

IN THE COURT OF THE MUNSIFF OF OTTAPALAM

Present:- Sri.M.R. Dileep, Munsiff, Ottapalam

Friday 13th day of March, 2026

22nd day of Phalguna, 1947. S.E.

ORIGINAL SUIT NO.308/2025.

Mulanjoor Nidhi Ltd. (CIN-U65990KL2020PLN061980),

Poonthuruthil Building, near LP school, Mulanjoor. P.O.,

via Chunangad, Ottapalam, Palakkad District. Pin 679511.

Rep. by its Managing Director Narayanankutty. N, aged 50 years,

S/o. Raman Ezhuthachan, Nalakulangara Veedu, Mulanjoor. P.O.,

Lakkidi Perur I, Palakkad District, Pin- 679511.

Plaintiff

-Vs-

1. Sindhu.R., aged about 40 years, W/o. Sreenivasan.P.,
Pathangalil House, Mangalam.P.O., Lakkidi Perur-1,
Ottapalam, Palakkad District, Pin-679301.

2. Sreenivasan.P., aged about 53 years, S/o. Chandrashekar,
Pathangalil House, Mangalam.P.O., Lakkidi Perur-1,
Ottapalam, Palakkad District, Pin-679301.

Defendants

.....

This suit coming on this day for final hearing before me in the presence of Sri.P.P.Kusalan, Advocate for the plaintiff and the defendants are called; absent; set ex parte, and this court passed the following:-

JUDGMENT

This is a suit for money.

2. The plaintiff's case, in brief, is as follows:-

The plaintiff is a company offering financial services. The defendants borrowed ₹30,000 from the plaintiff on 20.01.2024. When they borrowed the money, the defendants issued a promissory note for ₹ 30,000 to the plaintiff. The agreement was that the defendants would repay the money borrowed by them with 18% interest per annum on demand .They have defaulted on the loan and owe the plaintiff ₹ 36,392/- as

of the date of presentation of the plaint. The plaintiff is entitled to recover that amount from the defendants with 18% interest per annum .

3. The defendants were served with summonses. However, they did not come to court to defend the suit. Therefore, the suit was heard ex parte.

4. The plaintiff's managing director was examined as PW1, and the documents submitted in evidence by the plaintiff were marked as Exts.A1 to A4.

5. Heard the plaintiff's counsel .

6. PW1 testified in tune with the contents of the plaint. Ext. A2 is the loan application , and Ext.A3 is the promissory note signed by the defendants. The uncontroverted testimony of PW1 and the documents submitted in evidence prove the plaintiff's case. The plaintiff has claimed ₹3000 in recovery charges. Since the court is awarding the plaintiff its costs , it is not entitled to any separate recovery charges. In view of the discussion made above, the suit is decreed in part as follows :-

1. The defendants are ordered to pay the plaintiff ₹ 36,392/-, with 12% interest per annum from the date of the suit to the date of the decree and 6% interest per annum from the date of the decree to the date of payment.

2. The defendants are ordered to pay costs proportionate to the amount decreed.

Dictated to the Confidential Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court, on this, the 13th day of March , 2026.

Munsiff

APPENDIX:

Plaintiff's Witness Examined:

PW1 : Narayanankutty.N.

Plaintiff's Exhibits Marked:

A1 : 22.09.2023 : Certified copy of extract from the minutes of the proceeding of the board of director of company meeting.

A2 : 20.01.2024 : Original loan application form.

A3 : 20.01.2024 : Original pro note.

A4 : 30.06.2025 : Loan account statement.

Defendants' Witness and Exhibits : NIL.

Munsiff