

DECREE

IN THE COURT OF THE I JUNIOR CIVIL JUDGE,
CITY CIVIL COURT, AT SECUNDERABAD

PRESENT: SMT. B.DEEPTI
I JUNIOR CIVIL JUDGE

DATED THIS THE 21st DAY OF JULY, 2022

O.S. No. 382 OF 2018

Between:

M/s. Paramount Estate,
Partnership Firm represented by its Managing Partner,
Sri Soham Modi, having its office at
5-4-187/3 & 4,
II Floor, Soham Mansion,
M.G.Road, Secunderabad.

...Plaintiff

AND

The Relationship Manager,
Religare Finvest Ltd., Flat No. 401,
2nd Floor, G.S.Chambers, Nagarjuna Circle,
Punjagutta, Hyderabad.

Also at:

The Manager Religare Finvest Ltd.,
A-3/4/5, Tower-A, 5th floor, Noida, U.P.201301

Also at:

The Manager Religare Finvest Ltd.,
2nd Floor, Rajlok Building, 24 Nehru Place,
New Delhi.

...Defendant

CAUSE OF ACTION: The cause of action arose on 2, the date of sanctioning of the loan, and on all such dates when the TDS was paid by the plaintiff on behalf of defendant, and on 11.7.2016, the date of closure letter of the said loan and on various dates when the plaintiff addressed letters to the defendant for reimbursing the TDS for EMI's, paid by the plaintiff on behalf of defendant and on 5.3.2018 when the plaintiff got issued a notice to the defendant.

VALUATION: The suit is valued at Rs.1,79,964/- and paid a court fee of Rs.4,266/- paid under Section 20 of Andhra Pradesh Court Fee and Suit Valuation Act.



This suit is coming on this day before me for final hearing in the presence of **Sri C. Balagopal, Advocate for plaintiff** and **Sri G. Kaiyan Chakravarthi, Advocate for Defendant**, and the matter having been heard and stood over for consideration till today, this Court delivered the following:-

1. That the suit of the plaintiff be and the same is hereby decreed in favour of the plaintiff against the defendant.
2. That the defendant is hereby directed to pay an amount of Rs. 1,79,964/- together with interest @ 18% p.a. from the date of suit till realisation.
3. That the defendant do pay the costs to the plaintiff.

Given under my hand and the seal of the court on this the 21st day of July, 2022.

I Junior Civil Judge
City Civil Court, Secunderabad.

MEMO OF COSTS PLAINTIFF

DEFENDANT

1. Stamp on plaint	Rs. 4,226.00	--
2. Stamp on power	Rs. 2.00	--
3. Stamp on process		--
4. Advocate Fee		--
5. Publication Charges		--
6. Miscellaneous		--

I Junior Civil Judge
City Civil Court, Secunderabad.

Note:- The parties should apply as soon as possible for the return of exhibits which they may wish to preserve as the record will be liable to be destroyed after three years from this date.

IN THE COURT OF THE
CHIEF JUDGE, C.C. SECTION

PHOTO COPY SECTION

PCA No. 464/2022

Presented on 22/7/2022

C.F. Called on 02/8/2022

Charges Deposited on 4/8/2022 Rs. 54/-

Receipt No. 10/8/2022

Made Ready on 10/8/2022

Copy Delivered on 10/8/2022



Certified Photo Copy

C. SUPERINTENDENT

CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE PHOTO COPY

IN THE COURT OF THE I JUNIOR CIVIL JUDGE,
CITY CIVIL COURT, AT SECUNDERABAD

DATED THIS THE 21st DAY OF JULY, 2022

PRESENT: SMT. B.DEEPTI
I JUNIOR CIVIL JUDGE

O.S. No. 382 OF 2018

Between:

M/s. Paramount Estate,
Partnership Firm represented by its Managing Partner,
Sri Soham Modi, having its office at
5-4-187/3 & 4,
II Floor, Soham Mansion,
M.G.Road, Secunderabad.

...Plaintiff

AND

The Relationship Manager,
Religare Finvest Ltd., Flat No. 401,
2nd Floor, G.S.Chambers, Nagarjuna Circle,
Punjagutta, Hyderabad.

Also at:

The Manager Religare Finvest Ltd.,
A-3/4/5, Tower-A, 5th floor, Noida, U.P.201301

Also at:

The Manager Religare Finvest Ltd.,
2nd Floor, Rajlok Building, 24 Nehru Place,
New Delhi.

...Defendant

This suit is coming on this day before me for final hearing in
the presence of **Sri C.Balagopal, Advocate for plaintiff** and



A handwritten signature in black ink, likely of the judge, located to the right of the court stamp.

Sri G.Kalyan Chakravarthi, Advocate for Defendant, and the matter having been heard and stood over for consideration till today, this Court delivered the following:-

J U D G M E N T

This suit is filed to direct the defendant to reimburse an amount of Rs.1,79,964/- being the TDS paid by the plaintiff on behalf of defendant with interest @ 18% p.a.

2. The brief averments of the plaint are as follows:

Plaintiff contends that it has approached the defendant for sanction of loan of Rs. 2 Crores which was repayable in monthly EMI and that the defendant has sanctioned the loan after due process under loan account bearing No. XMORPAN00053973 and the monthly EMI was Rs. 5,66,806/- was payable every month for a period of 48 months. It was further contended that the said loan was sanctioned and the plaintiff was regular in payment of EMI every month and the EMI also attracted deduction of TDS and that the plaintiff paid the entire EMI regularly and also paid the TDS on behalf of defendant to the income tax authority and that the



Certified Photo Copy

X

plaintiff furnished the relevant TDS certificate to the defendant to show that the payment of TDS paid by the plaintiff on behalf of defendant.

3. It was further contended that the plaintiff paid all the EMIs every month without deducting the TDS, thus the plaintiff has paid the TDS on behalf of defendant which is payable by the defendant and that the total amount of TDS in respect of the said transaction is Rs. 5,82,297/- out of which Rs. 4,02,333/- has been reimbursed by the defendant and the balance of Rs. 1,79,964/- is payable by the defendant to the plaintiff that is for period 2015-2016 and April, 2015 to June, 2016 and that the plaintiff has been regularly requesting the defendant through letters on various dates for repayment of TDS, but the defendant failed to refund the amount nor replied to the letters addressed by the plaintiff to the defendant and that the loan was closed on 11.7.2016 and the defendant had also issued a letter of closure.

4. It was further contended that plaintiff got issued notice to the defendant through its counsel on 5.3.2018 which was received by the defendant at their New Delhi Office, but the defendant failed to reply the same. Hence, this suit.



A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'Jant'.

5. Sri G.Kalyan Chakravarthi, Advocate filed vakalath, but written statement not filed. Hence, treated no written statement.

6. To prove its case, plaintiff got himself examined as PW1 and got marked Exs.A1 to A9 to prove the claim of plaintiff.

7. Heard the counsel for plaintiff.

8. Now, the points for determination are:-

1) **Whether the plaintiff is entitled for recovery of money as prayed by them?**

2) **To what relief?**

9. POINT NO.1 :

It has been the claim of plaintiff that defendant is due for an amount of Rs. 1,79,964/- towards TDS amount which was paid by the plaintiff on behalf of defendant, inspite of repeated requests, the defendant failed to make payment, as such the plaintiff got issued legal notice on 5.3.2018 to the defendant, but the defendant did not pay the amount.

10. To prove the case of plaintiff, plaintiff got examined as PW1 and got marked Exs.A1 to A9.



[Handwritten signature]

11. Ex.A1 is original loan sanction letter, dt. 24.7.2014, Ex.A2 is original disburse letter, dt. 14.9.2014, Ex.A3 is original loan closure letter, dt. 11.7.2016, Ex.A4 is original correspondence regarding reimbursement of TDS, Ex.A5 is original no dues letter, dt. 9.11.2016, Ex.A6 is original chartered account certificate, dt. 1.2.2018, Ex.A7 is office copy of legal notice issued on behalf of plaintiff, dt. 5.3.2018, Ex.A8 is original postal receipts, dt. 7.3.2018 and Ex.A9 is original authorisation letter, dt. 7.3.2022.

12. The oral evidence supported by the documentary evidence shows that the plaintiff has taken loan amount of Rs.2,00,00,000/- from the defendant and has repaid the entire loan amount and also paid TDS to the income tax authority on behalf of defendant. Ex.A6 certificate shows that balance receivable TDS amount due by the defendant is Rs. 1,79,964/-. Therefore, the plaintiff is entitled for an amount of Rs.1,79,964/- which is payable by the defendant. The oral and documentary evidence adduced by the plaintiff remained un rebutted and unchallenged by the defendant. Hence, the plaintiff is entitled for recovery of money of Rs.1,79,964/- together with interest @ 18% p.a. from the date of suit to till the date of realisation. Accordingly, this point is answered in favour of plaintiff.



13. POINT NO.2

In the result, the suit is decreed in favour of the plaintiff with costs directing the defendant to pay an amount of Rs.1,79,964/- together with interest @ 18% p.a. from the date of suit till realisation.

Typed to my dictation by Stenographer, corrected and pronounced by me in the Open Court on this the 21st day of July, 2022.

I JUNIOR CIVIL JUDGE

CITY CIVIL COURT, SECUNDERABAD.

**APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE
WITNESSES EXAMINED**

For the defendants:-

--None--

For the Plaintiffs:-

PW1:- G.Naveen

DOCUMENTS MARKED

For the Plaintiffs:-

Ex.A1 - Original loan sanction letter, dt. 24.7.2014

Ex.A2 - Original disburse letter, dt. 14.9.2014

Ex.A3 - Original loan closure letter, dt. 11.7.2016

Ex.A4 - Original correspondence regarding reimbursement of TDS

Ex.A5 - Original no dues letter, dt. 9.11.2016

Ex.A6 - Original Chartered account certificate, dt. 1.2.2018,

Ex.A7 - Office copy of legal notice issued on behalf of plaintiff, dt. 5.3.2018,



Certified Photo Copy

Ex.A8 - Original postal receipts, dt. 7.3.2018

Ex.A9 - Original authorisation set set letter, dt. 28.6.2022.

For the defendants:

--Nil--


**I JUNIOR CIVIL JUDGE
CITY CIVIL COURT, SECUNDERABAD.**



CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE PHOTO COPY


C. SUPERINTENDENT

IN THE COURT OF THE JUDGE

CHIEF JUDGE, C.C.C. SEC. BAD

PHOTO COPY SECTION

PCA No. 4640/2022

Presented on 22/3/2022

C.F. Called on 02/8/2022

Charges Deposited on 4/8/2022 Rs. 54/-

Receipt No. 10/8/2022

Made Ready on 10/8/2022

Copy Delivered on

~~10/8/2022~~
~~10/8/2022~~
~~10/8/2022~~

DECREE

IN THE COURT OF THE I JUNIOR CIVIL JUDGE,
CITY CIVIL COURT, AT SECUNDERABAD

PRESENT: SMT. B.DEEPTI
I JUNIOR CIVIL JUDGE

DATED THIS THE 21st DAY OF JULY, 2022

O.S. No. 382 OF 2018

Between:

M/s. Paramount Estate,
Partnership Firm represented by its Managing Partner,
Sri Soham Modi, having its office at
5-4-187/3 & 4,
II Floor, Soham Mansion,
M.G.Road, Secunderabad.

...Plaintiff

AND

The Relationship Manager,
Religare Finvest Ltd., Flat No. 401,
2nd Floor, G.S.Chambers, Nagarjuna Circle,
Punjagutta, Hyderabad.

Also at:

The Manager Religare Finvest Ltd.,
A-3/4/5, Tower-A, 5th floor, Noida, U.P.201301

Also at:

The Manager Religare Finvest Ltd.,
2nd Floor, Rajlok Building, 24 Nehru Place,
New Delhi.

...Defendant

CAUSE OF ACTION: The cause of action arose on 2, the date of sanctioning of the loan, and on all such dates when the TDS was paid by the plaintiff on behalf of defendant, and on 11.7.2016, the date of closure letter of the said loan and on various dates when the plaintiff addressed letters to the defendant for reimbursing the TDS for EMI's, paid by the plaintiff on behalf of defendant and on 5.3.2018 when the plaintiff got issued a notice to the defendant.

VALUATION: The suit is valued at Rs.1,79,964/- and paid a court fee of Rs.4,266/- paid under Section 20 of Andhra Pradesh Court Fee and Suit Valuation Act.



This suit is coming on this day before me for final hearing in the presence of **Sri C. Balagopal, Advocate for plaintiff** and **Sri G. Kalyan Chakravarthi, Advocate for Defendant**, and the matter having been heard and stood over for consideration till today, this Court delivered the following:-

1. That the suit of the plaintiff be and the same is hereby decreed in favour of the plaintiff against the defendant.
2. That the defendant is hereby directed to pay an amount of Rs.1,79,964/- together with interest @ 18% p.a. from the date of suit till realisation.
3. That the defendant do pay the costs to the plaintiff.

Given under my hand and the seal of the court on this the 21st day of July, 2022.

I Junior Civil Judge
City Civil Court, Secunderabad.

MEMO OF COSTS PLAINTIFF

DEFENDANT

- | | |
|------------------------|-------------|
| 1. Stamp on plaint | Rs.4,226.00 |
| 2. Stamp on power | Rs. 2.00 |
| 3. Stamp on process | |
| 4. Advocate Fee | |
| 5. Publication Charges | |
| 6. Miscellaneous | |

Note:- The parties should apply as soon as possible for the return of exhibits which they may wish to preserve as the record will be liable to be destroyed after three years from this date.

I Junior Civil Judge
City Civil Court, Secunderabad.

COURT OF THE JUDGE
CHIEF JUDGE: C.C. SEC. BAL
PHOTO COPY SECTION
PCA No. 1640/2022
Presented on 22/7/2022
C.F. Called on 02/8/2022
Charges Deposited on 02/8/2022 Rs. 54/-
Receipt No. 10/8/2022
Made Ready on 10/8/2022
Copy Delivered on 10/8/2022



C. SUPERINTENDENT

CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE PHOTO COPY

Certified Photo Copy

IN THE COURT OF THE I JUNIOR CIVIL JUDGE,
CITY CIVIL COURT, AT SECUNDERABAD

DATED THIS THE 21st DAY OF JULY, 2022

PRESENT: SMT. B.DEEPTI
I JUNIOR CIVIL JUDGE

O.S. No. 382 OF 2018

Between:

M/s. Paramount Estate,
Partnership Firm represented by its Managing Partner,
Sri Soham Modi, having its office at
5-4-187/3 & 4,
II Floor, Soham Mansion,
M.G.Road, Secunderabad.

...Plaintiff

AND

The Relationship Manager,
Religare Finvest Ltd., Flat No. 401,
2nd Floor, G.S.Chambers, Nagarjuna Circle,
Punjagutta, Hyderabad.

Also at:

The Manager Religare Finvest Ltd.,
A-3/4/5, Tower-A, 5th floor, Noida, U.P.201301

Also at:

The Manager Religare Finvest Ltd.,
2nd Floor, Rajlok Building, 24 Nehru Place,
New Delhi.

...Defendant

This suit is coming on this day before me for final hearing in
the presence of **Sri C.Balagopal, Advocate for plaintiff** and



Sri G.Kalyan Chakravarthi, Advocate for Defendant, and the matter having been heard and stood over for consideration till today, this Court delivered the following:-

J U D G M E N T

This suit is filed to direct the defendant to reimburse an amount of Rs.1,79,964/- being the TDS paid by the plaintiff on behalf of defendant with interest @ 18% p.a.

2. The brief averments of the plaint are as follows:

Plaintiff contends that it has approached the defendant for sanction of loan of Rs. 2 Crores which was repayable in monthly EMI and that the defendant has sanctioned the loan after due process under loan account bearing No. XMORPAN00053973 and the monthly EMI was Rs. 5,66,806/- was payable every month for a period of 48 months. It was further contended that the said loan was sanctioned and the plaintiff was regular in payment of EMI every month and the EMI also attracted deduction of TDS and that the plaintiff paid the entire EMI regularly and also paid the TDS on behalf of defendant to the income tax authority and that the



Certified Photo Copy

[Handwritten signature]

plaintiff furnished the relevant TDS certificate to the defendant to show that the payment of TDS paid by the plaintiff on behalf of defendant.

3. It was further contended that the plaintiff paid all the EMIs every month without deducting the TDS, thus the plaintiff has paid the TDS on behalf of defendant which is payable by the defendant and that the total amount of TDS in respect of the said transaction is Rs. 5,82,297/- out of which Rs. 4,02,333/- has been reimbursed by the defendant and the balance of Rs. 1,79,964/- is payable by the defendant to the plaintiff that is for period 2015-2016 and April, 2015 to June, 2016 and that the plaintiff has been regularly requesting the defendant through letters on various dates for repayment of TDS, but the defendant failed to refund the amount nor replied to the letters addressed by the plaintiff to the defendant and that the loan was closed on 11.7.2016 and the defendant had also issued a letter of closure.

4. It was further contended that plaintiff got issued notice to the defendant through its counsel on 5.3.2018 which was received by the defendant at their New Delhi Office, but the defendant failed to reply the same. Hence, this suit.



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'M. K. S.', written over the bottom right of the court stamp.

5. Sri G.Kalyan Chakravarthi, Advocate filed vakalath, but written statement not filed. Hence, treated no written statement.

6. To prove its case, plaintiff got himself examined as PW1 and got marked Exs.A1 to A9 to prove the claim of plaintiff.

7. Heard the counsel for plaintiff.

8. Now, the points for determination are:-

- 1) **Whether the plaintiff is entitled for recovery of money as prayed by them?**
- 2) **To what relief?**

9. POINT NO.1 :

It has been the claim of plaintiff that defendant is due for an amount of Rs. 1,79,964/- towards TDS amount which was paid by the plaintiff on behalf of defendant, inspite of repeated requests, the defendant failed to make payment, as such the plaintiff got issued legal notice on 5.3.2018 to the defendant, but the defendant did not pay the amount.

10. To prove the case of plaintiff, plaintiff got examined as PW1 and got marked Exs.A1 to A9.



[Handwritten signature]

Certified Photo Copy

11. Ex.A1 is original loan sanction letter, dt. 24.7.2014, Ex.A2 is original disburse letter, dt. 14.9.2014, Ex.A3 is original loan closure letter, dt. 11.7.2016, Ex.A4 is original correspondence regarding reimbursement of TDS, Ex.A5 is original no dues letter, dt. 9.11.2016, Ex.A6 is original chartered account certificate, dt. 1.2.2018, Ex.A7 is office copy of legal notice issued on behalf of plaintiff, dt. 5.3.2018, Ex.A8 is original postal receipts, dt. 7.3.2018 and Ex.A9 is original authorisation letter, dt. 7.3.2022.

12. The oral evidence supported by the documentary evidence shows that the plaintiff has taken loan amount of Rs.2,00,00,000/- from the defendant and has repaid the entire loan amount and also paid TDS to the income tax authority on behalf of defendant. Ex.A6 certificate shows that balance receivable TDS amount due by the defendant is Rs. 1,79,964/-. Therefore, the plaintiff is entitled for an amount of Rs.1,79,964/- which is payable by the defendant. The oral and documentary evidence adduced by the plaintiff remained unrebutted and unchallenged by the defendant. Hence, the plaintiff is entitled for recovery of money of Rs.1,79,964/- together with interest @ 18% p.a. from the date of suit to till the date of realisation. Accordingly, this point is answered in favour of plaintiff.



13. POINT NO.2

In the result, the suit is decreed in favour of the plaintiff with costs directing the defendant to pay an amount of Rs.1,79,964/- together with interest @ 18% p.a. from the date of suit till realisation.

Typed to my dictation by Stenographer, corrected and pronounced by me in the Open Court on this the 21st day of July, 2022.

I JUNIOR CIVIL JUDGE

CITY CIVIL COURT, SECUNDERABAD.

**APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE
WITNESSES EXAMINED**

For the defendants:-

--None--

For the Plaintiffs:-

PW1:- G.Naveen

DOCUMENTS MARKED

For the Plaintiffs:-

Ex.A1 - Original loan sanction letter, dt. 24.7.2014

Ex.A2 - Original disburse letter, dt. 14.9.2014

Ex.A3 - Original loan closure letter, dt. 11.7.2016

Ex.A4 - Original correspondence regarding reimbursement of TDS,

Ex.A5 - Original no dues letter, dt. 9.11.2016

Ex.A6- Original Chartered account certificate, dt. 1.2.2018,

Ex.A7 - Office copy of legal notice issued on behalf of plaintiff, dt. 5.3.2018,

Certified Photo Gopy



Ex.A8 - Original postal receipts, dt. 7.3.2018

Ex.A9 - Original authorisation set set letter, dt. 28.6.2022.

For the defendants:

--Nil--


**I JUNIOR CIVIL JUDGE
CITY CIVIL COURT, SECUNDERABAD.**

CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE PHOTO COPY


C. SUPERINTENDENT



IN THE COURT OF THE JUDGE
CHIEF JUDGE: C.C. SECTAD
PHOTO COPY SECTION

PCA.No. 4649/2022

Presented on 22/7/2022

O.F. Called on 02/8/2022

Charges Deposited on 01/8 Rs. 54/-

Receipt No. 1018/2022

Made Ready on 10/8/2022

Copy Delivered on

~~10/8/22~~
~~10/8/22~~

DECREE

IN THE COURT OF THE I JUNIOR CIVIL JUDGE,
CITY CIVIL COURT, AT SECUNDERABAD

PRESENT: SMT. B.DEEPTI
I JUNIOR CIVIL JUDGE

DATED THIS THE 21st DAY OF JULY, 2022

O.S. No. 382 OF 2018

Between:

M/s. Paramount Estate,
Partnership Firm represented by its Managing Partner,
Sri Soham Modi, having its office at
5-4-187/3 & 4,
II Floor, Soham Mansion,
M.G.Road, Secunderabad.

...Plaintiff

AND

The Relationship Manager,
Religare Finvest Ltd., Flat No. 401,
2nd Floor, G.S.Chambers, Nagarjuna Circle,
Punjagutta, Hyderabad.

Also at:

The Manager Religare Finvest Ltd.,
A-3/4/5, Tower-A, 5th floor, Noida, U.P.201301

Also at:

The Manager Religare Finvest Ltd.,
2nd Floor, Rajlok Building, 24 Nehru Place,
New Delhi.

...Defendant

CAUSE OF ACTION: The cause of action arose on 2, the date of sanctioning of the loan, and on all such dates when the TDS was paid by the plaintiff on behalf of defendant, and on 11.7.2016, the date of closure letter of the said loan and on various dates when the plaintiff addressed letters to the defendant for reimbursing the TDS for EMI's, paid by the plaintiff on behalf of defendant and on 5.3.2018 when the plaintiff got issued a notice to the defendant.

VALUATION: The suit is valued at Rs.1,79,964/- and paid a court fee of Rs.4,266/- paid under Section 20 of Andhra Pradesh Court Fee and Suit Valuation Act.



This suit is coming on this day before me for final hearing in the presence of **Sri C. Balagopal, Advocate for plaintiff** and **Sri G. Kalyan Chakravarthi, Advocate for Defendant**, and the matter having been heard and stood over for consideration till today, this Court delivered the following:-

1. That the suit of the plaintiff be and the same is hereby decreed in favour of the plaintiff against the defendant.
2. That the defendant is hereby directed to pay an amount of Rs.1,79,964/- together with interest @ 18% p.a. from the date of suit till realisation.
3. That the defendant do pay the costs to the plaintiff.

Given under my hand and the seal of the court on this the 21st day of July, 2022.

I Junior Civil Judge
City Civil Court, Secunderabad.

MEMO OF COSTS PLAINTIFF

DEFENDANT


1. Stamp on plaint	Rs.4,226.00
2. Stamp on power	Rs. 2.00
3. Stamp on process	
4. Advocate Fee	
5. Publication Charges	
6. Miscellaneous	

I Junior Civil Judge
City Civil Court, Secunderabad.

Note:- The parties should apply as soon as possible for the return of exhibits which they may wish to preserve as the record will be liable to be destroyed after three years from this date.

IN THE COURT OF THE JUDGE

CHIEF JUDGE: C.C.C. SECUNDERABAD
PHOTO COPY SECTION
PCA.No. 4640/2022
Presented on 22/7/2022
C.C. called on 02/8/2022
Charges Deposited on 4/8 Rs. 54/-
Receipt No. 10/8/2022
Made Ready on 10/8/2022
Copy Delivered on 10/8/2022



Certified Photo Copy

C. SUPERINTENDENT

CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE PHOTO COPY

IN THE COURT OF THE I JUNIOR CIVIL JUDGE,
CITY CIVIL COURT, AT SECUNDERABAD

DATED THIS THE 21st DAY OF JULY, 2022

PRESENT: SMT. B.DEEPTI
I JUNIOR CIVIL JUDGE

O.S. No. 382 OF 2018

Between:

M/s. Paramount Estate,
Partnership Firm represented by its Managing Partner,
Sri Soham Modi, having its office at
5-4-187/3 & 4,
II Floor, Soham Mansion,
M.G.Road, Secunderabad.

...Plaintiff

AND

The Relationship Manager,
Religare Finvest Ltd., Flat No. 401,
2nd Floor, G.S.Chambers, Nagarjuna Circle,
Punjagutta, Hyderabad.

Also at:

The Manager Religare Finvest Ltd.,
A-3/4/5, Tower-A, 5th floor, Noida, U.P.201301

Also at:

The Manager Religare Finvest Ltd.,
2nd Floor, Rajlok Building, 24 Nehru Place,
New Delhi.

...Defendant

This suit is coming on this day before me for final hearing in
the presence of **Sri C.Balagopal, Advocate for plaintiff** and



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Smt. B. Deepthi', written diagonally across the bottom right corner of the page.

Sri G.Kalyan Chakravarthi, Advocate for Defendant, and the matter having been heard and stood over for consideration till today, this Court delivered the following:-

J U D G M E N T

This suit is filed to direct the defendant to reimburse an amount of Rs.1,79,964/- being the TDS paid by the plaintiff on behalf of defendant with interest @ 18% p.a.

2. The brief averments of the plaint are as follows:

Plaintiff contends that it has approached the defendant for sanction of loan of Rs. 2 Crores which was repayable in monthly EMI and that the defendant has sanctioned the loan after due process under loan account bearing No. XMORPAN00053973 and the monthly EMI was Rs. 5,66,806/- was payable every month for a period of 48 months. It was further contended that the said loan was sanctioned and the plaintiff was regular in payment of EMI every month and the EMI also attracted deduction of TDS and that the plaintiff paid the entire EMI regularly and also paid the TDS on behalf of defendant to the income tax authority and that the

Certified Photo Copy



X

plaintiff furnished the relevant TDS certificate to the defendant to show that the payment of TDS paid by the plaintiff on behalf of defendant.

3. It was further contended that the plaintiff paid all the EMIs every month without deducting the TDS, thus the plaintiff has paid the TDS on behalf of defendant which is payable by the defendant and that the total amount of TDS in respect of the said transaction is Rs. 5,82,297/- out of which Rs. 4,02,333/- has been reimbursed by the defendant and the balance of Rs. 1,79,964/- is payable by the defendant to the plaintiff that is for period 2015-2016 and April, 2015 to June, 2016 and that the plaintiff has been regularly requesting the defendant through letters on various dates for repayment of TDS, but the defendant failed to refund the amount nor replied to the letters addressed by the plaintiff to the defendant and that the loan was closed on 11.7.2016 and the defendant had also issued a letter of closure.

4. It was further contended that plaintiff got issued notice to the defendant through its counsel on 5.3.2018 which was received by the defendant at their New Delhi Office, but the defendant failed to reply the same. Hence, this suit.



5. Sri G.Kalyan Chakravarthi, Advocate filed vakalath, but written statement not filed. Hence, treated no written statement.

6. To prove its case, plaintiff got himself examined as PW1 and got marked Exs.A1 to A9 to prove the claim of plaintiff.

7. Heard the counsel for plaintiff.

8. Now, the points for determination are:-

1) ***Whether the plaintiff is entitled for recovery of money as prayed by them?***

2) ***To what relief?***

9. POINT No.1 :

It has been the claim of plaintiff that defendant is due for an amount of Rs. 1,79,964/- towards TDS amount which was paid by the plaintiff on behalf of defendant, inspite of repeated requests, the defendant failed to make payment, as such the plaintiff got issued legal notice on 5.3.2018 to the defendant, but the defendant did not pay the amount.

10. To prove the case of plaintiff, plaintiff got examined as PW1 and got marked Exs.A1 to A9.



[Handwritten signature]

11. Ex.A1 is original loan sanction letter, dt. 24.7.2014, Ex.A2 is original disburse letter, dt. 14.9.2014, Ex.A3 is original loan closure letter, dt. 11.7.2016, Ex.A4 is original correspondence regarding reimbursement of TDS, Ex.A5 is original no dues letter, dt. 9.11.2016, Ex.A6 is original chartered account certificate, dt. 1.2.2018, Ex.A7 is office copy of legal notice issued on behalf of plaintiff, dt. 5.3.2018, Ex.A8 is original postal receipts, dt. 7.3.2018 and Ex.A9 is original authorisation letter, dt. 7.3.2022.

12. The oral evidence supported by the documentary evidence shows that the plaintiff has taken loan amount of Rs.2,00,00,000/- from the defendant and has repaid the entire loan amount and also paid TDS to the income tax authority on behalf of defendant. Ex.A6 certificate shows that balance receivable TDS amount due by the defendant is Rs. 1,79,964/-. Therefore, the plaintiff is entitled for an amount of Rs.1,79,964/- which is payable by the defendant. The oral and documentary evidence adduced by the plaintiff remained unrebutted and unchallenged by the defendant. Hence, the plaintiff is entitled for recovery of money of Rs.1,79,964/- together with interest @ 18% p.a. from the date of suit to till the date of realisation. Accordingly, this point is answered in favour of plaintiff.



13. POINT NO.2

In the result, the suit is decreed in favour of the plaintiff with costs directing the defendant to pay an amount of Rs.1,79,964/- together with interest @ 18% p.a. from the date of suit till realisation.

Typed to my dictation by Stenographer, corrected and pronounced by me in the Open Court on this the 21st day of July, 2022.

I JUNIOR CIVIL JUDGE

CITY CIVIL COURT, SECUNDERABAD.

**APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE
WITNESSES EXAMINED**

For the defendants:-

--None--

For the Plaintiffs:-

PW1:- G.Naveen

DOCUMENTS MARKED

For the Plaintiffs:-

Ex.A1 - Original loan sanction letter, dt. 24.7.2014

Ex.A2 - Original disburse letter, dt. 14.9.2014

Ex.A3 - Original loan closure letter, dt. 11.7.2016

Ex.A4 - Original correspondence regarding reimbursement of TDS,

Ex.A5 - Original no dues letter, dt. 9.11.2016

Ex.A6- Original Chartered account certificate, dt. 1.2.2018,

Ex.A7 - Office copy of legal notice issued on behalf of plaintiff, dt. 5.3.2018,

Certified Photo Copy



Ex.A8 - Original postal receipts, dt. 7.3.2018

Ex.A9 - Original authorisation set set letter, dt. 28.6.2022.

For the defendants:

--Nil--


**I JUNIOR CIVIL JUDGE
CITY CIVIL COURT, SECUNDERABAD.**

CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE PHOTO COPY


C. SUPERINTENDENT



C. Balagopal. Adv.

IN THE COURT OF THE JUDGE

CHIEF JUDGE: C.C.C. SEC. BAI

PHOTO COPY SECTION

PCA No. 4640/2022

Presented on 22/7/2022

C.F. Called on 02/8/2022

Charges Deposited on 4/8/2022

Receipt No. 10/8/2022

Made Ready on 10/8/2022

Copy Delivered on 10/8/2022

~~S. Subramanian~~
10/8/2022