

Text	Human Summary
<p>The road was constructed but no compensation was paid. The appellants made various representations starting from the time, construction was going on and even after the construction work was completed. But when no heed was paid to their request, they approached the High Court of Kerala by way of Writ Petition under 226 and 227 of the Consitution No. 2329 of 2014. Before the learned Single Judge, affidavits were exchanged. In the counter affidavit, the stand taken by the Panchayat was that the land had been voluntarily given without any claim for compensation. The Panchayat denied of having given any assurance regarding adequate compensation to be paid to the appellants. It was also alleged that the construction of road was completed in 2010 whereas the appellants approached the High Court in 2014 as such, the petition was substantially delayed and liable to be dismissed on the ground of delay. It was also stated in the counter affidavit that the Appellants had voluntarily surrendered their portion of land for the purpose of construction/widening of the road and that is why no proceedings for acquisition were undertaken.</p>	<p>The High Court of Kerala has dismissed a Writ Petition by the appellants against the Panchayat. The petition alleged that the construction of a road was completed in 2010 and the petition was submitted to the High Court in 2014.</p>
<p>Therefore, a Division Bench of a High court is a court subordinate to this court within the meaning of section 195 (3) (Punishment for false evidence) accordingly an appeal lies to this court from an order of a Division Bench under section 476( Counterfeiting device or mark used for authenticating documents other than those described in section 467 (Forgery of valuable security, will, etc.), or possessing counterfeit marked material. ) It was contended that there is no ordinary right of appeal to this court and that such rights as there are those expressly conferred by the Constitution in a very limited and circumscribed set of circumstances, therefore, such appeals as lie to this court cannot be said to lie ordinarily. We do not agree. Such an argument concentrates</p>	<p>An appeal lies to this court from an order of a Division Bench under section 476(Counterfeiting device or mark used for authenticating documents other than those described in section 467 (Forgery of valuable security, will, etc. or possessing counterfeit marked material).</p>

<p>attention on the word ordinarily and ignored the words appealable decrees or sentences. Before we can apply the definition we have first to see whether there is a class of decrees or sentences in the court under consideration which are all open to appeal. If there are not, the matter ends and there is no right of appeal under section 476.B.(Counterfeiting device or mark used for authenticating documents other than those described in section 467, or possessing counterfeit marked material) If there are, then we have to see to which court those appeals will ordinarily lie. It is evident that the only court to which the appealable decrees and sentences of a Division Bench of a High Court can lie is the Supreme Court.</p>	
<p>between the parties is irretrievably broken down and that the appellant was directed to pay Rs. 1,25,000/- for maintenance of the respondent and Rs. 1,75,000/- towards maintenance and marriage expenses of their daughter who was living with the respondent. On the appeal being preferred by the respondent before the High Court, the order of the Family Court was set aside, and rightly so, as the ground of irretrievable break down of marriage could not have been availed of as to grant a decree of divorce. This power is only exercisable by this Court in exercise of its extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 142 (for Enforcement of decrees and orders of Supreme Court and orders as to discovery, etc.) of the Constitution of India. The present appeal emanates from the said order. This appeal is also pending before this Court for the last 12 years (@ Special Leave Petition of the year 2010). The appellant is stated to have got married after the decree of divorce was granted by the trial Court. Much water has flowed in more than two decades when for one reason or the other, the reconciliation between the parties has not been possible and is now practically impossible, given the present status of the parties. When we took up the appeal for hearing on 25.11.2021 it was agreed that in view of the marriage already performed by the appellant, the second time and the children therefrom, and</p>	<p>Divorce decree of divorce between the parties is irretrievably broken down and that the appellant was directed to pay Rs. 1,25,000 for maintenance of the respondent and Rs.1,75,000 towards maintenance and marriage expenses of their daughter who was living with the respondent.</p>

<p>the child from the marriage between the parties hereto having already married of with the cooperation of the parties.</p>	
<p>We may note the case of the respondent was that the appellant had thrown her out of the matrimonial home in October 2004 after assaulting her. There was a demand of dowry by the appellant and her family, and she was harassed and tortured. The daughter has been throughout living with the respondent since birth, and thus the divorce petition. The aforesaid respective stands are reflected from the pleadings of the parties in a divorce petition filed by the appellant under Section 13 (for divorce) of Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 on grounds of desertion. The petition was tried. The learned Addl. District Judge, Sonipat found that no reconsideration was possible and there was no documentary or other evidence to prove the dowry demand. The respondent aggrieved by the same preferred an appeal before the High Court which has been allowed by the impugned judgment dated 08.9.2009. On the appellant preferring the special leave petition, notice was issued and endeavor was made to resolve the dispute between the parties through Delhi Mediation Center in 2011 but nothing worked out and leave was granted on 04.7.2011.</p>	<p>The petition was filed by the appellant under Section 13 (for divorce) of Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 on grounds of desertion. The learned Addl. District Judge, Sonipat found that no reconsideration was possible and there was no documentary or other evidence to prove the dowry demand.</p>
<p>The sole respondent having not appeared despite service of regular notice and even after service of bailable warrants, this Court was constrained to issue non-bailable warrants to ensure his presence. As per the office report, it appears that after issuance of non-bailable warrants on 23.03.2022, the respondent surrendered before the Trial Court on 25.03.2022 and was taken into custody and sent to District Jail, Kannauj. Today, in the present proceedings taken up in virtual mode, the respondent has been produced before us through video link from District Jail, Kannauj by Mr. Vishnu Kant Mishra, Jail Superintendent. There being no lawyer appointed by the respondent, we would request the Supreme Court Legal Service Committee to provide him legal</p>	<p>The sole respondent has not appeared despite service of regular notice. Even after service of bailable warrants, this Court was constrained to issue non-bailable warrants. There being no lawyer appointed by the respondent, we request the Supreme Court Legal Service Committee to provide him with legal assistance.</p>

assistance with reference to the subject-matter of the present case. List the matter on 11.04.2022 The respondent shall continue to remain lodged at District Jail, Kannuaj until further orders of this Court.

Scores of ROUGE-L metrics:

Sample No.	Precision	Recall	F Score
1	0.49	0.60	0.54
2	0.40	0.39	0.39
3	0.53	0.53	0.53
4	0.43	0.51	0.47
5	0.65	0.97	0.77