

**26th KTBA CASE LAW UPDATE
(December 28, 2023)**

Committee Members

Shams Ansari (Convener)

0333-2298701

shamsansari01@gmail.com

Hameer Arshad Siraj

0333-2251555

hameer.siraj@gmail.com

Shabbar Muraj

0321-8920972

shabbar.muraj@pk.ey.com

Razi Ahsan

0300-0446892

razi.lawconsultancy@gmail.com

Noman Amin Khan

0310-2271271

noman.amin@mooreshekhamufti.com

Shiraz Khan

0333-2108546

shiraz@taxmanco.com

Faiq Raza Rizvi

0302-2744737

federalcorporation@hotmail.com

Imran Ahmed Khan

0300-9273852

iakjci@yahoo.com

Ehtisham Qadir

0334-2210909

ehtisham@aqadirncompany.com

Dear Members,

A brief update on a recent judgment by the Lahore High Court on “**Damages Awarded Against Illegal and Arbitrary Actions of the Departmental Officials Which Inflicted Loss to the Assessee**”, is being shared with you for your knowledge. The order has been attached herewith the update.

This update is in line with the efforts undertaken by our “**CASE LAW UPDATE COMMITTEE**” to apprise our Bar members with important court decisions.

You are equally encouraged to share any important case law, which you feel that should be disseminated for the good of all members.

You may contact the Committee Convener Mr. Shams Ansari or at the Bar’s numbers 021-99212222, 99211792 or email at info@karachitaxbar.com & ktba01@gmail.com

(Zafar Ahmed)
President

(M. Mehmood Bikiya)
Hon. General Secretary

**26th KTBA CASE LAW UPDATE
(December 28, 2023)**

DAMAGES AWARDED AGAINST ILLEGAL AND ARBITRARY ACTIONS OF THE DEPARTMENTAL OFFICIALS WHICH INFLICTED LOSS TO THE ASSESSEE

Appellate Authority: High Court of Sindh

Plaintiff: Muhammad Anwar

Section: 162 of the Income Tax Ordinance, 1979 [the repealed Ordinance].

Detailed judgment in Muhammad Anwar case was issued on June, 9 2022 [Suit No. 212 of 1984 reported as 2023 PTD 1519].

Background: The assessee imported a vessel for ship breaking at Gadani beach, which unfortunately collided and capsized. A dispute arose over the ship's value with Custom officials rejecting the assessment. Though under protest but the assessee paid the custom duty and the sales tax. During the course of settling a dispute with the Income Tax Department, however, the Custom department issued a letter dated 24-01-1981, instructing a work stoppage, resulting in the sinking and collapse of the ship. Due to these actions, the assessee incurred a significant loss, prompting the filing of a damages suit, which was decreed after 42 years.

The court, in its ruling, declared the instructions issued by Custom officers on 24-01-1981 to halt cutting, scrapping, removal, and lifting of scrap from the capsized ship as illegal and the assessee was granted damages amounting to Rs. 1,500,000.

Decision of the Court:

First Ruling of the Court: The court held the suit to be maintainable and the restriction on lawsuit in tax matters was dismissed as the Defendants were found to have acted with mala fide intent and highhandedness.

Second Ruling of the Court: The court ruled that it is a well-established legal principle that when any action is taken against a party by an official in their official capacity that may adversely affect its interests, a show-cause notice should be issued to enable the party to present its version. While, in this case, neither a

show-cause notice was issued to the assessee before the notice of 24-01-1981 nor the assessee was afforded the right to a hearing.

As within our constitution, the right to a fair trial is given as a fundamental right, it encompasses the procedural standards that courts must adhere to in safeguarding individuals' personal liberties and secondly the obligation that statutes and regulations must not encroach upon these rights.

Third Ruling of the Court: While the assessee was unable to provide medical records supporting the claim of damages due to mental torture, it would be unfair to deny compensation against the official Defendants. The proven illegal acts, marked by mala fide intent and aggravated by apparent maladministration, warrant redress. It is a well-established legal principle that the excessive use of lawful power is inherently unlawful. Therefore, in light of these circumstances, the assessee is awarded compensation of Rs. 1,500,000.

Comments: It regretfully took 42 long years for an individual to secure relief against mistreatment of the tax department. The office of the Federal Tax Ombudsman was not created in the past which otherwise could have played a proactive role in dispensation of Justice and providing redressal to the complaint against the highhandedness of the department.

DISCLAIMER:

This update has been prepared for KTBA members and carries a brief narrative on a detailed Judgment and does not contain an opinion of the Bar, in any manner or sort. It is therefore, suggested that the judgment alone should be relied upon. Any reliance on the summary in any proceedings or project would not be binding on KTBA.

Dear Members,

A brief update on a recent judgment by the Lahore High Court on “**Damages Awarded Against Illegal and Arbitrary Actions of the Departmental Officials Which Inflicted Loss to the Assessee**”, is being shared with you for your knowledge. The order has been attached herewith the update.

This update is in line with the efforts undertaken by our “**CASE LAW UPDATE COMMITTEE**” to apprise our Bar members with important court decisions.

You are equally encouraged to share any important case law, which you feel that should be disseminated for the good of all members.

You may contact the Committee Convener Mr. Shams Ansari or at the Bar’s numbers 021-99212222, 99211792 or email at info@karachitaxbar.com & ktba01@gmail.com and the following members;



Shams Ansari (Convener)
0333-2298701
shamsansari01@gmail.com



Hameer Arshad Siraj
0333-2251555
hameer.siraj@gmail.com



Shabbar Muraj
0321-8920972
shabbar.muraj@pk.ey.com



Razi Ahsan
0300-0446892
razi.lawconsultancy@gmail.com



Noman Amin Khan
0310-2271271
noman.amin@mooreshekhamufti.com



Shiraz Khan
0333-2108546
shiraz@taxmanco.com



Faiq Raza Rizvi
0302-2744737
federalcorporation@hotmail.com



Imran Ahmed Khan
0300-9273852
iakjci@yahoo.com



Ehtisham Qadir
0334-2210909
ehtisham@aqadirncompany.com

Best regards

(Zafar Ahmed)
President

(M. Mehmood Bikiya)
Hon. General Secretary

(Shams M. Ansari)
Convener: Case Law Update Committee

Sindh High Court

Suit No. 212 of 1984, decided on 9th June, 2022. Date of hearing: 1st October, 2021.

BEFORE ZULFIQAR AHMAD KHAN, J

MUHAMMAD ANWAR

vs

PAKISTAN through Secretary to the Government of Pakistan Ministry of Finance, Islamabad and 6 others

Plaintiff present in person.

Nemo for Defendants.

Law: Income Tax Ordinance, 1979

Section: 162

Income Tax Ordinance (XXXI of 1979)—S. 162—Damages, recovery of—Civil suit—Maintainability— Negligence of authorities—Quantum of loss, determination of—Mental shock, agony and torture—Proof—Plaintiff claimed that ship purchased by him for breaking sank near shore and 2100 metric tons of scrap remained under water and Income Tax Authorities/defendants restrained plaintiff from cutting, scrapping, removing and lifting that scrap from capsized ship, which resulted into loss—Authorities raised plea of bar of S. 162 Income Tax Ordinance, 1979, regarding maintainability of suit—Plaintiff claimed recovery of damages for the loss sustained by him—Validity—When certain actions of officials of Income Tax Department were called in question and they were found to be in excess of jurisdiction and tainted with mala fide then bar contained in S. 162 of Income Tax Ordinance, 1979, was not attracted and suit was maintainable—For relief of damages as claimed by plaintiff, there was no hard and fast rule to calculate quantum of compensation, as well as there was also no yardstick to measure the sufferings—Plaintiff claimed damages on account of huge present and future economic loss and on account of undergoing irreversible phase of perpetual mental torture and loss of re/ station—Mental shock, agony and torture implied a state of mind, which could be proved only by positive assertion of one who had experienced the same—Plaintiff claimed that owing to illegal act of authorities jointly and severally he suffered mental shock and agony but he could not produce any medical record to bolster/strengthen such contention—Plaintiff introduced on record that owing to acts of authorities whereby they directed plaintiff to stop work of breaking/cutting the vessel which he was legally entitled to perform, he suffered a lot and detailed out the same in his plaint—Quantum of damages would have been different if plaintiff had produced medical record in support of his claim of damages on account of mental torture—High Court awarded damages against officials of Income Tax department as their illegal acts tainted with mala fide and aggravated by their ex facie maladministration, were proved—Excessive use of lawful power was itself unlawful—Due to the actions of officials, plaintiff was prevented at least to a certain degree, from use and enjoyment of the vessel which he imported—High Court directed officials to pay the damages awarded against them jointly and severally, considering the principle of vicarious liability—Where government functionaries were guilty of committing illegality of such a degree, then they had to compensate the person wronged—Suit was decreed accordingly.

Amanullah Khan v. Mst. Akhtar Begum 1993 SCMR 504; Abbasia Cooperative Bank and another v. Hakeem Hafiz Muhammad Ghous and 5 others FLD 1997 SC 3; Al-Riaz Pvt. Ltd.

JUDGMENT:

ZULFIQAR AHMAD KHAN, JUSTICE:---.---

This suit has been filed by the plaintiff for recovery and damages.

2. The concise grievances of the plaintiff as depicted in the plaint are that plaintiff who is a sole proprietor, running an organization under the name and style of N.A. Industries, whose prime business being ship breaking. It is the case of the plaintiff that he opened a letter of credit No.75463 through Habib Bank Ltd, Foreign Exchange Branch, Karachi for the purchase of a scrap ship M.V. Marie ANN from Messrs Manila Inter-Ocean Lines Incorporated. The Vessel was not found in conformity with the agreement that was executed with the sellers. In the meantime the price internationally of vessel meant for breaking also fell from USD 110 to USD 50 per LDT. When this vessel arrived at Gadani beach for the purpose of breaking it struck against the rocks and capsized and started sinking. The plaintiff refused to take delivery and demanded refund of the balance amount from Habib Bank Ltd. that refused to do the needful. Ultimately, the plaintiff was compelled to take delivery of the capsized ship at a price of USD 1,50,000/-.

3. The Customs Officials refused to accept the renegotiated price and made an assessment against the Letter of Credit. The plaintiff paid the customs duty and sales tax under protest and started the salvage and scrapping of the ship. The ship was also surveyed by M/s Bhomal and Company to ascertain the damage caused to the ship. The Income Tax Department was informed about this difficult situation which the plaintiff was put into. The plaintiff has in the body of the plaint discussed further the amount that he recovered from the sale of the scrap and the loss that occurred to him. He has further alleged that 2100 metric tons of scrap remained under water and this was also brought to the notice of the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal which refused to accept that 2100 metric tons should be considered as a loss in the books of the plaintiff. Whilst this dispute with the Income Tax Department was going on, the I.T.O. issued a letter No.COS-CIRE-A-2/80-81/750 dated 24.01.1981 to the customs at Gadani wherein the Customs Department was instructed to stop the plaintiff from cutting, scrapping, removing and lifting the scrap from the capsized ship. Further by its letter dated 16.02.1981 the customs stopped all work including business of cutting and lifting and selling of scrap. According to the plaintiff, this action on the part of the Income Tax Department as well as customs of stopping the work resulting in the gradual sinking and collapsing of the ship. The scrap that was lying at the shore got rusty and deteriorated. The costly equipments maintained by the plaintiff at the beach was lost, destroyed or damaged due to non-use and stoppage by the Income Tax Department. It is further stated by the plaintiff that he went from pillar to post requesting officials to allow the plaintiff to continue with the scrapping and breaking work but his request was turned down. The plaintiff having been aggrieved by the said actions of the defendants served a notice upon the defendants claiming damages for the loss sustained to him but could not succeed, hence he filed this suit for damages.

4. The Defendants contested the matter by filing written statements. Defendants in operating part of the written statement raised certain objections that the suit was not maintainable as well as barred by limitation as well as Section 162 of Income Tax Ordinance, 1979 ("Ordinance, 1979") as any act of the Income Tax Department through their officers done in good faith or intended to be done cannot be questioned in any court. It is further averred in the written statement that the present lis being filed against the defendants in their official capacity, thus no damages can be claimed against the persons by name. The Defendants denied the assertions of the plaintiff in one way or the other. It is

further alleged in the written statement that there was a dispute in respect of assessment of plaintiff's business as he produced defective records/books of accounts and in that epoch the petitioner got substantial relief in appeal filed by the plaintiff before the learned Commissioner (Appeals) and the question of loss of 2100 metric tons of scrap was neither raised by the plaintiff before the Commissioner (Appeals) nor it was within his jurisdiction to evaluate the loss in the assessment. Lastly, the defendants, prayed for dismissal of the lis in hand filed by the plaintiff.

4. Upon scanning record and proceedings, it unfurls that on 10.09.2006, issues were framed and with mutual consent of the parties, matter was referred to the learned Commissioner for recording evidence. The issues settled by this court are as under:-

"1. Whether the suit is barred under Section 162 of the Income Tax Ordinance, 1979?

2. Whether the suit is barred by limitation?

3. Whether the order passed by the defendants stopping the cutting, lifting and removing of the scrap by the plaintiff was illegal and without jurisdiction?

4. Whether if the finding on issue No.3 is in the affirmative then whether the plaintiff has suffered any damages due to such acts of omission and commission, if so, to what extent?

5. Relief?"

5. Plaintiff in person being a senior citizen introduced on record his grievances at great length. Precisely, he submitted that action taken on 24.01.1981 by the Income Tax Officer along with Customs Officials which resulted in stoppage of his work owing to which the vessel started sinking at Gadani and he suffered irreparable loss. He further stated that the official defendants jointly and severally stopped him from, cutting, scraping, removing and lifting scrap from the capsized ship and vide letter dated 16.02.1981, the defendants stopped all work including business of cutting, lifting and selling of scrap which act of the defendant is in disregard of the mutual agreement as well as the act of stopping business of the plaintiff in respect of collecting scrap of the vessel on the part of the defendant is illegal and unlawful, therefore, he is entitled to the damages as prayed through the lis in hand.

6. None appeared to set forth the case of the defendants. The case diaries reflect that the defendants on many occasions remained absent despite sending intimation/notice to the respective counsel as well as defendants. Nonetheless, the Court is under duty to decide the suit taking into consideration the overall effects of the case meaning that material and evidence brought on the record is to be considered in order to decide the suit. Where the evidence of the plaintiff was recorded and from several issues framed burden of some was put on the plaintiff and side of the defendant was closed as they failed to bring their witnesses on the date of hearing, it became mandatory to examine the evidence brought rather than decreeing the suit straightaway without examination of evidence brought on record. The Apex Court in the case of Khan v. Mst. Akhtar Begum reported in 1993 SCMR 504 pleased to hold the similar principle.

7. In my considerate view, the Issues Nos. 1 and 2 are correlated and concomitant to the maintainability of the suit, therefore, would be thus discussed simultaneously, in the same breath;

8. An austere look to the substratum of the record and proceedings, it manifests that the Defendants in operating part of their stance/written statement challenged the very

maintainability of the lis at hand on the ground that the suit is barred under Section 162 of Income Tax Ordinance, 1979 ("Ordinance, 1979") as any act of the Income Tax Department through their officers done in good faith or intended to be done so cannot be questioned in any court. It is further averred in the written statement that the present lis filed against the defendants in their official capacity, hence no damages could be claimed against the persons by name. It is thus necessary to have a glance at Section 162 of the Ordinance, 1979 to reach to a just conclusion of the issues under discussion.

"162. Bar of suits in Civil Courts. No suit shall be brought in ' any Civil Court against any order made under this Ordinance and no prosecution, suit or other proceeding shall lie against any person for anything in good faith done or intended to be done under this Ordinance."

9. It is gleaned from a cursory look at the foregoing provision of law that the jurisdiction of this court is barred to entertain the present lis, however, the Apex Court in the case of Cooperative another v. Hakeem Hafiz Muhammad 5 others(PLD 1997 SC 3) very succinctly summed up the law with regard to the effect of clauses ousting the jurisdiction of Civil Courts viz. "...It well-settled principle of interpretation that the provision contained in a statute ousting the jurisdiction of Courts of general jurisdiction is to be construed very strictly and unless the case falls within the letter and spirit of the barring provision, it should not be given effect " It is also well settled position that where the jurisdiction of the Civil Courts to examine the validity of an action or an order of executive authority or a special tribunal is challenged on the ground of ouster of jurisdiction of the Civil Court, it must be seen that:-

"(a) that the authority or the tribunal was validly constituted under the Act;

(b) that the order passed or the action taken by the authority or tribunal was not mala fide;

(c) that the order passed or action taken was such which could be passed or taken under the law which conferred exclusive jurisdiction on the authority or tribunal; and

(d) that in passing the order or taking the action, the principles of natural justice were not violated."

10. Unless all the conditions mentioned above are satisfied, the order or action of the authority or the tribunal would not be immune from being challenged before a Civil Court. As a necessary corollary, it follows that where the authority or the tribunal acts in violation of the provisions of the statute which conferred jurisdiction on it or the action or order is in excess or lack of jurisdiction or mala fide or passed in violation of the principles of natural justice, such an order/ notice/action/show cause could be challenged before the Civil Court in spite of a provision in the statute barred the jurisdiction of Civil. Court. Consequently, it remains to be examined whether the impugned notice issued by the defendants/Income Tax Officer suffers from any such defect as would, as per the formulation of the Honourable Supreme Court, allow the plaintiff to approach this Court for relief despite the bar contained in section 162 of the Ordinance, 1979.

11. Apart from above, the plaintiff challenged the action of the defendants/Income Tax Officer owing to which the plaintiff had to stop his work of breaking the vessel and collecting its scrap at Gadani Beach which he was legally entitled to. Per plaintiff, the said action of the defendant/Income Tax Officer vide letter dated 24.01.1981 (Exh P-18 available at page 261 of the evidence file) is illegal and ultra vires. It is conducive to elaborate the doctrine of ultra vires at this juncture. The said doctrine envisages that an authority can exercise only

so much power as is conferred on it by law. An action of the authority is intra vires when it falls within the limits of the power conferred on it but, ultra vires if it goes outside this limit. To a large extent, the courts have developed the subject by extending and refining this principle, Which has many ramifications and which in some of its aspects attains a high degree of artificiality. There are plethora of precedents of this Court in which this court reported to have held that when certain actions of the officials of Income Tax Department are called in question and they are found to be in excess of jurisdiction and tainted with mala fide then the bar contained in Section 162 of the Ordinance, 1979 will not be attracted and a suit is held to be maintainable. This principle was also held in a recent verdict announced in the case of Al-Riaz Pvt. Ltd. v. (2018 CLC 596) (authored by my reverend brother Mr. Justice Muhammad Faisal Kamal Alam). For a ready reference, the relevant excerpt is reproduced as under:-

"19. In his counter arguments, Mr. Arif Khan, Advocate, who represents Plaintiff No. 1 (Al-Riaz [Pvt.]Limited), contended that the above mentioned statutory Bar will only be applicable where the officials, in the present case, Defendants Nos. 1 and 2 would have acted lawfully while exercising their authority in a bona fide and reasonable manner, but the conduct of said official Defendants is tainted with sheer mala fide and highhandedness, as even after decision of the Federal Tax Ombudsman (FTO), these Defendants have not withdrawn / discharged the attachment order in respect of the subject property, which continues till date; this factual aspect has not been seriously disputed by the learned Assistant Attorney General. To further augment his arguments, the Plaintiff's counsel has relied upon the aforementioned reported Judgments of Asia Petroleum and Syed Rounaq handed down by this Court. The first Judgment is given in a tax matter, whereas, the second decision pertains to a land dispute under the Colonization of Government Lands Act. In the first case, it has been held by this Court that when certain actions of the officials of Income Tax Department are called in question and they are found to be in excess of jurisdiction and tainted with mala fide then the Bar contained in the aforementioned Section 162 will not be attracted and a suit is held to be maintainable, fly now statutory Bar ousting the plenary jurisdiction of this Court as envisaged in Section 9 of the Code of Procedure 1908, has to be construed strictly and if it is found that Officials or the authorities mentioned under a pa statute, which is invoking a statutory Bar, has not acted fairly, justly and reasonably, then such Bar could into service. This argument for Plaintiff side has substance. This principle is further fortified in Abbasia Cooperative case; PLD 1997 Supreme Court Page-03."

[underline added for emphasis]

12. Mindful to the nitty-gritties of the case, I feel no reluctance to hold that this suit is maintainable, therefore, the Issues Nos. 1 and 2 answered accordingly.

13. In my considerate view, the Issues Nos. 3 and 4 are inextricably linked based upon similar evidence and record, therefore, it would be advantageous to discuss these simultaneously, in the same breath.

14. The claim of Plaintiff is supported by the documentary evidence. Also the crux of the grievance of Plaintiff was not controverted in the evidence as despite providing many opportunities, the contesting official Defendants failed to cross-examine the Plaintiff. The penultimate issue before this Court is that whether the official defendants while issuing the notice dated 24.01.1981 (available at page No.261 of the evidence file) whereby the work of the plaintiff with respect to collection of scrap of the vessel was stopped, acted lawfully? Plaintiff in person has argued by referring to various documentary evidence, which he has produced in his evidence that highhandedness of official Defendants started when they commenced assessment against the plaintiff while the Defendants had already cleared and

permitted the plaintiff to start his work of cutting and breaking the imported vessel when it was berthed at the Gadani Beach, and in the intervening period,- the impugned notice of stopping of breaking and cutting the vessel imported by the plaintiff was handed out without issuing any show cause notice to the plaintiff. It is a settled principle of law that if any action is being taken against a party detrimental to the latter's interests by any official in its official capacity, he be issued a show-cause notice in order to come to know former's version, but in this case neither the show cause notice was issued to the plaintiff prior issuing the impugned notice dated 24.01.1981 nor a right of hearing was provided to the plaintiff. The defence witness No.2 namely Syed Shakil Shah who is Assistant Collector of Customs by profession during his testimony introduced on record that no show cause notice was issued by the Customs Department prior to stoppage of scrapping of the vessel, the said admission of DW-2 is available at page No. 651 the evidence file. In our Constitution, right to fair trial is a fundamental right. This constitutional reassurance envisaged and envisioned both procedural standards that courts must uphold in order to protect peoples personal liberty and a range of liberty interests that statutes and regulations must not infringe.

15. Reverting to the merits of the issues under discussion, having perused and analyzed the record and proceedings, it is quite apparent that the procedure prescribed by law was never adhered to by the official Defendants while issuing the impugned letter dated 24.01.1981, thus, the impugned action of the defendants in respect of stopping breaking/cutting the subject vessel is without any legal justification and liable to be set at naught in this proceeding.

16. The whys and wherefores lead to the conclusion that the Plaintiff is entitled to the reliefs claimed. I accordingly declare that in respect of the subject vessel imported by the plaintiff for breaking and cutting, defendants illegally, wrongfully and by excessive use of power and authority stopped the breaking/cutting vide letter dated 24.01.1981, owing which the said vessel sunk at the Gadani Beach due to which the plaintiff suffered heavy losses.

17. In view of the reasoning and rationale herein-contained, Issues Nos. 3 and 4 are answered as discussed in paras 15 and 16.

18. The only issue now remains is the relief of damages (Issue No.5) as claimed by the Plaintiff. There is no hard and fast rule to calculate the quantum of compensation, as well as there is also no yardstick to measure the sufferings. The plaintiff has claimed damages on account of huge present and future economic loss and on account of undergoing irreversible phase of perpetual mental torture and loss of reputation. It is fact that Mental shock, agony and torture imply a state of mind. Such state of mind can be proved only by a positive assertion of one who experiences the same. (PLD 2021 Sindh 1 and 1996 CLC 627).. Plaintiff claimed that owing to the illegal act of the defendants jointly and severally he suffered mental shock and agony but he could not produce any medical record to bolster/strengthen the said contention but on the other hand, in the memo of plaint he introduced on record that owing acts of the defendants whereby they directed the plaintiff to stop the work of breaking/ cutting the vessel which he was legally entitled to perform, he suffered a lot and detailed out the same in para-17 of the plaint. Quantum of damages would have been different if Plaintiff had produced medical record in support of his claim of damages on account of mental torture, but at the same time, it would be unjust if no damages are granted against officials Defendants, when their illegal acts tainted with mala fide and aggravated by their ex facie maladministration, has been proved as well as it is a celebrated principle of law that excessive use of lawful power is itself unlawful. No doubt, due to impugned action, the Plaintiff has been prevented at least to a certain degree, from

use and enjoyment of the vessel which he imported.

19. In these circumstances, a reasonable compensation for Plaintiff would be Rs. 15,00,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Hundred Thousand Only), which should be payable by the Defendants jointly and severally, considering the principle of vicarious liability. Through various judicial pronouncements, it is now a settled legal position that where government functionaries are guilty of committing illegality of such a degree, then they have to compensate the person wronged, in instance case, the Plaintiff. The Issue No.5 is answered in the above terms.

20. The upshot of the above is that the present suit is decreed .in the following terms:-

- (i) The Defendants are jointly and severally liable to pay damages to the tune of Rs. 15,00,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Hundred Thousand), to Plaintiff.
- (ii) The above mentioned decretal amount shall carry a component of 10% [ten percent] mark-up from the date of filing of the suit till satisfaction of the decree.
- (iii) Considering the peculiar facts of the case, the Plaintiff is also awarded costs of the proceeding.