

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

FAO No. 2018 of 2006 (O&M)
Date of decision: January 7,2016

United India Insurance Co. Ltd.

.....Appellant

VS.

Vandana Arora and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.KANNAN

Present: Mr. R.M.Suri, Advocate
for the appellant.

None for the respondents.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

K.KANNAN,J (Oral)

1. The appeal is on the issue of quantum by the Insurance Company. The claim was made by the wife and children of the deceased who was 42 years of age. There are two principal objections taken that the Tribunal took the multiplier 15 instead of 14 and that further the Tribunal had also not taken note of the family pension that was being received by the wife to make appropriate deduction.

2. While the contention regarding multiplier is well taken and I notice that would have made difference of Rs. 60,000/- which can be more than offset the compensation by the scales of loss of consortium that are now being provided. In

this case, this has not been provided and consequently I do not think this will make a difference. There is no scope for making deduction of pension received and this subject has been brought out through to several decisions and it would not require to be re-stated here.

3. The overall compensation determined Rs. 9,17,920/- would not require any interference.

4. I maintain the award and dismiss and appeal.

JANUARY 07, 2016

Rajeev

**(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE**