

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**FAO No.1135 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : 14.03.2016**

Mafi Devi

.....Appellant

Versus

Bodh Raj and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DARSHAN SINGH

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

Present: Mr. Virender Mandhan, Advocate for appellant.

DARSHAN SINGH, J.

The present appeal has been preferred by the appellant-claimant against the award dated 04.09.2015, passed by learned Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal, Karnal (hereinafter called the 'Tribunal') vide which the appellant-claimant has been awarded the compensation to the tune of Rs.3,04,660/- along with interest @ 7.5% per annum from the date of filing the petition till realisation, on account of the injuries suffered by her in the motor vehicular accident, which took place on 23.03.2012.

2. The present appeal has been preferred by the appellant-

claimant for enhancement of the amount of the compensation.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant-claimant contended that no amount has been awarded to the claimant towards attendant charges. The appellant-claimant has suffered multiple injuries including fractures. The compensation awarded under the other conventional heads is also inadequate.

4. I have duly considered the aforesaid contentions.

5. It is an admitted fact that appellant-claimant Mafi Devi has not suffered any disability on account of the injuries suffered by her in the present accident. However, she has remained hospitalised for a long period and the learned Tribunal has rightly awarded a sum of Rs.2,63,660/- towards his treatment and medicine expenses. In addition to that, she has been awarded a sum of Rs.25,000/- towards pain and suffering which is also quite adequate. She has also been awarded a sum of Rs.5000/- towards transportation and Rs.5000/- towards special diet. Learned counsel for the appellant has not been able to point out as to how these amounts are inadequate. No evidence has been led by the claimant to establish that she has employed any attendant during the period of hospitalisation. So, she is not entitled for any amount towards attendant charges. Thus, the compensation awarded by the learned Tribunal is just and appropriate. No enhancement is called for.

6. Resultantly, the present appeal is without any merits and the same is hereby dismissed.

14.03.2016

sunil yadav

**(DARSHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**