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

**CWP No.10415 of 2018
Date of decision:03.05.2018**

Taranum and another ...Petitioners
Versus
Shiv Kumar and others ...Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rakesh Kumar Jain

**Present: Mr. R.S.Budhwar, Advocate,
for the petitioners.**

Rakesh Kumar Jain, J.

The petitioners are aggrieved against the order/award dated 02.05.2013 passed by the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Kurukshetra and the order dated 10.02.2014 by which the application of the petitioner for review/re-calling of the order/award dated 02.05.2013 has been dismissed.

The present petition has been filed by minor son and daughter of Karam Singh through their uncle Kulwant Singh as their next friend and guardian to challenge the impugned order.

Briefly stated, Paramjit Kaur w/o Karam Singh (mother of the petitioners) died in a vehicular accident on 03.12.2011. Karam Singh and the petitioners filed a petition under Sections 166, 140, 141 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 for claiming compensation before the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Kurukshetra, which was disposed of by the Tribunal on 02.05.2013 on the basis of a compromise arrived at between the parties. Thereafter, the

petitioners, through their uncle, filed an application for recalling of the order dated 02.05.2013, which was dismissed vide order dated 10.02.2014.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that since the Tribunal has awarded less amount on account of the death of Paramjit Kaur, therefore, the petitioners, who are minors, have filed this petition through their uncle.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioners and perusing the available record, I am of the considered opinion that the matter has been compromised before the Tribunal for a sum of ₹4 lacs after recording the statement of Karam Singh, father of the petitioners, who is their natural guardian. It is thereafter that the review application was filed by the petitioners through their uncle on the ground of inadequacy of the amount of compensation, which has rightly been turned down by the Tribunal by passing a well considered order, which does not require any interference by this Court.

Dismissed.

May 03, 2018
vinod*

(Rakesh Kumar Jain)
Judge

Whether speaking / reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No