



299

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

FAO-2534-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 17.09.2025

NAZIRA AND ANR.

.... Appellants

VERSUS

NARINDER AND ORS

.... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present : Mr. Manish Verma, Advocate for the appellants.

Mr. Abhinav Singla, Advocate for respondent No.2.

Mr. Raj Kumar, Advocate for respondent No.3.

ALKA SARIN, J. (ORAL)

1. The present appeal has been preferred by the claimant-appellants aggrieved by the quantum of compensation awarded by the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Panchkula (hereinafter referred to as the 'Tribunal') vide award dated 03.08.2021.

2. Since the factum of the accident is not in dispute, the facts, as recorded in the impugned award passed by the Tribunal, are not being adverted to herein for the sake of brevity.

3. The Tribunal in the present case had awarded the following compensation :

Sr. No.	Heads	Compensation Awarded
1.	Monthly income	₹6,000
2.	Annual income	[₹6,000 x 12] = ₹72,000
3.	Deduction 1/2	[₹72,000 - ₹36,000] = ₹36,000
4.	Future prospects @40%	[₹36,000 + ₹14,400] = ₹50,400
5.	Multiplier of 15	[₹50,400 x 15] = ₹7,56,000
6.	Funeral expenses	₹15,000
7.	Loss of estate	₹15,000
8.	Loss of consortium	₹80,000 [₹40,000 x2]
	Total Compensation	₹8,66,000
	Interest	@ 6% per annum

4. Learned counsel for the claimant-appellants would contend that the income of the deceased, who was about 14 years of age, has been assessed notionally as ₹6,000 per month (₹72,000 per annum) which ought to have been assessed as per the minimum wages applicable to a skilled worker prevalent at the time of the accident which were ₹10,200 per month. In support of his arguments, learned counsel for the claimant-appellants has relied upon the judgment passed in the case of **Kajal vs. Jagdish Chand & Ors. [2020 (2) RCR (Civil) 27]** which was later followed in the case of **Baby Sakshi Greola vs. Manzoor Ahmad Simon & Anr. [2025 (1) RCR (Civil) 238]**. Learned counsel would further contend that though the claimant-appellants do not challenge the deduction, the addition made towards the future prospects and the multiplier as applied by the Tribunal, however, the amounts awarded under the conventional heads i.e. funeral expenses and loss of estate and under the head loss of consortium are not in accordance with the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases of **National Insurance Company Ltd. vs. Pranay Sethi & Ors. [(2017) 16 SCC 680]**,

Magma General Insurance Company Limited vs. Nanu Ram alias Chuhru Ram & Ors. [(2018) 18 SCC 130] and N. Jayasree & Ors. vs. Choramandalam M.S General Insurance Company Ltd. [2021(4) RCR (Civil) 642].

5. *Per contra*, the learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3 have vehemently argued that sufficient amount has already been awarded as compensation in the present case and that there is no scope of any enhancement.

6. Heard.

7. The argument of the learned counsel for the claimant-appellants that the income of the deceased ought to have been assessed as that of a skilled worker deserves to be accepted. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Baby Sakshi Greola** (supra), while relying upon the case of **Kajal** (supra), assessed the notional income of a 7-year-old child, who had received injuries, on the basis of minimum wages payable to a skilled worker. Still further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court recently in the case of **Karuna Parmar vs. Prakash Sinha & Ors. [2025 (1) TAC 730]**, yet again relying on **Baby Sakshi Greola** (supra), awarded the compensation in the case of a 6-year-old child, who had died in an accident which occurred on 07.03.2014, as per the minimum wages applicable for a skilled worker in the year 2014. The minimum wages of a skilled worker at the time of the accident i.e. 21.02.2019 were ₹10,200 per month. Hence, the income of the deceased is assessed as ₹10,200 per month. Since there is no challenge to the deduction, the addition made towards the

future prospects and the multiplier as applied by the Tribunal, the same are accordingly maintained.

8. Further, the amounts awarded under the conventional heads and under the head loss of consortium are not in consonance with the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Hence, as per the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases of **Pranay Sethi** (supra), **Magma General Insurance Company Limited** (supra) and **N. Jayasree** (supra), the claimant-appellants would be entitled to ₹18,000 (₹15,000 + 20% increase) towards loss of estate and ₹18,000 (₹15,000 + 20% increase) towards funeral expenses. The claimant-appellants, being the parents of the deceased, would also be entitled to ₹48,000 each (₹40,000 + 20% increase) under the head filial consortium.

9. Accordingly, the reworked compensation to which the claimant-appellants are entitled is as under :

Sr. No.	Heads	Compensation Awarded
1.	Monthly income	₹10,200
2.	Annual income	[₹10,200 x 12] = ₹1,22,400
3.	Deduction 1/2	[₹1,22,400 - ₹61,200] = ₹61,200
4.	Future prospects @ 40%	[₹61,200 + ₹24,480] = ₹85,680
5.	Multiplier of 15	[₹85,680 x 15] = ₹12,85,200
6.	Funeral expenses	₹18,000
7.	Loss of estate	₹18,000
8.	Loss of consortium (i) Filial	[₹48,000 x 2] = ₹96,000
	Total Compensation	₹14,17,200

10. The amount in excess of and over and above the amount awarded by the Tribunal shall also attract interest @ 7.5% per annum from the date of

filing of the claim petition till the realization of the entire amount. The amount shall be apportioned between the claimant-appellants as directed by the Tribunal.

11. In view of the decision by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Parminder Singh vs. Honey Goyal & Ors. [AIR 2025 SC 1713]**, after calculation of the enhanced amount, the same be transferred by respondent No.3-Insurance Company in the bank account(s) of the claimant-appellants within a period of six weeks from today. The particulars of the bank account(s) along with the requisite documents in support thereof shall be furnished by the claimant-appellants to respondent No.3-Insurance company within a period of two weeks from today and needful shall be done by respondent No.3-Insurance Company after verification thereof within a period of four weeks thereafter along with up-to-date interest. The compliance shall be reported by the Bank to the Tribunal concerned.

12. In view of the above discussion, the present appeal is allowed and the award passed by the Tribunal is modified accordingly. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

17.09.2025
Aman Jain

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking
Whether reportable: Yes/No