

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

**F.A.O No. 1470 of 1992
Date of decision:- 12.03.2018**

Smt. Sheela Devi and Ors.

...Appellants

Versus

Paramjit Singh and Others

...Respondents

BEFORE: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present: Mr. Dinesh Saini, Advocate,
for the appellants.

Mr. Abhinandan Pandhi, Advocate,
for the respondent No.4.

RITU BAHRI J. (Oral)

This appeal has been filed by the claimant-appellants seeking enhancement of compensation awarded by Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Sonipat (hereinafter referred to as 'the Tribunal') vide award dated 11.08.1992, on account of death of Vinod Kumar in a motor vehicular accident which took place on 05.05.1991.

FACTS NOT IN DISPUTE

Brief facts of the case are that, on 05.05.1991, husband of Ram Murti and father of Kamlesh was going to Delhi from Panipat in Maruti Car bearing No. DDB 3902 being driven by Vinod Kumar. When they reached near village Teha on G.T. Road it was about 3.0 p.m., a truck bearing registration No. HYS8576 being driven by respondent No. 1 Paramjit Singh appeared from the front side in the rash and negligent manner and hit the Maruti car. All the occupants of the said Maruti Car suffered injuries. They were removed to Civil Hospital, Sonipat. Pritpal

Husband of Smt. Ram Murti and father of Kamlesh and Prem etc. alongwith Saroj and Vinod Kumar were declared dead. The said offending truck was owned by respondent Nos. 2 and 3.In this regard, an FIR got registered by the claimants against respondent No.1.

Consequently, claimants-appellants filed a claim petition before the Tribunal.

COMPENSATION ASSESSED BY THE MACT

On the basis of evidence led by the parties, the Tribunal came to a conclusion that the accident had been caused on account of negligent driving of offending vehicle by respondent No.1. Claimants deposed that at the time of accident/death, deceased was 24 years of age at and he was earning Rs.1400/- per month being a Driver.

This finding was rightly given on the basis of FIR, and others documentary evidence led by the claimants. Hence, Tribunal assessed the compensation as under:

<i>Sr. No.</i>	<i>Heads</i>	<i>Calculations</i>
(i)	Salary	Rs.1,200/-
(ii)	1/4 th deducting from (i) towards personal expenses	Rs.1,200-3,00=Rs.9,00/-
(iii)	Multiplier applied	Rs.9,00X12X16=1,72,800/-
(iv)	Compensation towards last rites and funeral expenses	Rs.3,000/-
	Total Compensation	Rs. 1,75,800/-

Feeling dissatisfied with the impugned award, the claimant-appellants have preferred the present appeal.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case file.

REASSESSED COMPENSATION

The fact of accident is admitted and proved. In the present

case learned counsel for the appellant has referred the judgment of co-ordinate Bench of this Court in case **Gian Devi versus General Manager , Haryana Rodways, Chandigarh 2004(3) R.C.R> (Civil) 199,** whereby salary of the deceased being a driver assessed at Rs.1800/-. He also stated that as per the law laid down in ***Sarla Verma and others vs. Delhi Transport Corporation and another , 2009 (3) RCR (Civil) Page 77,*** in case of deceased's age of 24 years, multiplier of 18 would be applicable, to calculate the amount of compensation payable to the claimants, but Tribunal took multiplier on lower side. In the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, to meet the ends of justice and compensation awarded by the Tribunal requires to be reassessed keeping in view the aforesaid judgments and also by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in a case of ***National Insurance Company Ltd vs. Pranay Sethi and others, passed in Spl Leave Petition (Civil) No. 25590 of 2014, decided on October 31, 2017 wherein*** the issue with regard to awarding of amount under the conventional heads has been authoritatively decided, while observing as under :-

“54. As far as the conventional heads are concerned, we find it difficult to agree with the view expressed in Rajesh. It has granted Rs. 25,000/- towards funeral expenses, Rs. 1,00,000/-loss of consortium and Rs. 1,00,000/- towards loss of care and guidance for minor children. The head relating to loss of care and minor children does not exist. Though Rajesh refers to Santosh Devi, it does not seem to follow the same. The conventional

and traditional heads, needless to say, cannot be determined on percentage basis because that would not be an acceptable criterion. Unlike determination of income, the said heads have to be quantified. Any quantification must have a reasonable foundation. There can be no dispute over the fact that price index, fall in bank interest, escalation of rates in many a field have to be noticed. The court cannot remain oblivious to the same. There has been a thumb rule in this aspect. Otherwise, there will be extreme difficulty in determination of the same and unless the thumb rule is applied, there will be immense variation lacking any kind of consistency as a consequence of which, the orders passed by the tribunals and courts are likely to be unguided. Therefore, we think it seemly to fix reasonable sums. It seems to us that reasonable figures on conventional heads, namely, loss of estate, loss of consortium and funeral expenses should be Rs. 15,000/-, Rs. 40,000/- and Rs. 15,000/- respectively. The principle of revisiting the said heads is an acceptable principle. But the revisit should not be fact-centric or quantum-centric. We think that it would be condign that the amount that we have quantified should be enhanced on percentage basis in every three years and the enhancement should be at the rate of 10% in a span of three years. We are disposed to hold so because that will bring in consistency in respect of

those heads.”

In the present case, the compensation is being reassessed as per the judgments mentioned above:-

Sr. No.	Heads	Calculations
(i)	Salary	Rs.1,800/-
(ii)	40% added in (i) towards future prospects	Rs.1,800 +7,20=Rs.2,520/-
(iii)	1/3 rd deducting from (ii) towards personal expenses	Rs.2,520 -Rs. 840= Rs.1,680/-
(iv)	Multiplier applied	Rs.1,680X12X18= 3,62,880/-
(v)	Compensation towards conventional heads	Rs. 70,000/-
	Total reassessed compensation	Rs.4,32,880/-
	Enhanced amount of compensation	Rs.4,32,880 -1,75,800=Rs.2,57,080/-

The enhanced amount of compensation of **Rs.2,57,080 /-** shall be payable within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. As per the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in case **Shri Nagar Mal and Ors versus The Oriental Insurance Company Ltd. And Ors decided on 19.01.2018** the enhanced amount of compensation shall carry interest @ 7.5% per annum from the date of filing of the claim petition, till its realization. Remaining conditions of disbursal of amount shall remain unaltered.

Accordingly, the award stands modified to the above extent and the present appeal is partly allowed.

12.03.2018

Riya Grover

(RITU BAHRI)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

Yes

No