



FAO-3004-2006 (O&M)

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

FAO-3004-2006 (O&M)

Date of Decision: November 19, 2024

Om Vir Singh

.....Appellant

Vs.

Jagat Singh and others

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Pankaj Middha, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. R.A. Sheoran, Advocate
for respondent No. 2

Mr. Lalit Garg, Advocate
for respondent No. 3-Insurance Co.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA J.

1. The present appeal has been preferred against the award dated 03.02.2006, passed in the claim petition filed under Section 166/140 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Panipat (for short, 'the Tribunal') seeking enhancement of the compensation, on account of the damage caused to the jeep of the appellant in a motor vehicular accident occurred on 21.08.2002.

2. At the very outset, learned counsel for the appellant contends that the compensation granted to the appellant on account of the damage caused to his jeep in an accident, is on the lower side and deserves to be enhanced, since in his claim petition, he stated that he spent an amount of Rs.1,71,435/- on repair of his jeep

and accordingly, he claimed compensation to the tune of Rs.5,00,000/-.

**FAO-3004-2006 (O&M)**

3. Per contra, learned counsel for respondent No. 3-Insurance Company contends that award has rightly been passed and the amount of compensation as assessed by the learned Tribunal has rightly been granted.
4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the whole record of this case.
5. A bare perusal of the record shows that in the present case, a surveyor was appointed, who assessed the loss to the jeep to the tune of Rs.1,11,430/-. The claimant/appellant also examined Roshan Lal, Sr. Assistant, United India Insurance Co. Ltd, Divisional Office, Panipat, who appeared as PW5 and deposed about the authenticity of the bills Ex P5 to ExP18. In his cross examination, he also admitted that Engineer Vinod Kumar was appointed as Surveyor, who proved his report Ex R-1.
6. The learned Tribunal after taking into consideration the bill Ex P5 to Ex P18 has rightly awarded the compensation to the appellant to the tune of Rs.1,20,000/- on account of repair charges of the jeep.
7. In view of the above facts and circumstances of the present case, I do not find any infirmity in the award dated 03.02.2006 passed by learned Tribunal and the same is upheld.
8. Consequently, the present appeal is **dismissed** being devoid of any merit.
9. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

November 19, 2024

Gaurav Arora

Gaurav Arora
2024.11.25 16:22
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

Whether speaking/non-speaking : Speaking
Whether reportable : Yes