

**(Heard through Video Conferencing)**

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

**FAO-1978 of 2018 (O&M)  
DATE OF DECISION: 06.04.2021**

Union of India

...Appellant

Versus

Balbir Singh and another

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA**

Argued by: Mr. K.K. Kahlon, Advocate, and  
Mr. Vikas Chatrath, Advocate,  
for the appellants.

Mr. Anand Singh, Advocate,  
for respondents No.1, 2, 4 & 5.

Mr. Anurag Sharma, Advocate,  
For respondent No.3.

\*\*\*

**ARUN MONGA, J.**

Impugned herein is the judgment dated 08.02.2018 passed by the learned Railway Claims Tribunal, Chandigarh (hereafter referred to as the Tribunal), directing the appellant to pay to the respondents a compensation of Rs. 8 lakhs with interest @ 6% per annum from 16.09.2015 (the date of registration of the claim application) till the date of the impugned order.

2. The claim arose out of an untoward incident dated 07.07.2015 resulting into the death of Rajat Jasrotia, a young student of Army Public School, Jalandhar Cantt. Respondents are his unfortunate parents.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant argued that the Tribunal erred in holding that the appellant was negligent and liable to pay

compensation; that against the claim for compensation of Rs. 4 lakhs, as per the norms prevailing at the relevant time, the Tribunal wrongly awarded compensation of Rs. 8 lakhs and that it also erred in further awarding interest on the compensation amount.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents has defended the award.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for parties with their able assistance gone through the record.

6. The order of the learned Tribunal contains cogent and convincing reasons based on record, for holding that the untoward incident occurred due the negligence of the appellant. On perusal of the record, I am also inclined to agree with the said finding.

7. Admittedly, the schedule to the Railway Accidents and Untoward, Incidents (Compensating) Rules, 1990 fixing the amount of compensation was amended with effect from 01.01.2017, revising the amount of compensation in such cases from Rs. 4 lakhs and to Rs. 8 lakhs.

8. In *Union of India v. Rina Devi 2018(3) RCR(Civil) 40*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India held as under:

*“15. We now propose to deal with the following issues seriatim:*

*(i) Whether quantum of compensation should be as per the prescribed rate of compensation as on the date of application/incident or on the date of order awarding compensation:*

Xxx                      xxxx

***Re(i) Quantum of compensation***

Xxx                      xxxx

15.4 *Accordingly, we conclude that the compensation will be payable as applicable on the date of the accident with interest as may be considered reasonable from time to time on the same pattern as in accident claim cases. If the amount so calculated is less than the amount prescribed as on the date of the award of the Tribunal, the claimant will be entitled to higher of the two amounts. This order will not affect the awards which have already*

*become final and where limitation for challenging such orders has expired. This order will not by itself be a ground for condonation of delay. Seeming conflict in Rathi Menon (supra) and Kalandi Charan Sahoo (supra) stands explained accordingly. The 4-Judge Bench judgment in Pratap Narain Singh Deo (supra) holds the field on the subject and squarely applies to the present situation. Compensation as applicable on the date of the accident has to be given with reasonable interest and to give effect to the beneficial legislation, if compensation as provided on the date of the award of the Tribunal is higher than unrevised amount with interest, the higher of the two amounts has to be given.*

*Xxx xxxxxxxx”*

9. It is obvious that at the time of passing the judgment in Rina Devi (supra), the Hon'ble Apex Court took into account the element of past interest, while extending the benefit of revised higher compensation in those cases also which pertained to the period prior to 01.01.2017, but were then pending or had not attained finality, and which would otherwise attract the unrevised lower rate of compensation.

10. In present case, the claim application was registered on 16.09.2015. Impugned judgment was rendered on 08.02.2018. In the meantime, the amended schedule came to effect from 01.01.2017, revising the amount of compensation in such cases from Rs. 4 lakhs and to Rs. 8 lakhs. If interest @ 6% from 16.09.2015 (the date of registration of the claim application) as awarded by the learned Tribunal or even from 07.07.2015, the date of untoward incident is added to prescribed rate of compensation of Rs. 4 lakhs in the unrevised schedule, the total would be less than Rs. 8 lakhs. This being the situation and in view of the judgment *ibid*, I am of the opinion that the learned Tribunal rightly awarded the compensation of Rs. 8 lakhs. Merely because in the claim application, the claimants had sought compensation of Rs. 4 lakhs is inconsequential.

11. However, for the reasons stated above, I am of the opinion that the learned Tribunal erred in further awarding interest on Rs. 8 lakhs from 16.09.2015 (the date of registration of the claim application) till the date of the impugned order.

12. None-the-less, it is necessary in the interest of justice that appropriate provision be made by the Court to ensure expeditious payment of compensation amount to the respondents. Section 34 of the Code of Civil Procedure contains general provision for future interest in money decrees.

13. As a result, it is directed that the amount of compensation of Rs. 8 lakhs be paid in equal shares to the respondents within two months from the receipt of certified copy of the order, otherwise the same shall bear interest @ 9% per annum from the date of this order.

14. The impugned order/award is modified and appeal is disposed of accordingly.

15. Pending applications, if any, stand also disposed of.

**06.04.2021**  
Jiten

**(ARUN MONGA)**  
**JUDGE**

**Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No**  
**Whether reportable : Yes/No**