

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

**R.S.A No. 4907 of 2015
Date of decision:- 15.11.2019**

Saroj and ors.

...Appellants

Versus

State of Haryana & ors.

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present:- Mr. Raj Kapoor Malik Advocate
for the appellants

Mr. R.K.S Brar, Addl.A.G Haryana

RITU BAHRI J. (Oral)

1. The present appeal has been preferred by the claimants-appellants, seeking enhancement of the amount of compensation awarded by the Court of District Judge Kaithal whereby the learned Appellate Court has allowed the appeal of the appellants by setting aside judgment and decreed dated 06.12.2013 passed by learned Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.) Kaithal and awarded the compensation to the appellants to the tune of Rs.06,48,000/- along with interest @6% per annum.

2. As per appellants, on 02.07.2010, Jasmer alias Minu (deceased) had gone to irrigate his land where a transformer was installed in the field . At about 10 P.M, when the deceased carried down the handle of the transformer, he was electrocuted as the current was running. The chest of the deceased touched the handle and current passed through him and he died at the spot. DDR dated 03.07.2010 was registered and post mortem of the deceased was conducted.

3. While assessing compensation, the Court below took the

income of the deceased at Rs.4000/- per month and 1/4th was deducted towards personal expenses and applied the multiplier of 18. The total compensation awarded to the claimants was Rs.06,48,000/-.

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 no future prospects have been awarded. Further nothing has been awarded under conventional heads.

5. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the respondent-State 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 deceased died due to electrocution, as it had been duly proved by the claimants/appellants. There was leakage of current and the respondents failed to prove that there was no leakage of current in the transformer.

8. The children as well as parents are also entitled for compensation of Rs.40,000/- each under the head of loss of 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) RCR Civil 837***.

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 seems 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 :-

Sr. No.	Heads	Calculations
(i)	Income	Rs.4,500/- per month
(ii)	40% of (i) above to be added as future prospects=	Rs.4,500+Rs.1800=Rs.6300/- per month
(iii)	1/4 th of (ii) deducted as personal expenses of the deceased=	Rs.6300-Rs.1575=Rs.4725/- per month
(iv)	Compensation after multiplier of 18 is applied	Rs.4725 X 12 X 18= Rs.10,20,600/-
(v)	Conventional heads (Loss of estate, loss of consortium and funeral expenses)	Rs.70,000/-
(vi)	Loss of consortium (children)	Rs.80,000/- (Rs.40,000/- each)
(vii)	Loss of fillail consortium (mother of the deceased)	Rs.40,000/-
	Total Compensation awarded	Rs.12,10,600/-
	Enhanced amount of compensation	12,10,600-06,48,000=Rs.05,62,600/- (rounded off to Rs.5,62,000/-)

11. The enhanced amount of compensation of Rs.05,62,000/- 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% per annum 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*. The remaining conditions of disbursal of amount and recovery rights shall remain unaltered.

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

15.11.2019

G Arora

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE
Yes
No