



Digitally signed
by SHUBHAM
SINGH
RAGHUVANSHI
Date:
2026.10.08
10:42:43 +0530



CGHC010307042023

2026:CGHC:43438

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****MAC No. 1669 of 2023**

1 - Durvasa Pandey S/o Vanmali Pandey Aged About 40 Years R/o Paraugudapara Vill Gumdel Thana Nagarnaar District Bastar Chhattisgarh.

2 - Smt. Tanuja Pandey W/o Durvasa Pandey R/o Paraugudapara Vill Gumdel Thana Nagarnaar District Bastar Chhattisgarh.

... Appellants**versus**

1 - Umesh Thakur S/o Falsingh Thakur Resident Of Vill Karekot Thana Mardum Present R/o Aadaval Tahsil Jagdalpur District Bastar Chhattisgarh.

2 - Hitesh Panigrahi S/o Hement Panigrahi Dewangan R/o Matamandir Para Aasna Tah. Jagdalpur District Bastar Chhattisgarh.

3 - The Branch Manager, Choramandalam General Assurance Company Ltd. Ward No. 25 Guru Govind Singh Ward 2nd Floor Simran Tower Pandri Road Lic Building Raipur, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

--- Respondent(s)

For Appellants	:	Mr. Vikash A. Shrivastava, Advocate
For Respondent Nos.1 & 2	:	None
For Respondent No.3	:	Mr. Ghanshyam Patel, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal

Order on Board

(07.10.2026)

1. This appeal under Section 173 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (for short the "Act of 1988") has been preferred by the appellants/claimants seeking enhancement of the amount of compensation, challenging the impugned award dated 04.05.2023, passed in Claim Case No.160/2021, by learned 3rd Additional Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Bastar Place Jagdalpur (CG), whereby the learned Claims Tribunal has awarded a total sum of Rs.4,99,000/- as compensation for the death of Divya Pandey aged about 13 years, who died in a road accident which took place on 21.10.2021.
2. Learned counsel for the appellants would submit that although the Tribunal has assessed notional income of the deceased to be Rs. 36,000/- per annum, as per **Hitesh Nagjibhai Patel Vs. Bababhai Nagjibhai Rabari & Anr. 2025 SCC OnLine SC 3446**, in case of a child having suffered injury or having passed away, the calculation of loss of income has to be made on the metric of minimum wages payable to a skilled worker. Hence, it is prayed that the amount of compensation may be enhanced and must be calculated as per the minimum wages.
3. Learned counsel for respondent No.3/insurance company

would submit that the Claims Tribunal after appreciating oral and documentary evidence available on record rightly awarded the compensation amount. Hence, the compensation awarded by the Claims Tribunal is just and proper and requires no interference.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties, considered their rival submissions made herein-above and went through the records with utmost circumspection.
5. In the case at hand, it is true that the learned Tribunal has taken notional income of the deceased as Rs.36,000/- per annum. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of **Hitesh Nagjibhai Patel Vs. Bababhai Nagjibhai Rabari & Anr., 2025 SCC OnLine SC 3446** has held that a minor child who suffers death or permanent disability in a motor vehicle accident cannot be placed in the same category as a non-earning individual for the purpose of assessing compensation merely because the child was not engaged in gainful employment. It has been further held that in such a case, where a child has suffered injury or has passed away, the computation of compensation under the head of loss of income ought to be made by adopting, at the very least, the minimum wages payable to a skilled workman as notified for the relevant period in the respective State where the cause of action arises. The relevant paragraphs 9 and 15 are reproduced hereinbelow:

“9. On the aspect of monthly income of the minor appellant, we are inclined to interfere with the judgment and order of the Courts below. In the present case, it is evident that the Courts below have failed to take into account the monthly income of the appellant while determining the quantum of compensation. It is now a well-entrenched and consistently reiterated principle of law that a minor child who suffers death or permanent disability in a motor vehicle accident, cannot be placed in the

*same category as a non- earning individual for the purposes of assessing the amount of compensation because the child was not engaged in gainful employment at the time of the accident. In such a case, the computation of compensation under the head of loss of income ought to be made by adopting, at the very least, the minimum wages payable to a skilled workman as notified for the relevant period in the respective State where the cause of action arises. The said observation was rendered by this Court, in **Kajal v. Jagdish Chand and Ors.(2020) 4 SCC 413, and Baby Sakshi Greola v. Manzoor Ahmad Simon and Anr., 2024 SCC OnLine SC 3692.***

“15. For the purpose of emphasis, it is again clarified here that when a Tribunal or the High Court in appeal, is concerned with the case involving a child having suffered injury or having passed away, the calculation of loss of income necessarily has to be made on the matrix of minimum wages payable to a skilled worker in the respective State at the relevant point of time. It is our hope that this restatement helps avoiding such errors and thereby obviates the necessity of this Court’s interference, applying well-established principles of law.”

6. In view of the above, the deceased Divya Pandey is considered as a semi skilled worker and her monthly income is assessed at Rs. 9,930/- per month as per the Minimum Wages Notification issued by the office of the Labour Commissioner, Chhattisgarh, prevailing at the relevant point of time i.e. on 21.10.2021. To that extent, the impugned award needs to be modified.
7. Thus, in light of the aforesaid discussion and in light of the judgments of the Supreme Court rendered in the matters of **National Insurance Company Ltd. V. Pranay Sethi¹, Sarla Verma & Ors. Vs. Delhi Transport Corporation & Ors² and Magma General Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Nanu**

1 (2017) 16 SCC 680

2 (2009) 6 SCC 121

Ram @ Chuhru Ram & Ors³, this Court is computing the compensation as below:-

Sr. No.	Heads	Compensation awarded by the Tribunal	Compensation awarded by this Court
1	Income	Rs. 36,000/-	Rs. 9930 x 12 = 1,19,160/-
2.	Future prospect	(+)40% (i.e. Rs. 14400)= Rs.50,400/-	(+)40% (i.e. Rs. 47,664) = 1,66,824/-
3.	Deduction	(-) 1/2 (i.e. 25200) = 25200/-	(-) 1/2 (i.e. 83412) = 83,412/-
4.	Multiplier (as the deceased was aged below 15 years)	(x) 15 = 03,78,000/-	(x) 15 = 12,51,180/-
5	Other conventional heads	Rs. 1,21,000/-	Rs. 1,21,000/- (16500+16500+88000)
	Total	Rs. 4,99,000/-	Rs. 13,72,180/-

8. In view of the aforesaid analysis, the lumpsum amount of compensation of Rs.4,99,000 /- awarded by the Claims Tribunal is enhanced to Rs.13,72,180/-. Hence, after deducting the amount of Rs.4,99,000 /-, the appellants are held entitled for an additional amount of Rs.8,73,180/-. The additional amount of compensation shall carry interest @ 6% per annum from filing of the claim application before the Claims Tribunal till its realization. Rest of the conditions of the impugned award shall remain intact.

3 (2018) 18 SCC 130

9. In the result, the appeal is **partly allowed** and the impugned award is modified to the extent as indicated herein-above.
10. Records of the Tribunal along with a copy of this judgment be sent forthwith for compliance and necessary action, if any.
11. The Registry is directed to communicate the claimants in writing “the enhanced amount” in this appeal as against the award made by the concerned Tribunal. The said communication be made in Hindi Deonagri language and the help of paralegal workers may be availed with a co-ordination of Secretary, Legal Aid of the concerned area wherein the claimants resides.

Sd/-

(Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal)
Judge