

**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUN SUKHIJA,**  
**ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE – 07, (CENTRAL DISTRICT)**  
**TIS HAZARI COURTS, DELHI.**

**SUIT NO.:- 218/2018**

**UNIQUE CASE ID NO.:- 6290/2018**

**IN THE MATTER OF :-**

**M/s. ICICI Bank Ltd.**  
**Registered Office at:**  
**Landmark, Race Course Circle,**  
**Alkapuri, Vadodara – 390 007.**

**And Corporate Office at:**  
**ICICI Bank Towers,**  
**Bandra Kurla Complex,**  
**Mumbai – 400 051.**

**Having its Branch Office at:**  
**2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Videocon Tower,**  
**Block E-1, Jhandewalan Extension,**  
**New Delhi-110055.**  
**Through: Sh. Mohit Grover**

**....Plaintiff**

**VERSUS**

**Mukesh Rajput**  
**S/o Harprit Singh**  
**B-1 1810 Tower-12A Purvanchal**  
**Royal Park Sec-137 Noida**  
**Gautam Budha Nagar Opp.**  
**CNG Pump & Indian TV News Channel**  
**Noida-201304.**

**Also at:-**

**Mukesh Rajput**

**S/o Harprit Singh**

**A.P.N. Trading Company**

**C-55 Sec-2 Noida Opp. Priyagold**

**Noida-201301.**

**....Defendant**

**SUIT FOR RECOVERY OF RS.3,81,110/- (RUPEES THREE LAKHS EIGHTY ONE THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED TEN ONLY)**

**Date of institution of the Suit : 29/09/2018**

**Date on which Judgment was reserved : 02/07/2020**

**Date of Judgment : 20/07/2020**

**::- J U D G M E N T -::**

By way of present judgment, this Court shall adjudicate upon suit for recovery of Rs.3,81,110/- filed by the plaintiff against the defendant.

**CASE OF THE PLAINTIFF AS PER PLAINT**

Succinctly, the necessary facts for just adjudication of the present suit, as stated in the plaint, are as under:-

- (a) The Plaintiff i.e. ICICI Bank Limited is a Banking Company incorporated under the Indian Companies Act 1956, having its registered office, branch office and Corporate Office at the aforementioned addresses. The operation of the plaintiff bank is subject to the guidelines promulgated by the Reserve Bank of India from time to time. The bank is inter-alia engaged in the business of financing Vehicles apart from other portfolios. Sh. Mohit Grover, who has been duly authorized by way of power of attorney and is competent to file, sign, verify, institute the present suit and follow-up the legal proceedings on behalf of the Bank.

- (b) The defendant approached the plaintiff bank for grant of loan for purchasing a car make ALTO K10 under the ICICI Bank Car Loan Scheme. The defendant executed Credit Facility Application Form. In view of the request of defendant and the documents submitted by him, the plaintiff had granted the loan facility vide Loan No. LANOD00037006990. An amount of Rs.3,57,811/- (Rupees Three Lakhs Fifty Seven Thousand Eight Hundred Eleven Only) was financed and disbursed by the plaintiff on 31.01.2018 to the defendant. The said loan facility was granted to the defendant for a period of 60 (Sixty) months commencing from 15.02.2018 till 15.01.2023. The defendant had agreed to pay the monthly installments in 60 (Sixty) equated monthly installments of Rs.7,475/- (Rupees Seven Thousand Four Hundred Seventy Five Only). Defendant also executed loan agreement, which contained the terms and conditions governing his loan. Defendant also executed Unattested Deed of Hypothecation hypothecating the vehicle financed from the loan amount of the plaintiff. Defendant further agreed to strictly comply with the repayment schedule. From the said loan amount, a Vehicle/Car make ALTO K10, bearing registration no. DL5CP5619 was financed and the same was hypothecated in favour of the plaintiff as a security towards the loan advanced by the plaintiff.
- (c) The defendant failed to adhere to the financial discipline and committed defaults and failed to regularize his account. After availing the loan facility for purchasing of the aforesaid vehicle, the defendant has paid only 02 (Two) installments to the plaintiff bank and thereafter, he did not pay any installment amount to the plaintiff bank towards the EMI or the interest. As per Statement of Account dated 03.08.2018, 4 (Four) installments are overdue and payable by him to the plaintiff bank.

(d) Thereafter, in view of the non-payment of loan / credit amount and interest, the subject contract/loan facility was recalled by the plaintiff bank through Legal Notice dated 03.07.2018, which was sent and defendant was under obligation to make the payment of entire outstanding amount of Rs.3,81,110/- (Rupees Three Lakhs Eighty One Thousand One Hundred Ten Only) in consequences thereof, which defendant has failed to do, as demanded by the plaintiff bank vide Legal Notice dated 03.07.2018. The plaintiff is maintaining the proper accounts in the usual and ordinary course of its business. As per the Statement of Account dated 03.08.2018 maintained by the plaintiff bank, the defendant is liable to pay a sum of Rs.3,81,110/- (Rupees Three Lakhs Eighty One Thousand One Hundred Ten Only), which the defendant has failed to pay.

#### **EX-PARTE PROCEEDINGS**

The defendant was served at his first address as per postal receipts and courier receipts alongwith the tracking reports, but despite service, the defendant has not appeared and proceeded ex-parte vide Order dated 13.08.2019.

#### **EX-PARTE EVIDENCE OF THE PLAINTIFF AND DOCUMENTS RELIED UPON BY PW-1**

The plaintiff, in order to prove its case, led plaintiff's evidence and got examined Ms. Nitu Srivastava as PW-1. PW-1 has filed her evidence by way of affidavit, wherein, she reiterated and reaffirmed the contents of the plaint. PW-1 in her testimony has relied upon the following documents:-

1. Power of Attorney is Ex.PW-1/1 (OSR).
2. Preliminary Credit Facility Form is Ex.PW- 1/2.
3. Credit Facility Application Form is Ex.PW-1/3.
4. Un-attested Deed of Hypothecation is Ex.PW-1/4.

5. Irrevocable Power of Attorney is Ex.PW-1/5.
6. Legal Notice dated 03.07.2018 is Ex.PW-1/6.
7. Copy of postal receipts are marked as Mark-X.
8. Foreclosure Statement and Statement of Account dated 03.08.2018 are Ex.PW-1/7.
9. Certificate under section 65-B of the Evidence Act is Ex.PW-1/8.
10. Certificate under Section 2A of Banker Book Evidence Act is Ex.PW-1/9.

This Court heard ex-parte final arguments, as advanced by Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff through video conferencing. I have perused the material available on record.

#### **FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE COURT**

The plaintiff has filed the present suit for recovery of the suit amount against the defendant. In the present case, the defendant was proceeded ex-parte, despite this fact, the plaintiff has to prove its case on merits and satisfy the Court that the plaintiff is entitled for the recovery of the suit amount from the defendant.

As per plaintiff, a sum of 3,81,110.22p was due as on 03/08/2018 against the defendant. The break-up of the said amount is as under:-

Principal Outstanding	– Rs.3,46,961.20
Late payment penalty	– Rs.1,684.00
Cheque bouncing charges and other charges	– Rs.0.00
Interest for the month	– Rs.1,518.70
Prepayment charges @ 5.9% at O/S Principal	– Rs.20,470.72
Interest on pending installment	– Rs.10,475.60
<b>Total</b>	<b>– Rs.3,81,110.22</b>

The plaintiff has claimed a sum of Rs.20,470.72p towards the pre-payment charges at the outstanding principal. In the Credit Facility Application Form

Ex.PW-1/3, no pre-payment charges have been mentioned. Moreover, pre-payment charges are recoverable only when borrower himself is coming forward to make the entire outstanding amount prior to completion of period, for which the loan was advanced whereas, in the present case, it is the plaintiff, who has recalled the loan as defendant defaulted in making regular installment. In these circumstances, plaintiff cannot be held to be entitled to pre-payment charges.

The plaintiff has also claimed amount of Rs.10,475.60/- towards interest on the pending installment. Credit facility application form Ex.PW-1/3 reflects the agreed fixed rate of interest at 9.29% p.a. but this interest has already been calculated in the installments, hence, grant of separate interest on the defaulted amount would result in charging interest twice, therefore, plaintiff cannot claim interest on the pending installments and consequently, same cannot be awarded.

The present suit of the plaintiff is well within the period of limitation. In the present case, the plaintiff/PW-1 has proved on record the documents, as mentioned in her testimony, showing the liability of the defendant. The defendant has not filed the Written Statement to contest the present suit of the plaintiff. The defendant has also not cross-examined the PW-1 to contradict or disprove the case of the plaintiff. The defendant has chosen not to appear and when the case of the plaintiff has gone un-challenged, uncontroverted, un-rebutted and duly corroborated by the documents, this Court has no reason to disbelieve the version of the plaintiff qua the other claims, as mentioned in Ex.PW-1/7. The plaintiff has been able to prove its case. Hence, plaintiff is entitled for the recovery of amount of Rs.3,50,163.90/- say Rs.3,50,164/- from the defendant.

Section-34 CPC postulates and envisages the pendent-elite interest at any rate not exceeding 6% and future interest at any rate not exceeding the rate at which nationalized banks advance loan. Keeping in mind the mandate of the said

proposition, interest of justice would be served if plaintiff is granted simple rate of interest @ 6% per annum from 04.08.2018 till decision of the suit and future rate of interest @ 9% per annum till its realization. The prior interest is already included in Ex.PW-1/7.

Applying priori and posteriori reasoning, this Court is satisfied that plaintiff has been able to prove its case against the defendant for the aforesaid amount.

**RELIEF**

From the discussions, as adumbrated hereinabove, I hereby pass the following

**FINAL ORDER**

- a. a decree of Rs. Rs.3,50,164/- is passed in favour of the plaintiff and against the defendant along-with simple rate of interest @ 6% per annum from 04/08/2018 till decision of the suit and future simple rate of interest @ 9% per annum till its realization.
- b. The cost of the suit is also awarded in favour of the plaintiff and against the defendant.

Decree-sheet be prepared accordingly.

File be consigned to Record Room after due compliance.

**Announced through video conferencing on  
this 20<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2020.**

**(ARUN SUKHIJA)  
ADJ-07 (Central)  
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi**

CS No. 218/18 (ID no.6290/2018)

ICICI Bank Ltd.

Vs.

Mukesh Rajput

20.07.2020

The Judgment has been pronounced through cisco webex video conferencing.

Present: Sh.Vishal Rao, Ld. Counsel for the Plaintiff.

Defendant is already ex-parte.

Vide Separate Judgment announced through video conference the suit of the Plaintiff is decreed in terms of the Judgment. Decree Sheet be prepared accordingly.

File be consigned to record room after due-compliance.

**(Arun Sukhija)**

ADJ-07/Central/Tis Hazari Courts,  
Delhi/20.07.2020