

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

FAO No.265 of 2001

Date of Decision: 11.03.2024

Iqbal Singh

...Appellant

Versus

Manager, Ajit Transport Company Regd & Anr.

...Respondents

**CORAM:** ***HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA***

Present:- Ms. Sonia G. Singh Samber, Advocate  
for the appellant.

Respondent No.1 proceeded against *ex-parte*  
vide the order dated 06.02.2002.

Mr. Harsh Aggarwal, Advocate  
for respondent No.2-Insurance Company.

\*\*\*\*\*

**MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J. (Oral)**

Feeling aggrieved and dis-satisfied with the order passed by the Commissioner, Workmen Compensation and Assistant Labour Commissioner, at Sangrur (for short 'the Competent Authority') on 14.02.2000, whereby the appellant-claimant (here-in-after to be referred as 'the claimant') has been awarded compensation to the tune of Rs.17,445.72Ps, along-with interest @ 6% per annum from the date of accident, on account of the injuries suffered by him and the penalty to the extent of 50% of the above-said amount has also been imposed, he (claimant) has chosen to prefer the instant appeal to seek the enhancement in the amount of compensation.

2. Bereft of the unnecessary details, the facts, emanating from the perusal of the file and resulting in the filing of the present appeal, are that the

claimant filed a claim application for seeking compensation of Rs.40,000/- from respondent No.1-employer and respondent No.2-Insurance Company, while averring that he had been working with respondent No.1 as 'Conductor' on the Bus bearing registration No.PB-11-B/9185. On 29.06.1993, when he was going in the afore-said Bus from Nabha to Sangrur, during the course of his employment, the leaf-spring (*kamani patta*) of the Bus broke down which led to an accident resulting in the injuries on his left leg. The respondents filed their written-statements and controverted the claim of the claimant therein, on various grounds. Then, the parties were put to the trial by framing the issues and after appreciating and evaluating the evidence led by them on the record and hearing their respective counsel, the Competent Authority allowed the above-referred claim application and granted compensation to the claimant, as already discussed in the opening para of this judgment.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the appellant-claimant as well as learned counsel for respondent No.2-Insurance Company in the instant appeal and have also perused the file carefully.

4. Learned counsel for the claimant has submitted the copy of the Disability-Certificate of the claimant (Exhibit P-3), in the Court wherein he is shown to have suffered 15% permanent disability and she contends that the claimant has, thus, become crippled for the rest of his life due to the injuries as suffered by him in the afore-said accident but the Competent Authority has awarded the above-mentioned meagre amount as compensation for the same and hence, he is entitled to the enhancement in the afore-detailed amount.

5. Per-contra, learned counsel for respondent No.2-Insurance Company argues that the claimant has already been sufficiently and suitably

compensated by the Competent Authority and therefore, he has no occasion to ask for any further enhancement in the amount of compensation.

6. As per the above-referred Disability-Certificate, the claimant had suffered 15% permanent disability due to the shortening of his left limb by  $\frac{1}{2}$  inch. A perusal of the impugned order reveals that the Competent Authority has calculated the amount of compensation by taking the afore-said disability into consideration. The claimant has not able to show as to how the above-mentioned calculation is wrong/incorrect.

7. As a sequel to the fore-going discussion, it follows that the impugned order does not suffer from any illegality, infirmity, irregularity or perversity so as to warrant any interference by this Court. Resultantly, the same is upheld and the appeal in hand, being *sans* any merit, stands dismissed.

11.03.2024  
pooja

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)  
JUDGE

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