



**212-2 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

FAO-3905-2002

Date of Decision: 07.11.2025

BOHTI DEVI

....Appellant

Versus

SURESH AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARMOD GOYAL

Present: Mr. Vishal Garg Narwana, Advocate
for the appellant.

Parmod Goyal, J. (Oral)

Injured claimant/appellant has preferred the present appeal being aggrieved by the impugned order dated 26.03.2002, passed by learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Jind (hereinafter referred to as 'Tribunal'), whereby an amount of Rs.12,000/- was awarded to appellant for injuries suffered by her.

2. Injured claimant/appellant had asserted that she is 40 years old household lady and labourer earning Rs.2,000/- per month. She claimed to have suffered multiple injuries in the accident and her left leg was broken. As per injured/claimant she was admitted to Civil Hospital Narwana where she was medico legally examined. She asserted that she feels pain and cannot walk properly even now. She claimed that she had remained in the hospital for about 2 ½ months. In support of her claim, she had duly examined Dr. R.K. Singla as PW3, who proved MLR as Ex.PA. Perusal of



Ex.PA shows that there were three injuries on her person.

3. Admittedly, no documentary evidence has been placed on record by claimant showing that she remained admitted for 2 ½ months in the hospital. MLR Ex.PA had shown three injuries on the body of claimant, however, nature of injuries that whether they were grievous or simple in nature has not been proved by claimant. Accordingly, following compensation was awarded by the learned Tribunal :-

1	Pain and suffering	Rs.5,000/-
2	Expenses on medicines	Rs.1,000/-
3	Loss of income for 3 months at the rate of Rs.2,000/- per month	Rs.6,000/-
	Total	Rs.12,000/-

4. Since no evidence with regard to medical expenses has been proved on record, the amount of Rs.1,000/- awarded by learned Tribunal warrants no interference. Appellant has been sufficiently compensated to loss of income as amount of Rs.6,000/- equivalent to three months income was granted. However, I find that compensation for pain and suffering to be on the lower side. Claimant/appellant had suffered three injuries and, therefore, keeping in view multiple injuries, learned Tribunal ought to have awarded higher compensation for pain and sufferings. Accordingly, claimant/appellant is held entitled to Rs.10,000/- instead of Rs.5,000/- for pain and suffering. Petitioner shall be entitled to interest @7.5% per annum from date of filing claim petition till realization over enhanced amount of Rs.5,000/-.



5. With above modification, appeal is partly allowed and is disposed of.

07.11.2025
chiranjeev

(PARMOD GOYAL)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No