

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A. SHANKAR NARAYANA

M.A.C.M.A. No.3303 OF 2012

AND

MACMAMP Nos.1153, 2311, 2271, 2257 & 2283 OF 2015

IN

CMA Nos.1420, 1467, 1482, 1491 & 2381 OF 2004

-

COMMON JUDGMENT:

Since MACMA No.3303 of 2012, and CMA Nos.1420, 1467, 1482, 1491 and 2381 of 2004, wherein review MACMAMP Nos.1153, 2311, 2271, 2257 and 2283 of 2015, respectively, are filed, arise out of one and the same accident, they are being disposed of by this common judgment.

2 . MACMA No.3303 of 2012 is preferred by M/s. United India Insurance Company Limited, represented by its Branch Manager, Mahajanwadi Chowk, Yavatmal of Maharashtra State - respondent No.2 in O.P. No.525 of 2000, on the file of the Chairman, Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal – cum – District Judge, Adilabad District (for brevity 'the Tribunal'), aggrieved of the order and decree therein, dated 20-03-2003, fastening 50% of liability on the amount awarded as compensation.

3 . MACMAMP Nos.1153, 2311, 2271, 2257 and 2283 of 2015 are filed by the respective petitioners - claimants seeking to review the common judgment, dated 18-07-2014, passed by this Court in CMA Nos.1420, 1467, 1482, 1491 and 2381 of 2004, respectively, preferred by M/s. United India Insurance Company Limited, represented by its Branch Manager, Mahajanwadi Chowk, Yavatmal

of Maharashtra State, which is appellant in MACMA No.3303 of 2012, aggrieved of the common order and decrees, dated 20-03-2003, passed by the Tribunal in O.P. Nos.526, 524, 529, 527 and 528 of 2000, respectively. By the said common judgment, this Court allowed the appeals, but also enhanced the compensation in each claim. Admittedly, no cross-objections were filed by the claimants. Hence, the claimants filed the aforesaid review petitions seeking to review the said common judgment which request is granted having issued notices to the opposite parties.

4. Owners of Matador Van bearing registration No.MH-26- 6982 and Lorry bearing registration No.TN-28-V-4458, which are involved in the accident, are respondent Nos.1 and 3 in the O.Ps. before the Tribunal, while its respective insurers are respondent Nos.2 and 4, respectively. The insurer of matador van is the appellant in all the appeals before this Court.

5. For the sake of convenience, the parties herein are hereinafter referred to as arrayed in the respective OPs before the Tribunal.

6. Respondent No.2 preferred the aforesaid appeals mainly on the ground that though, respondent No.1 violated the conditions of insurance policy by allowing the passengers to travel in the matador van, a goods carriage, that led to taking place of accident, wherein two persons sustained injuries and four person died, the Tribunal fastened liability to the extent of 50% negligence on the driver of the matador van, and thereby making it (respondent No.2) liable for payment of compensation jointly and severally to that extent and, therefore, to set aside the common order and decrees to the extent of liability fastened on it.

7. CMA Nos.1420, 1467, 1482, 1491 and 2381 of 2004, which are directed against the common order passed by the Tribunal in O.P.Nos.526, 524, 529, 527 and 528 of 2000, respectively, were preferred by respondent No.2 questioning the apportionment of liability as well as quantum of compensation.

8 . Notices were ordered to the respondents in the review petitions, particularly, to respondent No.2, which is the appellant in all the appeals. After hearing both sides, having satisfied that the common judgment passed by this Court requires to be reviewed, this common judgment is being rendered along with MACMA No.3303 of 2012, which was not disposed of earlier for the reason that it was numbered subsequently having allowed the delay condonation petition in 2012, whereas the other CMAs were registered in 2004 itself. It is not in dispute that all the claims arise out of one and the same accident.

9. Turning to the facts, on 03-04-2000, one G. Shanker, W. Maruthi, Mangam Ashok, Gurunule Sambu and Sande Nago Rao, belonging to Bharampur and Vatnamguda villages of Adilabad District, went to the market at Nagpur on Matador Van bearing registration No.MH 26 6982, which was driven by one Madavi Dev Rao, for selling mangoes. After selling their respective mangoes, on 04-04-2000, having purchased two quintals of Mirchi each and three quintals of onions each, for selling them at Adilabad, loaded them in the very same matador van and while they were returning to Adilabad, near Kinhi - G bus stop, on National Highway No.7, at about 6.00 p.m., it is alleged, the driver of matador van drove it in a rash and negligent manner and dashed the lorry bearing registration No.TN 28V 4458, which was coming in opposite direction, resulting in death of G. Shanker, G. Sambu, Sande Nago Rao, and Madavi Dev Rao, while injuries to W. Maruthi and Mangam Ashok.

i). The stand taken by the petitioners in all the claims before the Tribunal has been that due to rash and negligent driving of the driver of the matador van, the accident had occurred, and that the driver of the lorry had also contributed to the accident.

ii) (a) W. Maruthi, who is petitioner in O.P. No.525 of 2000, stating that he sustained fractures to both legs and pelvis; he was aged 25 years; earning Rs.2,000/- per month by doing labour work, filed the claim petition seeking a total sum of Rs.2,00,000/- (Rupees two lakhs) towards compensation.

(b) Mangam Ashok, who is petitioner in O.P. No.526 of 2000, pleading that he was aged 33 years; earning Rs.2,000/- per month by doing labour work, and stating that he sustained fracture to his left wrist and left leg tibia, sought to award a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees one lakh) as compensation.

iii) (a) The wife, minor children and father, respectively, of Gurnule Shanker, who died in the accident, filed O.P. No.524 of 2000 claiming that the deceased was 38 years old and earning Rs.2,000/- per month, sought to award a sum of Rs.2,50,000/- (Rupees two lakhs and fifty thousand) as compensation.

(b) The wife, minor children and mother, respectively, of Sende Nago Rao, who died in the accident, filed O.P. No.529 of 2000 pleading that the deceased was aged 35 years, earning Rs.2,000/- per month as a labourer and also doing business of seasonal fruits, sought to award a sum of Rs.2,50,000/- as compensation.

(c) The parents and the younger brother of Madavi Dev Rao, who died in the accident, filed O.P.No.527 of 2000 pleading that both the vehicles, referred to above, were responsible for the accident, resulting in death of the deceased, and that he was 22 years old, earning Rs.2,500/- per month, died in unmarried status, sought to award a sum of Rs.2,50,000/- as compensation.

(d) The wife, two minor children and parents of G. Sambu, who died in the accident, filed O.P. No.528 of 2000 pleading that the deceased was 33 years old, earning Rs.2,000/- per month as a labourer and also doing the business of seasonal fruits, sought to award a sum of Rs.2,50,000/- as compensation.

10. Respondent No.3, who is owner of the lorry, remained *ex parte* before the Tribunal in all the OPs.

11. Respondent Nos.1, 2 and 4 have filed their respective counters.

i) Respondent No.1 pleaded that due to rash and negligent driving of the lorry driver, the accident had occurred and, therefore, himself and respondent No.2 are not liable to pay compensation, besides pleading that the amount claimed is highly excessive.

ii) Respondent No.2, while denying various averments made in the claim petitions, pleaded that the lorry driver, who was coming in the opposite direction was responsible for the accident. It has also pleaded that, at least, both the drivers of the vehicles are responsible for the accident and sought the petitioners to prove that the driver of matador van had valid driving license and the van was duly insured with it. It has also taken a plea that the van was a goods vehicle and the petitioners were not permitted to travel in it, except its driver.

iii) Respondent No.4, insurer of the lorry, while denying the averments made in the claim petitions, pleaded that only due to rash and negligent driving of the driver of the van, the accident had occurred, and that there was no fault on the part of the lorry driver and, therefore, sought to dismiss the claim petitions, apart from contending that the claims in all these claim petitions are highly excessive.

12. The Tribunal, based on the above pleadings, framed the following issues in O.P. Nos.525 and 526 of 2000 relating to injury claims:

“i) Whether the accident occurred on 4.4.2000 due to rash and negligent driving with a vehicle bearing Nos.MH.26.7982 & TN-28-U-4458 by its drivers?

ii) Whether the petitioner is entitled to any compensation ? If so, to what amount and against which of the respondents?

iii. To what relief ? ”

Relating to the death claims in O.P. Nos.524, 527, 528 and 529 of 2000, the Tribunal framed the following issues:

“ i) Whether the accident occurred on 4.4.2000 due to rash and negligent driving with a vehicle bearing Nos.MH.26.6982 & TN-28-U.4458 by its drivers ?

ii) Whether the petitioners are entitled to any compensation ? If so, to what amount and against which of the respondents ?

iii) To what relief ? ”

13. The Tribunal proceeded with joint trial of all the claim petitions treating O.P. No.525 of 2000 as leading claim petition, and recorded evidence in the said O.P. for all the claims.

14. The petitioner in O.P. No.525 of 2000 examined himself as PW.1 and marked Exs.A-1 to A-9. The petitioner No.1 in O.P. No.524 of 2000 examined herself as PW.2 and marked Ex.A-10. The petitioner in O.P. No.526 of 2000 examined himself as PW.3 and marked Exs.A-11 and A-12. Petitioner No.1 in O.P. No.527 of 2000 examined herself as PW.4 and marked Ex.A-13. Petitioner No.1 in O.P. No.528 of 2000 examined herself as PW.5 and marked Ex.A-14. Petitioner No.1 in O.P. No.529 of 2000 examined herself as PW.6 and marked Ex.A-15. On behalf of respondent Nos.1, 2 and 4, who contested the claims, no witnesses were examined and no documents were marked. However, copies of observation panchanama in Crime No.26 of 2000 of Police Station,

Panderkowda, Camp at Wadki and insurance policy were marked as Exs.B-1 and B-2, respectively, on behalf of respondent No.2.

15. Respondent Nos.2 and 3 - insurers of the vehicles involved in the accident, obtained permission from the Tribunal under Section 170 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (for short 'the Act') to take all defences available to the owners of their respective vehicles.

16. The Tribunal has taken up issue No.1, which is common in all the claim petitions, and having analyzed the evidence of PWs.1 and 2, the injured petitioners, who asserted that when the matador van's driver was trying to avert the motor cyclist on the road, the lorry came in the opposite direction, and, then, both the lorry and the matador van hit each other. Thus, assessing the evidence on record, the Tribunal found that both the drivers of the vehicles are equally responsible for the accident, and accordingly, held issue No.1 in favour of the petitioners.

17. On issue No.2 in O.P. Nos.525 and 526 of 2000, the Tribunal granted a sum of Rs.1,66,000/- and Rs.30,500/-, respectively, towards compensation to the respective petitioners for the injuries sustained by them.

i) In O.P. No.524 of 2000, the Tribunal has granted Rs.2,35,000/- towards compensation for the death of G.Shanker; in O.P. No.529 of 2000, granted a sum of Rs.2,00,000/- towards compensation for the death of Sande Nago Rao; in O.P. No.527 of 2000, granted a total sum of Rs.1,70,000/- towards compensation for the death of Madavi Dev Rao, based on the observations of the Larger Bench of this

Court in **APSRTC, Hyderabad and another v.**

B. Vijaya and others, relating to the options for seeking compensation either under the Workmen's Compensation Act, or under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, and in O.P. No.528 of 2000, granted Rs.2,10,000/- towards compensation for the death of G. Sambu. The Tribunal apportioned the compensation amounts payable to the dependants of the deceased in these four claim petitions, where deaths resulted. On issue No.3, the Tribunal allowed all the claim petitions with suitable directions as to withdrawal of compensation amounts.

18. Challenging the compensation awarded by the Tribunal in all the claim petitions, respondent No.2 - United India Insurance Company Limited, which is insurer of the matador van, preferred all the aforesaid appeals.

i) In the grounds of appeal, respondent No.2 states that the Tribunal overlooked the fact that only due to rash and negligent driving of the driver of the lorry, the accident had occurred, since lorry was fully loaded with jack fruits, its driver lost the control, which resulted in accident, whereas the matador van was empty without any goods, as alleged by the petitioners.

ii) It is stated that the petitioners failed to establish that the injured and the deceased were travelling along with goods. It is stated that despite a specific plea and leading documentary evidence under Exs.B-1 and B-2 that respondent No.1 violated terms of the insurance policy (Ex.B-2), still, the Tribunal failed to frame an issue and address the same, and that the said plea cuts the case of the petitioners at the root level, which the Tribunal has completely ignored.

iii) It is also stated that in O.P. No.525 of 2000, the Tribunal,

somehow, accepted permanent disability of the petitioner at 25% though, the doctor was not examined whose examination is mandatory in view of the decision of this Court in **United India Insurance Company Limited v. Mohd. Khaj Rasool Sayyed @ Mohd. Khaja Main Shaik and Another.**

iv) Respondent No.2 also attacked earnings of the injured petitioners as well as the deceased, selection of multiplier and the amounts awarded towards pain and suffering, and sought to set aside the orders and decrees passed by the Tribunal and to exonerate it from the liability.

19. Heard Sri G.S. Prakash Rao, learned counsel for appellant - M/s United India Insurance Company Limited in MACMA No.3303 of 2012 and respondent No.1 in all the review petitions, and Sri S. Surender Reddy, learned counsel for the respondent No.1 in MACMA No.3303 of 2012 and review petitioners.

20. The appeal in MACMA No.3303 of 2012 was dismissed for default against respondent No.2, owner of the matador van, by the orders of this Court, dated 29-11-2011, however, the same makes no difference in deciding the controversy herein. Though, notices were served on respondent Nos.3 and 4, owner and insurer of the lorry, none appears on their behalf.

21. Concerning the first issue framed by the Tribunal in all the claim petitions, the Tribunal found that both the drivers are equally responsible for the accident.

22. The Tribunal observing that though the crime was registered against the matador van's driver, since he died in the

same accident, the Station House Officer reported the offence against him as 'abated', observed that there is absolutely no basis for the police to come to the conclusion that the driver of the matador van alone was at fault, and that it was only the opinion of the police officer without any basis and, therefore, no credence can be given to the opinion of the police officer; further observing that it has got jurisdiction to decide as to who were at fault, proceeded with examining the scene of occurrence panchanama and finding from the scene of occurrence panchanama, the place where tyre marks were found occurring in the middle of the road revealing negligence of both the drivers of the vehicles involved in the accident; also observing that since matador van was a light motor vehicle and the lorry was a heavy motor vehicle, in case of head on collision, driver of the light motor vehicle cannot be blamed and even Ex.B-1, observation of panchanama, clearly reflects that tyre marks were found on the middle of the road and both vehicles were found at a distance of 200 feet from each other; and also the very fact that there was impact from the side of the driver of the lorry and the side of the driver of the matador van, due to which there was impact on drivers' seats, it can be inferred that it was 'head-on-collision', held that in such accident, the driver of one vehicle alone cannot be found fault with and both vehicle drivers are equally responsible for the accident. The Tribunal has also commented that the Assistant Sub-Inspector of Police without there being any basis to register the case against the matador van's driver alone basing on the information said to have given by the injured which is not recorded, simply stating that the Assistant Sub-Inspector of Police referred the injured persons to the Hospital for treatment and he went to the spot, despite recording that the matador van and the lorry hit face-to-face and the matador van landed towards western side of the road, and the cabin and engine of both vehicles were completely damaged.

i) These are the observations that drove the Tribunal to arrive at a conclusion that both the drivers were equally responsible for the

accident. That has been the reason the liability was apportioned to the extent of 50% each on the owners and insurers of both the vehicles.

23. Perused the record, more particularly, Ex.B-1. The observations made by the Tribunal, as afore-narrated, cannot be found fault, as the same were based on probabilities, which are taken in aid of Ex.B-1 contents, in which case, certainly, the stand of respondent No.2, that since First Information Report (FIR) was registered against the driver of the matador van, no liability can be fastened on it, cannot be countenanced. Therefore, the finding recorded by the Tribunal on issue No.1 in all the claim petitions, since well reasoned and well appreciated, does not suffer from any legal infirmity warranting any interference, as such, the same is confirmed.

MACMA No.3303 of 2012:

24. In O.P. No.525 of 2000, since the petitioner is a coolie by profession, the Tribunal fixing his monthly income at Rs.1,500/- and determining the permanent disability sustained by him at 25%, granted Rs.6,000/- towards loss of past earnings at 100% for a period of four (04) months, as he must not have attended to his work during the said period, and for a period of 30 months, granted Rs.11,250/-. Further, the Tribunal applying multiplier '16', granted Rs.72,000/- ($\text{Rs.1,500/-} \times 12 \times 16 \times 25\%$) towards loss of future earnings.

Thus, the Tribunal held that the petitioner is entitled to Rs.89,250/- towards loss of past and future earnings. Based on Ex.A-5, bill issued by Dr. Phadke Hospital, Yeothmal, the Tribunal granted Rs.21,444/- besides granting Rs.25,000/- towards pain and suffering and Rs.15,000/- towards loss of amenities in life on account of 25% permanent disability and, thus, awarded a total sum of Rs.1,66,000/- towards compensation.

i) As seen from the medical record filed by PW.1 which consists of Exs.A-1 to A-9, the petitioner sustained fracture of right femur shaft, left tibia and pelvis and he had undergone surgical intervention, rods were inserted in left tibia and right femur which were later removed on 02-11-2001. Thus, when viewed, in the light of grievous injuries sustained by the petitioner, it cannot be said that the Tribunal went wrong in fixing income of the petitioner at Rs.1,500/- per month and awarding Rs.89,250/- towards loss of past and future earnings, besides awarding the amounts towards medical expenses, pain and suffering and loss of amenities in life and, thus, arriving at Rs.1,66,000/- towards compensation.

Thus, the appeal is devoid of merit and is, accordingly, dismissed confirming the order and decree passed by the Tribunal.

MACMAMP Nos.1153, 2311, 2271, 2257 & 2283 OF 2015:

25. Review petitions have been filed by the claimants seeking to review the common judgment in the above MACMAs, on the ground that this Court proceeded on the premise that the appeals were filed by the claimants though, they were filed by the respondent No.2 - United India Insurance Company Limited in the claim petitions and enhanced the compensation in all the cases, which finding requires to be reviewed. The other ground taken by the review petitioners herein is that in the judgement copy, it was mentioned that the appeals were allowed in part though, they are liable to be dismissed and, therefore, common judgment passed in the above MACMA Nos.1420, 1467, 1482, 1491 and 2381 of 2004 is to be reviewed.

i) As seen from the common judgment passed by this Court in the above MACMA Nos.1420, 1467, 1482, 1491 and 2381 of 2004, somehow, the amounts awarded by the Tribunal were enhanced,

though, there were no cross-objections. It is also true that it was recorded that all the appeals are allowed, which, in fact, were preferred by - United India Insurance Company Limited, respondent No.2 in the claim petitions. It is, therefore, clear that there appears to be error apparent on the face of record, which requires review, and that has been the reason, notices were ordered to respondents and afforded opportunity of being heard and taken up for common disposal along with MACMA No.3303 of 2012, which also arises out of the same accident and was not disposed of along with MACMA Nos.1420, 1467, 1482, 1491 and 2381 of 2004 since it was numbered subsequently by allowing the delay condonation petition.

ii) It is now well settled that in an appeal preferred by the Insurance Company, compensation awarded by the Tribunal cannot be enhanced without there being cross-objection. Such a power was only vested with the Hon'ble Supreme Court under Article 142 of the Constitution of India. In that view of the matter, the common judgment passed by this Court in all the aforementioned appeals requires to be reviewed.

iii) Learned counsel for the review petitioners (claimants) has placed reliance on the decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **New India Assurance Company Limited v. Gopali and others** and the High Court of Delhi in **ICICI Lombard General Insurance C.Ltd., v. Sita Ram Garg & others** for the proposition that the Tribunals and the Courts are competent to grant just and fair compensation, though, it exceeds the claim made by the petitioners. He further contended that the Delhi High Court in **Sita Ram Garg's Case** (Supra 4) placing reliance on the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Gopali's Case** (Supra 3), held in paragraph No.10 that even without any cross-objections being filed by the claimants, the Tribunals and the High Courts can grant compensation more than what is claimed by a victim in a motor vehicular accident.

iv) It is no doubt true, a single Judge of Delhi High Court based on

Gopali's Case (Supra 3), held as in the above. However, in **Gopali's Case** (Supra 3), the Hon'ble Supreme Court while exercising its power under Article 142 of the Constitution of India enhanced compensation determined by the High Court by applying appropriate multiplier. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Jitendra Khimshankar Trivedi and others v. Kasam Daud Kumbhar and others** emphasized the said principle. But, however, in such a situation, for doing complete justice to the parties, the Hon'ble Supreme Court exercised the jurisdiction under Article 142 of the Constitution of India. Hence, such power to enhance the compensation cannot be exercised by this Court.

26. In O.P. No.526 of 2000, the Tribunal has granted Rs.30,500/- towards compensation for the injuries sustained by the petitioner. The Tribunal has not considered any partial permanent disability. The Tribunal has taken Rs.1,500/- as the monthly earnings and computed the same at Rs.4,500/- towards three months loss of past earnings. The Tribunal has also granted Rs.20,000/- towards pain and suffering; Rs.3,380/- towards treatment charges and Rs.690/- towards hospital charges and, thus, granted a total sum of Rs.30,500/- towards compensation. Since the petitioner sustained fracture of tibia, as reflected in Ex.A-11, the amounts awarded by the Tribunal cannot be construed as on higher side warranting any interference.

27. In O.P. No.524 of 2000, the Tribunal has granted Rs.2,35,000/- towards compensation, fixing the annual income of the deceased at Rs.24,000/- per annum and Rs.16,000/- per annum towards his contribution to his family, applied multiplier 13 taking the age of deceased as 40 years, and thereby granted Rs.2,08,000/- towards loss of dependency, besides granting Rs.12,000/- towards loss of consortium and Rs.15,000/- towards loss of estate. Even the amount of compensation granted by the Tribunal to the petitioners, who are

dependants of the deceased, cannot be construed as on higher side.

28. In O.P. No.529 of 2000, the Tribunal has granted a sum of Rs.2,00,000/- towards compensation taking the annual income of the deceased at Rs.18,000/- per annum, deducting $\frac{1}{3}$ rd there-from and the contribution to the family at Rs.12,000/-, applying multiplier '15' as the deceased was aged 36 years and arrived at Rs.1,80,000/- towards loss of dependency, besides granting Rs.15,000/- towards loss of consortium and Rs.15,000/- towards loss of estate, making a total of Rs.2,00,000/- also cannot be construed as on higher side.

29. In O.P. No.527 of 2000, as already mentioned in the above, placing reliance on the judgment of this Court in **B. Vijaya's Case** (Supra 1), held that the petitioners are entitled to seek compensation by exercising the option under Section 167 of the Act, which, of course, does not suffer from any infirmity. The Tribunal has granted Rs.1,70,000/- towards compensation fixing the annual income of the deceased at Rs.18,000/- and deducting $\frac{1}{3}$ rd there-from towards his personal expenses, the contribution at Rs.12,000/- per annum and, thus, arrived at Rs.1,56,000/-. Besides the same, the Tribunal has also granted Rs.14,000/- towards loss of estate. Even, the amount of Rs.1,70,000/- cannot be construed as excessive.

30. In O.P. No.528 of 2000, the Tribunal has granted Rs.2,10,000/- towards compensation fixing the annual income of the deceased as Rs.18,000/- and after deducting $\frac{1}{3}$ rd there-from towards personal expenses, arrived the contribution of the deceased to his family at Rs.12,000/- per annum and applied multiplier '15' taking the age of the deceased as 36 years, and thereby worked out the annual dependency at Rs.1,80,000/-. Besides the same, the Tribunal has also granted Rs.15,000/- towards loss of consortium and Rs.15,000/- towards loss of estate and, thus, granted Rs.2,10,000/- as

compensation and the same also cannot be construed as on higher side, when kept in view, the decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Sarla Verma & others v. Delhi Transport Corporation and another** and **Rajesh and others v. Rajbir Singh and others**.

31. Thus, viewed from any angle, the contention of learned counsel for respondent No.2 – M/s United India Insurance Company Limited, which is the appellant in all the MACMAs, that the Tribunal went wrong in fixing monthly earnings and applying multiplier in death cases and also injury cases where permanent disability was considered, cannot be accepted. Therefore, the amount granted by the Tribunal in O.P. No.525 of 2000 is confirmed.

32. Concerning review petitions, the same are allowed in view, of the foregoing discussion and, consequently, CMA Nos.1420, 1467, 1482, 1491 and 2381 of 2004 are dismissed confirming the amounts granted by the Tribunal in O.P. Nos.526, 524, 529, 527 and 528 of 2000 towards compensation. There shall be no order as to costs.

33. As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous applications, if any, pending in the appeal and the review petitions, stand disposed of.

A. SHANKAR NARAYANA, J

August 07, 2015.

Mgr