government as per the notification passed in 25th February 2022. Sec. 166(3) reads as” No application for compensation shall be entertained unless it is made within six months of the occurrence of the accident”. Hence since the claim has been made at a belated stage i.e., after the lapse of 6 months from the date of the occurrence of the accident and hence it is not a surviving claim and is totally barred by limitation as per the amended

provisions of M.V.Act and hence the petition is liable to dismissed.

18. Further stated that, at present there is no cause of action against this respondent Insurance Company and as such this respondent has been unnecessarily joined as a party to the present proceedings in the capacity of insurer of vehicle allegedly involved in the accident took place on 05-04-2023. But since the claim petition is filed after a delay of 6 months thus not tenable and maintainable in the eyes of law. On these grounds prays to dismiss the petition on the ground of delay in filing the claim petition as prayed in the accompanying application.

19. I.A.No.II objected by petitioner by filing objections, contending that the present application filed by the respondent No.2 and 4 is contrary to the law and true facts of the case same is to be dismissed. The reasons mentioned in the application are not true, the respondent No.2 and 4 are intends to take the illegal benefit of the present amendment of Motor Vehicle Act. The Motor Vehicle Act is

beneficial legislation and the respondents cannot be denied the compensation to be payable to the petitioner.

20. The petitioner is the resident of Haldipur village and the accident in question caused within the jurisdiction of Davangere Rural Police station limits. The crime was registered at Davangere Rural Police station at Crime No.110/2023. It is impossible for the petitioner to know that when police officials of Davangere Rural Police station might prepare the chargesheet and when they have put up the charge sheet to the court. Moreover officials of the Davangere Rural Police station have not intimated in this regard. This petition was illiterate and she has no knowledge about the claiming the compensation and its procedure. The delay in filing the petitioner is bonafide one and after the treatment they were taking the bed rest as per the advise of the doctor.

21. Further contended that, the petitioner sustained the greivous injuries to his body and took treatment at District Hospital at Davangere, after first aid, she was

advised to take treatment of major hospital at any major hospital at her native place, since her patella was fractured. The petitioner has not received the notice from the jurisdictional M.A.C.T. Davangere about the occurrence of accident. Even the police officials also not intimated or advised to the petitioner for supply of the documents such as ownership of the vehicle, driving license, other relevant documents. After the due diligence the petitioner contacted her advocate and after collecting the said documents, this petition has been filed. There is no malafide intention behind the delay the reason mentioned above is genuine one. The petitioner took treatment at Tejaswini hospital Mangalore, till now she is under treatment. Hence prays to dismissed the application with cost.

22. **IA.No.III** filed by **R4** company supported with the Memorandum of Facts submitted by counsel for respondeant No.4 (The Oriental Insurance Co.,Ltd) Insurance Company contending that, he know the facts of this case. As per the petition contents, the instant petition arising out of the road traffic accident which was occurred

on 05-04-2023 and the said petition was filed U/s. 166 of the M.V.Act on 18-12-2023. Thus the petition was preferred after the lapse of six months from the date of accident. The amendment to M.V.Act came in to force on 01-04-2022 and as per Sec. 166(3) of the said Act, “ No appliation for compensation shall be entertained unless it is made within six months of the occurrence of the accident”. Since the petition is not filed within the prescribed period of six months from the date of accident and the same was file beyond the period of limitation, the instant petition is not maintainable as the same is time barred. Moreover the petition has not taken suitable orders at the earliest stage from the Hon’ble Principle MACT to condone the delay and even the petitioner has not filed any application before this Tribunal for condoning the delay in filing this petition. Hence the accompanying application is being filed to get the order of dismissal of the petition on the point of limitation. If the present application is allowed then no injustice or inconvenience will be caused to the petitioner. But on the other hand if the said application is not allowed then great

injustice, inconvenience and monetary loss will be caused to the respondent No.4 Insurance Company. Hence prays to allow the application.

23. I.A.No.III objected by petitioner by filing objections, contending that the present application filed by the respondent No.2 and 4 is contrary to the law and true facts of the same is to be dismissed. The reasons mentioned in the application are not true, the respondent No.2 and 4 are intends to take the illegal benefit of the present amendment of Motor Vehicle Act. The Motor Vehicle Act is beneficial legislation and the respondents cannot be denied the compensation to be payable to the petitioner.

24. The petitioner is the resident of Haldipur village and the accident in question caused within the jurisdiction of Davangere Rural Police station limits. The crime was registered at Davangere Rural Police station at Crime No.110/2023. It is impossible for the petitioner to know that when police officials of Davangere Rural Police station might prepare the chargesheet and when they have put up

the charge sheet to the court. Moreover officials of the Davangere Rural Police station have not intimated in this regard. This petition was illiterate and she has no knowledge about the claiming the compensation and its procedure. The delay in filing the petition is bonafide one and after the treatment they were taking the bed rest as per the advise of the doctor.

25. Further contended that, the petitioner sustained the greivous injuries to his body and took treatment at District Hospital at Davangere, after first aid, she was advised to take treatment of major hospital at her native place since her patella was fractured. The petitioner has not received the notice from the jurisdictional M.A.C.T. Davangere about the occurance of accident. Even the police officials also not intimated or advised to the petitioner for supply of the documents such as ownership of the vehicle, driving license, other relevant documents. After the due diligence the petitioner contacted her advocate and after collecting the said documents, this petition has been filed. There is no malafide intention behind the delay the reason

mentioned above is genuine one. The petitioner took treatment at Tejaswini hospital mangalore, till now she is under treatment. Hence prays to dismissed the application with cost.

26. Heard both respective counsels on I.A.No.I to III Perused application, annexed affidavit, objections and other material on record.

27. The points that arise for my consideration are as follows;

1. Whether the petitioner has made out grounds to allow I.A. No.I and to condone the delay ?
2. Whether the respondent no.2 and 4 company made out grounds to reject the petition under VII Rule 11(d) R/w C.P.C R/w Section 166(3) of Karnataka Motor Vehicles Act.
3. What order?

27. My answer to the above points are as under

Point No.1 : In the Affirmative

Point No.2 : In the Negative

Point No.3: As per the final order,
for the following

REASONS

28. **Point No.1** : In the present case the petitioner filed I.A.No.I to condone the delay and respondent no.2 and 4 company filed application to dismiss the petition as it is barred by limitation.

Section 166(3) of the Motor Vehicles Act (MV Act) mandates that no application for compensation shall be entertained by the Claims Tribunal unless it is filed within six months of the accident. The limitation as prescribed was six months from the date of accident.

29. Clause (3) of Section 166 of the Act, which was introduced by the Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Act, 2019, provides that a claim for such compensation must be filed before the Tribunal within six months from the date of accident.

30. Petition is filed petitioner for compensation filed under Section 166 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988. petitioner filed petition on 18.12.2023. Second and fourth respondent companies have filed applications raising

issue of maintainability with prayer to dismiss the claim petition on the ground that accident being occurred on 05.04.2023 and the claim petition filed on 18.12.2023 which is after the period of six months of occurrence. The delay in filing could not be condoned in view of the Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Act, 2019.

31. Learned counsel for respondent no.2 submits that, alleged Motor Accident took place 05-04-2023. This respondent is the insurer of vehicle bearing Reg.No. R.J-25/GA-1898 which was involved as alleged in the petition. As per the documents on record, the alleged accident was occurred on 05-04-2023. And claim the petition has been filed on 18-12-2023. i.e, after the expiry of 8 months 13 days from the date of alleged accident and there is an inordinate delay on the part of claimant in filling the claim petition and it has not been filed within time limit as specified under provisions of M.V.Act. In view of the provisions of M.V.Act 1988 (amended as in 2019) the section 166(3) has come in to effect from 1st April 2022 by Central Government as per the notification

passed in 25th February 2022. Sec. 166(3) reads as” No application for compensation shall be entertained unless it is made within six months of th occurrence of the accident”. Hence since the claim has been made at a belated stage i.e., after the lapse of 6 months from the date of the occurrence of the accident and hence it is not a surviving claim and is totally barred by limitation as per the amended provisions of M.V.Act and hence the petition is liable to dismissed. at present there is no cause of action against this respondent Insurance Company and as such this respondent has been unnecessarily joined as a party to the present proceedings in the capacity of insurer of vehicle allegedly invoved in the accident took place on 05-04-2023. The claim petition is filed after a delay of 6 months thus not tenable and maintainable in the eyes of law.

32. Learned counsel for respondent no.4 also submitted that the accident was occurred on 05-04-2023 and the petition was filed U/s. 166 of the M.V.Act on 18-12-2023. Thus the petition was preferred after the

lapse of six months from the date of accident. The amendment to M.V.Act came in to force on 01-04-2022 and as per Sec. 166(3) of the said Act, “ No appliation for compensation shall be entertained unless it is made within six months of the occurrence of the accident” . Since the petition is not filed within the prescribed period of six months gfrom the date of accident and the same was file beyond the period of limitation, the instant petition is not maintainable as the same is time barred. Moreover the petition has not taken suitable orders at the eraliest stage from the Hon’ble Principle MACT to condone the delay and even the petitioner has not filed any application before this Tribunal for condoning the delay in filing this petition. Hence If the application is allowed no injustice will be caused to the petitioner., on the other hand if the said application is not allowed then great injustice and monitory loss will be caused to the respondent No.4 Insurance Company hence prayed to allow the application.

33. On the other hand the learned counsel for petitioner submits that, the petitioner filed this case for seeking the compensation for the injuries sustained by him in the Motor Vehicle Accident, After the accident petitioner took treatment at various hospitals like chittageri District hospital Davangere, Shridevi Multi Speciality Hospital Honnavara, the petitioner had no knowledge about the court proceedings or how to apply for the compensation before the court. After the due enquiry she learnt that she has to engage an advocate to apply for the claiming compensation for the injuries sustained by her in Motor Vehicle Accident. Now she has engaged an advocate and applied this application for compensation and has no knowledge of the application has to be filed before the 6 months of accident. The police officials of Davangere Rural Police Station have also not intimated her at this regard. If any delay in filing this case is bonafide one and there is no malafide intention. The petitioner is the resident of Haldipur village and the accident in question caused within the jurisdiction of

Davangere Rural Police station limits. The crime was registered at Davangere Rural Police station at Crime No.110/2023. It is impossible for the petitioner to know that when police officials of Davangere Rural Police station might prepare the chargesheet and when they have put up the charge sheet to the court. Moreover officials of the Davangere Rural Police station have not intimated in this regard to this petitioner. This petition was illiterate and she has no knowledge about the claiming the compensation and its procedure. The delay in filing the petitioner is bonafide one and after the treatment they were taking the bed rest as per the advise of the doctor. The petitioner sustained the greivous injuries to his body and took treatment at District hospital at Davangere, after first aid, she was advised to take treatment at any major hospital at her native place, since her patella was fractured. Even the police officials also not intimated or advised to the petitioner for supply of the documents such as ownership of the vehicle, driving license, other relevant documents. After the due

diligence the petitioner contacted her advocate and after collecting the said documents, this petition has been filed.

34. Admittedly prior to 01.04.2022 there was no limitation for filing claims seeking compensation for injury or death. Clause (3) of Section 166 of the Act, which was introduced by Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Act, 2019, provides that a claim for such compensation must be filed before the Tribunal within six months from the date of accident. Moreover Section 166 is to provide necessary compensation to the victims of the road traffic accidents and the said enactment is a benevolent legislation.

35. In this case accident occurred on 05.04.2023 and claim petition filed on 18.12.2023 which was beyond the period of six months, that is around 08 months 13 days. Such inordinate delay in absence of provisions contained in Section 166 as amended by the Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Act, Amendment came into force

with effect from 01.04.2022 by virtue of Ministry of Road Transport specified “No application for compensation shall be entertained unless it is made within six months of the occurrence of the accident”.

36. From perusal of application reveals that the petitioner sustained injury and she was taking treatment, and has no knowledge to meet legal aspect, hence she could not file the petition in time. Moreover the Motor Vehicle Act is a beneficial legislation aimed at providing relief to the victims, or their families. The ratio laid down in Dhannala case applies to the present case. Moreover the petitioner stated the reasons for delay in filing this petition. Petitioner stated that she was under treatment. The respondent no.2 and 4 company submits that the petition is barred by limitation, but the limitation point is a mixed question of law and fact. The petitioner stated the reason for delay, hence without giving the opportunity to the petitioner the petition cannot be dismissed at threshold.

37. It is held in a decision in 2023 ACJ 940 (Akshay Raj V/s Ministry of Law and Justice and others)- Lordships held that,- Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, Section 166(3) and 166(4) (as amended by Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Act, 2019) read with Central Motor Vehicles Rules, 1989, rule 150-A-Annexure XIII (as inserted by GSR 164 (E) dated 25.02.2022) and Limitation Act, 1963, section 29(2)-Claim application – Limitation – Whether provisions of section 29(2) of Limitation Act would be applicable for entertaining the claim application filed beyond the limitation of six months provided under section 166(3) of MV Act and claim application cannot be dismissed in limine-Held:yes: there is no provision under MV Act excluding the applicability of provisions of section 29(2) of Limitation Act: moreover, as per Sl.No.21of Annexure XIII to rule 150-! Tribunal shall treat Detailed Accident Report as claim application and Sl.No.17 provides extension of time to file DAR therefore no discrimination can be made against claimants for filing claim application beyond the period of six months when

statute does not oust the applicability of provisions of Limitation Act.

38. It is also held in the following decision that,

2023 LiveLaw (Ker)50-Hon'ble High Court Kerala

- held- 24. As a fall out of my findings, the impugned orders are set aside, it is held that the provisions of the limitation Act would be applicable for entertaining the petitions for claiming the compensation even beyond the period of six months, for, by taking into consideration, rule 17 of Annexure XIII framed under Rule 150A of the Central Motor Vehicles Rules 1989, the limitation to entertain the claim petition cannot be restricted to six (6) months as there is no provision in the Act excluding the applicability of provisions of Section 29(2) of the Limitation Act. In other words, it is held that the claim petitions, if filed beyond the period of six months cannot be dismissed in limine.

The provisions of the Motor Vehicles Amended Act the Rules to ensure the mandate of law so that the litigants are not made to suffer for having not filed claim petitions within a period of six months. And all the MACT's are directed to entertain the petition and decide the same, in accordance with law.

And it is also held by Hon'ble Karnataka High Court, in WRIT PETITION NO.201961 OF 2023 (MV) Between The Divisional

manager United India Insurance Company Ltd., V/s Ramu @ RameshS/o Yallappa. - Held- The MV Act being a beneficial Act, the provisions thereof had to be given beneficial meaning and effect. The benefit under the Act, cannot be taken away on a technical aspect that too of limitation, thus, the Trial Court having applied Section 5 of the Limitation Act to the fact situation, I do not find any infirmity thereof.

39. Hence in view of the same, the petitioner explained and mentioned the grounds for delay in filing present petition, hence, the application filed by the petitioner is deserves to be allowed and applications filed by the respondent no.2 and 4 company not deserves to be allowed. Hence **point no.1 answered in the Affirmative point no.2 answered in the Negative.**

40. **Point No.3:** In view of the discussions made above this court proceeds to pass the following:

ORDER

I.A.No.I filed by the applicant/petitioner Under Section 166(3) of M.V. Act R.w. section 5 of Limitation Act is hereby allowed, delay in filing petition is hereby condoned.

I.A.No.II And III filed by the applicants/ respondent no.2 and 4 under order VII Rule 11(d) R.w.Sec. 151 C.P.C. R/w.. Sec.166(3) of Karnataka Motor Vehicle Act are hereby dismissed.

(Directly dictated to the Stenographer to the computer, corrected and then pronounced by me in the open court on this date the 10th day of June, 2025)

(B.S.Rayannawar)
Senior Civil Judge & Prl. JMFC &
AMACT, Kumta.