



FAO-3312-2007 (O&M)

-1-

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

FAO-3312-2007 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 05.12.2024

Smt. Manju and others

.....Appellants

Vs.

Laxman Singh and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Vikas Kumar Rana, Advocate, and
Mr. Ram Lal Yadav, Advocate, for
Mr. Lokesh Sinhal, Advocate,
for the appellants.

Mr. Vinod Gupta, Advocate,
for respondent No.3-Insurance Company.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA J.

1. The present appeal has been preferred against the award dated 18.04.2007 passed in the claim petition filed under Section 166 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 by the learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Faridabad (for short, 'the Tribunal'), whereby the claim petition filed by the appellants/claimants, was dismissed.

FACTS NOT IN DISPUTE

2. The brief facts of the case are that on 24.01.2005, Ved Parkash (since deceased) alongwith Khem Chand was travelling on a motorcycle bearing registration No.HR-29-K-5572, which was being driven by Ved Parkash, while Khem Chand was pillion rider. When they reached near



Sugarcane Kanta at village Nariyala at about 7:00 P.M, a tractor trolley, which was being reversed, struck against the motorcycle. As a result thereof, both the riders fell down and sustained grievous injuries. Due to grievous injuries, Ved Parkash succumbed there on the spot whereas, Khem Chand was referred to a Nursing Home for treatment. In this regard, FIR was registered by one Prabhu Dayal against driver of the offending vehicle i.e. respondent No.1.

3. Upon notice of the claim petition, respondents appeared and filed written reply denying the factum of accident/compensation.

4. From the pleadings of the parties, the Tribunal framed the following issues:-

“1) Whether the accident in question took place due to rash and negligent driving of tractor No.HR-30-B-2998 by Laxman Singh respondent No.1? OPP.

2) Whether the petitioners are entitled to compensation? If so how much and from whom? OPP.

3) Whether the petition is not maintainable in the present form? OPR.

4) Whether the petition is bad for non-joinder and misjoinder of parties? OPR.

5) Whether the petitioners have no locus standi and cause of action to file the present petition? OPR.

6) Relief.”

5. After taking into consideration the pleadings and the evidence on record, the learned Tribunal dismissed the claim petition. Hence, the present appeal.

**SUBMISSIONS OF THE LEARNED COUNSELS FOR THE PARTIES**

6. The learned counsel for the claimants/appellants contends that the learned Tribunal has wrongly dismissed the claim petition by deciding issue No.1 against the appellants/claimants after holding that they have failed to prove that the accident was caused due to rash and negligent driving of respondent No.1 (driver) and has not appreciated the evidence in correct perspective while deciding their claim petition. The findings arrived at by the learned Tribunal are based on the conjectures and surmises and wrongly held that the tractor bearing registration No. HR-30-B-2998 was not involved in the accident. Even, FIR was registered against respondent No.1 (driver) under Sections 283, 337 and 304-A IPC at Police Station Chhainsa, District Faridabad. He further contends that the learned Tribunal has erred while assessing the monthly income of the deceased as Rs.2,500/- per month whereas, appellants/claimants have proved on record that deceased was working as an Apprentice with DHBVNL. After the completion of his apprenticeship, he would have got appointment as a Lineman and would draw a salary in the pay scale of Rs.4,500-7,000. Therefore, he prays that the award deserves to be set aside and compensation needs to be awarded to the claimants/appellants, as per the latest law.

7. *Per contra*, learned counsel for respondent No.3-Insurance Company, however, vehemently argues that the award does not suffer from any illegality and infirmity and the claim petition has rightly been dismissed by the learned Tribunal. Therefore, he prays for dismissal of the present appeal.



8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the whole record of this case.

9. The relevant portion of the award is reproduced as under:-

“Issue No.1 :

7. *The claimants in order to prove this issue had examined Khem Chand PW-1. He stated that he alongwith Ved Parkash was coming from Ballabgarh to Mohna on motorcycle on 24.1.2005 and when they were near the weigh-bridge near village Nariyala at about 7.00 p.m., a tractor trolley was reversing and Ved Parkash blew the horn but the tractor trolley came and hit the motor cycle and Ved Parkash was run over and he became unconscious. He stated that he sustained injuries in the accident and the scars were still visible on the forehead. He stated that he regained consciousness after 5-6 days in a Nursing Home at Mohna but he could not recollect the name of Nursing Home. He stated that he had seen the tractor trolley reversing and there was no vehicle in between. He stated that he had not gone to the police station in connection with the accident nor the police had recorded his statement. He stated that he did not tell the registration number of the vehicle to anybody.*

8. *Prabhu Dayal PW4 deposed that Khem Chand and Ved Parkash had gone from village Mohna to Ballabgarh and they had left the village at 9.00 a.m. and the same evening at 8.00 p.m., he received information from some one that the motor cycle had met with an accident and he reached the spot alongwith 5-6 persons and saw the motor cycle lying with the tractor trolle and both the riders were lying on the spot and Khem Chand was a little conscious and Ved Parkash had died and Khem*



Chand had told him that it was dark and motor cycle hit the tractor trolly from behind and thereafter, Khem Chand became unconscious and they were shifted to the hospital and he had made a statement Ex.P2 on which the FIR was lodged.

9. *Laxman Singh RWI stated that no accident was caused by him while driving the tractor and the tractor was at their house in village Ghorl and the trolley was in their field. In the cross-examination, he admitted that he was facing trial.*

10. *The onus of this issue was upon the claimants and they were to prove the involvement of the tractor and they were also to show that the tractor was being driven by respondent no.1. Counsel for the claimants had taken me through the pleadings and had urged that the version given in the claim petition was the same as given in the first information report and the tractor trolley was reversing and it came and hit the motor cycle and that is how the accident occurred and there was no discrepancy or contradiction.*

11. *On the other hand, it was urged that the case was full of contradictions and at each point there is a variation and the tractor has been falsely involved and the facts have been twisted to suit the claimants. It was urged that the first version given to the police is contained in the FIR which was lodged on 24.1.2005 at 8.00 p.m. and according to this, the tractor trolley was parked and the accident occurred as it was night and the motor cycle hit the tractor trolley from behind and it was also mentioned in the FIR that the tractor trolley did not have any mark of identification or number and the story given in the petition was different and it does not speak*



about the trolley reversing. It was urged that if the tractor trolley was reversing and according to Khem Chand, they had seen it from a distance of 2.5 killas then the motor cyclist should have taken care. It was urged that Khem Chand was not an eye-witness nor his name was mentioned in the FIR and he is an introduced witness. It was urged that Prabhu Dayal had reached the spot after the accident and since the FIR was against an unknown vehicle and there was variance in his statement, the statement of the witness should be disbelieved and it was a case where motor cyclist had hit the trolley from behind which proves that the deceased was himself negligent and the evidence led on the file is beyond pleadings and is, therefore, to be disbelieved. Reliance was placed by Counsel for respondents 1 & 2 on Tarak Mandal & Anr. Versus Hari Bhagwan & Ors., II ACC 24 (Rajasthan); Ram Karan & Ors. Versus Zile Singh & Or(2002) ACC 15 (P&H); Smt. Sarli Devi Versus Mool Chand & Ors., III (2003) ACC 428 (P&H); and Smt.Kokilbai & Anr. Versus Abdul Baha, III (2003) ACC 526 (DB) (Madya Pradesh). Counsel for Insurance Company had placed reliance on Minu B. Mehta and another Versus Balkrishna Ramchandra Nayan and another, 1977 ACJ 118 (Supreme Court); Surinder Kaur and others Versus Raj Kumar and others, 199(3) PLR 709 (P&H; C.N. Krishna Murthy Versus P. Shashidhara Murthy and others, 1999 ACJ 601 (Karnataka); Chintaman Sadashiv Deshpande Versus Maharashtra State Road Transport Corporation, 1986 ACJ 191 (Bombay); Indro Devi Versus Hari Ram Malhotra & Ors., II (1997) ACC 515 (DB) (Himachal Pradesh); Kiran Wati and others Versus Hari Singh and others,



1992 ACJ 68 (P&H); Ram Karan Versus Zile Singh, 2001(3) RCR (Civil) 582 (P&H); Oriental Insurance Company Ltd. Versus Rachna & Ors., I(2002) ACC 608 (P&H); The Unique Motor and General Insurance Co. Ltd. And another Versus The New India Assurance Co. Ltd. And others, 1967 ACJ 317 (Punjab); Vimala and others Versus Devadoss and others, 1993 ACJ 321 (Madras); Smt. Pamela Gambhir Versus Smt.Santosh Nayyar, 2001(2) RCR (Civil) 337 (P&H); New India Assurance Company Limited Versus Rakesh Vashisht and others, 2005(4) RCR (Civil) 803 (P&H); New India Assurance Co. Ltd. Versus Rakesh Vashisht & ors., 2006(1) LJR 671 (P&H); and Secretary, Communication Ministry, Government of India, Department of P & T, New Delhi and others Versus Ramrao alias Ramdas and others, 1991 ACJ 278 (Bombay).

12. In a claim petition, it is incumbent on the claimant(s) to prove the negligence before holding the owner, driver and the Insurance Company liable for compensation. The accident occurred in the month of January at about 7.15 p.m. The sun sets early and it is pitch dark at 7.00 p.m. The FIR was lodged at 8.00 p.m. but it does not mention the name of the driver or the number of the offending vehicle. It was for the claimant to adduce cogent and convincing evidence to prove the involvement of the offending vehicle. The FIR was lodged by Prabhu Dayal who admittedly reached the spot after the accident had occurred. He had stated in his complaint that the trolly was stationary and the motor cycle had hit from behind. In the first statement made to the police, it was also stated by Prabhu Dayal that there was no indication that the vehicle was parked and it was



on that account that the accident had occurred. A perusal of the claim petition shows that a different version has been given and it is stated that the tractor trolley was reversing and it came and hit the motor cycle. Respondent no. 1 had admitted that he was facing trial but that itself is not sufficient. There is a variation in the version given in the FIR and that contained in the claim petition the altogether different story has been given. The police had investigated the case. They would have prepared the site plan which would have indicated the spot where the accident had occurred. It was important to see whether the trolley was parked on the road or on the katcha portion. Admittedly, the trolley did not bear any registration number. The version given by the respondent was that the tractor was not attached to the trolley and it was somewhere else. Therefore, it was the claimants' duty to examine such witnesses which could connect the tractor to this accident. Khem Chand's presence on the spot is also doubtful. He had stated that he had received injuries in the accident but he could not give the name of the Nursing Home where he was admitted. His MLR was not produced on record. There is no reason why he did not lodge the FIR. The explanation given by PW1 was that he had fallen unconscious and had remained so for 4-5 days. If that was so, medical record would have been produced in support of this plea. In the absence of this evidence, it is difficult to accept that Khem Chand was present at the spot or had witnessed the accident. It is found that there is a variation between the version given to the police at the first available opportunity and the pleadings and Khem Chand is an introduced witness. The FIR was against an



unknown vehicle. The negligence of the tractor driver has not been proved. The motor cycle had hit the trolley from behind and in that case, it was to be shown that the trolley was parked on the road. Thus, in the given circumstances, I find that the claimants have failed to prove the involvement of the tractor trolley or negligence of its driver and the issue is answered against the claimants.”

10. A bare reading of the above shows that the learned Tribunal has not appreciated the evidence on record and has wrongly dismissed the claim petition filed by the appellants/claimants on the ground that the accident did not occur in the manner suggested and the appellants/claimants failed to prove the involvement of the tractor trolley or negligence of respondent No.1 (driver).

ANALYSIS OF RECORD

11. A perusal of the record shows that the learned Tribunal did not take into consideration the factum of lodging of the FIR. Further, the admission of respondent No.1 that he was facing trial also proves the factum of accident. Therefore, the reasoning given by the learned Tribunal while dismissing the claim petition is not acceptable to this Court.

12. A perusal of the record further shows that:-

- (i) In postmortem report, in column of information furnished by the police, it is written as ‘road side accident’.



- (ii) FIR was registered under Sections 283, 337 and 304-A IPC at Police Station Chhainsa, District Faridabad, which states the whole factum of accident.
- (iii) Khem Chand (eye-witness) was examined as PW-1, who narrated the factum of accident and stated that he and Ved Parkash (since deceased) were going from Ballabgarh to Mohana on motorcycle on 24.01.2005. When they reached near weigh bridge near village Nariyala at about 7:00 P.M., a tractor trolley was being reversed there. Ved Parkash (since deceased), who was driving the motorcycle blew its horn. However, accident took place between motorcycle and the tractor trolley. He fell on the side whereas, Ved Parkash (since deceased) was run over by trolley wheel. He became unconscious. The accident occurred due to fault of tractor driver. In his cross-examination, he has stated that he regained consciousness after 5-6 days in a nursing home at Mohna.
- (iv) Dr. Urmila Wadhawan, Medical Officer, ESI Hospital, NH 3, Faridabad, was examined as PW3, who stated that she conducted post mortem examination on the dead body of Ved Parkash and brought the original post mortem report and proved Ex.P1, which is a photocopy of the same.



- (v) Prabhu Dayal was examined as PW4, who stated that he received information from someone that motorcycle being driven by Ved Parkash with Khem Chand had met with an accident near village Naryala near sugarcane kanta with tractor trolley. He was the author of FIR. He stated that when they reached the spot, trolly was there but tractor was not there. He further stated that trolly was loaded with sugarcane and was bearing eight tyres.
- (vi) Laxman Singh was examined as RW1, who in his cross-examination admitted that he was facing trial for the alleged accident.

13. A perusal of the above analysis prove the factum of accident due to rash and negligent driving of tractor trolley by respondent No.1. Therefore, the award dated 18.04.2007 is totally against the evidence on record and has been passed without application of judicial mind. Therefore, the same is liable to be set aside.

14. The calculation regarding Issue No.2 has already been done by the learned Tribunal.

15. So far as Issue No.3 is concerned, since Issue No.1 is decided in favour of the appellants/claimants, therefore, the claim petition is maintainable and this issue is decided in favour of the appellants/claimants.

16. Issue Nos.4 and 5 were not pressed by the appellants/claimants at the time of the claim proceedings before the learned Tribunal.



17. A perusal of the award shows that the deceased was of 22 years of age and was working as an Apprentice in DHBVNL. After the completion of his apprentice, he would have got appointment as a Lineman and would draw a salary in the pay scale of Rs.4,500-7,000. However, under the prevailing facts of the present case, his income is to be assessed as Rs.3,000/- per month, in accordance with the minimum wages prescribed for skilled worker in the State of Haryana.

SETTLED LAW ON COMPENSATION

18. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Sarla Verma Vs. Delhi Transport Corporation and Another** [(2009) 6 Supreme Court Cases 121], laid down the law on assessment of compensation and the relevant paras of the same are as under:-

“30. Though in some cases the deduction to be made towards personal and living expenses is calculated on the basis of units indicated in Trilok Chandra, the general practice is to apply standardised deductions. Having a considered several subsequent decisions of this Court, we are of the view that where the deceased was married, the deduction towards personal and living expenses of the deceased, should be one-third (1/3rd) where the number of dependent family members is 2 to 3, one-fourth (1/4th) where the number of dependent family members is 4 to 6, and one-fifth (1/5th) where the number of dependent family members exceeds six.

31. Where the deceased was a bachelor and the claimants are the parents, the deduction follows a different principle. In regard to bachelors, normally, 50% is deducted as personal and living expenses, because it is assumed that a bachelor would tend to spend more on himself. Even otherwise, there is



also the possibility of his getting married in a short time, in which event the contribution to the parent(s) and siblings is likely to be cut drastically. Further, subject to evidence to the contrary, the father is likely to have his own income and will not be considered as a dependant and the mother alone will be considered as a dependant. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, brothers and sisters will not be considered as dependants, because they will either be independent and earning, or married, or be dependent on the father.

32. Thus even if the deceased is survived by parents and siblings, only the mother would be considered to be a dependant, and 50% would be treated as the personal and living expenses of the bachelor and 50% as the contribution to the family. However, where the family of the bachelor is large and dependent on the income of the deceased, as in a case where he has a widowed mother and large number of younger non-earning sisters or brothers, his personal and living expenses may be restricted to one-third and contribution to the family will be taken as two-third.

** * * * **

42. We therefore hold that the multiplier to be used should be as mentioned in Column (4) of the table above (prepared by applying Susamma Thomas³, Trilok Chandra and Charlie), which starts with an operative multiplier of 18 (for the age groups of 15 to 20 and 21 to 25 years), reduced by one unit for every five years, that is M-17 for 26 to 30 years, M-16 for 31 to 35 years, M-15 for 36 to 40 years, M-14 for 41 to 45 years, and M-13 for 46 to 50 years, then reduced by two units for every five years, that is, M-11 for 51 to 55 years, M-9 for 56 to 60 years, M-7 for 61 to 65 years and M-5 for 66 to 70 years.



19. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **National Insurance Company Ltd. Vs. Pranay Sethi & Ors.** [(2017) 16 SCC 680] has clarified the law under Sections 166, 163-A and 168 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, on the following aspects:-

- (A) Deduction of personal and living expenses to determine multiplicand;
- (B) Selection of multiplier depending on age of deceased;
- (C) Age of deceased on basis for applying multiplier;
- (D) Reasonable figures on conventional heads, namely, loss of estate, loss of consortium and funeral expenses, with escalation;
- (E) Future prospects for all categories of persons and for different ages with permanent job; self-employed or fixed salary.

The relevant portion of the judgment is reproduced as under:-

*“52. As far as the **conventional heads** are concerned, we find it difficult to agree with the view expressed in Rajesh². It has granted Rs.25,000 towards funeral expenses, Rs 1,00,000 towards loss of consortium and Rs 1,00,000 towards loss of care and guidance for minor children. The head relating to loss of care and minor children does not exist. Though Rajesh refers to Santosh Devi, it does not seem to follow the same. The conventional and traditional heads, needless to say, cannot be determined on percentage basis because that would not be an acceptable criterion. Unlike determination of income, the said heads have to be quantified. Any quantification must have a reasonable foundation. There can be no dispute over the fact that price index, fall in bank interest, escalation of rates in*



many a field have to be noticed. The court cannot remain oblivious to the same. There has been a thumb rule in this aspect. Otherwise, there will be extreme difficulty in determination of the same and unless the thumb rule is applied, there will be immense variation lacking any kind of consistency as a consequence of which, the orders passed by the tribunals and courts are likely to be unguided. Therefore, we think it seemly to fix reasonable sums. It seems to us that reasonable figures on conventional heads, namely, loss of estate, loss of consortium and funeral expenses should be Rs.15,000, Rs.40,000 and Rs.15,000 respectively. The principle of revisiting the said heads is an acceptable principle. But the revisit should not be fact-centric or quantum-centric. We think that it would be condign that the amount that we have quantified should be enhanced on percentage basis in every three years and the enhancement should be at the rate of 10% in a span of three years. We are disposed to hold so because that will bring in consistency in respect of those heads.

* * * * *

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.*

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 to 50 years and 10% where the deceased was between the age of 50 to 60 years should be regarded as the necessary method of computation. The established income means the income minus the tax component.

59.5. For determination of the multiplicand, the deduction for personal and living expenses, the tribunals and the courts shall be guided by paras 30 to 32 of Sarla Verma⁴ which we have reproduced hereinbefore.

59.6. The selection of multiplier shall be as indicated in the Table in Sarla Verma¹ read with para 42 of that judgment.

59.7. The age of the deceased should be the basis for applying the multiplier.

59.8. Reasonable figures on conventional heads, namely, loss of estate, loss of consortium and funeral expenses should be Rs 15,000, Rs 40,000 and Rs 15,000 respectively. The aforesaid amounts should be enhanced at the rate of 10% in every three years.”

20. Hon’ble Supreme Court in the case of **Magma General Insurance Company Limited Vs. Nanu Ram alias Chuhru Ram & Others [2018(18) SCC 130]** after considering ***Sarla Verma (supra)*** and ***Pranay Sethi (Supra)*** has settled the law regarding consortium. Relevant paras of the same are reproduced as under:-

“21. A Constitution Bench of this Court in Pranay Sethi² dealt with the various heads under which compensation is to be awarded in a death case. One of these heads is



loss of consortium. In legal parlance, "consortium" is a compendious term which encompasses "spousal consortium", "parental consortium", and "filial consortium". The right to consortium would include the company, care, help, comfort, guidance, solace and affection of the deceased, which is a loss to his family. With respect to a spouse, it would include sexual relations with the deceased spouse.

*21.1. **Spousal consortium** is generally defined as rights pertaining to the relationship of a husband-wife which allows compensation to the surviving spouse for loss of "company, society, cooperation, affection, and aid of the other in every conjugal relation".*

*21.2. **Parental consortium** is granted to the child upon the premature death of a parent, for loss of "parental aid, protection, affection, society, discipline, guidance and training".*

*21.3. **Filial consortium** is the right of the parents to compensation in the case of an accidental death of a child. An accident leading to the death of a child causes great shock and agony to the parents and family of the deceased. The greatest agony for a parent is to lose their child during their lifetime. Children are valued for their love, affection, companionship and their role in the family unit.*

22. Consortium is a special prism reflecting changing norms about the status and worth of actual relationships. Modern jurisdictions world-over have recognised that the value of a child's consortium far exceeds the economic value of the compensation awarded in the case of the death of a child. Most jurisdictions therefore permit parents to be awarded compensation under loss of



consortium on the death of a child. The amount awarded to the parents is a compensation for loss of the love, affection, care and companionship of the deceased child.

23. The Motor Vehicles Act is a beneficial legislation aimed at providing relief to the victims or their families, in cases of genuine claims. In case where a parent has lost their minor child, or unmarried son or daughter, the parents are entitled to be awarded loss of consortium under the head of filial consortium. Parental consortium is awarded to children who lose their parents in motor vehicle accidents under the Act. A few High Courts have awarded compensation on this count. However, there was no clarity with respect to the principles on which compensation could be awarded on loss of filial consortium.

24. The amount of compensation to be awarded as consortium will be governed by the principles of awarding compensation under "loss of consortium" as laid down in Pranay Sethi². In the present case, we deem it appropriate to award the father and the sister of the deceased, an amount of Rs 40,000 each for loss of filial consortium.

CONCLUSION

21. In view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the above referred to judgments, the present appeal is allowed. The award dated 18.04.2007 is hereby set aside. The appellants/claimants are held entitled to compensation as per the calculations made here-under:-

<i>Sr. No.</i>	<i>Heads</i>	<i>Compensation Awarded</i>
1	Monthly Income	Rs.3,000/-
2	Future prospects @ 40%	Rs.1,200/- (40% of 3,000)
3	Deduction towards personal expenditure 1/4th	Rs.1,050/- {(3,000 + 1,200) X 1/4}
4	Total Income	Rs.3,150/- (4,200 – 1,050)
5	Multiplier	18
6	Annual Dependency	Rs.6,80,400/- (3,150 X 12 X 18)
7	Loss of Estate	Rs.18,000/-
8	Funeral Expenses	Rs.18,000/-
9	Loss of Consortium Parental : Rs. 48,000/- x 2 Spousal : Rs. 48,000/- x 1 Filial : Rs. 48,000/- x 2	Rs.2,40,000/-
	Total Compensation	Rs.9,56,400/-

22. So far as the interest part is concerned, as held by Hon’ble Supreme Court in **Dara Singh @ Dhara Banjara Vs. Shyam Singh Varma** 2019 ACJ 3176 and **R.Valli and Others VS. Tamil Nandu State Transport Corporation** (2022) 5 Supreme Court Cases 107, the appellants-claimants are granted the interest @ 9% per annum on the amount of compensation from the date of filing of claim petition till the date of its realization.

23. The Insurance Company-respondent No. 3 is directed to deposit the amount of compensation along with interest with the Tribunal within a period of two months from the date of receipt of copy of this judgment. The Tribunal is further directed to disburse the amount of compensation along with interest in the accounts of the claimants/appellants. The



FAO-3312-2007 (O&M)

-20-

claimants/appellants are directed to furnish their bank accounts details to the learned Tribunal.

24. Respondent No.3-Insurance Company is hereby directed to disburse the current scheduled fees to Mr. Vinod Gupta, Advocate, within a period of 20 days from the date of receipt of the copy of this judgment.

25. Disposed of accordingly.

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

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

05.12.2024

Virrendra

Whether speaking/non-speaking : Yes

Whether reportable : Yes/No