



163 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

FAO-4605-2025
Date of Decision: July 20, 2026

Raj Bala and others ...Appellants

Versus

Akhilesh Kumar and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present:- Mr. Amardeep Hooda, Advocate for the appellants.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J.(Oral)

Learned counsel for the appellants could not convince this Court that compensation awarded to the claimants-appellants is inadequate or any of the guidelines as laid down by Hon’ble Supreme Court in cases of *“National Insurance Company Limited v. Pranay Sethi and others”* 2017(4) RCR (Civil) 1009; *“Sarla Verma and others v. Delhi Transport Corporation and another”*, (2009) 6 Supreme Court Cases 121; and *“Magma General Insurance Company Ltd. v. Nanu Ram @ Chuhru Ram and others”*, 2018(18) SCC 130, have been breached, inasmuch as deceased was found to be 61 years of age, based upon school transfer certificate (Ex.P1). In the absence of any proof regarding his actual earnings, the minimum wages at the relevant time was taken into consideration. Since the deceased was 61 years of age, multiplier of 7 has been appropriately applied. Nothing was required to be added towards future prospects as per *Pranay Sethi’s case (supra)*, since the deceased had exceeded 60 years of age.

As such, finding the present appeal to be devoid of any merit, the same is hereby dismissed.

July 20, 2026	(DEEPAK GUPTA)
sarita	JUDGE
Whether reasoned/speaking:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No