

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 11.09.2015

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.S.KARNAN

C.M.A.No.3265 of 2012

G.Muthukumaran

...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.36 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)

सत्यमेव जयते

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.1,78,000/- with interest, as compensation.

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 125% disability which has been certified by four doctors. The claimant is a practicing doctor, attached to the Stanley Government Hospital, Chennai. The claimant had sustained bone fracture injuries on his right hand and a surgical operation was conducted on his right hand. Further, the claimant had sustained injuries on left retina of left eye and as such, the vision has been affected. The Tribunal had not granted adequate compensation.

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 sustained 125% disability and he is a practicing doctor and penetrating injuries has been sustained in his left eye. Besides, his right hand had been fractured and surgical operation was conducted. Hence, this Court grants additional compensation as follows:-

Rs.1,25,000/- towards disability; Rs.90,000/- towards loss of earning during medical treatment period; Rs.25,000/- towards transport; Rs.15,000/- towards nutrition; Rs.15,000/- towards attender charges; Rs.3,00,000/- towards loss of amenities and loss of comfort as the claimant has sustained penetrating injuries in his left eye and he is a

practicing doctor. In total, this Court awards a sum of Rs.5,70,000/- as additional compensation. This amount will carry interest at the rate of 7.5% per annum from the date of filing the claim petition till the date of payment of compensation.

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 partly is allowed. There is no order as to costs.

sd/
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR(CO)

/TRUE COPY/

SUB-ASSISTANT 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.3265 of 2012

WEB COPY

CO-TEJ

JD 18/11/2015