

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

F.A.O No. 4962 of 2013

Date of decision:- 25.09.2019

Sardari Devi and ors.

...Appellants

Versus

Kanwarjit Singh & ors.

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present:- Mr. Rakesh Bakshi, Advocate
for the appellants

Mr. Naveen Kapur, Advocate
for respondent No. 3

RITU BAHRI J. (Oral)

C.M. No. 21003-CII-2013

For the reasons mentioned in the application, delay of 93 days
in filing of the appeal is condoned.

The application stands disposed of.

FAO No.4962-2013

1. The present appeal has been preferred by the claimants-appellants, seeking enhancement of the amount of compensation awarded by the learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Ambala (for short, 'the Tribunal') to the tune of Rs.03,18,000/- vide impugned award dated 14.03.2013 on account of death of Seo Ram.

2. As per claimants, on 29.03.2011, Seo Ram (since deceased) along with Mandeep Singh were going to Mohali on motorcycle bearing registration No. HR-07P-6471 driven by Mandeep Singh. Seo Ram was sitting as pillion rider on the motorcycle. When they reached near village

Rajgarh, a swift car bearing registration No. DL-2CAN-0785, which was being driven by respondent No. 1, struck against the motorcycle. Due to the impact, the deceased died on the spot F.I.R No. 16 under Sections 304-A/279/337 IPC was registered against respondent No. 1 on 29.03.2011.

3. While assessing compensation, the Tribunal took the income of the deceased at Rs.5000/- per month and 30% future prospects were awarded. 1/2 was deducted towards personal expenses and applied the multiplier of 7. Rs.20,000/- were awarded on account of transportation, Rs.25,000/- were awarded on account of loss of love and affection. The total compensation awarded to the claimants was Rs.03,18,000/-.

4. The learned counsel for the claimants-appellants contends that the compensation awarded by the learned Tribunal is on the lower side and deserves to be enhanced, as the Tribunal has not applied the right multiplier method.

5. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the respondent-driver has vehemently opposed the present appeal.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. It is not in dispute between the parties that the accident had taken place, as the accident had been duly proved by the claimants/appellants.

8. Further the parents are also entitled for compensation of Rs.40,000/- each under the head of loss of filial consortium, in view of judgment of Hon'ble the Supreme Court of India in a case of ***Magma General Insurance Co. Ltd vs Nanu Ram Alias Chuhru Ram, 2018 (4)***

9. Reference at this stage can be made to a recent judgment of Hon'ble the 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.”.

10. In the present case, the compensation is being reassessed as per the judgments mentioned above by taking the income of the deceased at Rs.5000/- per month keeping in view the fact that he was student of Engineering College. :-

<i>Sr. No.</i>	<i>Heads</i>	<i>Calculations</i>
(i)	Income	Rs.5000/- per month
(ii)	40% of (i) above to be added as future prospects=	Rs.5000+Rs.2000=Rs.7000/- per month
(iii)	1/2 of (ii) deducted as personal expenses of the deceased=	Rs.7000-Rs.3500=Rs.3500/- per month
(iv)	Compensation after multiplier of 18 is applied	Rs.3500X 12 X 17= Rs.07,14,000/-
(v)	Conventional heads (Loss of estate and funeral expenses)	Rs.30,000/-
(vi)	Loss of filial consortium (parents)	Rs.80,000/-(Rs.40,000/- each)
(vii)	Total Compensation awarded	Rs.08,24,000/-
	Enhanced amount of compensation	08,24,000-03,18,000=Rs.05,06,000/-

11. The enhanced amount of compensation of Rs.05,06,000/- shall be payable within a period of forty five days from the date of receipt of

certified copy of this order. The appellants shall also get interest @ 9% in view of judgment of Hon'ble the Apex Court in Civil Appeal No. 4528-2019 titled as *Dara Singh @ Dhara Banjara vs. Shyam Singh Varma and ors, decided on 01.05.2019.*

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

25.09.2019
G Arora

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE
Yes
No