



FAO-2082-2022

-1-

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

114

FAO-2082-2022

Date of decision :03.11.2025

INDRO AND ANOTHER

... APPELLANTS

VERSUS

SATISH AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARMOD GOYAL

Present: Mr. Sukhdev Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Divyam Sigh, Advocate
for the appellants.

Mr. Sukhleen, Advocate for
Mr. Abhishek Chokkar, Advocate
for respondent Nos. 1 and 2.

PARMOD GOYAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that the only issue in the present case is the non-grant of consortium to claimant No. 2, i.e., the minor child, Dinesh. He admits that, as far as loss of dependency and other heads are concerned, the learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Panipat (hereinafter referred to as 'Tribunal'), vide its impugned order dated 17.01.2022, has rightly awarded compensation of Rs. 11,46,400/- with 7.5% interest from the date of filing till realization.

2. The only grievance of the claimants-appellants is with regard to the non-award of consortium to the minor child, i.e., Claimant No. 2. Learned counsel for the Insurance Company has fairly admitted that in *National Insurance Company Ltd. v. Pranay Sethi and others*, 2017 (4) RCR (Civil) 1009 and *Magma General Insurance Company Limited vs. Nathu Ram alias Chuhu*

Ram & Ors, 2018 (18) SCC 130, Hon'ble Supreme Court had held that child is



entitled to parental consortium.

3. Claimant No. 2 shall be entitled to an additional amount of Rs. 40,000/- towards consortium, over and above the compensation already awarded by the learned Tribunal. The claimant shall also be entitled to interest at the rate of 7.5% from the date of filing of the claim petition till realization.
4. The appeal is, therefore, allowed in the above terms.

03.11.2025
manoj

(PARMOD GOYAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	Yes/No