IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

FIRST APPEAL NO. 2556 OF 2016

Sunanda W/o Anand Uplanchewar
Age- 48 years, Occ. Household,
R/o. 107, Mangalwar Peth,
Behind Kamala Devi Hospital
Sidhi Balaji Heights, Flat No. 7,
3rd Floor, Pune-11. ....APPELLANT
[Orig. Claimant]

VERSUS

1. Jogindarsingh Guljarsingh Khaira
Age- Major, Occ- Business,
R/o. Dashmesh Nagar, Nanded,
Tq. & Dist. Nanded.

2. The Branch Manager,
United India Insurance Co. Ltd.
Dayawan Complex, Station Road,
Parbhani, Tq. & Dist. Parbhani. .....RESPONDENTS
[Orig. Respondents]

.....

Mr. P.N. Kalani, Advocate for appellant
Mr. P.B. Kulkarni h/f Mr. N.B. Narwadkar, Advocate for respondent No. 1
Mr. A.B. Gatne, Advocate for respondent No. 2

....

CORAM : NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI, J.

DATE : 20th AUGUST, 2024

ORAL JUDGMENT :

1. Admit. Heard finally.

2. By this appeal, claimant challenges judgment and award passed by Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Parbhani, in Motor Accident Claim Petition No. 263 of 2013.

3. On 05.03.2013, Anand Chandrakant Uplanchewar, wife Sunanda Uplanchewar, son Ankush, daughter Ankita, sister-in-law Shubhangi, brother-in-law Tanju and niece Shweta were proceeding to Parbhani for the program of Dohal-jewan of Uma Uplanchewar in Omni car bearing registration No. MH-12-GR-6584. Anand was driving the car. At about, 6.00 to 6.30 am, when their car reached near Panhera shivar on Pathri-Parbhani road, at that time, one truck bearing registration No. MH-26-H-6313 came from opposite direction in rash and negligent manner and gave severe dash to the car of claimants. Due to the accident, Anand, Ankush and Ankita and one more inmate in the car expired on the spot and rest of the occupants of the car were injured.

4. Claimant filed Motor Accident Claim Petition No. 263/2013 claiming compensation of Rs. 34,40,500/-.

The Tribunal after hearing the parties partly allowed the claim by awarding compensation of Rs. 22,60,000/- along with 7.5% interest per annum. Claimant is aggrieved by non grant of compensation under the head, 'future prospects' by the Tribunal.

5. Heard learned advocate for claimant, learned advocate for respondent No. 1 and learned advocate for respondent No. 2. Perused the record.

6. Learned advocate for claimant submits that the Tribunal has erred in denying compensation under the head future prospects. In view of decision in ***Smt. Sarla Verma and others vs. Delhi Transport Corporation and Another***, (2009) 6 SCC 121 and ***National Insurance Company Limited vs. Pranay Sethi and others***, (2017) 16 SCC 680, claimant is entitled for 15% addition towards future prospects.

7. Learned advocate for insurance company, on the other hand, strenuously opposed the claim of claimant contending that Tribunal has rightly denied compensation under the head future prospects by relying on decision of this Court in ***New India Insurance Co. Vs. Alpa Rajesh Shah***, 2013 C.J. (Bom) 1623.

8. Learned advocate for respondent No. 1/owner opposed the claim contending that insurance company is liable to the compensation and not the owner.

9. Perusal of record shows that accidental death of

deceased is not in dispute. Claimant Sunanda is the eye witness to the accident. The Tribunal by relying on the version of claimant Sunanda and police papers has rightly held that accident has occurred due to rash and negligent driving of the truck.

10. In support of contention that deceased was serving in Army Base Workshop, Kirkee, Pune and was drawing salary of Rs. 28,326/- per month, PW 2 Dilipkumar Sarjerao was examined who was serving as accounts officer in the army. He has deposed that deceased Anand was drawing salary of Rs. 28,326/- and also placed on record salary certificates.

11. The Tribunal held gross salary of deceased at Rs. 28,326/- and assessed net salary at Rs. 25,000/- and further assessed notional income of deceased at Rs. 3,00,000/-. Considering the dependency, Tribunal has deducted 1/3rd amount towards personal expenses and has assessed Rs. 2,00,000/- as annual dependency. The Tribunal has further observed that "*as there is no evidence brought on record in respect of future prospectus in view of principle laid down in New India Insurance Co. Vs. Alpa Rajesh Shah (cited supra) claim in respect of future prospectus cannot be considered*."

12. The Tribunal erred in placing reliance on the above ratio ignoring the fact that in this case deceased was in Government service and drawing salary and he was not self-employed. The Tribunal has also ignored the ratio in Pranay Sethi (supra) that;

> *"58. ------------. Judicial notice can be taken of the fact that salary does not remain the same. When a person is in a permanent job, there is always an enhancement due to one reason or the other. To lay down as a thumb rule that there will be no addition after 50 years will be an unacceptable concept."*

13. Reliance is placed on paragraph 59.3 of Pranay Sethi (supra) by learned advocate for insurance company to contend that claimant may be entitled for 15% future prospects. Para 59.3 reads thus:

> *"59.3 While determining the income, an addition of 50% of actual salary to the income of the deceased towards future prospects, where the deceased had a permanent job and was below the age of 40 years, should be made. The addition should be 30%, if the age of the deceased was between 40 to 50 years. In case the deceased was between the age of 50 to 60 years, the addition should be 15%. Actual salary should be read as actual salary less tax."*

14. In the same judgment, para 59.4 reads thus:

"59.4. In case the deceased was self-employed or on a fixed salary, an addition of 40% of the established income should be the warrant where the deceased was below the age of 40 years. An addition of 25% where the deceased was between the age of 40 t0 50 years and 10% where the deceased was between the age of 50 t0 60 years should be regarded as the necessary method of computation. The established income means the income minus the tax component."

15. Learned advocate for insurance company has vehemently submitted that only wife is the claimant in the present matter and therefore 50% amount should have been deducted by the Tribunal towards personal expenses. The Tribunal has erred in deducting 1/3rd amount towards personal expenses. After deducting half amount, future prospects may be awarded.

In reply, learned advocate for claimant submits that even son of the deceased namely Ankush has expired in the said accident and daughter-in-law and grand son of the deceased were dependent on deceased and therefore, Tribunal has rightly deducted 1/3rd amount towards personal expenses.

16. Be that as it may, admittedly, insurance company has not filed appeal challenging the said aspect of deduction of 1/3rd amount towards personal expenses. Hence, this Court is not

inclined to accept the submission of insurance company.

17. In view of observations in the above quoted paragraph, since deceased was in a Government service, an addition of 15% of the established income needs to be made as the deceased was above the age of 50 years. The established income of the deceased is Rs. 25,000/- per month and annual income is Rs. 3,00,000/-, in which 15% addition of Rs. 45,000/- needs to be made towards future prospects. Claimant is therefore entitled for following compensation.

Sr. No.	Heads	Amount (Rs.)
1	Notional Income Rs. 25,000+ future prospects @ 15% i.e. 3,750/-	28,750/-
2	Annual Notional Income 28750 x 12	3,45,000/-
3	Less 1/3rd Deduction i.e. Rs. (3,45,000 – 1,15,000)	2,30,000/-
4	Annual Notional Income Multiplied by multiplier of 11 (2,30,000 x 11)	25,30,000/-
5	Non Pecuniary damages awarded by Tribunal: i)Loss of Consortium and love and affection- 50,000/- ii) Funeral Expenses- 10,000/-	60,000/-
6	Total Compensation needs to be awarded	25,90,000/-
7	Compensation awarded by Tribunal	22,60,000/-

8	**Total Enhanced compensation (25,90,000 – 22,60,000)**	**3,30,000/-**

18. In the result, following order:

ORDER

(I) First Appeal is partly allowed with proportionate costs.

(II) Impugned judgment and award dated 29.12.2015, passed by Chairman, Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Parbhani in M.A.C.P. No. 263/2013 is hereby modified.

(III) Respondents No. 1 and 2 are jointly and severally held liable to pay enhanced compensation of Rs. 3,30,000/- to the claimant.

(IV) Claimant shall be entitled for interest @ 7.5 per annum on the enhanced compensation from the date of filing of claim till realization.

V) Insurance Company shall deposit enhanced compensation along with accrued interest in the Tribunal within 12 weeks from the date of uploading of this judgment.

(VI) Claimant to pay additional Court fees on enhanced amount as per rules.

[NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI, J.]

Bhagyawant Punde