

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

Sr. No.327

**FAO No.2980 of 2003
Date of decision : 08.12.2017**

Jita Ram

..... Appellant

VERSUS

Ramesh Kumar and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Akash Vashisth, Advocate for
Mr. Bhupinder Singh Walia, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Atul Gaur, Advocate for
Mr. Sumeet Goel, Advocate
for respondent No.3-Insurance Company.

SUDHIR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

The claimant Jita Ram, son of Moman Ram Jat, met with an accident on 15.04.1997, in which he suffered seven injuries. The learned Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal, Hisar (MACT, Hisar) awarded compensation of ₹30,000/- and aggrieved by the Award dated 26.07.2001 of the MACT, Hisar, the present appeal has been filed.

2. It has been submitted by learned counsel for the appellant that the compensation has been assessed on the lower side as the learned MACT, Hisar, has failed to take into consideration the disability certificate (Ex.P-1). However, he admits that the said disability certificate pertains to the right eye.

3. In the impugned award, a list of injuries suffered in the accident, has been given. It is not in dispute that apart from the injuries listed, the appellant did not suffer any other injury. Reference to the list

makes it abundantly clear that the appellant did not suffer any injury on the right eye in the accident. Thus, the disability certificate (Ex.P-1) could not have been read into the evidence in the present case.

4. In view of the above, I do not find any error in the impugned Award dated 26.07.2001 passed by learned MACT, Hisar. Appellant-Jita Ram has not even produced the bills of treatment undergone by him and therefore, there is no scope for any enhancement in this appeal.

5. The appeal is dismissed, accordingly.

(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE

December 08, 2017

Ramandeep Singh

Whether speaking / reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes/ No