C.M.A.No.1808 of 2013

(Video Conferencing)

C.SARAVANAN, J.

Today, this case was listed under the caption "for being mentioned" at the instance of the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent Insurance Company in C.M.A.No.1808 of 2013 which was allowed on 28.08.2020.

2. The learned counsel for the 2nd respondent Insurance Company has pointed out that there is a mistake in the calculation in so far as the future prospects is concerned, inasmuch as there is no proof to substantiate that the deceased was a permanent employee. She further submits that as per decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **National Insurance Company Limited** Vs. **Pranay Sethi and Others**, (2017) 16 SCC 680, the future prospects of the deceased has to be considered as 40% and not 50%.

3. The learned counsel for the appellants/claimants objects and submits that the deceased was aged about 28 years and was a permanent

employee as an operator in an Industrial Unit and the salary certificate was marked as one of the Exhibits before the Tribunal. Therefore, he submits that the order passed is need not be modified.

4. I have carefully considered the submissions of the learned counsel for the appellants and the 2nd respondent Insurance Company.

5. Even though the submission of the learned counsel for the appellants/claimants is that the deceased was a permanent employee, there are no records to substantiate the same. Therefore, there was an error in the calculation. Accordingly, the calculation is re-quantified. Future prospects is calculated at 40% of the income in the tabular column in paragraph No.26. Accordingly, the order passed on 25.08.2020 stands modified. The operative portion of the order passed on 25.08.2020 (i.e., from 26th to 33rd Paragraphs) shall read as follows:-

> 26. At the same time the request for enhanced compensation for a sum of Rs.7,08,000/- over and above a sum of Rs.3,50,000/- already awarded is not in accordance with the principle enunciated in the above Judgments. The compensation is re-quantified in the light of the decision of the Hon'ble

Division Bench of this Court in **New India Assurance Company Limited.** Vs. **R.Nagaraj and Others**, 2018 SCC OnLine Mad 1356 : 2018 (2) TN MAC 40 DB, wherein, provisions of Order 41 Rule 33 was invoked even in the case where the claimants were not the appellants for awarding higher amount of compensation in an appeal filed by the Insurance Company. Therefore, the just compensation to be awarded to the claimants following the above decisions of the Court is as follows.-

Heads and Calculation		Re-quantified amount of this Court
Loss of dependency:-		
Monthly Income of the deceased fixed by the Tribunal	: Rs.6,000/-	
Add: Future Prospects at 40% (6,000 x 40%)	: Rs.2,400/-	

	: Rs.8,400/-	

Annual Income (8,400 x 12)	: Rs.1,00,800/-	
Less: Personal Expenses at 1/2nd (1,00,800 x 1/2)	: Rs. 50,400/-	

	: Rs. 50,400/-	

Multiplier 17 (50,400 x 17)	: Rs.8,56,800/-	

Heads and Calculation	Re-quantified amount of this Court
	Rs.8,56,800/-
Loss of Estate	Rs. 15,000/-
Funeral Expenses	Rs. 15,000/-
Loss of filial consortium	Rs. 40,000/-
Total	**Rs.9,26,800/-**

The total compensation is thus re-quantified as Rs.9,26,800/- and is rounded off to Rs.9,30,000/-.

27. In the result, the compensation is enhanced from Rs.3,50,000/- to Rs.9,30,000/-. Therefore, the 2nd respondent is directed to pay the enhanced amount of compensation of Rs.5,80,000/- (9,30,000 – 3,50,000) together with interest at 7.5% per annum from the date of the claim petition till the date of deposit, within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this Judgment.

28. If the 2nd respondent has not deposited the amount of compensation awarded by the Tribunal, it also directed to deposit the same together with interest and costs as directed by the Tribunal, less any amount already deposited, within the aforesaid period.

29. Since the compensation awarded by the Tribunal is re-quantified now, the 2nd to 4th appellants are directed to pay the necessary court fee on the enhanced amount of compensation, within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this Judgment and file the proof of payment of court fee before the Tribunal for withdrawing the compensation.

30. The re-quantified compensation of Rs.9,30,000/- shall

be apportioned as follows:-

1st appellant (since deceased)	Rs.3,25,000/-
2nd appellant (unmarried sister of deceased at the time of his death)	Rs.3,25,000/-
3rd appellant	Rs.1,40,000/-
4th appellant	Rs.1,40,000/-

31. Since the 1st appellant died during the pendency of this appeal, the 2nd to 4th appellants are entitled to succeed to estate of the 1st appellant equally. Therefore, the 2nd to 4th appellants are permitted to withdraw the share of the 1st appellant (since deceased) together with interest and proportionate costs equally, less any amount already withdrawn by the 1st appellant (since deceased) during his life time, by filing suitable application before the Tribunal.

32. The 2nd to 4th appellants are also permitted to withdraw their respective shares together with interest thereon and proportionate costs, less amount already withdrawn if any, by filing suitable application.

33. Accordingly, this Civil Miscellaneous Appeal is allowed. No cost.

5. The Registry is directed to carryout the above correction in the order and issue fresh order copy to the parties.

17.09.2020

jen

C.SARAVANAN, J.
jen

C.M.A.No.1808 of 2013

17.09.2020

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved On	03.08.2020
Pronounced On	25.08.2020

CORAM

THE HON'BLE **MR.JUSTICE C.SARAVANAN**

C.M.A.No.1808 of 2013

(Through Video Conferencing)

1.M.Kanniappan (died)

2.Komala

3.M.Navaneetham

4.K.Gunasundari ... Appellants

Vs.

1.Chithirai Vadivu
(Exparte in Lower Court)

2.M/s.Cholamandalam General Ins. Co. Ltd.,
Dare House, 2nd Floor,
N.S.C.Bose Road, Chennai – 600 001. ... Respondents

(A1 died. A2 to A4 as legal representatives of the deceased A1 M.Kanniappan were recorded vide order dated 03.08.2020 made in C.M.P.No.7897 of 2020)

Civil Miscellaneous Appeal filed under Section 173 of Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, against the Judgment and Decree made in M.C.O.P.No.2091 of 2009 on the file of City Civil Court, X Addl. & District Judge, I/c. of XV Additional Court, Chief Judge, Chennai dated 17th day of December 2012.

For Appellants : Mr.T.G.Balachandran

For R2 : M/s.R.Sreevidhya

JUDGMENT

The claimants are the appellants in this Civil Miscellaneous Appeal. They are aggrieved by the impugned Judgment and Decree dated 17.12.2012 passed by the Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal at Chennai presided over by the X Additional and District Judge in M.C.O.P.No.2091 of 2009.

2. By the impugned Judgment and Decree, the Tribunal has awarded a sum of Rs.3,50,000/- as compensation as against the claim amount of Rs.6,00,000/-, together with interest at 7.5% per annum from the date of the claim petition till the date of deposit, to the appellants/claimants.

3. During dependency of this appeal, the 1st appellant, the father of the deceased K.Murugan passed away and therefore an application was filed to record the other appellants as his legal representatives vide C.M.P.No.7897 of 2020 which was allowed on 03.08.2020.

4. In this appeal, the appellants/claimants seek for enhancement of compensation awarded by the Tribunal.

5. The appellants, who were the claimants before the Tribunal, filed the above claim petition before the Tribunal as legal representatives/dependents of the deceased K.Murugan, who died in an accident. At the time of the accident, the deceased was aged about 28 years and was stated to be working as an operator an industrial unit in Kanchipuram District and was earning a sum of Rs.7,618/- as income per month.

6. In the claim petition before the Tribunal, the appellants stated that on 10.05.2009, the deceased K.Murugan was travelling as a pillion

rider on a motorcycle driven by one Raja Selvam. When they were negotiating return to a petrol bunk, insured Innova Car bearing registration No TN-09-AW-1658 knocked the motorcycle, as a result of which, the deceased sustained grievous injury. He was taken for treatment in a private hospital and thereafter to the Government hospital, where he succumbed to injuries and died on 13.05.2009.

7. Before the Tribunal, the respondents denied the allegations and prayed for dismissal of the claim petition. The Tribunal after considering the evidence on record concluded that the driver of the issued Innova car bearing registration No. TN-09-AW-1658 was guilty of negligent driving in absence of any contrary evidence. The Tribunal held that the respondents were jointly and severally liable to pay the aforesaid compensation of Rs.3,50,000/- to the appellants/claimants.

8. In this appeal, the appellant have prayed for enhancement of compensation for the balance amount of Rs.2,50,000/-. However, during the course of argument, the learned counsel for the appellants submitted that the appellants were entitled for a total compensation of

Rs.15,17,000/- but had wrongly totaled it to Rs.10,58,000/- in the chart that submitted by the learned counsel for the appellants.

9 In other words, during the course of the argument, it was submitted that the appellants were entitled to a balance compensation of Rs.7,08,000/- over and above Rs.3,50,000/- and in excess of the amount claimed in the claim petition.

10. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent Insurance Company submitted that the 1st appellant who had since deceased, the father of the deceased K.Murugan was a class II heir while the 2nd to 4th appellants were the married sisters and unmarried sister respectively of the deceased K.Murugan and they were not the dependants of the deceased K.Murugan.

11. It is therefore submitted that the award passed by the Tribunal has to at best be confirmed in absence of an appeal /cross objection by the 2nd respondent Insurance Company against the impugned Judgment and Decree of the Tribunal.

12. Responding to the above submission made on behalf of the 2nd respondent Insurance Company, the learned counsel for the appellants submitted that the father of the deceased was a class II heir within the meaning of Hindu Succession Act 1956 and therefore entitled to claim compensation as a legal representative of the deceased in terms of Section 166 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988. Similarly, the sisters were also the dependants of the deceased K.Murugan within the meaning of the aforesaid provision.

13. He submits that nowhere in Section 166(1), the dependants alone can file a compensation application is mentioned but all the legal representatives alone can claim compensation especially blood sisters. Further legal representatives are not defined in the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988. It is submitted that only under the provisions of Fatal Accidents Act, 1855 for compensation of the death of a person, all L.Rs. can apply for compensation as per Clause 1 and Clause 2 heir as per Hindi Succession Act, 1956. Even though under Clause II father is the No.1 legal representative and sisters and brothers are No.2 legal

representatives. Now, he is dead so the legal heirship goes to all three sister.

14. In this connection reliance was placed on the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Gujarat State Road Transport Corporation, Ahmedabad** Vs. **Ramanbhai Prabhatbhai and Another**, 1987 (3) SCC 234.

15. The learned counsel for the appellants further submitted that the appellants are entitled for a just compensation under Section 168 of the Act and therefore prayed for enhancement of the compensation by another sum of Rs.11,67,000/-. Details of the calculation are as under:-

Heads and Calculation	Amount
<u>Loss of dependency</u>:- Monthly Income of the deceased fixed by the Tribunal : Rs.6,000/- Future prospects at 50% (6,000 x 50%) : Rs.3,000/- -------------- : Rs.9,000/-	

Heads and Calculation	Amount
Annual Income (9,000 x 12) : Rs.1,08,000/- Deduction towards personal expenses (1,08,000 x 1/4th = 27,000) : Rs. 27,000/- ------------------- : Rs. 81,000/- ------------------- Multiplier : 17 (81,000 x 17) : Rs.13,77,000/-	Rs.13,77,000/-
Loss of Estate	Rs. 15,000/-
Funeral Expenses	Rs. 15,000/-
Loss of love and affection	Rs. 1,00,000/-
Pain and sufferings	Rs. 10,000/-
Total	**Rs.15,17,000/-**
Less : Tribunal award amount	- Rs. 3,50,000/-
Amount of enhance of compensation in this Court	Rs.11,67,000/-

16. I have considered the arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the appellants and the 2nd respondent Insurance Company.

17. The expression used in Section 166 of the Act is legal representative. The expression is of much wider purport. A Division bench of this court in **New India Assurance Co Ltd** Vs. **Sasikala Devi**,

(2011) 7 MLJ 511 held that a brother of the deceased who was included as the legal representative of the deceased claimant was not dependent on the income of the deceased and therefore not entitled to claim compensation but was entitled to pecuniary compensation for the period from which the claim petition was filed to the period of death of the mother and the funeral expenses.

18. The question that needs to be answered in this Appeal is who are the “legal representatives” for the purpose of Section 166 (c) of the Act. The Act does not define the expression “legal representatives”. Under section 2 (11) of the Civil Procedure Code “legal representative” has been defined to mean a person in law represents the estate of a deceased person and includes any person who intermeddles with the estate of the deceased and where a party sues or is sued in a representative character, the person on whom the estate devolves on the death of the party suing or sued.

19. Therefore, the right to claim compensation has to be considered in the background of the right to entitlement. The expression

used in Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 is of much wider purport and therefore would not only include any person who is a legal heir and is dependent on the deceased for his survival and therefore entitled to succeed to the estate of the deceased but also include any person who is dependent on the income of the deceased who may not necessarily be a legal heir of the deceased.

20. In **Gujarat State Road Transport Corpn.** Vs. **Ramanbhai Prabhatbhai and Another**, (1987) 3 SCC 234, the Hon'ble Supreme Court while dealing with Section 110-A of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939 held as follows:-

> **11.** Clauses (*b*) and (*c*) of sub-section (1) of Section 110-A of the Act provide that an application for compensation arising out of an accident may be made where death has resulted from the accident by all or any of the legal representatives of the deceased or by any agent duly authorised by all or any of the legal representatives of the deceased. The proviso to sub-section (1) of Section 110-A provides that where all the legal representatives of the deceased have not joined in any such application for compensation, the application shall be made *on behalf of or for the benefit of all the legal representatives of the deceased* and the legal representatives who have not so joined shall be

impleaded as respondents to the application. The expression "legal representative" has not been defined in the Act. Section 2(11) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 defines "legal representative" as a person who in law represents the estate of a deceased person and includes any person who intermeddles with the estate of the deceased and where a party sues or is sued in a representative character the person on whom the estate devolves on the death of the party so suing or sued. The above definition, no doubt, in terms does not apply to a case before the Claims Tribunal but it has to be stated that even in ordinary parlance the said expression is understood almost in the same way in which it is defined in the Code of Civil Procedure. A legal representative ordinarily means a person who in law represents the estate of a deceased person or a person on whom the estate devolves on the death of an individual. Clause (*b*) of sub-section (1) of Section 110-A of the Act authorises all or any of the legal representatives of the deceased to make an application for compensation before the Claims Tribunal for the death of the deceased on account of a motor vehicle accident and clause (*c*) of that sub-section authorises any agent duly authorised by all or any of the legal representatives of the deceased to make it. The proviso to sub-section (1) of Section 110-A of the Act appears to be of some significance. It provides that the application for compensation shall be made on behalf of or for the benefit of all the legal representatives of the deceased. Section 110-A(1) of the Act thus expressly states that (*i*) an application for compensation may be made by the legal representatives of the deceased or their agent, and (*ii*) that such application shall be made on behalf of or for the benefit of all the legal representatives. Both the person or persons who can make an application for compensation and the persons for whose benefit such application can be made are thus indicated in Section 110-A of the Act. This section in a way is a substitute to the extent indicated above for the provisions of Section 1-A of the Fatal Accidents Act, 1855 which provides that "every such action or suit shall be for the benefit of the wife, husband, parent and child, if any, of the person whose death shall have been so caused, and shall be brought by and in the name of the executor, administrator or representative of the person deceased". While the Fatal Accidents Act, 1855 provides that such suit shall be for the benefit of the wife, husband, parent and child of the deceased. Section 110-A(1) of the Act says that the application shall be made on behalf of or for the benefit of the legal representatives of the deceased. A legal representative in a given case need not necessarily be a wife, husband, parent and child. It is further seen from Section 110-B of the Act that the Claims Tribunal is authorised to make an award determining the amount of compensation which appears to it to be just and specifying the person or persons to whom compensation shall be paid. This provision takes the place of the third para of Section 1-A of the Fatal Accidents Act, 1855 which provides that in every such action, the court may give such damages as it may think proportioned to the loss resulting from such death to the parties respectively, for whom and for whose benefit such action shall be brought. Persons for whose benefit such an application can be made and the manner in which the compensation awarded may be distributed amongst the persons for whose benefit the application is made are dealt with by Section 110-A and Section 110-B of the Act and to that extent the provisions of the Act do supersede the provisions of the Fatal Accidents Act, 1855 insofar as motor vehicle accidents are concerned. These provisions are not merely procedural provisions. They substantively affect the rights of the parties. As the right of action created by the Fatal Accidents Act, 1855 was "new in its species, new in its quality, new in its principles, in every way new" the right given to the legal representatives under the Act to file an application for compensation for death due to a motor vehicle accident is equally new and an enlarged one. This new right cannot be hedged in by all the limitations of an action under the Fatal Accidents Act, 1855. New situations and new dangers require new strategies and new remedies.

13. We feel that the view taken by the Gujarat High Court is in consonance with the principles of justice, equity and good conscience having regard to the conditions of the Indian society. Every legal representative who suffers on account of the death of a person due to a motor vehicle accident should have a remedy for realisation of compensation and that is provided by Sections 110-A to 110-F of the Act. These provisions are in consonance with the principles of law of torts that every injury must have a remedy. It is for the Motor Vehicles Accidents Tribunal to determine the compensation which appears to it to be just as provided in Section 110-B of the Act and to specify the person or persons to whom compensation shall be paid. The determination of the compensation payable and its apportionment as required by Section 110-B of the Act amongst the legal representatives for whose benefit an application may be filed under Section 110-A of the Act have to be done in accordance with well-known principles of law. We should remember that in an Indian family brothers, sisters and brothers' children and sometimes foster children live together and they are dependent upon the bread-winner of the family and if the bread-winner is killed on account of a motor vehicle accident, there is no justification to deny them compensation relying upon the provisions of the Fatal

> Accidents Act, 1855 which as we have already held has been substantially modified by the provisions contained in the Act in relation to cases arising out of motor vehicles accidents. We express our approval of the decision in ***Megjibhai Khimji Vira*** v. ***Chaturbhai Taljabhai*** [AIR 1977 Guj 195 : 1977 ACJ 253 : 1977 TAC 366] and hold that the brother of a person who dies in a motor vehicle accident is entitled to maintain a petition under Section 110-A of the Act if he is a legal representative of the deceased.

21. These provisions are pari materia with the provisions of Motor Vehicles Act, 1988.

22. In the present case, the mother of the deceased had predeceased him. Therefore, there is no difficulty in arriving to a conclusion that the 1st appellant being the aged father of the deceased (who has since deceased during the pendency of this appeal) and the unmarried sister of the deceased namely 4th appellant who were aged 59 and 24 respectively at the time of the death of the deceased K.Murugan were his dependents and were entitled to file claim petition for compensation. Therefore, for the purpose of determining the claim and for determination a just compensation for the purpose of section 168 of the Act, I am of the view that they were entitled to file claim petition.

The 2nd and the 3rd appellant being married sisters at the time of the accident cannot be said to the dependents of the deceased K Murugan in absence of any other evidence to support such a plea.

23. In my view, the Tribunal ought to have given a categorical conclusion on facts that only the 1st appellant (who has since deceased during the pendency of this appeal) and the 4th appellant alone were the dependents/legal representatives of the deceased K.Murugan for the purpose of Section 166 (c) of the Act. Since, the 1st appellant died during the pendency of the present appeal, the 2nd and 3rd appellants are to be treated as the legal representatives of the 1st appellant along with the 4th appellant as they would succeed to the estate of the 1st appellant.

24. Therefore the remaining issue and the point for determination in this appeal is whether the Tribunal had awarded a just compensation to the appellants?

25. The Tribunal has considered the income of the deceased as Rs.6,000/- as against a sum of Rs.7,618/-per month. The appellants have

also given the calculation for the enhanced compensation based on the aforesaid income arrived by the Tribunal. Therefore, the compensation payable is to be re-determined based on the decisions of the Supreme Court in **Sarla Verma (Smt) and Others** Vs. **Delhi Transport Corporation and Another**, (2009) 6 SCC 12; **National Insurance Company Limited** Vs. **Pranay Sethi and Others**, (2017) 16 SCC 680 and the decision of the Supreme Court and **Magma General Insurance Company Limited** Vs. **Nanuram @ Chuhru Ram and Others**, (2018) 18 SCC 130 : 2018 OnLine SC 1546 has Tribunal did not have the benefit of these Judgments when it passed the impugned Judgment and Decree.

26. At the same time the request for enhanced compensation for a sum of Rs.7,08,000/- over and above a sum of Rs.3,50,000/- already awarded is not in accordance with the principle enunciated in the above Judgments. The compensation is re-quantified in the light of the decision of the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in **New India Assurance Company Limited.** Vs. **R.Nagaraj and Others**, 2018 SCC OnLine Mad 1356 : 2018 (2) TN MAC 40 DB, wherein, provisions of Order 41 Rule

33 was invoked even in the case where the claimants were not the appellants for awarding higher amount of compensation in an appeal filed by the Insurance Company. Therefore, the just compensation to be awarded to the claimants following the above decisions of the Court is as follows.-

Heads and Calculation	Re-quantified amount of this Court
Loss of dependency:- Monthly Income of the deceased fixed by the Tribunal : Rs.6,000/- Add: Future Prospects at 50% (6,000 x 50%) : Rs.3,000/- --------------- : Rs.9,000/- --------------- Annual Income (9,000 x 12) : Rs.1,08,000/- Less: Personal Expenses at 1/2nd (1,08,000 x 1/2) : Rs. 54,000/- -------------------- : Rs. 54,000/- --------------------	

Heads and Calculation		Re-quantified amount of this Court
Multiplier 17 (54,000 x 17)	: Rs.9,18,000/-	Rs.9,18,000/-
Loss of Estate		Rs. 15,000/-
Funeral Expenses		Rs. 15,000/-
Loss of filial consortium		Rs. 40,000/-
Total		**Rs.9,88,000/-**

The total compensation is thus re-quantified as Rs.9,88,000/- and is rounded off to Rs.10,00,000/-.

27. In the result, the compensation is enhanced from Rs.3,50,000/- to Rs.10,00,000/-. Therefore, the 2nd respondent is directed to pay the enhanced amount of compensation of Rs.6,50,000/- (10,00,000 – 3,50,000) together with interest at 7.5% per annum from the date of the claim petition till the date of deposit, within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this Judgment.

28. If the 2nd respondent has not deposited the amount of compensation awarded by the Tribunal, it also directed to deposit the same together with interest and costs as directed by the Tribunal, less any amount already deposited, within the aforesaid period.

29. Since the compensation awarded by the Tribunal is re-quantified now, the 2nd to 4th appellants are directed to pay the deficit court fee on the enhanced amount of compensation, within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this Judgment and file the proof of payment of deficit court fee before the Tribunal for withdrawing the compensation.

30. The re-quantified compensation of Rs.10,00,000/- shall be apportioned as follows:-

1st appellant (since deceased)	35% (10,00,000 x 35/100)	Rs.3,50,000/-
2nd appellant (unmarried sister of deceased at the time of his death)	35% (10,00,000 x 35/100)	Rs.3,50,000/-
3rd appellant	15% (10,00,000 x 15/100)	Rs.1,50,000/-
4th appellant	15% (10,00,000 x 15/100)	Rs.1,50,000/-

31. Since the 1st appellant died during the pendency of this appeal, the 2nd to 4th appellants are entitled to succeed to estate of the 1st appellant equally. Therefore, the 2nd to 4th appellants are permitted to withdraw the share of the 1st appellant (since deceased) together with interest and proportionate costs equally, less any amount already withdrawn by the 1st

appellant (since deceased) during his life time, by filing suitable application before the Tribunal.

32. The 2nd to 4th appellants are also permitted to withdraw their respective shares together with interest thereon and proportionate costs, less amount already withdrawn if any, by filing suitable application.

33. Accordingly, this Civil Miscellaneous Appeal is allowed. No cost.

25.08.2020

jen
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No

Notes:-In view of the present lock down owing to COVID-19 pandemic, a web copy of the order may be utilized for official purposes, but, ensuring that the copy of the order that is presented is the correct copy, shall be the responsibility of the advocate / litigant concerned.

To:
The Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal,
(City Civil Court, Chennai),
Chennai.

C.SARAVANAN, J.

jen

Pre-delivery Judgment made
in
C.M.A.No.1808 of 2013

25.08.2020