IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved On	18.11.2020
Pronounced On	08.12.2020

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.SARAVANAN

C.M.A.No.1711 of 2011
and
M.P.No.1 of 2011
(Through Video Conferencing)

National Insurance Company Limited,
Trichy Road,
Coimbatore 641 005. ... Appellant/4th respondent

Vs.

1.M.Mylathal

2.M.Poongodi

3.M.Nandhini

4.M.Poorni

5.M.Latha ... Respondents 1 to 5/Petitioners 1 to 5

6.K.Sivakumar

7.N.Ravindran

8.N.Palaniswamy ... Respondents 6 to 8/Respondents 1 to 3

Civil Miscellaneous Appeal filed under Section 173 of Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 against the Judgment and Decree passed in M.A.C.T.O.P.No.508 of 2007 dated 16.07.2009 on the file of the Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal, Additional District and Sessions Judge, Fast Track Court No.3, Coimbatore.

For Appellant : M/s.N.B.Surekha
For R2 to R5 : Mr.P.M.Duraiswamy
For R6 to R8 : Not Ready in notice

J U D G M E N T

The Insurance Company is the appellant in this appeal. It is aggrieved by the impugned Judgment and Decree dated 16.07.2009 passed by the Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal, Additional District and Sessions Judge, Fast Track Court No.3, Coimbatore in M.C.O.P.No.508 of 2007.

2. By the impugned Judgment and Decree, the Tribunal has awarded a sum of Rs.4,14,500/- as compensation to the 1st to 5th respondents/claimants, who are the dependents of the deceased V.Mohan Raj, who met with an accident on 17.09.1990. Almost after a lapse of 16 years, a claim petition came to be filed during the month of October 2007.

3. The Tribunal after considering the evidences on record passed the impugned Judgment and Decree upholding the case for granting compensation to the 1st to 5th respondents/claimants, who are the wife and the daughters of the deceased V.Mohan Raj who met with an accident on 17.09.1990 and died on 20.10.1990. Pending this appeal, the 1st respondent died. The 2nd to 5th respondents are the legal representatives of the deceased 1st respondent.

4. In this appeal, the appellant/Insurance Company had challenged the compensation awarded mainly on the ground of limitation stating that the claim petition was filed after a lapse of 16 years and therefore ,the Tribunal ought not to have entertained the claim petition.

5. In this appeal, the appellant/Insurance Company has also questioned the Judgment and Decree on the ground of the 1st to 5th respondents/claimants failure to give insurance policy details/particulars in the claim petition and the notional income of Rs.3,000/- per month of the deceased fixed by the Tribunal to award the aforesaid compensation to them was excessive. The learned counsel for the appellant/Insurance Company relied on the following decisions:-

i. Purohit and Company Vs. Khatoonbee and Another, AIR 2017 SC 1612 : (2017) 4 SCC 783.

ii. The Oriental Insurance Company Limited Vs. R.Mahendran and Another, 2016 SCC OnLine 23256 : (2016) 2 TN MAC 691.

iii. The Divisional Manager, United India Insurance Co. Ltd. Vs. Radhabai and Others, Judgment dated 03.09.2020 passed by this Court in C.M.A.No.3594 of 2014.

iv. National Insurance Company Limited Vs. Prembai Patel and Others, (2005) 6 SCC 172.

v. Janaki and Others Vs. M.J. Xavier and Others, 2012 SCC OnLine Ker 7347.

vi. United India Insurance Co. Ltd. Vs. Sudhakar and Others, 2007 (1) MLJ 234.

vii. United India Insurance Company Limited Vs. R.Venkatesan and Another, 2004 ACJ 727.

viii. Kasinathan and Others Vs. P.A.Thangavel and Others, CDJ 2004 MHC 129.

ix.National Insurance Company Limited, Pudukkottai Vs. Rani and Others, 2004 (4) L.W.151.

6. Defending the impugned order, the learned counsel for the 1st to 5th respondents/claimants submits that the issue is no open. He further submits that this Court in C.M.A.No.1074 of 2014 and in C.M.A.No.1532 of 2014 vide order dated 25.08.2014 has held that the Motor Vehicles Act, 1980 is a beneficial piece of legislation and therefore, benefit of just compensation cannot be denied merely because the claimants lodged a claim petition after a lapse of considerable time.

7. The learned counsel for the 1st to 5th respondents / claimants further submitted that the restriction of time as in Section 166 (3) of Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 was deleted with effect from 14.11.1994 and therefore, the limitation 6 months + 6 months with a petition to condone delay in filing the claim petition has been done away. He further submits that each case has to be examined on merits.

8. He further submits that in any event, this was not a basis on which the claim petition was contested before the Tribunal by the appellant / Insurance Company. The learned counsel further submitted that as per the decision of the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in D.Srinivas Vyas Vs. Income Tax Officer, Anna Salai, Chennai - 600 006 in T.C.A.Nos.167 to 174 of 2012, the limitation was a mixed question of fact and law cannot be to the disadvantage of the respondents/claimants in the appeal for the first time.

9. It is submitted that the ground of limitation which is sought to be raised for the first time in this appeal cannot be decided in the present Civil Miscellaneous Appeal unless the 1st to 5th respondents/claimants were put to notice of such defence before the Tribunal at the first instance. There they would have explained the delay to the satisfaction of the Tribunal. Therefore, it is submitted that this appeal has to fail on this ground.

10. He further submits that as per Rule 4(1) (2) of TNMAC Rules, 1989, the onus was on the insurer to give particulars of the insurance and the accident vehicle. He further submits that this question also ought to have been raised before the Tribunal at the first instance in which case, the 1st to 5th respondents/claimants would have got an opportunity to defend themselves before the Tribunal. Since this ground has also been raised for the first time in this appeal, the present appeal has to fail.

11. The learned counsel for the 2nd to 4th respondents relied on the following decisions:-

i. D.Srinivas Vyas Vs. Income Tax Officer, 2016 SCC

OnLine Mad 6427.

ii. Periyasamy Vs. The Secretary, Dhanwanthari Service Society General Hospital, Judgment dated 25.08.2014 passed by this Court in C.M.A.Nos.1074 and 1532 of 2014.

iii. The Oriental Insurance Company Limited Vs. Sellammal and Others, 2014 SCC OnLine Made 9811 : (2015) TN MAC 354 (DB).

iv. The New India Assurance Co. Ltd. Vs. C.Padma and Another, 2003 (7) SCC 713.

12. I have considered the submissions of the learned counsel for the appellant and the 1st to 5th respondents. I have also perused the impugned Judgment and Decree and the case laws filed by the respective counsel in support of their contentions.

13. The deceased V.Mohan Raj was aged about 42 years who is said to have met with an accident on 17.09.1990. Ex.A1 FIR dated 18.09.1990 was registered before the jurisdictional police based on the complaint lodged by the deceased himself on the following day after the accident, after he was admitted in the hospital by third parties.

14. It appears that the complaint for registering Ex.A1 FIR was taken at the hospital when the deceased was admitted in the hospital on account of a medico legal case.

15. As per Ex.A1 FIR dated 18.09.1990 in C.C.No.360/91, the particulars of the person involved in the accident has been partly hand written though the other particulars of the vehicle are typed. As far as the details of injuries given in the FIR are as follows:-

i. Blood injuries in left palm, left arm fold, right hip and left ankle

ii. Simple injuries in chest and right side of the head.

16. Ex.A1 FIR also records that the deceased initially got discharged from the hospital as there were no attenders to attend him in hospital and was later readmitted in the hospital by his wife and a relative. Ex.A1 FIR confirms that the deceased V.Mohan Raj was a married person. Ex.A1 FIR also confirms the involvement of the insured vehicle bearing registration number TCC 6016 in the accident.

17. Ex.A2 is the Motor Vehicle Inspector's Report Inspector dated 18.09.1990 filed before the Judicial Magistrate No.V, Coimbatore. In Sl.No.13, there are no details of injury or death due to the accident. It merely states Section 279 (Rash and Negligent Driving) and 337 (Causing hurt by Act of endanger life or the personal safety of others) of

I.P.C as against the injuries. Sl.No.10 of Ex.A2 is silent regarding the insurance policy details of the accident vehicle.

18. The deceased V.Mohan Raj died on 20.10.1990 in the hospital as is evident from Ex.A4 Death Certificate dated 07.11.1990. Ex.A3 Postmortem Report dated 20.10.1990 has described the medical condition of the deceased V.Mohan Raj at the time of the death.

19. Ex.A3 Postmortem Report dated 20.10.1990 has concluded that the cause of the death was due to the neck injuries. Ex.A3 Postmortem Report dated 20.10.1990 indicates that the deceased was ill nourished and had bed sore all over his body and died due to neck injuries and the complication thereof. Unfortunately, the Accident Register has not been filed.

20.Thus, there is a variance in the description of the injuries suffered by the deceased as in Ex.A1 FIR and Ex.A3 Postmortem Report. All that can be inferred from a reading of Ex.A1 FIR and Ex.A3 Postmortem Report is that the deceased V.Mohan Raj died in the hospital while undergoing treatment and his death was not due to natural cause.

21. The ground work for filing claim petition on 15.03.2007 appears to have started only in April, 2002 with issue of Ex.A6 legal notice dated 09.04.2002 to the 6th to 8th respondents. This is almost ten and half years after the claim petition death of the deceased. Ex.A6 legal notice dated 09.04.2002 was issued in the name of the 1st respondent. She is described as wife of the deceased V.Mohan Raj.

22. It is also not clear as to why Ex.A6 legal notice dated 09.04.2002 was issued on behalf of the father of the deceased as he is a Class II heir. If indeed the claimants were the Class I heir of the deceased V.Mohanraj, there was no necessity to issue Ex.A6 in the name of the father of the deceased. It does raise a reasonable suspicion of foul play. However, these were not agitated and raised before the Tribunal.

23. It is also not clear as to why the claimants remained silent and did not take any steps to claim any compensation from the owner or the appellant Insurance Company earlier.

24. In Purohit and Company Vs. Khatoonbee and Another, AIR 2017 SC 1612, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that the claimants should approach the Tribunal within a reasonable time and the question of reasonability would depend on the facts and circumstances of the case.

25. There a delay of 28 years without reference to any other facts was held could not be considered as a prima facie

reasonable period, for approaching the Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal. The claim was held to be a stale claim and ought to have been treated as a dead claim, when the respondents approached the Tribunal by filing a claim petition on 23.02.2005.

26. In the present case also, the claimants have not given any reasons as to why the claim petition was filed belatedly on 15.03.2007 for an accident which took place on 17.09.1990. Further, on going through the Ex.A4 dated 07.11.1990 the death certificate, the name of the father of the deceased alone has been given. Name of the 1st respondent (since deceased) as the wife of the deceased V.Mohan Raj has not been given.

27. A suit was filed in O.S.No.4413 of 2004 on 29.08.2004 for declaring the claimants as legal representatives to succeed to the estate of the deceased V.Mohanraj. The suit was thereafter decreed exparte on 31.03.2005 as is evident from a reading of Ex.A.5 dated 31.03.2005.

28. There is no explanation as to why it took another two years for the 1st to 5th respondents/claimants to file the claim petition on 15.03.2007 after a lapse of two years. The delay is an enormous delay. These gaps do raise a reasonable doubt.

29. In the claim petition also, no reasons have disclosed for the delay in filing the claim petition. The appellant Insurance Company has also not contested the same before the Tribunal. This ground no doubt ought to have been taken before the Tribunal as a defence by the appellant Insurance Company. As delay is a mixed question of fact and law, it cannot be raised for the first time before this Court in an appeal. It was incumbent on the part of the claimants to explain the same in their claim petition. However, from a reading of Rule 4-A (4) of the Tamil Nadu Motor Vehicles Accidents Claims Tribunal Rules, 1989, it is evident that a claim petition need not be filed by the claimant(s). Same is reproduced below:-

> 4-A (1). Notwithstanding anything contained in rule 3 and 24, any Police Officer not below the rank of a Sub-Inspector of Police, who is entrusted with the investigation of the motor vehicles accident, shall, without waiting for the result of the investigation or prosecution and as expeditiously as possible get an application in Forms I and II appended to these rules from the party injured in the accident or all or any of the legal representatives of the deceased, as the case may be, and forward the same to the Claims Tribunal, who shall treat it an application for the purpose of Section 140 and 166 of the Act. The said Police Officer shall also gather full particulars of the Insurance Certificate in respect of the motor vehicle involved in

the accident and furnish them to the injured party or to the legal representatives of the deceased. The party concerned shall, before the Tribunal passes the award, pay the fee prescribed in rule 24.

(2). An officer investigating into an accident shall, after a case is registered forward copies of the First Information Report relating to the accident to (i) the Claims Tribunal having jurisdiction; and (ii). the President of the District Committee for Legal Aid and Advice concerned constituted by the Tamil Nadu State Legal Aid and Advice Board;

(3). An officer investigating into an accident shall, immediately after an accident is registered, also furnish the particulars to the nearest Legal Aid Committee or centre constituted by the Tamil Nadu State Legal Aid and Advice Board;

(4). Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-rule (3), the officer of the Transport Department inspecting the vehicle involved in an accident shall furnish immediately the following information to the Insurance Company with which the vehicle is insured:-

(i). Name and address of the owner of the vehicle;
(ii). Name of the driver and/or conductor;
(iii). Registration number of the vehicle;
(iv). Particulars of permits if any, in respect of the vehicle, with validity;
(v). Date of expiry of fitness certificate; and
(vi). Date of expiry of the insurance.

30. The above Rule is an exception to Rule 3 and Rule 25 of the Tamil Nadu Motor Vehicles Accidents Claims Tribunal Rules, 1989. As per the rules extracted above, a Police Officer not below rank of a Sub-Inspector of Police shall be entrusted with the investigation and shall without waiting for the result of the investigation or prosecution and as expeditiously as possible get an application in Forms I and II appended to these Rules from the party injured in the accident or all or any of the legal representatives of the deceased, as the case may be, and forward the same to the Claims Tribunal, who shall treat it an application for the purpose of Sections 140 and 166 of the Act.

31. Thus, it was incumbent on the part of the Sub-Inspector of Police to have forwarded a duly filled Forms I and II to the Tribunal. Thus, there is no scope for any delay

in filing a claim petition in Forms I and II appended to the above Rules as they are to be filled up by the Sub-Inspector investigating it who shall forward the same to the Claims Tribunal. The Claims Tribunal shall treat it an application for the purpose of Sections 140 and 166 of the Act. It is not clear as to why the above Rule was not followed.

32. Even otherwise, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Jai Prakash Vs. National Insurance Company Limited and Others, (2010) 2 SCC 607 has laid the following guidelines which are extracted below:-

> 21.For complying with Section 166(4) of the Act, the jurisdictional Motor Accidents Claims Tribunals shall initiate the following steps:
>
> (a) The Tribunal shall maintain an institution register for recording the AIRs which are received from the Station House Officers of the police stations and register them as miscellaneous petitions. If any private claim petitions are directly filed with reference to an AIR, they should also be recorded in the register.
>
> (b) The Tribunal shall list the AIRs as miscellaneous petitions. It shall fix a date for preliminary hearing so as to enable the police to notify such date to the victim (family of the victim in the event of death) and the owner, driver and insurer of the vehicle involved in the accident. Once the claimant(s) appear, the miscellaneous application shall be converted to claim petition. Where a claimant(s) file the claim petition even before the receipt of the AIR by the Tribunal, the AIR may be tagged to the claim petition.
>
> (c) The Tribunal shall enquire and satisfy itself that the AIR relates to a real accident and is not the result of any collusion and fabrication of an accident (by any "police officer-advocate-doctor" nexus, which has come to light in several cases).
>
> (d) The Tribunal shall by a summary enquiry ascertain the dependent family members/legal heirs. The jurisdictional police shall also enquire and submit the names of the dependent legal heirs.
>
> (e) The Tribunal shall categorise the claim cases registered, into those where the insurer disputes liability and those where the insurer does not dispute the liability.
>
> (f) Wherever the insurer does not dispute the liability under the policy, the Tribunal shall

make an endeavour to determine the compensation amount by a summary enquiry or refer the matter to the Lok Adalat for settlement, so as to dispose of the claim petition itself, within a time-frame not exceeding six months from the date of registration of the claim petition.

(g) The insurance companies shall be directed to deposit the admitted amount or the amount determined, with the Claims Tribunals within 30 days of determination. The Tribunals should ensure that the compensation amount is kept in a fixed deposit and disbursed as per the directions contained in Kerala SRTC v. Susamma Thomas [(1994) 2 SCC 176 : 1994 SCC (Cri) 335] .

(h) As the proceedings initiated in pursuance of Sections 158(6) and 166(4) of the Act are different in nature from an application by the victim(s) under Section 166(1) of the Act, Section 170 will not apply. The insurers will therefore be entitled to assist the Tribunal (either independently or with the owners of the vehicles) to verify the correctness in regard to the accident, injuries, age, income and dependants of the deceased victim and in determining the quantum of compensation.

33. The above suggestion of the Hon'ble Supreme Court is in line with the above Rules. Therefore, there was no necessity for the claimant to file a claim petition. Sub-Rule 4 to Rule 4-A which has been extracted above enjoins the Officer of the Transport Department inspecting the vehicle involved in the accident also to furnish particulars as prescribed therein to the Insurance Company with which the vehicle is insured.

34. It is only after considering the statement, if any, of the applicant recorded under Rule 5, the Tribunal has to pass order. Thus, it is the duty of the Police Officer not below the rank of the Sub-Inspector to file Forms I and II and it is the duty of the Officer of the Transport Department to have enquired and furnish details of the Insurance Policy/Certificate before the Tribunal.

35. Though Ex.A2 Motor Vehicles Inspector's Report is silent about the Insurance Policy, this defence ought to have been brought to the notice of the Tribunal by the appellant Insurance Company before the award was passed. The appellant Insurance Company failed to do so. In The Oriental Insurance Company Limited Vs. R.Mahendran and Another, 2016 SCC OnLine 23256 : (2016) 2 TN MAC 691, it was held unless insurer's particulars are given, no liability can be fixed on the Insurance Company. This view was reiterated in The Divisional Manager, United India Insurance Co. Ltd. Vs. Radhabai and

Others, Judgment dated 03.09.2020 passed by this Court in C.M.A.No.3594 of 2014, wherein, it was held as follows:-

> 8.In the case on hand also, the claimants have not given the full insurance particulars in their claim petition and M.V.I.Report (Ex.P2) also does not disclose the insurance particulars for the subject vehicle which was involved in the accident. Without insurance particulars, it is impossible for any Insurance Company to find out whether the subject vehicle has been insured with them or not.
>
> 9.For the foregoing reasons, the contention of the learned counsel for the Appellant will have to be necessarily accepted by this Court. The Tribunal has however, by an erroneous finding observed that the claimants have discharged their initial burden of proof that the appellant / Insurance Company is the insurer for the subject vehicle which was involved in the accident. This Court is of the considered view that the initial burden of the claimants has not been discharged in this case as observed by the Tribunal under the impugned Award.

36. I find that the decisions of this Court rendered in the above two case have not considered the scope of Rule 4-A (4)(ii) of the Tamil Nadu Motor Vehicles Accidents Claims Tribunal Rules, 1989. Therefore, the present Civil Miscellaneous Appeal also fails on this score.

37. Therefore, I am satisfied that the Tribunal was justified in awarding compensation to the 1st to 5th respondents/claimants though the claim was filed belatedly by taking advantage of the amendment to the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 deleting the period of limitation prescribed in Section 166(3) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 with effect from 14.11.1994.

38. The Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in National Insurance Company Limited., Pudukkottai Vs. Rani and others, 2004 (4) L.W.151 has merely followed the decision in Nagappa vs. Gurudayul Singh, (2003) 2 SCC 274, wherein, it has been emphasised that the Act was intended to award just compensation to the victim(s) or their dependents.

39. The income of Rs.3,000/- of the deceased as a watchman in the year of 1990 appears to be on a higher side.

The Tribunal has however accepted the same based on the statement contained in the claim petition. In absence of any other documents to substantiate that the deceased would have earned a sum of Rs.3,000/- per month, I am of the view that the same needs to be re-looked at and tweaked a bit.

40. In my view, a sum of Rs.1,500/- per month can be considered to be the reasonable notional income for computing the compensation as the deceased was a watchman. The deceased V.Mohan Raj was aged about 42 years at the time of the accident and death. Therefore, the correct multiplier to be adopted is 14 as per the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sarla Verma (Smt) and Others Vs. Delhi Transport Corporation and Another, (2009) 6 SCC 121. Similarly, the addition towards future prospects to be added in the income of the deceased V.Mohan Raj is 25% of the notional income as per the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in National Insurance Company Limited Vs. Pranay Sethi and Others, (2017) 16 SCC 680.

41. The deceased was supporting to the 1st to 5th respondents/claimants at the time of the accident and death. Therefore, the deduction towards personal expenses can be restricted to 1/4th of the notional income of the deceased and the balance for the contribution to his family.

42. Since the Tribunal has awarded only an amount of Rs.2,000/- towards funeral expenses. It is enhanced by another sum of Rs.1,000/- towards Transportation. Therefore, this Court totally awards a sum of Rs.3,000/- towards loss of funeral expenses and the transportation instead of compensation awarded by the Tribunal towards funeral expenses.

43. Since the 1st respondent/1st claimant died pending this appeal, no amount of compensation is ordered to be awarded towards loss of consortium. Therefore, a sum of Rs.10,000/- awarded towards loss of consortium by the Tribunal is liable to be disallowed applying the latin maxin Actio Personalis moritur-cum-personna" (a personal action dies with the parties to the cause of action). At the same time, compensation awarded by the Tribunal towards loss of love and affection to the 2nd to 5th respondents / 2nd to 5th claimants is confirmed. Similarly, amount awarded towards loss of estate by the Tribunal stands confirmed.

44. Therefore, a sum of Rs.4,14,500/- awarded as compensation by the Tribunal is re-quantified as follows:-

Heads and Calculation	Amount
Loss of dependency:- Monthly Income of the deceased - Rs.1,500/- Annual Income (1,500 x 12) : Rs.18,000/- Add: Future Prospects at 25% (18,000 x 25%) : Rs. 4,500/- ---------------- : Rs.22,500/- Less: Personal Expenses at 1/4th (22,500 x 1/4) : Rs. 5,625/- ---------------- : Rs.16,875/- ---------------- Multiplier 14 (16,875 x 14) : Rs.2,36,250/-	Rs.2,36,250/-
Loss of love and affection to 2nd to 5th respondents (Rs.10,000 x 4)	Rs. 40,000/-
Funeral Expenses and Transportation	Rs. 3,000/-
Loss of Estate	Rs. 2,500/-
Total	Rs.2,81,750/- Rounded off to Rs.2.82,000/-

Thus, the compensation of Rs.4,14,500/- awarded by the Tribunal is reduced to Rs.2,82,000/-.

46. The appellant Insurance Company is therefore directed to deposit the aforesaid amount of compensation of Rs.2,82,000/- together with interest at 7.5% per annum from the date of filing of the claim petition till the date of deposit and the costs awarded by the Tribunal, less any amount already deposited, within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this Judgment.

47. It is further noticed that by an order dated 23.06.2011, this Court directed the appellant Insurance Company to deposit the entire amount of compensation awarded by the Tribunal together with accrued interest and costs to the credit of M.C.O.P.No.508 of 2007 vide M.P.No.1 of 2011 in this Civil Miscellaneous Appeal.

48. Therefore, if the appellant Insurance Company had deposited the entire amount of compensation of Rs.4,14,500/- together with interest and costs pursuant to the above order of this Court, it is permitted to withdraw the balance amount after satisfying the re-quantified amount of compensation, by

filing suitable application before the Tribunal.

49. Since the surviving claimants, i.e, the 2nd to 5th respondents are the legal representatives of the deceased V.Mohan Raj and the 1st respondent/ 1st claimant, the above compensation of Rs.2,82,000/- together with interest and costs shall be shared equally between them. Therefore, the 2nd to 5th respondents are permitted to withdraw their respective share, less any amount already withdrawn by them and/or by the 1st respondent/1st claimant during her lifetime, by filing suitable application before the Tribunal.

50. Accordingly, this Civil Miscellaneous Appeal is partly allowed with the above observations. No cost. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar (CS-VIII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

jen

To:-

Additional District and Sessions Judge,
The Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal,
Fast Track Court No.3, Coimbatore.

Copy To

The Section Officer,
V.R. Section, High Court,
Madras.(2 copies)

+1cc to Mr.N.B.Surekha, Advocate, S.R.No. 39680
+1cc to Mr.P.M.Duraiswamy, Advocate, S.R.No. 39835

C.M.A.No.1711 of 2011
and M.P.No.1 of 2011

PM(CO)
GN(07/06/2021)