



W.P. Nos.44572/2025, etc. Batch

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on	Pronounced on
18.11.2025	24.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

**W.P. NOS.44572, 20729, 25843, 25833, 25835, 25839,
25846, 42202, 42208, 42213 OF 2025**

AND

**W.M.P. NOS. 49727, 49728, 29051, 29052, 29042, 29058, 29045, 29056,
29035, 29036, 45657, 29032, 29033, 47259, 47254, 47266 & 47265 OF 2025**

Life Insurance Corporation of India
Rep. By its Secretary – Legal
Zonal Office, LIC Building
11th Floor, 153, Anna Salai
Chennai 600 002.

.. Petitioner in 44572, 25843,
25833, 25835, 25839, 25846,
& 42202, 42208, 42213/2025

- Vs -

1. The Insurance Ombudsman
Office of the Insurance Ombudsman
(Tamil Nadu & Puducherry)
IV Floor, Fathima Akthar Court
453 – Anna Salai, Teynampet
Chennai 600 018.

.. R-1 in all the petitions

2. Indra Bai Surana
3. B.Natarajan
4. Princess V.Naik
5. K.Kesavan
6. R.Hemalatha
7. Sathyavathi Sridhar
8. S.Ramachandran
9. V.Ganesan

.. R-2 in WP 44572/2025
.. R-2 in WP 25843/2025
.. R-2 in WP 42202/2025
.. R-2 in WP 42213/2025
.. R-2 in WP 25833/2025
.. R-2 in WP 25839/2025
.. R-2 in WP 25846/2025
.. R-2 in WP 25835/2025



W.P. Nos.44572/2025, etc. Batch

10. V.N.Naik

.. R-2 in WP 42208/2025

B.Natarajan

.. Petitioner in WP 20729/2025

- Vs -

1. The Insurance Ombudsman
Office of the Insurance Ombudsman
(Tamil Nadu & Puducherry)
IV Floor, Fathima Akthar Court
453 – Anna Salai, Teynampet
Chennai 600 018.

2. The Executive Director
CRM Department
M/s.LIC of India, 4th Floor
No.153, Anna Salai, Chennai 600 002.

3. The Branch Manager
M/s.LIC of India
No.12, Railway Road
Kancheepuram
Kancheepuram District.

.. Respondents in WP 20729/25

W.P. Nos. 44572, , 25833, 25835, 25893,25846, 42202, 42208, 42213 of
2025 filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying this Court to
issue a writ of certiorari calling for the records relating to the Award

Nos.IO/CHN/A/LI/0224/2025-2026, IO/CHN/A/LI/0368/2024-2025,
IO/CHN/A/LI/0145/2025-2026, IO/CHN/A/LI/0128/2025-2026,
IO/CHN/A/LI/00013/2025-2026, IO/CHN/A/LI/0366/2024-2025,
IO/CHN/A/LI/0006/2025-2026, IO/CHN/A/LI/0054/2025-2026,
IO/CHN/A/LI/0368/2024-2025 & IO/CHN/A/LI/0145/2025-2026 dated



W.P. Nos.44572/2025, etc. Batch

13.10.2025, 29.03.2025, 28.07.2025, 22.07.2025, 14.05.2025, 29.03.2025, 28.07.2025, 14.05.2025 & 02.06.2025, passed by the 1st respondent and quash the same.

W.P. No. 20729 filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying this Court to issue a writ of mandamus directing the 2nd respondent to pay the benefits claimed by the petitioner under Policy No.706418455 as per 1st respondent's award No.IO/CHN/A/LI/0368/2024-2025 dated 29.03.2025 within the stipulated period fixed by this Hon'ble Court.

For Petitioners : Mr. SP.Chockalingam in
WP Nos. 44572, 25843, 25833,
25835, 25893, 25846, 42202,
42208 & 42213/2025

Mr. M.K.Bhoopathy Rajan in
WP No.20729/2025

For Respondents : Mr. SP.Chockalingam, for RR-2
& 3 in WP No.20729/2025
Mr. T.Velmurugan for R-2 in
WP No.25833/2025
Mr.Varun Ranganathan for R-2
in WP No.25835/2025
Ms.T.P.Savitha for R-2 in WP
No.25839/2025
Mr. R.Kalyan Kishen Singh for
R-2 in WP No.25846/2025
Not Ready in Notice reg. Resp.
In WP Nos.42202 & 42208/2025



WEB COPY

3. It is the case of the petitioner that the respective life assured had taken the policy, viz., Jeevan Saral and after proper underwriting, the policy was issued to the life assured based on the respective proposal forms submitted, which the date of maturity prescribed in the respective policies. The policies, while provided for death benefit during the period of policy cover, but, in the event of the life assured surviving the policy period, maturity amount along with loyalty addition is payable, which, however, has not been quantified in the respective policy documents, which have been issued by the petitioner. There is no dispute with the fact that the policy was issued for varying terms and on varying premiums payable by the life assured.

4. It is the further case of the petitioner that the respective life assured survived the policy term upon which the maturity amount became payable to the life assured and based on the conditions of the policy, the maturity amount was calculated along with loyalty addition and was offered as maturity benefit to the respective life assured.

5. It is the further case of the petitioner that vide the respective communication, the maturity amount payable to the life assured was communicated and the life assured, not being satisfied with the amount



W.P. Nos.44572/2025, etc. Batch

payable as maturity benefit, preferred a complaint with the 1st respondent u/r 13 (1)(d) & (1) of the Insurance Ombudsman Rules, 2017 r/w Section 24 of the Insurance Regulatory & Development Authority Act, 1999.

6. The life assured contended that the amount of premium paid by the life assured under the policy was more than the amount offered as maturity benefit and, therefore, sought for return of the premium amount paid along with interest at 9.5%. The 1st respondent, on the respective complaints, forwarded the same to the petitioner to which the petitioner submitted the details of the policy in the form of a self-contained Note along with the copies of the policy documents and proposal forms. The 1st respondent upon receipt of the note, passed the respective impugned award directing the petitioner to return the premium paid by the life assured along with interest at the rate specified in Rule 17 (7) of the Insurance Ombudsman Rules, 2017 after deducting the earlier settlement made towards maturity benefit. Aggrieved by the said award, while W.P. Nos.44572, , 25833, 25835, 25893,25846, 42202, 42208, 42213 of 2025 have been filed by the petitioner/LIC of India, W.P. No.20729/2025 has been preferred by the life assured seeking payment of the benefits by the 2nd respondent in the writ petition in terms with the award passed by the 1st respondent.



WEB COPY

7. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that prior to the plan being floated for being availed by the consumers, the features of the plan, including the product details, benefits, pricing and other terms and conditions were placed before the Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority (for short 'IRDAI') and only after approval of the authority, the plan was introduced in the market.

8. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that the plan was introduced on 12.2.2004 after following the aforesaid procedure and the benefits under the plan, pricing, viz., premium charged and other terms and conditions are in consonance with the settled principles of public welfare. Further the product brochures for advertisement of the product was also approved by the authority. However, without taking into consideration all these aspects about the salient features of the policy as also the manner in which the policy has been introduced in the market, the 1st respondent has passed the impugned orders, which is perverse and reveals non-application of mind to the materials.



WEB COPY

9. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that the insurance policy provides coverage against the risk of untimely death and premium amount is charged based on the age of the proponent and higher the age, higher is the premium, as the higher age at entry is directly proportional to higher risk of death. Higher the risk of death, the higher the element of risk cover, which leads to higher mortality charges.

10. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that as per the circular of IRDAI, the mortality tables used for fixing the premium is one prescribed by the Institute of Actuaries of India and the mortality tables used for computing premium in the present policy by the petitioner is the one prescribed by IRDAI and as such there is no violation of any of the settled principles of insurance.

11. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that insofar as the present plan taken by the respective life assured is concerned, unlike regular insurance plans, wherein higher premium is charged for proponent higher in age, under this plan, premium amount is decided by the policy holder irrespective of the age of the proponent at the start of the policy and the death sum assured is equal to 250 times of monthly premium amount



WEB COPY

irrespective of age. Therefore, irrespective of the age of the proponent, the higher aged proponents will get the very same insurance cover in same premium amount as that of proponents of lower age, but the maturity value will differ according to age at entry of the insured.

12. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that in respect of Jeevan Saral policy taken by the respective life assured, it provides for a higher death cover along with return of premium barring the first year premium along with loyalty additions if the life assured meets with death during the tenure of the policy and if the life assured survives the period of the policy, the life assured will be given the maturity value along with loyalty additions for the completed term, which is a variable component depending on the age of the policy holder at the time of taking the policy.

13. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that the policy provides for auto cover for one year in case premium amount has been paid for a period of three years and, thereafter, if the due premium is not paid within the due date or even during the period of grace, the policy does not lapse, but the basic risk cover, excluding rider benefits continues to be



WEB COPY

available to the life assured for a period of 12 months from the due date of the first unpaid premium.

14. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that the respective life assured had submitted the proposal form only after getting acquainted with the terms and conditions of the plan and the petitioner had admitted the proposal form from the life assured for the respective terms sought for by them. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that to a Question No.14 in the proposal form *“Have you understood fully the terms and conditions of the plan you propose to take”* the life assured/proposer had answered in the affirmative as *“Yes”*. This clearly shows that the respective life assured had understood the terms and conditions of the policy and had understood the benefits that would be available to him in the event of his survival or on death to his nominee and, therefore, the life assured is estopped from contending that he/she was not aware about the benefits available upon maturity of the policy.

15. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that the premium paid is directly linked to the risk coverage, viz., death sum assured and is in no way linked in any manner with the maturity sum assured. It is further




WEB COPY

submitted that the maturity value payable per Rs.100/- monthly premium is provided in advance for each age and term of policy and the maturity value payable under the plan is well defined at the inception itself.

16. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that the petitioner has not committed anything wrong and the proponent/life assured was given complete freedom to choose the monthly amount of premium he wants to pay which is connected with the high amount or risk coverage as per the plan conditions and it is not linked to the maturity sum assured along with loyalty additions.

17. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that in the policy bond issued to the respective life assured, the field Maturity Sum Assured in the Schedule of Policy has been left blank inadvertently and the non-mentioning of the maturity amount in the policy no way changes the scope and benefits under the policy, as all the terms and conditions are approved by IRDAI. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that the policy bond also provides in the 4th page for the policy holder to examine the policy and if any mistake is found, to return it immediately for correction. The respective life assured having received the policy and having knowledge about non-



18. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that even if the maturity sum assured column is left blank inadvertently, the conditions in the policy provides that in the event of the life assured surviving on the date of maturity, a sum equal to maturity sum assured in force after partial surrenders, if any, along with corresponding loyalty additions would be payable. Therefore, the life assured would be entitled only to the maturity sum assured as per the schedule of the policy, even if the maturity sum assured column has been left blank due to error in the computer program and that error cannot be put against the petitioner to even refund the entire premiums paid along with interest.

12



which is payable on two different occasions. However, even if the inadvertent error has crept in the policy in not printing the maturity sum assured, presuming but not admitting that there was no consensus on the policy, even then the respective life assured had not taken any steps to return the policy and had utilised the benefit of the risk cover under the policy till the term of the policy, which fact has not been properly adjudicated by the 1st respondent while passing the award.

20. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that the concept of life insurance is founded on the principle that a small contribution from every one is ringed in to avert the financial crisis suffered due to the death of a breadwinner of a family, which is covered by the policy of insurance, inspite of the fact that the larger denomination do not receive anything in return for the said contribution, which is the sole intention under the Term Assurance concept plans of which the present policy Jeevan Saral is one, but which includes a better benefit of a portion as maturity sum assured to the life assured well. Therefore, once the policy holder has accepted the concept and entered into a contract of insurance with the petitioner, he cannot turn back and claim that even the amount paid by him by way of premium has not been realised by him, as such is not the concept of term assurance plans.



WEB COPY

21. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that the non-printing of the maturity value in the policy schedule was informed to the life assured and the life assured having been provided with two different benefits under the policy, viz., life coverage and maturity and having enjoyed the benefit of life coverage till the maturity of the policy cannot now turn back and claim that the maturity sum assured is not commensurate with the premium amount paid by the life assured.

22. Referring to Section 64 and 65 as also Section 20 of the Contract Act, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the parties both having committed a mistake, in that the maturity sum assured has not been spelt out by the petitioner in the policy document and the life assured not having properly gone through the same and brought it to the notice of the petitioner, both are equally liable for the mistake and it cannot be fastened on the petitioner alone, as has been done through the order passed by the 1st respondent, directing refund of the premium paid by the life assured along with interest, which, if allowed to subsist, then it would not only open a Pandora's Box for similar claims being made against the petitioner, but would also work hardship to the petitioner, as the amount of premium refunded to



WEB COPY

such life assured would have an impact on the other policy holders in getting better benefits under their policy, as any additions, which are published by the petitioner on the basis of the profit earned by them would be drastically reduced and the bona fide policy holders would not be able to realise the proper benefits.

23. The 1st respondent, without properly appreciating all the aforesaid aspects, has travelled beyond the scope of the policy conditions and ordered refund of the entire premium paid by the policy holder with interest after having enjoyed the risk cover for the entire term of the policy, which is grossly perverse, arbitrary and unreasonable and the same deserves to be interfered with.

24. Per contra, the respective learned counsel appearing for the life assured submitted that the terms and conditions have not been provided to them by the agent, who had canvassed on behalf of the petitioner and the life assured were made to believe that in case they survive the policy term, they would be getting the maturity sum assured along with loyalty additions, which would be greater than the premium paid by them.



WEB COPY

25. It is further submitted by the learned counsel that even in the policy document, neither the terms and conditions have been given nor there is any mention about the maturity sum assured and believing the words of the agent, who canvassed the policy on behalf of the petitioner, they have taken the policy and, therefore, the petitioner cannot now contend that the life assured have been informed about the terms and conditions.

26. When the contract itself is ab initio void, the petitioner cannot maintain its case by claiming that the parties are bound by the contract of insurance. In support of the aforesaid submissions, learned counsel placed reliance upon the decision of a learned single Judge of this Court in ***P.Subramanian – Vs – The Insurance Ombudsman & Ors. (W.P. No.8397 of 2019 – Dated 01.06.2020).***

27. Since the whole issue revolves around the documents that have been placed before this Court, which is not in dispute, putting the life assured on notice does not arise and this Court is inclined to consider the documents and pass orders.



WEB COPY

28. This Court gave its careful consideration to the submissions advanced by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and perused the materials available on record to which the attention of this Court was drawn.

29. This Court is conscious of the concept of insurance and the social and societal benefit that it passes on to the families in case of unforeseen events happening. But that cannot alone be the sole determinant factor to look at all the insurance policies as one and the same, as the policies are of varying nature catering to varying segments and it takes within its fold different risk options, including maturity options. Normally, the policies are segregated into three categories, viz., conventional, market oriented and term assurance. Though all the policies cover the risk aspect as a specific criteria, however, built within it are certain salient features, which are the main reason for attracting the customers. Therefore, of necessity, the customers should be made known of the salient features, which distinguishes one policy from the other so that of the very many policies, the intending proposers would be able to choose the best plan, that would suit their specific needs.

30. There is no necessity to state that risk coverage is the main fruit in respect of an insurance policy. However, insofar as conventional policies are



WEB COPY

concerned, maturity benefit along with additions, are relevant considerations in the mind of any person, who proposes to take a policy of insurance.

Leaving aside the market linked policy, the other form of policy is a term assurance policy in which for a very low premium, the risk alone is covered benefitting the nominee in case of any unforeseen happening and if the life assured survives the term, no amount is paid to the life assured.

31. The present policies, which is the subject matter of the present petitions, is a combination of a conventional and term assurance policy. However, the said factum is not spelt out either in the policy document or in the affidavit filed by the petitioner, but it could be deciphered from the terms of the policy.

32. According to the petitioner, inadvertently, the amount of the benefit payable at the time of maturity, which is shown as “Maturity Sum Assured” has erroneously been omitted to be entered in the policy. However, in clause 14 of the proposal, the life assured has given an undertaking that he/she has fully understood the terms and conditions of the plan, which he/she is taking and, therefore, he/she cannot try to wriggle out of the same by claiming that the maturity amount is not even equivalent to the premium



paid by them and, therefore, the premium paid should be refunded to them along with interest, moreso, when the life assured, over the term of the policy has enjoyed the risk coverage.

33. In the aforesaid backdrop, the whole case lingers upon the policy document and the benefits which is committed to be provided to the life assured during the subsistence of the policy and at the time of maturity.

34. True it is that the respective life assured has enjoyed risk coverage under the policy during the entire extent of the term. However, can his enjoyment be the ground to negate the case of the life assured when the error in the policy is due to the omission/error on the part of the petitioner.

35. A careful perusal of the policy bond reveals that in the 'Schedule' the maturity sum assured payable, the death benefit sum assured payable, the accident benefit sum assured payable along with the instalment premium and instalment rider premium have been shown. While the death benefit sum assured and accident benefit sum assured have been shown, however, there is a conspicuous absence of any figure relating to 'Maturity Benefit Sum Assured', which according to the petitioner, is an inadvertent slip.



WEB COPY

36. To wriggle out of this predicament, the petitioner wants this Court to advert to page-4 of the policy bond, wherein, according to the petitioner, the following is printed in bold letters :-

"YOU ARE REQUESTED TO EXAMINE THIS POLICY, AND IF ANY MISTAKE BE FOUND THEREIN, RETURN IT IMMEDIATELY FOR CORRECTION."

37. True it is that the above disclaimer is provided in the 4th page of the policy document. This is a document, which is, day-in and day-out, being handled by the petitioner and even according to the petitioner, about 1,20,985 death claims have been settled on this policy, meaning thereby, that there are more number of maturity claim cases and that the petitioner has been dealing with this policy document daily. However, a document, which is dealt with by the petitioner daily does not result in the petitioner finding an error in the issued policy; rather the petitioner puts the ball in the court of the life assured to find out the error and inform the petitioner by returning the policy.

38. In case of a contract, both the parties are equally liable for any mistake and in a case of this sort, the petitioner being the author of the



WEB COPY

document with which it is more conversant, ought to have been more careful while issuing the policy as it is bound by the terms of the policy and any error crept in due to its own act, cannot be fastened on the other party, who has taken the policy by adverting to the last page of the document, where a disclaimer is given to the effect that if any error or mistake is found, the policy document is to be returned back to the insurer.

39. Merely because the life assured have not returned the policy to the insurer, it cannot be taken to mean that he/she has accepted the terms of the policy or that he/she has found the mistake and still has retained the policy with them. The error or mistake, which has crept in could also be found out and corrected by the petitioner, but the petitioner only puts the blame on the 2nd respondent that he has accepted the terms of the policy, when it is the petitioner who is the author and who of its own volition has accepted over affidavit that an inadvertent error in not mentioning the maturity sum assured had crept in, in the policy. In spite of the petitioner having issued lakhs of similar policy, yet the error in the maturity sum assured not being mentioned has not passed the eyes of the petitioner, yet the petitioner wants to rely upon a disclaimer in the 4th page to tie the hands of the policy holder by stating that the error/mistake has not been pointed out, which would be a



deemed acceptance by the policy holder. The petitioner cannot mulct the responsibility on the life assured alone for this act, as it is the author of the document who ought to have been more careful, while handling public money and now it cannot now turn back and claim that returning the premium back to the life assured would cause grave prejudice to the other policy holders, as it is the duty of the petitioner to have been vigilant and the sufferance of the other policy holders is the look out of the petitioner and not that of the life assured.

40. Coming to the other contention relating to the undertaking of the life assured that he/she has fully understood the terms and conditions of the plan, which he/she had proposed to take, for which, the answer of the life assured has been in the affirmative and, therefore, the 2nd respondent is bound by his undertaking, however, the said contention cannot be accepted for the simple reason that the terms and conditions of the plan, which the 2nd respondent had taken is not part and parcel of the proposal form nor it is the case of the petitioner that a copy of the terms and conditions of the plan had been provided to the 2nd respondent. The policy has been procured through an agent by the petitioner by filling the proposal form of which the terms and conditions are not part of it. At best, the terms of the proposal form alone



WEB COPY

could be held to be binding on the 2nd respondent along with his answers to the questions which have been given in the proposal form, but in respect of certain terms and conditions relating to a policy, which the proposer wishes to take, which are not part of the proposal form, the answer in the affirmative to the question in clause 14 of the proposal form cannot be taken to mean that the terms and conditions of the plan are accepted by the proposer/life assured, as it is the agent, who has given the details about the policy and there is no material on which the proposer is basing his understanding. Therefore, the proposer cannot be mulcted with any responsibility in the absence of any material to show that the details of the plan was within the knowledge of the proposer/life assured.

41. The last of the contention relates to the maturity sum assured payable on the maturity of the policy in the event of the policy holder surviving the term of the policy.

42. In this regard, it is the claim of the petitioner that the higher the age, the higher the premium, but lower the maturity benefit, in case of survival of the policy holder till the maturity of the policy, though the death



WEB COPY

benefit is 250 times of the monthly premium payable excluding the return of premium paid less the first year premium.

43. In this regard, a careful perusal of the policy issued by the petitioner reveals that the 'Schedule' to the policy details about the maturity benefit and benefit on death and for better appreciation, the same are quoted hereunder:-

<i>Maturity Benefit</i>	<i>In the event of the Life Assured surviving the date of maturity a sum equal to Maturity Assured in force after partial surrenders, if any, along with the corresponding loyalty addition, if any, shall be payable.</i>
<i>Benefit on Death</i>	<i>A sum equal to the Death Benefit Sum Assured along with all premiums paid (excluding premiums paid for the first policy year, any extra premium and premiums in respect of Accident Benefit and Term Rider Benefits) shall be payable provided the policy is in full force on the date of death. Loyalty Addition, if any, shall also be payable. If the proposer and/or Life Assured had surrendered the policy partially, as per terms of this policy, the benefit shall be reduced in proportion of the reduction in premium for the main plan.</i>

44. There is no ambiguity with regard to the terms relating to maturity benefit and benefit on death. In this regard, a perusal of the policy, more particularly, the top portion of the Schedule when looked at, it reveals that Death Benefit Sum Assured under main plan and Accident Benefit Sum Assured is fixed and it is explicitly shown in the requisite column and the

24



instalment premium for the main plan and accident benefit premium is shown. However, there is a conspicuous absence with regard to the maturity sum assured as the column is empty. There is no amount specified against the maturity sum assured.

45. Even if it is to be taken, as provided in the tabular statement that a sum equal to maturity sum assured in force, after partial surrenders, if any, along with corresponding loyalty addition, if any, shall be payable, the entire policy document is silent on the maturity sum assured in force, if the stand of the petitioner is to be taken that it is based on the age of the policy holder coupled with the premium amount paid. It is the duty cast on the petitioner, as the issuer of the policy, to commit as to what would be the amount that would be payable to the policy holder on his surviving the term of the policy, excluding the loyalty addition.

46. The conditions and privileges, which are referred to within the policy, which are provided in the succeeding pages of the policy document is also silent on the aspect relating to maturity sum assured, though there is specific mention about the surrender value, guaranteed surrender value, accident benefit, if opted for, loans, partial surrenders, disability to the life



WEB COPY

assured and death of life assured. Even in the conditions, annexed to the policy document, except for the above, there is no specific mention about the maturity sum assured.

47. Though it is the submission of the petitioner that the maturity value payable per Rs.100/- monthly premium is provided in advance for each age and term of policy and the maturity value payable under the plan is well defined at the inception itself, however, as pointed out above, neither the proposal form nor the policy document which have been issued to the 2nd respondent clearly spells out the maturity value which would be payable under the plan and if at all it is well defined at the hands of the petitioner, it would not suffice as knowledge of the same should be had by the policy holder/life assured and not the petitioner alone. Unless the policy holder/life assured is provided with the details as to what is the maturity sum assured that would be receivable by him if he survives the term of the policy, the petitioner cannot attribute any responsibility on the life assured.

48. When the manner in which the maturity sum assured would be payable, as is provided for in the schedule, it is incumbent on the petitioner, as the issuer of the policy, to provide the details as to the maturity sum



WEB COPY

assured that would be payable to the policy holder on his surviving the policy term in the policy document. Failure to spell out the same in the policy document would have to be mulcted on the petitioner and it cannot be fastened on the policy holder/life assured.

49. In the present case, as pointed out above, there is a clear absence of all the necessary details relating to the maturity sum assured that would be payable to the life assured and there is also no material evidencing that the life assured/policy holder was provided with all the details with regard to the maturity sum assured that would be payable to him on his surviving the term of the policy and that being the case, the only inference that could be drawn from the incontrovertible materials is that the petitioner did not have the consent from the policy holder/life assured with regard to the essential term of the agreement relating to the exact value of the maturity sum assured that would be payable on his surviving the policy term at the inception of the policy. Therefore, this mutual mistake would render the contract/agreement void ab initio in terms of Section 20 of the Indian Contract Act and, therefore, the fact situation warrants the liability to be fixed on the petitioner to refund the premium paid by the life assured as the contract itself is void, as the computable maturity sum assured has not been specifically spelt out.



W.P. Nos.44572/2025, etc. Batch

WEB COPY

directed to settle the benefits to the petitioner in terms with the award passed by the 1st respondent within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

24.11.2025

Index : Yes / No

GLN

To

The Insurance Ombudsman
Office of the Insurance Ombudsman
(Tamil Nadu & Puducherry)
IV Floor, Fathima Akthar Court
453 – Anna Salai, Teynampet
Chennai 600 018.



WEB COPY



W.P. Nos.44572/2025, etc. Batch

M.DHANDAPANI, J.

GLN

**W.P. NOS. 44572, 20729,
25843, 25833, 25835, 25893,
25846, 42202, 42208, &
42213 OF 2025**

**Pronounced on
24.11.2025**