

PERMANENT LOK ADALAT, BENGALURU

No.2, Ground Floor, Technical Education Building, Palace Road, Bengaluru-560001
Ph: 080-22371011, Email- plabangalore@gmail.com

Visit Our Website: <http://kslsa.kar.nic.in/PLA>.

DIARY

Date: 19.12.2020

Sl. No	Case Number	Summary of Proceedings	Next Date of Hearing
<u>ICICI BANK LIMITED- CHAMARAJAPET BRANCH</u>			
1	399/2018	<p>Petitioner's Counsel is present, filed Memo with copy of SMS and he is ready for settlement through conciliation. In fact, the Petitioner has given proposal of amicable settlement through SMS by showing his willingness to give 3 installments for payment of Petition claim in case the Respondents come for one time settlement. Having considered the nature of dispute, it appears that the said proposal is reasonable. But, the Respondents-1 to 3 are continuously absent and they are not coming forward for settlement. In fact, they have not even turned up for filing Written Statement. As such, it is clear that the Respondents are not ready for amicable settlement through conciliation. Thus, it is clear that the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit.</p> <p>For Affidavits and production of original documents.</p>	29.01.2021
<u>ICICI BANK LIMITED- BOMMANAHALLI BRANCH</u>			
2	84/2019	<p>Both the parties are absent.</p> <p>For Appearance of both the parties for the purpose of settlement through conciliation as last chance.</p>	29.01.2021
3	85/2019	<p>Both the parties are absent.</p> <p>For Appearance of both the parties for the purpose of settlement through conciliation as last chance.</p>	29.01.2021

4	87/2019	Both the parties are absent. For Appearance of both the parties for the purpose of settlement through conciliation as last chance.	29.01.2021
5	89/2019	Both the parties are absent. For Appearance of both the parties for the purpose of settlement through conciliation as last chance.	29.01.2021
6	97/2019	Both the parties are absent. For Appearance of both the parties for the purpose of settlement through conciliation as last chance.	29.01.2021
7	255/2019	Both the parties are absent. For Appearance of both the parties for the purpose of settlement through conciliation as last chance.	29.01.2021
8	262/2019	Both the parties are absent. For Appearance of both the parties for the purpose of settlement through conciliation as last chance.	29.01.2021
9	323/2019	Both the parties are absent. For Appearance of both the parties for the purpose of settlement through conciliation as last chance.	29.01.2021
10	324/2019	Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit. For Affidavit and production of original documents.	29.01.2021
11	325/2019	Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit. For Affidavit and production of original documents.	29.01.2021

12	326/2019	Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit. For Affidavit and production of original documents.	29.01.2021
13	333/2019	Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit. For Affidavit and production of original documents.	03.02.2021
14	359/2019	Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit. For Affidavit and production of original documents.	03.02.2021
15	360/2019	Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit. For Affidavit and production of original documents.	03.02.2021
16	370/2019	Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of	03.02.2021

		<p>powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit.</p> <p>For Affidavit and production of original documents.</p>	
17	374/2019	<p>Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit.</p> <p>For Affidavit and production of original documents.</p>	03.02.2021
18	375/2019	<p>Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit.</p> <p>For Affidavit and production of original documents.</p>	03.02.2021
19	377/2019	<p>Both the parties are absent.</p> <p>For Appearance of both the parties for the purpose of settlement through conciliation as last chance.</p>	03.02.2021
20	379/2019	<p>Both the parties are absent.</p> <p>For Appearance of both the parties for the purpose of settlement through conciliation as last chance.</p>	03.02.2021
21	381/2019	<p>Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit.</p> <p>For Affidavit and production of original documents.</p>	03.02.2021

22	383/2019	Both the parties are absent. For Appearance of both the parties for the purpose of settlement through conciliation as last chance.	03.02.2021
23	385/2019	Both the parties are absent. For Appearance of both the parties for the purpose of settlement through conciliation as last chance.	03.02.2021
24	386/2019	Both the parties are absent. For Appearance of both the parties for the purpose of settlement through conciliation as last chance.	03.02.2021
25	389/2019	Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit. For Affidavit and production of original documents.	03.02.2021
26	390/2019	Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit. For Affidavit and production of original documents.	03.02.2021
27	391/2019	Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit. For Affidavit and production of original documents.	03.02.2021
28	394/2019	Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-	03.02.2021

		<p>C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit.</p> <p>For Affidavit and production of original documents.</p>	
29	395/2019	<p>Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit.</p> <p>For Affidavit and production of original documents.</p>	03.02.2021
30	396/2019	<p>Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit.</p> <p>For Affidavit and production of original documents.</p>	03.02.2021
31	408/2019	<p>Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit.</p> <p>For Affidavit and production of original documents.</p>	03.02.2021
32	410/2019	<p>Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are</p>	03.02.2021

		permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit. For Affidavit and production of original documents.	
33	411/2019	Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit. For Affidavit and production of original documents.	03.02.2021
34	425/2019	Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit. For Affidavit and production of original documents.	05.02.2021
35	426/2019	Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit. For Affidavit and production of original documents.	05.02.2021
36	499/2019	Both the parties are absent. For Appearance of both the parties for the purpose of settlement through conciliation as last chance.	05.02.2021
37	500/2019	Both the parties are absent. For Appearance of both the parties for the purpose of settlement through conciliation as last chance.	05.02.2021
38	502/2019	Both the parties are absent. For Appearance of both the parties for the purpose of settlement through conciliation as last chance.	05.02.2021

39	504/2019	Both the parties are absent. For Appearance of both the parties for the purpose of settlement through conciliation as ultimate chance.	05.02.2021
40	509/2019	Both the parties are absent. For Appearance of both the parties for the purpose of settlement through conciliation as ultimate chance.	05.02.2021
41	510/2019	Both the parties are absent. For Appearance of both the parties for the purpose of settlement through conciliation as ultimate chance.	05.02.2021
42	534/2019	Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit. For Affidavit and production of original documents.	04.02.2021
43	535/2019	Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit. For Affidavit and production of original documents.	04.02.2021
44	536/2019	Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit. For Affidavit and production of original documents.	04.02.2021

45	538/2019	Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit. For Affidavit and production of original documents.	04.02.2021
46	539/2019	Both the parties are absent. They are not coming forward for settlement through conciliation. As such, the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit. For Affidavit and production of original documents.	04.02.2021
47	192/2020	Both the parties are absent. For Appearance of both the parties for the purpose of settlement through conciliation as last chance.	05.02.2021
48	196/2020	Both the parties are absent. For Appearance of both the parties for the purpose of settlement through conciliation as last chance.	05.02.2021
<u>STATE BANK OF INDIA- MAHADEVAPURA BRANCH</u>			
49	111/2019	No representation on behalf of both the parties. For Affidavit and production of original documents as last chance.	11.02.2021
50	113/2019	No representation on behalf of both the parties. For Affidavit and production of original documents as last chance.	11.02.2021
<u>INDIAN OVERSEAS BANK- PEENYA BRANCH</u>			
51	271/2019	No representation on behalf of both the parties. For Affidavit and production of original documents as last chance.	11.02.2021
52	275/2019	No representation on behalf of both the parties.	11.02.2021

		For Affidavit and production of original documents as last chance.	
<u>STATE BANK OF INDIA- RACPC, MALLESHWARAM BRANCH</u>			
53	144/2019	Petitioner's Counsel is present. Respondents-2 and 3 are also present. Both parties prayed time. Heard. Time granted. For settlement of the dispute as ultimate chance.	06.01.2021
<u>STATE BANK OF INDIA- SMECC, KORAMANGALA BRANCH</u>			
54	179/2020	Petitioner's Counsel is present and he is ready for settlement through conciliation. In fact, in the petition as well as notice issued to the Respondents-1 to 3, the Petitioner has given proposal of amicable settlement by showing his willingness to give rebate of Rs.99,888/- out of the Petition claim in case the Respondents-1 to 3 come forward for one time settlement. Having considered the nature of dispute, it appears that the said proposal is reasonable. But, the Respondents-1 to 3 are continuously absent and they are not coming forward for settlement. In fact, they have not even turned up for filing Written Statement. As such, it is clear that the Respondents are not ready for amicable settlement through conciliation. Thus, it is clear that the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit. For Affidavits and production of original documents.	10.02.2021
55	180/2020	Petitioner's Counsel is present and he is ready for settlement through conciliation. In fact, in the petition as well as notice issued to the Respondents-1 to 3, the Petitioner has given proposal of amicable settlement by showing his willingness to give rebate of Rs.51,411/- out of the Petition claim in case the Respondents-1 to 3 come forward for one time settlement. Having considered the nature of dispute, it appears that the said proposal is reasonable. But, the Respondents-1 to 3 are continuously absent and they are not coming forward for settlement. In fact, they have not even turned up for filing	10.02.2021

		<p>Written Statement. As such, it is clear that the Respondents are not ready for amicable settlement through conciliation. Thus, it is clear that the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit.</p> <p>For Affidavits and production of original documents.</p>	
56	181/2020	<p>Petitioner's Counsel is present and he is ready for settlement through conciliation. In fact, in the petition as well as notice issued to the Respondents-1 to 3, the Petitioner has given proposal of amicable settlement by showing his willingness to give rebate of Rs.37,994/- out of the Petition claim in case the Respondents-1 to 3 come forward for one time settlement. Having considered the nature of dispute, it appears that the said proposal is reasonable. But, the Respondents-1 to 3 are continuously absent and they are not coming forward for settlement. In fact, they have not even turned up for filing Written Statement. As such, it is clear that the Respondents are not ready for amicable settlement through conciliation. Thus, it is clear that the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit.</p> <p>For Affidavits and production of original documents.</p>	10.02.2021
57	182/2020	<p>Petitioner's Counsel is present and he is ready for settlement through conciliation. In fact, in the petition as well as notice issued to the Respondents-1 to 3, the Petitioner has given proposal of amicable settlement by showing his willingness to give rebate of Rs.48,928/- out of the Petition claim in case the Respondents-1 to 3 come forward for one time settlement. Having considered the nature of dispute, it appears that the said proposal is reasonable. But, the Respondents-1 to 3 are continuously absent and</p>	10.02.2021

		<p>they are not coming forward for settlement. In fact, they have not even turned up for filing Written Statement. As such, it is clear that the Respondents are not ready for amicable settlement through conciliation. Thus, it is clear that the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit.</p> <p>For Affidavits and production of original documents.</p>	
58	183/2020	<p>Petitioner's Counsel is present and he is ready for settlement through conciliation. In fact, in the petition as well as notice issued to the Respondents-1 to 3, the Petitioner has given proposal of amicable settlement by showing his willingness to give rebate of Rs.88,939/- out of the Petition claim in case the Respondents-1 to 3 come forward for one time settlement. Having considered the nature of dispute, it appears that the said proposal is reasonable. But, the Respondents-1 to 3 are continuously absent and they are not coming forward for settlement. In fact, they have not even turned up for filing Written Statement. As such, it is clear that the Respondents are not ready for amicable settlement through conciliation. Thus, it is clear that the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit.</p> <p>For Affidavits and production of original documents.</p>	10.02.2021
59	185/2020	<p>Petitioner's Counsel is present and he is ready for settlement through conciliation. In fact, in the petition as well as notice issued to the Respondents-1 & 2, the Petitioner has given proposal of amicable settlement by showing his willingness to give rebate of Rs.1,49,184/- out of the Petition claim in case the Respondents-1 & 2 come forward for one time settlement. Having considered the nature of dispute, it appears that</p>	10.02.2021

		<p>the said proposal is reasonable. But, the Respondents-1 & 2 are continuously absent and they are not coming forward for settlement. In fact, they have not even turned up for filing Written Statement. As such, it is clear that the Respondents are not ready for amicable settlement through conciliation. Thus, it is clear that the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit.</p> <p>For Affidavits and production of original documents.</p>	
60	187/2020	<p>Respondents-1 & 2 are absent.</p> <p>Petitioner's Counsel is present and prayed time to report settlement.</p> <p>For reporting settlement.</p>	10.02.2021
61	190/2020	<p>Petitioner's Counsel is present and he is ready for settlement through conciliation. In fact, in the petition as well as notice issued to the Respondents-1 & 2, the Petitioner has given proposal of amicable settlement by showing his willingness to give rebate of Rs.34,894/- out of the Petition claim in case the Respondents-1 & 2 come forward for one time settlement. Having considered the nature of dispute, it appears that the said proposal is reasonable. But, the Respondents-1 & 2 are continuously absent and they are not coming forward for settlement. In fact, they have not even turned up for filing Written Statement. As such, it is clear that the Respondents are not ready for amicable settlement through conciliation. Thus, it is clear that the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit.</p> <p>For Affidavits and production of original documents.</p>	10.02.2021

62	191/2020	<p>Petitioner's Counsel is present and he is ready for settlement through conciliation. In fact, in the petition as well as notice issued to the Respondents-1 to 3, the Petitioner has given proposal of amicable settlement by showing his willingness to give rebate of Rs.20,560/- out of the Petition claim in case the Respondents-1 to 3 come forward for one time settlement. Having considered the nature of dispute, it appears that the said proposal is reasonable. But, the Respondents-1 to 3 are continuously absent and they are not coming forward for settlement. In fact, they have not even turned up for filing Written Statement. As such, it is clear that the Respondents are not ready for amicable settlement through conciliation. Thus, it is clear that the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit.</p> <p>For Affidavits and production of original documents.</p>	10.02.2021
63	199/2020	<p>Petitioner's Counsel is present and he is ready for settlement through conciliation. In fact, in the petition as well as notice issued to the Respondents-1 & 2, the Petitioner has given proposal of amicable settlement by showing his willingness to give rebate of Rs.72,441/- out of the Petition claim in case the Respondents-1 & 2 come forward for one time settlement. Having considered the nature of dispute, it appears that the said proposal is reasonable. But, the Respondents-1 & 2 are continuously absent and they are not coming forward for settlement. In fact, they have not even turned up for filing Written Statement. As such, it is clear that the Respondents are not ready for amicable settlement through conciliation. Thus, it is clear that the dispute did not settle as per Section 22-C(7) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Hence, this case is taken for decision by virtue of powers vested under Section 22-C(8) of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Accordingly, this case is posted for evidence. Both the parties are permitted to adduce evidence by way of Affidavit.</p>	10.02.2021

		For Affidavits and production of original documents.	
64	226/2020	No representation on behalf of the Respondents-1 to 3. Petitioner's Counsel is present and prayed time for settlement. For Appearance and Written Statement of the Respondents-1 to 3 and for reporting settlement.	29.01.2021
<u>BANK OF BARODA- VICTORIA ROAD BRANCH</u>			
65	265/2020	Both the parties present. Conciliation held. Dispute settled. Accordingly, Joint Memo filed. Contents of the Joint Memo are accepted as true and correct by both the parties when read over and explained to them. Heard both the sides. Settlement is genuine and voluntary. Hence, it is accepted. In terms of settlement, the Respondent paid Rs.10,000/- today to the Petitioner. The Petitioner reports receipt of that amount. Award is passed in terms of Joint Memo:- <u>JOINT MEMO</u> As per conciliation held and advise made before this Permanent Lok Adalat, the dispute is settled as under: 1. The Respondent shall pay a sum of Rs.9,00,000/- in full and final settlement of the Petition claim. 2. Today the Respondent is paying Rs.10,000/- towards part of Award and agreed to pay the balance amount of Rs.8,90,000/- on or before 28-02-2021 . 3. In default to pay the balance as agreed above, the Respondent shall pay Petition Claim of Rs.15,06,050.14 less Rs.10,000/- paid today with interest @ Rs.11.20% p.a., from 01-12-2020 till the date of realization.	
66	266/2020	Both the parties present. Conciliation held. Dispute settled. Accordingly, Joint Memo filed. Contents of the Joint Memo are accepted as true and correct by both the parties when read over and explained to them. Heard both the sides. Settlement is genuine and voluntary. Hence, it is	

		<p>accepted. In terms of settlement, the Respondent paid Rs.10,000/- today to the Petitioner. The Petitioner reports receipt of that amount. Award is passed in terms of Joint Memo:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>JOINT MEMO</u></p> <p>As per conciliation held and advise made before this Permanent Lok Adalat, the dispute is settled as under:</p> <p>1. The Respondent shall pay a sum of Rs.9,80,000/- in full and final settlement of the Petition claim.</p> <p>2. Today the Respondent is paying Rs.10,000/- towards part of Award and agreed to pay the balance amount of Rs.9,70,000/- as under:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">1.Rs.3,00,000/- on or before 31-12-2020;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">2.Rs.6,70,000/- on or before 31-03-2021.</p> <p>3. In default to pay the balance as agreed above, the Respondent shall pay Petition Claim of Rs.12,96,806/- less Rs.10,000/- paid today with interest @ Rs.11.40% p.a., from 01-12-2020 till the date of realization.</p>	
67	267/2020	<p>Petitioner is present and prayed time to return the progress of the Notice. Heard. Time granted.</p> <p>For return of Notice of the Respondent as last chance.</p>	29.01.2021
68	269/2020	<p>Both the parties present. Conciliation held. Dispute settled. Accordingly, Joint Memo filed. Contents of the Joint Memo are accepted as true and correct by both the parties when read over and explained to them. Heard both the sides. Settlement is genuine and voluntary. Hence, it is accepted. In terms of settlement, the Respondents paid Rs.300/- today to the Petitioner. The Petitioner reports receipt of that amount. Award is passed in terms of Joint Memo:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>JOINT MEMO</u></p> <p>As per conciliation held and advise made before this Permanent Lok Adalat, the dispute is settled as under:</p>	

		<p>1. The Respondents shall pay a sum of Rs.5,25,000/- in full and final settlement of the Petition claim.</p> <p>2. Today the Respondents are paying Rs.300/- towards part of Award and agreed to pay the balance amount of Rs.5,24,700/- on or before 19-05-2021.</p> <p>3. In default to pay the balance as agreed above, the Respondents shall pay Petition Claim of Rs.7,70,779.53 less Rs.300/- paid today with interest @ Rs.10.70% p.a., from 01-12-2020 till the date of realization.</p>	
<u>BANK OF BARODA- PFS BRANCH</u>			
69	268/2020	<p>Petitioner is present and prayed time to return the progress of the Notice. Heard. Time granted.</p> <p>For return of Notice of the Respondent as last chance.</p>	29.01.2021
<u>BANK OF BARODA- K.G.ROAD BRANCH</u>			
70	270/2020	<p>Petitioner is present. Respondent's Counsel Sri. C. Manjunatha, Advocate files Memo of appearance on behalf of the Respondent and undertook to secure the Respondent on the next date and to settle the matter. Heard. Permitted.</p> <p>For appearance of the Respondent and for settlement.</p>	28.12.2020
71	271/2020	<p>Petitioner is present. Respondent-2 is also present. Conciliation held between the Petitioner and Respondent-2. Dispute settled. Accordingly, Joint Memo filed. Contents of the Joint Memo are accepted as true and correct by both the parties when read over and explained to them. Heard both the sides. Settlement is genuine and voluntary. Hence, it is accepted. In terms of settlement, the Respondent paid Rs.2,50,000/- today through Cheque dated 25.12.2020 to the Petitioner towards part of Award amount. The Petitioner reports receipt of that Cheque. Award is passed in terms of Joint Memo:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>JOINT MEMO</u></p> <p>As per conciliation held between the Petitioner and Respondent-2 and advise made before this Permanent Lok Adalat, the dispute is settled as</p>	

		<p>under:</p> <p>1. The Respondent-2 shall pay a sum of Rs.10,00,000/- in full and final settlement of the Petition claim.</p> <p>2. Today the Respondent-2 is paying Rs.2,50,000/- through post dated Cheque dated 25.12.2020 towards part of Award amount and agreed to pay the balance amount of Rs.7,50,000/- on or before 10-02-2021.</p> <p>3. On payment of entire Award amount by the Respondent-2 as stated above, the Petitioner shall issue NOC to the Respondent-2 immediately.</p> <p>4. In default to pay the balance as agreed above, the Respondent-2 shall pay the Petition Claim of Rs.23,30,012/- less Rs.2,50,000/- paid today through Cheque with interest @ Rs.12.00% p.a., from 30-04-2017 till the date of realization.</p> <p>5. If the Respondent-2 clears the Award amount as stated above in Paras-1 and 2, the Petition stands dismissed as against the Respondent-1. In case, the Award amount is not cleared, the Petitioner is at liberty to proceed against the Respondent-1 as claimed in the petition.</p>	
72	272/2020	<p>Petitioner is present. Respondent's Counsel Sri. C. Manjunatha, Advocate files Memo of appearance on behalf of the Respondent and undertook to secure the Respondent on the next date and to settle the matter. Heard. Permitted.</p> <p>For appearance of the Respondent and for settlement.</p>	28.12.2020
73	273/2020	<p>Petitioner is present. Sri. C. Manjunatha, Advocate undertook to secure the Respondent on the next date and to settle the matter. Heard. Permitted.</p> <p>For appearance of the Respondent and for settlement.</p>	28.12.2020
<u>BANK OF BARODA- CITY MARKET BRANCH</u>			
74	274/2020	<p>Both the parties present. Conciliation held. Dispute settled. Accordingly, Joint Memo filed. Contents of the Joint Memo are accepted as true and correct by both the parties when read over and explained to them. Heard both the sides.</p>	

		<p>Settlement is genuine and voluntary. Hence, it is accepted. In terms of settlement, the Respondent paid Rs.5,000/- today to the Petitioner. The Petitioner reports receipt of that amount. Award is passed in terms of Joint Memo:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>JOINT MEMO</u></p> <p>As per conciliation held and advise made before this Permanent Lok Adalat, the dispute is settled as under:</p> <p>1. The Respondent shall pay a sum of Rs.40,000/- in full and final settlement of the Petition claim.</p> <p>2. Today the Respondent is paying Rs.5,000/- towards part of Award and agreed to pay the balance amount of Rs.35,000/- as under:</p> <p>1. Rs.12,000/- on or before 22-01-2021; 2. Rs.12,000/- on or before 22-02-2021; 3. Rs.11,000/- on or before 22-03-2021.</p> <p>3. In default to pay the balance as agreed above, the Respondent shall pay Petition Claim of Rs.49,750/- less Rs.5,000/- paid today with interest @ Rs.12% p.a., from 21-02-2020 till the date of realization.</p>	
75	275/2020	<p>Petitioner is present and prayed time to return the progress of the Notice. Heard. Time granted.</p> <p>For return of Notice of the Respondent.</p>	29.01.2021
76	276/2020	<p>Both the parties present. Conciliation held. Dispute settled. Accordingly, Joint Memo filed. Contents of the Joint Memo are accepted as true and correct by both the parties when read over and explained to them. Heard both the sides. Settlement is genuine and voluntary. Hence, it is accepted. In terms of settlement, the Respondent paid Rs.2,000/- today to the Petitioner. The Petitioner reports receipt of that amount. Award is passed in terms of Joint Memo:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>JOINT MEMO</u></p> <p>As per conciliation held and advise made before this Permanent Lok Adalat, the dispute is settled as under:</p>	

		<p>1. The Respondent shall pay a sum of Rs.65,000/- in full and final settlement of the Petition claim.</p> <p>2. Today the Respondent is paying Rs.2,000/- towards part of Award and agreed to pay the balance amount of Rs.63,000/- as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rs.15,000/- on or before 20-01-2021; 2. Rs.15,000/- on or before 20-02-2021; 3. Rs.15,000/- on or before 20-03-2021; 4. Rs.18,000/- on or before 20-04-2021. <p>3. In default to pay the balance as agreed above, the Respondent shall pay Petition Claim of Rs.97,654/- less Rs.2,000/- paid today with interest @ Rs.12% p.a., from 01-05-2017 till the date of realization.</p>	
77	277/2020	<p>Petitioner is present and prayed time to return the progress of the Notice. Heard. Time granted.</p> <p>For return of Notice of the Respondent.</p>	29.01.2021
78	278/2020	<p>Petitioner is present and prayed time to return the progress of the Notice. Heard. Time granted.</p> <p>For return of Notice of the Respondent.</p>	29.01.2021
<u>INDIAN OVERSEAS BANK- BANASHANKARI BRANCH</u>			
79	279/2020	<p>Both the parties present. Conciliation held. But, dispute not settled. The Respondent is directed to file his statement on the next date.</p> <p>For filing Written Statement of the Respondent.</p>	29.01.2021
<u>INDIAN OVERSEAS BANK- COX TOWN BRANCH</u>			
80	280/2020	<p>Though notice through Hand Process said to have been served on the Respondents, report is not clear. Even, the Respondents-1 & 2 are absent.</p> <p>Petitioner is present and prayed time for sending notices through RPAD. Heard. Permitted.</p> <p>For return of Notice of the Respondent issued through RPAD.</p>	29.01.2021
81	281/2020	<p>Though notice through Hand Process said to have been served on the Respondent, report is not clear. Even, the Respondent is absent.</p>	29.01.2021

		Petitioner is present and prayed time for sending notice through RPAD. Heard. Permitted. For return of Notice of the Respondent issued through RPAD.	
--	--	---	--

Prepared by: Srinath R.S. - 

Verified by: Manjunatha K.N. 

Shivaleela M.G. - 

**BY ORDER OF
The Chairman, Permanent Lok Adalat**


19/12/2020
Sheristedar (I/c)