



FAO-2785-2006 (O&M)

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

FAO-2785-2006 (O&M)

Date of Decision: October 15, 2024

Baljeet Kaur and another

.....Appellants

Vs.

Binder Singh and others

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Akshay Jindal, Advocate
for the appellants.

Mr. R.C. Kapoor, Advocate and
Mr. Rohit Pathania, Advocate
for respondent No. 3

SUDEEPTI SHARMA J.

1. The present appeal has been preferred against the award dated 21.03.2006 passed in the claim petition filed under Section 163-A of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 by the learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Sirsa (for short, 'the Tribunal') for enhancement of compensation, granted to the claimants/appellants.

FACTS NOT IN DISPUTE

2. The brief facts of the case are that on 12.01.2005 at about 6 A.M, respondent No. 1-Binder Singh, a driver of Truck Bearing No. RJ-13G/1771 in order to start another truck, which had some starting problem, directed the Jasmel Singh (since deceased) to hold a wooden log (gulla) in between two trucks, so that respondent No. 1 by giving the push to another truck could help him starting the said truck. Accordingly, Jagmel Singh (since deceased) held the wooden log in

**FAO-2785-2006 (O&M)**

between the two trucks. When respondent No. 1 started the offending truck in order to give a push to another truck, the wooden log slip away from the hands of Jasmel Singh and the same fell down all of sudden. As result, Jasmel Singh (since deceased) was sandwiched between the two trucks and sustained serious injuries. He was shifted to General Hospital, Mandi Dabwali, where he succumbed to his injuries.

3. Upon notice of the claim petition, respondents appeared and denied the factum of compensation.

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

- 1) Whether the accident in question was caused by the use of Truck Bearing No. RJ-13G/1771 rashly and negligently, resulting into causing the death of Jasmel Singh son of Paramjeet Singh, as alleged? OPP
- 2) Whether the petitioners are entitled to receive any compensation amount, if so, how much and from whom ? OPP
- 3) Whether the claim petition is not maintainable in the present form? OPR
- 4) Whether the petitioners have no cause of action to file the present petition? OPR
- 5) Whether the petitioners have no locus standi to file the present claim petition? OPR
- 6) Whether the petition is bad for non-joinder and mis-joinder of parties? OPR

**FAO-2785-2006 (O&M)**

7) Whether respondent No. 1 was not holding a valid and effective driving license to drive a truck at the time of the alleged accident, if so, to what effect? OPR

8) Relief.

5. After taking into consideration the pleadings and the evidence on record, the learned Tribunal allowed the claim petition filed by the claimants/appellants and granted the compensation to the tune of Rs.1,82,000/- along with interest @ 7.5% per annum. Hence the claimants/appellants filed the present appeal for enhancement of compensation.

SUBMISSIONS OF THE COUNSEL FOR THE PARTIES

6. The learned counsel for the claimants-appellants contends as under:-

- i) That the compensation awarded to the claimants is on the lower side, as Jasmel Singh (since deceased) was only 19 years old at the time of accident.
- ii) That Section 163-A of Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 is substituted by Section 164 of Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (Act 32 of 2019 w.e.f 01.04.2022) and compensation should be enhanced as per the substituted statutory provision i.e. Section 164 of the Act.
- iii) That the present case is covered by the judgment rendered by this Court in **FAO No.4301 of 2006**, titled as “**Akaljit Kaur and Others Vs. Parveen Kumar and Others.**” wherein the claim under Section 163-A of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 was converted to Section 164 of Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (Act 32 of 2019 w.e.f 01.04.2022) by relying upon the judgment of Hon’ble *Supreme Court in the case of Ram Murti and others Vs. Punjab State Electricity Board [2022(4) TAC 738]* wherein it was held that Section 164 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (Act 32 of 2019 w.e.f 01.04.2022) provides for payment of compensation in case of death in the amount of Rs.5 lakhs and in the case of grievous hurt of Rs.2.5 lakhs.

**FAO-2785-2006 (O&M)**

7. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondent however, vehemently argues that the award has rightly been passed and the amount of compensation as assessed by the learned Tribunal has rightly been granted.

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

9. A perusal of the award indicates that in the present case, the claimants filed the claim petition seeking compensation on account of death of their son Jasmel Singh, who was about 19 years of age. Since section 163-A of Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 is now substituted by Section 164 of Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (Act 32 of 2019 w.e.f 01.04.2022) and compensation should be enhanced as per the substituted statutory provision i.e. Section 164 of the Act, therefore, the appellants herein are entitled to be granted the benefit of beneficial provision enacted by the Parliament under Chapter 11 of which Section 164 provides for payment of compensation in the case of death in the amount of Rs.5 lakhs and in the case grievous hurt of Rs.2.5 lakhs.

10. Further, this Court in **FAO No.4301 of 2006**, titled as “**Akaljit Kaur and Others Vs. Parveen Kumar and Others**” held as under:-

“11. Hon’ble Supreme Court in the case of **Ram Murti and others Vs. Punjab State Electricity Board** [2022(4) TAC 738] held that the appellants therein to be granted the benefit of beneficial provision enacted by the Parliament under Chapter 11 of which Section 164 provides for payment of compensation in the case of death in the amount of Rs.5 lakhs and in the case grievous hurt of Rs.2.5 lakhs.

12. This Court in **FAO-195-2006** titled as **Mamta and Others Vs. Happy and Others**, decided on 29.05.2024, held that since Motor

**FAO-2785-2006 (O&M)**

Vehicle statute is a beneficial legislation, the Judge should not go into the technicalities of the provisions, under which the application or petition is moved but should apply his judicial mind, as these are only the irregularities and not illegalities which cannot be cured. It has been observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that the loss caused to the claimants or the relationship or to the victim of the limb cannot be compensated. Still the Court should make every effort by exercising its discretion empathetically. Further, Justice should actually be shown to be delivered by application of judicial mind with intelligence, prudence, care and caution and by showing empathy. The Court decision should be such that they strengthen the trust and confidence of public and litigants in judicial system and judiciary."

11. In view of the above, the appeal is allowed. The award dated 21.03.2006 is modified to the extent that the claimants/appellants are held entitled to compensation to the tune of Rs.5 lakhs. The Tribunal has awarded compensation of Rs.1,82,000/- to the claimants, therefore, now the enhanced amount of Rs.3,18,000/- (Rs.5,00,000-1,82,000/-) be disbursed equally amongst the claimants.

12. 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 enhanced amount from the date of filing of claim petition till the date of its realization.

13. The Insurance Company is directed to deposit the awarded amount along with interest with the Tribunal within a period of two months from today.

**FAO-2785-2006 (O&M)**

The appellants-claimants are directed to furnish their bank account details to the Insurance Company/Tribunal. The Tribunal is further directed to disburse the enhanced amount of compensation along with interest in the bank accounts of the appellants-claimants.

14. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

October 15, 2024

G Arora

Whether speaking/non-speaking : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No