

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 11.09.2015

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.S.KARNAN

C.M.A.No.3262 of 2012

Sukitha

... Appellant/Petitioner

Vs.

1.V.K.Raman

2.United India Insurance Co. Ltd.,
Motor Third Party Claims Office,
38, Annasalai, Chennai-2.

... Respondents/Respondents

PRAYER: Civil Miscellaneous Appeal is filed under Section 173 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, against the judgment and decree dated 22.01.2003 made in M.C.O.P.No.32 of 1999, on the file of III Judge, Court of Small Causes Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal, Chennai.

For Appellant : Mr.P.Deivendra

For Respondents : Mr.SK.Krishnamurthy for R-2
Exparte (R1)

J U D G M E N T

The short facts of the case are as follows:-

On 01.06.1998, at about 4.30 p.m., when the claimant and others were travelling in a car bearing Registration No. TCV 6006, on the Trichy Main Road, the driver of the car drove it in a negligent manner and dashed it against the oncoming lorry. As a result, the claimant had sustained injuries. Hence, the claim petition has been filed against the owner and insurer of the car.

2. The Insurance Company had filed a counter statement and resisted the claim petition. The Insurance Company submits that in the said accident, two vehicles were involved, but the owner and insurance company of the other lorry involved in the accident have not been impleaded as necessary parties. As per the policy conditions, the claimant is not entitled to receive

compensation. In the said accident, 4 passengers had sustained injuries. Hence, all the 4 claim petitions were tried together and common award was passed by the learned Tribunal, after framing two issues.

3. On the side of the claimants, 12 witnesses were examined and 81 documents were marked as exhibits. On the side of the respondents, no witness, no documentary evidence. After recording evidence of both sides and on perusing the exhibits, the Tribunal had granted a sum of Rs.1,45,000/- with interest.

4. Not being satisfied with the quantum of compensation, the claimant has filed the above appeal.

5. The highly competent counsel Mr.P.Deivendra appearing for the claimant submits that the claimant had sustained multiple bone fracture injuries in right and left hand. The claimant had undergone medical treatment for a long period, as an inpatient, at two different hospitals. The Tribunal had not granted adequate compensation under the relevant heads. The claimant had spent a sum of Rs.83,732/- towards medical expenses. The doctor had assessed the disability at 45% since the claimant had sustained multiple bone fracture injuries. Besides, the dentist had issued disability certificate stating that the claimant had sustained 30% disability.

6. The highly competent counsel Mr.SK.Krishnamurthy appearing for the Insurance Company submits that in the said accident, a lorry also had been involved. As such, the owner and insurer of the lorry are necessary parties, but they have not been impleaded as necessary parties. The doctor had assessed the disability, which is on the higher side. However, the Tribunal had granted an adequate compensation to the claimant.

7. On considering the facts and circumstances of the case and arguments advanced by the highly competent counsels on either side and on perusing the typed-set of papers, this Court is of the view that the claimant had spent a sum of Rs.83,732/- towards medical expenses and he had sustained 75% disability as per the evidence of the Orthopaedist and Dentist. Hence, this Court grants additional compensation as follows:-

Rs.75,000/- towards disability; Rs.15,000/- towards pain and suffering; Rs.5,000/- towards transport; Rs.5,000/- towards nutrition; Rs.15,000/- towards loss of earning during medical treatment period; Rs.40,000/- for loss of amenities and loss of comfort. In total, this Court awards a sum of Rs.1,55,000/- as additional compensation with interest at the rate of 7.5% per annum from the date of filing the claim till date of payment of compensation. The appeal value is

Rs.1,55,000/- and hence, the same is allowed.

8. This Court directs the second respondent/Insurance Company to deposit the said amount within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, into the trial Court. After such deposit being made, it is open to the claimant, to withdraw the said amount, after filing a Memo, along with a copy of this order.

9. In the result, the above appeal is allowed. There is no order as to costs.

Sd/-
Asst.Registrar

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar

r n s

To

1.The III Judge,Court of Small Causes,
Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal,
Chennai.

2.The Section Officer,
VR Section High Court Madras

सत्यमेव जयते C.M.A.No.3262 of 2012

aa18/11/2015

WEB COPY