

103

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

**RA-CR No.203-CII of 2018 (O&M) in  
FAO No.2728 of 2013  
Date of Decision : 21.01.2019**

National Insurance Company Limited

..... Non-Applicant/Appellant

versus

Harjeet Singh and others

..... Applicant/Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA**

Present : Mr. Anil Kumar Spehia, Advocate  
for the applicant/respondents No.1 to 3.

Mr. Ashwani Talwar, Advocate with  
Mr. J. S. Chatrath, Advocate  
for the non-applicant/appellant.

**SUDIP AHLUWALIA, J. (ORAL)**

**CM No.23140-CII of 2018**

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the delay of 59  
days in filing the review application is condoned.

Application stands disposed off.

**RA-CR No.203-II of 2018**

In this review application, the applicant-Harjeet Singh seeks  
modification in the earlier common judgment passed by this Court in  
***FAO Nos.2727 and 2728 of 2013***, on 20.07.2018.

2. In **FAO No.2728 of 2013**, the total admissible claim of the  
petitioner was assessed at Rs.4,08,000/- towards Dependency Entitlement,

while an additional amount of Rs.15,000/- each was awarded towards Loss of Estate and Funeral Expenses. On the other hand, in **FAO No.2727 of 2013**, the award in favour of the claimant, who happens to be the father of the petitioner-Harjeet Singh for the death of his wife-Jaswinder Kaur, was awarded in which the component of increase towards Future Prospects was also taken into account. The grievance of the petitioner is that the same component should also has been factored while deciding in his own claim case in which the compensation was granted in favour of the petitioner on account of the death of Jasmeet Singh-son of the said deceased Jaswinder Kaur, who both were killed in the same accident.

3. Perusal of the aforesaid judgment passed by this Court goes to show that in Para No.14 of the same, the additional compensation towards increase on account of Future Prospects in terms of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in “**National Insurance Company Limited Vs. Pranay Sethi and others**” **2017(4) R.C.R. (Civil) 1009**, was actually awarded which also should have been in the case of the present petitioner. However, the same was not mentioned in the aforesaid judgment which certainly is an error of clerical nature, since the same case law was fully applicable to the present petitioner when the two claim applications were disposed off together in a single judgment.

4. Consequently, the present application is allowed and the aforesaid judgment of this Court passed on 20.07.2018 is modified to the extent that an additional amount of Rs.1,63,200/-, which happens to be exact 40% of the Dependency Entitlement of the petitioner, as assessed

originally, is granted. This is on the basis that the deceased, who was found to have been self-employed, was in the age slab of 25-30 years.

5. This order shall form a part of the original judgment.

January 21, 2019

*rittu*

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Whether reportable:

Yes/No

Yes/No

(SUDIP AHLUWALIA)

JUDGE