

HIGH COURT LEGAL SERVICES COMMITTEE, CHENNAI

Lok Adalat-I organised by the High Court Legal Services Committee  
Wednesday, the 10<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2016

LOK ADALAT AWARD

(Chapter VI and u/s 21 of Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987)  
Presided over by  
The Hon'ble Mr.JUSTICE P.THANGAVEL (Retd.)  
and

Members

Mr.M.Mohamed Ismail  
Mr.M.Boopathy

A.S.No.1069 of 2009

(This Appeal Suit is filed to set aside the decree and judgment dated 15.10.2008 made in O.S.No.365 of 2007 passed by the learned Additional District Judge, (Fast Track Court No.V) Coimbatore at Tiruppur)

Gopalakrishnan .. Appellant  
Vs.

1.M.Karuppusamy  
2.P.Ravichandran  
3.Sulochana  
(No Relief is Claimed against  
3rd Respondent and hence given up) .. Respondents

This case came up for settlement before the Lok Adalat.  
Mr.J.Franklin learned counsel for the appellant and  
Mr.P.Sundarajan, learned counsel for the respondents are  
present.

TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

The appeal in A.S.No.1069 of 2009 pending on the file of High Court, Madras and preferred against the Judgment and decree dated 15.10.2008 made in O.S.No.365 of 2007 on the file of the learned Additional District Judge (FTC V Coimbatore at Tirupur) has been referred to Lok Adalat for conciliation today.

2. The respondents 1 and 2 in this appeal as plaintiffs filed a suit for specific performance with regard to the property described in the suit against the appellant, who is the first defendant in the suit and against one Sulochana as second defendant. The second defendant remained ex parte. After considering the contentions raised on both sides, the trial court was pleased to grant decree for specific performance in favour of the plaintiffs/respondents 1 and 2 and against the appellant/first defendant in the suit. The second defendant,

Sulochana remained ex parte before the trial court. Aggrieved at the judgment and decree passed in the above said suit viz., O.S.No.365 of 2007 , this first appeal in A.S.No.1069 of 2009 has been filed.

3. The appellant assisted by counsel and respondents 1 and 2 represented by counsel are present before Lok Adalat today. Both parties have compromised the disputed claim between them. An endorsement was made on the appeal memorandum by both sides to the effect that the dispute with regard to the demised property has been compromised and the appellant/defendant is willing to not press the appeal. Consequent to the compromise arrived at between both the parties, appellant also requested to refund the court fee refundable to him.

4. An endorsement made on the grounds of appeal, has been recorded. In view of the compromise arrived at between both parties, the appeal filed by the appellant/first defendant is dismissed as not pressed with a direction to refund the court fee in view of the endorsement made on the appeal memorandum. No order as to costs. Appellant is permitted to withdraw the amount deposited before the trial court. Award is passed accordingly.

Sd/-

Gopalakrishnan

Sd/-

Counsel for the Appellant

The full Court fee paid shall be refunded to the appellants in the manner provided under Section 69-A of the Tamil Nadu Court-Fees and Suits Valuation Act, 1955 and the Court Fees Act, 1870 as provided for under sub Sec.1 of Section 21 r/w 25 of LSA Act 1987 as amended in 1994.

Sd/-

Judge

Sd/-

Member

Sd/-

Member

Sd/-

Asst.Registrar

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar

To:

The parties/Advocate concerned

Copy to:

1.The Additional District Judge, (Fast Track Court No.V)  
Coimbatore at Tiruppur.


2.The Secretary, High Court Legal Services Committee, Chennai.

3. The Section Officer, V.R.Section, High Court, Madras.

4.The Section Officer, Lok Adalat Section, High Court, Madras.  
(+ 2 Copies)

Gv  
KR/21/3/16

A.S.No.1069 of 2009



WEB COPY