

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

1. Civil Revision No. 300 of 2016 (O&M)

Oriental Bank of Commerce

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Kurukshetra and Others

... Respondent(s)

AND

2. Civil Revision No. 461 of 2016 (O&M)

Oriental Bank of Commerce

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Kurukshetra and Others

... Respondent(s)

DATE OF DECISION: 19.07.2023

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal.

Present: Mr. Amarjit Singh Virk, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Sandeep K. Sharma, Advocate
for the respondent No.2 to 5.

Anil Kshetarpal, J.

1. These two connected revision petitions have come up for final disposal. The public sector bank assails the correctness of the order dated 02.05.2015 passed by the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Kurukshetra (hereinafter referred to as “the Tribunal”).

2. In substance, the dispute that arises for adjudication is with regard to the difference in payment of the rate of interest to the claimant.

**Civil Revision No. 300 of 2016 (O&M) AND
Civil Revision No. 461 of 2016 (O&M)**

The question is, “Whether the claimant is entitled to the interest at the rate which is payable against the fixed deposit receipt or on a saving bank account?” At the most, the case of the petitioner-bank is that a fixed deposit receipt for a particular period was never renewed by the court official within a prescribed period and, hence, the interest payable to a saving bank account holder is payable on the amount deposited.

3. Keeping in view the fact that the claimant was a minor, hence, the Tribunal, in the year 1998, created the fixed deposit receipt for a period of three years which was valid upto the year 2001. However, the same was never renewed by the court official. The amount remained with the bank upto 14.03.2012. As per the instructions issued by the bank, the fixed deposit receipt could be renewed, retrospectively, within a period of ten years. However, there was some delay.

4. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts of the case, the delay shall stand condoned. The order passed by the Tribunal is in the interest of justice. Hence, no ground is made out to interfere. Consequently, both the revision petitions are dismissed.

5. The miscellaneous application(s) pending, if any, in both the revision petitions shall stand disposed of.

**(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge**

July 19, 2023
“DK”

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