

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
BENCH AT AURANGABAD.**

25. WRIT PETITION No. 7525 of 2019

Mangalbai W/o Rajabhau Devkate ...Petitioner

VERSUS

Maroti Laxman Ingole and others ...Respondents

Mr. H.V. Tungar, Advocate for petitioner

CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.

DATE : 24th June, 2019

PER COURT:

1. The petitioner, who is widow of deceased Rajabhau, who suffered a motor accident, is aggrieved by the order dated 15th October, 2018 passed by the learned Member, Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Beed, in M.A.C.P. Darkhast No. 113/2017
2. The learned Counsel for the petitioner has strenuously criticised the impugned order and has drawn my attention to the six grounds formulated in the memo of the petition.
3. There is no dispute that Rukhminibai is the mother of the deceased and the petitioner is the wife of the deceased. The shares of compensation amount have been decided by the

learned Member, Motor Accident Claims Tribunal. It is the contention of the petitioner-widow that legal representatives of Rukhminibai should not be awarded any share out of the compensation amount on the ground that Rukhminibai is now deceased. The Tribunal has concluded that the share that would go to Rukhminibai, would now be shared by her legal representatives.

4. Considering the above, I do not find that the impugned order passed by the Tribunal rejecting the application Exh. 10/C filed by the petitioner seeking the refund of the share that went to deceased Rukhminibai, could be termed as being perverse or erroneous.

5. This petition, being devoid of merit, is dismissed.

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE)
JUDGE

Madkar