

**(2005) 05 DEL CK 0146**  
**In the Delhi High Court**  
**Case No : LPA 698 of 2004**

Mrs. Chandra Prabha Dogra

APPELLANT

Vs

LIC of India and Others

RESPONDENT

---

**Date of Decision :** 17-05-2005

**Acts Referred:**

**Citation :** (2005) 05 DEL CK 0146

**Hon'ble Judges :** B.C. Patel, C.J.; Sanjay Kishan Kaul, J

**Bench :** Division Bench

**Advocate :** J.L. Jain, for the Appellant; Ravinder Sethi Rajiv Kumar and Kamal Mehta, for the Respondent

**Final Decision :** Dismissed

---

## **Judgement**

B.C. Patel, C.J.—This appeal is preferred against the order made by learned Single Judge in WP(C) No. 6926 of 2003 decided on 19.4.2004

2. It appears that the petitioner was at the relevant time rendering services as an agent of Life Insurance Corporation of India. Earlier petition was filed seeking direction for restoration of the agency from the date of termination with continuity of benefits etc. However, direction was given to decide the memorial of the petitioner dated 30.9.2002 and that came to be rejected by the Chairman, LIC by order dated 17.4.2004 which was impugned in the present writ petition. It transpires that the petitioner was feeling that action is taken in view of the complaints made against the Branch Manager. It was also contended that no misappropriation in respect of policy holders' money or deception of policy holders was proved and thus such an action could not have been taken. It was at best in breach of the norms in depositing her cheques on behalf of the prospective clients. Therefore, no adverse order could have been passed.

3. What is required to be noted in the instant case is that it is an admitted position that the petitioner used to collect money from the parties and used to give her own cheques. In some cases, it is noticed that cheques bounced and the

policies were returned. The amount was so collected in cash from the prospective policy holders. It is in these circumstances it was thought fit not to continue the petitioner as an agent and appropriate action was taken for forfeiture of renewal commission.

4. We find no reason to interfere with the order of learned Single Judge in this matter.

5. Dismissed.