

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE T.R.RAMACHANDRAN NAIR
&
THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE P.V.ASHA

FRIDAY, THE 19TH DAY OF JUNE 2015/29TH JYAISHTA, 1937

RP.No. 455 of 2015 IN MACA.721/2012

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN MACA 721/2012 of HIGH COURT OF KERALA

REVIEW PETITIONER/CROSS OBJECTOR/RESPONDENT:

SWAPNA SETHU, W/O SIVAPRASAD
AGED 36 YEARS, RESIDING AT
SIVADAM, PANNIYANKARA
P.O., THIRUVANNOOR NADA
PANNIYANKARA AMSOM DESOM
KOZHIKODE

BY ADV. SRI.AVM.SALAHUDIN

RESPONDENT/RESPONDENT/APPELLANT:

THE ORIENTAL INSURANCE CO. LTD.
MANJERI, REP. BY THE ASSISTANT MANAGER & amp;
AUTHORISED SIGNATORY
THE ORIENTAL INSURANCE CO. LTD., REGIONAL OFFICE
ERNAKULAM, METRO PALACE, ERNAKULAM NORTH
KOCHI 18

BY SRI.A.R.GEORGE

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
19-06-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

**T.R.RAMACHANDRAN NAIR &
P.V.ASHA, JJ.**

Review Petition No.455 OF 2015

Dated this the 19th day of June, 2015

ORDER

Ramachandran Nair, J.

The only ground taken in the review petition is that even though under different heads compensation has been granted, this Court did not grant compensation for the period of leave availed of by the appellant after the accident. Reliance is placed on Annexure A2 document produced by the respondent in the appeal.

2. Heard the learned counsel on both sides.

In fact as far as the grant of compensation is concerned, we have assessed the functional disability as 75% and have granted compensation for permanent disability by taking due multiplier also. Even though we have not separately granted any amount under the head now sought for, as rightly pointed out by the learned counsel for the Insurance Company, since the multiplier method is adopted and as the amount is granted based on the salary received by her, there will

not be any denial of compensation on that count. It is submitted that otherwise it will amount to duplication. Apart from the same, we do not find that there is any apparent error in the judgment. The total amount of compensation granted in the case is ₹4,007,600/- (Rupees forty lakhs seven thousand and six hundred only). Hence the review petition is dismissed.

T.R.RAMACHANDRAN NAIR, JUDGE

P.V.ASHA, JUDGE

SV.