**4-1001-2215.5669 Tashkent city**

Below is a concise summary of the key information extracted from the court decision document, focusing on the essential details such as the court's decision, reasoning, monetary claims, approved amounts, and procedural timelines, without including personal information:

**Key Information from the Court Decision**

1. **Court and Case Details**:
   * **Court**: Tashkent Interdistrict Economic Court
   * **Case Number**: 4-1001-2215/5669
   * **Decision Date**: April 27, 2022
   * **Location**: Tashkent, Uzbekistan
2. **Parties Involved**:
   * **Plaintiff**: "Yusuf Malik Exsoni" Farmer Household
   * **Defendant**: "Global Textile Solutions" LLC
3. **Nature of the Dispute**:
   * The case involves a contractual dispute over a cotton production and procurement contract dated March 10, 2021 (amended to March 13 in some sections).
   * The plaintiff delivered 118,556 kg of cotton from the 2021 harvest, against a contractual obligation of 139.3 tons.
4. **Claims and Counterclaims**:
   * **Plaintiff’s Initial Claim**: Recovery of 82,671,557 UZS as principal debt from the defendant.
   * **Plaintiff’s Amended Claim (Rejected)**: During proceedings, the plaintiff sought to amend the claim to 82,670,000 UZS (principal debt), 99,927,000 UZS (interest), and 73,383,000 UZS (penalty), but this was rejected by the court.
   * **Defendant’s Counterclaim**: Recovery of 37,463,664 UZS as a penalty from the plaintiff for partial non-delivery of cotton.
5. **Court’s Decision**:
   * **Plaintiff’s Initial Claim**: Partially granted.
     + **Approved Amount**: 16,595,482.87 UZS (principal debt) + 459,286.11 UZS (state duty) + 21,600 UZS (postal expenses) to be recovered from the defendant in favor of the plaintiff.
     + **Reason**: The court found that 22,964,305.75 UZS was unjustifiably withheld by the defendant (related to credit fund deductions), but the remaining 60,084,538 UZS claimed was unfounded as payments for delivered cotton were made.
   * **Plaintiff’s Amended Claim**: Rejected.
     + **Reason**: The amendment introduced new claims (interest and penalty) not part of the original claim, which is not permissible under Article 157 of the Economic Procedural Code (EPC) as it changes the subject matter beyond allowable limits.
   * **Defendant’s Counterclaim**: Partially granted.
     + **Approved Amount**: Reduced penalty of 6,368,822.88 UZS (from 37,463,664 UZS) + 749,273.29 UZS (state duty) + 21,600 UZS (postal expenses) to be recovered from the plaintiff in favor of the defendant.
     + **Reason**: The defendant was entitled to a penalty (30% of delivered cotton value per contract clause 5.2) for the plaintiff’s failure to deliver the full 139.3 tons. The court reduced the penalty under Article 326 of the Civil Code, balancing the interests of both parties.
   * **Net Outcome**: After offsetting, the defendant must pay the plaintiff 16,595,482.87 UZS (principal debt), adjusted for state duties and expenses.
6. **Key Legal Reasoning**:
   * **Plaintiff’s Claim**: Payments for 118,556 kg of cotton were verified, but 22,964,305.75 UZS was unjustifiably retained by the defendant (Civil Code Articles 449, 465, 1023).
   * **Amended Claim Rejection**: EPC Article 157 allows changes to the claim’s basis or amount, but not new claims like penalties, per Supreme Court Resolution No. 13.
   * **Counterclaim**: Breach of contract (short delivery) justified a penalty (Civil Code Article 333, Contract Clause 5.2), reduced for fairness (Civil Code Article 326).
   * **Procedural Costs**: Allocated proportionally to the satisfied portions of claims (EPC Article 118).
7. **Monetary Summary**:
   * **Claimed by Plaintiff**: 82,671,557 UZS (initial); 255,980,000 UZS (amended, rejected).
   * **Claimed by Defendant**: 37,463,664 UZS (counterclaim).
   * **Approved for Plaintiff**: 16,595,482.87 UZS (net principal debt after offset).
   * **Approved for Defendant**: 6,368,822.88 UZS (reduced penalty).
   * **State Duty Returned**: 1,677,600 UZS to the plaintiff for the rejected amended claim portion.
8. **Duration of Process**:
   * **Filing Date**: Not explicitly stated, but the counterclaim was accepted on April 1, 2022 (per court ruling).
   * **Decision Date**: April 27, 2022.
   * **Estimated Duration**: Approximately 1 month from counterclaim acceptance to decision (exact filing date unavailable).
9. **Appeal Window**:
   * Either party may appeal within 30 days from the decision’s entry into legal force to the Tashkent City Court’s Economic Panel via the Tashkent Interdistrict Economic Court.
10. **Additional Orders**:
    * Issuance of writs of execution and a certificate for the return of 1,677,600 UZS state duty to the plaintiff upon the decision’s legal enforcement.

This summary captures the critical outcomes, legal basis, and procedural details necessary for evaluating the court case flow, aligning with your goal of testing LLMs for information retrieval and building a Court Case Flow Predictor. Let me know if you need further refinements!

**4-1704-2201-1305 Andijan**

**Key Information from the Court Decision**

1. **Court and Case Details**:
   * **Court**: Buston Interdistrict Economic Court (Iz boskan District)
   * **Case Number**: 4-1704-2201/1305
   * **Decision Date**: November 1, 2022
   * **Location**: Buston District, Andijan Region, Uzbekistan
2. **Parties Involved**:
   * **Plaintiff**: "Oltin Mato Group" LLC (represented by the Andijan Regional Territorial Administration of the Uzbekistan Chamber of Commerce and Industry)
   * **Defendant**: "Izzatbek Zokirjon" Farmer Household
3. **Nature of the Dispute**:
   * The case revolves around a cotton procurement contract (No. 85, dated December 25, 2019) for the 2020 cotton harvest.
   * The plaintiff provided the defendant with fuel, mineral fertilizers, and other products, along with payments, to produce and deliver 69 tons of "Andijan-37" variety cotton from 21.1 hectares of land.
4. **Claims**:
   * **Plaintiff’s Claim**: Recovery of 2,999,187.765 UZS (approximately 2.999 million UZS) as principal debt from the defendant.
   * **Basis**: The plaintiff alleged that after reconciling the 2020 cotton harvest accounts, the defendant owed 2,999,187.765 UZS, calculated from a shortfall between delivered cotton (345,013,493.15 UZS worth) and payments/products provided (342,920,305.39 UZS).
5. **Court’s Decision**:
   * **Plaintiff’s Claim**: Rejected in full.
     + **Approved Amount**: 0 UZS (no recovery granted).
     + **State Duty**: 599,837.55 UZS (20% of the claimed amount, per legal norm) to be recovered from the defendant in favor of the Republic budget, as the plaintiff (via the Chamber) is exempt from state duty but lost the case.
   * **Reasoning**:
     + The plaintiff provided a unilateral reconciliation statement claiming a debt of 2,999,187.765 UZS, but supporting evidence was insufficient.
     + Payments totaling 196,300,002 UZS (from February 27 to December 28, 2020) and products worth 148,713,491 UZS (seeds, fuel, fertilizers) were confirmed, but an invoice for 2,468,765.38 UZS of soybean seeds was rejected as irrelevant to the cotton contract (per EPC Article 71).
     + The plaintiff failed to substantiate the debt under EPC Article 68, which requires clear evidence of claims.
   * **Additional Note**: The plaintiff retains the right to file a new claim regarding the seed-related debt.
6. **Key Legal Reasoning**:
   * **Evidence Insufficiency**: EPC Article 68 mandates that parties prove their claims. The plaintiff’s soybean seed invoice was not linked to the cotton contract (EPC Article 71), rendering it inadmissible.
   * **Procedural Absence**: The defendant was duly notified but did not attend or object, allowing the court to proceed without them (EPC Article 170, Part 3).
   * **Cost Allocation**: EPC Article 118 assigns court costs proportionally to claim outcomes; since the plaintiff’s claim was rejected, the defendant bears the state duty for the budget.
7. **Monetary Summary**:
   * **Claimed by Plaintiff**: 2,999,187.765 UZS (principal debt).
   * **Approved for Plaintiff**: 0 UZS.
   * **State Duty Imposed**: 599,837.55 UZS (payable by the defendant to the Republic budget).
8. **Duration of Process**:
   * **Filing Date**: Not explicitly stated in the document.
   * **Decision Date**: November 1, 2022.
   * **Estimated Duration**: Unknown due to lack of filing date; only the decision date is provided.
9. **Procedural Notes**:
   * The hearing was held openly in a mobile court session at the Buston Interdistrict Economic Court building.
   * The plaintiff’s representative attended, while the defendant was absent despite proper notification.