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

**FAO No. 949 of 2000**
**DECIDED ON: APRIL 01, 2019**

**BALJIT SINGH @ JIT AND OTHERS**

**APPELLANTS**

**VERSUS**

**KASHMIR SINGH & OTHERS**

**RESPONDENTS**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN**

Present: Mr. R.S. Longia, Advocate
for the appellants.

None appeared for respondents in spite of service

*****

**AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (ORAL):**

The award dated 16.12.1999 passed by the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Kurukshetra (for brevity 'the Tribunal') passed in MACT Case No. 219 of 1998 has been assailed in appeal by legal representatives of Jai Kaur seeking enhancement of compensation awarded under Section 166 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (for brevity 'the Act'). The appellants are three minor children and husband of the deceased.

The driver, owner and insurer (i.e. Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd.) of truck bearing registration No. PB-02-H-9718 (hereinafter referred to as

SHAM SUNDER
2019.04.09 10:36
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document
HIGH COURT CHANDIGARH

'offending vehicle') have been arrayed as respondents No. 1 to 3 respectively in the appeal.

The brief facts necessary for adjudication of the present appeal are that Jai Kaur alongwith Rahul was going on scooter bearing registration No. HR-07-A-6389. When they reached near the tyre shop of Bishan Singh at Pipli, the scooter was struck by the offending vehicle. As a result of the impact, both the riders fell down and were dragged to a distance by the offending vehicle. Rahul died at the spot and Jai Kaur received multiple injuries and died in the hospital.

A claim petition under Section 166 of the Act was filed. The Tribunal after considering the facts and on appreciating the evidence adduced held that the accident was caused due to rash and negligent driving of the offending vehicle. The driver, owner and insurer of the offending vehicle were held jointly and severally liable to pay compensation.

In the claim petition it was pleaded that the deceased was 35 years of age and was doing the job of tailoring, knitting etc. Her earning was claimed to be ₹2000/- per month. In the cross-examination PW-2 Baljit Singh admitted that she was 40 years of age. The claimants failed to prove occupation and monthly earning of the deceased. The Tribunal considered the deceased as house-wife and assessed the notional monthly earning of the deceased as ₹1000/-; and multiplier of '16' was applied. The Tribunal awarded a sum of ₹1,96,000/- alongwith interest @12% per annum. The amount awarded included ₹2000/- for funeral expenses and ₹2000/- for loss of estate.

SHAM SUNDER
2019.04.09 10:36
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document
HIGH COURT CHANDIGARH

Learned counsel for the appellants contends that income assessed by the Tribunal is on the lower side, as the deceased apart from doing house work, was doing the job of tailoring and knitting. His grievance is that amounts awarded under the conventional heads are on the lower side.

The claimants failed to produce any evidence on record that the deceased was having any earning by doing tailoring and knitting work. In such circumstances, she is to be treated as a house wife.

In Indian society, role of a lady towards her family cannot be measured in monetary terms. She has multifarious roles to play as a mother, as a wife and may more. She is not working for some financial benefit but it is her affection, sincerity and care towards her family that keeps her working round the clock. The Supreme Court in ***Jitendra Khimshankar Trivedi and others Versus Kasam Daud Kumbhar and others*, (**2015) 4 SCC 237, has held as under:

> *"Even assuming Jayvantiben Jitendra Trivedi was not self employed doing embroidery and tailoring work, the fact remains that she was a housewife and a home maker. It is hard to monetize the domestic work done by a house mother.The services of the mother/wife is available 24 hours and her duties are never fixed. Courts have recognisedthe contribution made by the wife to the house is unvaluable and that it cannot be computed in terms of money. A housewife/home-maker does not work by the clock and she is inconstant attendance of the family throughout and such services rendered by the home maker has to be necessarily kept*

SHAM SUNDER
2019.04.09 10:36
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document
HIGH COURT CHANDIGARH

*in view while calculating the loss of dependency."*

The accident occurred in the year 1998. Considering the pleadings wherein it was claimed that the deceased was earing ₹2000/- per month is an indicator towards financial status of the claimants. Having a clue from the minimum wages at the time of accident, monthly income of the deceased is assessed as ₹2000/- per month. As the notional income is being assessed, no deduction for self-expenses is to be made. Reliance in this regard is placed on the decision of Division Bench of this Court in ***Paramjit Singh and another Versus Dilbagh Singh alias Bagga and others, 2014 (4) RCR (Civil) 895***, wherein it was held that no deduction for self expenses is to be made in case of notional income. Relevant para is quoted below:

> *"15. After the decision in Lata Wadhwa's case (supra), the notional income of the housewife is estimated according totheir age. The notional income of the housewife was takento be Rs.3,000/- per month if she had been between the age group of 34 to 59 at the time of accident. The only riddle which is to be solved by us is as to whether 1/3rd cut should be applied on the notional income or not? The answer to this question is couched in the aforesaid extracted paragraph of the judgment of Lata Wadhwa's case (supra), as in that case, the Supreme Court was searching for a modest notional income of the housewife who was not earning an income but rendering multifarious services while managing all the chores of the family. Since it is a case where the Courts are confronted with the notional income of the housewife on account of her multifarious*

SHAM SUNDER
2019.04.09 10:36
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document
HIGH COURT CHANDIGARH

*services which not only includes rearing the children but also performing all matrimonial obligations, in our considered view, the deduction of 1/3rd out of her notional income is not warranted."*

As the quantum of compensation is being revisited, it would be appropriate that the amounts under the conventional heads are awarded in consonance with the decision of the Supreme Court in ***National Insurance Company Limited Vs. Pranay Sethi and others AIR 2017 SC 5157***. The claimants are entitled to ₹15,000/- each for loss of funeral expenses and for loss of estate. Another sum of ₹40,000/- is awarded for loss of consortium.

There is no challenge to the fact that the deceased was 40 years of age, it would be appropriate that multiplier of '15' is applied as per the decision of the Supreme Court in ***Sarla Verma and others Vs. Delhi Transport Corporation and another (2009) 6 SCC 21.***

In view of above discussion, compensation is re-calculated as under:

| | **Head** | **Compensation awarded** |
|---|---|---|
| (i) | Monthly income | ₹ 2000/- per month |
| (ii) | Annual Income | ₹ 24000/- per annum |
| (iii) | Multiplier | 15 (as per age of deceased) |
| (iv) | Loss of income | 24000x15= ₹3,60,000/- |
| (v) | Funeral expenses | ₹15,000/- |
| (vi) | Loss of estate | ₹15,000/- |
| | Loss of consortium | ₹40,000/- |
| | Total Compensation awarded | ₹4,30,000/- |

The award dated 16.12.1999 is modified to the extent that amount of ₹1,96,000/- awarded by the Tribunal is enhanced to ₹4,30,000/-.

SHAM SUNDER
2019.04.09 10:36
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document
HIGH COURT CHANDIGARH

The appellants shall be entitled to the enhanced amount alongwith interest @6% per annum from the date of filing of the claim petition till the realization of the amount.

The appeal is allowed in the afore-said terms.

**(AVNEESH JHINGAN)**
**JUDGE**

**APRIL 01, 2019**
sham

***Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No***
***Whether reportable Yes/No***

SHAM SUNDER
2019.04.09 10:36
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document
HIGH COURT CHANDIGARH