



FAO-1016-2006 (O&M)

-1-

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

**CM-23008-CII-2024 IN/AND
FAO-1016-2006 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 10.01.2025**

Gurdeep Kaur and another

.....Appellants

Vs.

Angrej Singh alias Geja and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Gurpreet Singh Gurna, Advocate,
for the appellants.

Ms. Simran, Advocate
for Mr. Pardeep Goyal, Advocate
for respondent No.3–Insurance Company.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA J. (ORAL)**CM-23008-CII-2024**

1. This is an application for bringing on record the legal representatives of deceased appellant No.1-Gurdeep Kaur.
2. Notice in the application.
3. On the asking of the Court, Ms. Simran, Advocate, appearing for Mr. Pardeep Goyal, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.3 and submits that she has no objection to the prayer made in the application.
4. In view of the no objection and for the reasons mentioned in the



FAO-1016-2006 (O&M)

-2-

application, the same is allowed. The persons, as mentioned in para No.3 of the application, are allowed to be brought on record as legal representatives of the deceased appellant No.1, subject to all just exceptions.

5. Amended memo of parties attached with the application is ordered to be taken on record and the main case i.e. FAO-1016-2006 is taken on Board today itself.

FAO-1016-2006 (O&M)

1. The present appeal has been preferred against the award dated 01.02.2005 passed in the claim petition filed under Section 163-A of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 by the learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Bathinda (for short, 'the Tribunal') for enhancement of compensation granted to the appellants/claimants on account of death of Jaswant Singh alias Billu, who died in a motor vehicular accident occurred on 20.11.2003, whereby the appellants/claimants were granted compensation to the tune of Rs.1,36,400/- alongwith interest @ 6% per annum.

2. As sole issue for determination in the present appeal is confined to quantum of compensation awarded by the learned Tribunal, a detailed narration of the facts of the case are not reproduced for the sake of brevity.

SUBMISSIONS OF THE LEARNED COUNSELS FOR THE PARTIES

3. Learned counsel for the appellants/claimants has made the following submissions:-

- i) That the amount assessed by the learned Tribunal is on the lower side.



ii) That 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.

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.

4. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondent-Insurance Company, 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.



FAO-1016-2006 (O&M)

-4-

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

6. A perusal of the award shows that in the present case the appellants/claimants filed the claim petition seeking compensation on account of the death of Jaswant Singh alias Billu, who was aged about 50 years at the time of accident. 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), compensation is liable to be enhanced as per the substituted statutory provision i.e. Section 164 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, therefore, the appellants/claimants 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 case of death in the amount of Rs.5 lakhs and in case of grievous hurt of Rs.2.5 lakhs.

7. 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 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."

8. In view of the above, the present appeal is **allowed**. Accordingly, the award dated 01.02.2005 is modified by converting the claim petition under Section 163-A (pre 2018 amendment) to Section 164 (post 2018 amendment) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988. As there is no evidence on record to show that appellant/claimant No.2 is an adopted daughter of deceased-Jaswant Singh alias Billu, therefore, she is not entitled to any compensation. As such, the appellant No.1 is held entitled to compensation to the tune of Rs.5 lakh.

9. Since, appellant-Gurdeep Kaur died during the pendency of appeal and her legal representatives have been brought on record therefore, they are entitled to enhanced amount of compensation in equal shares.



FAO-1016-2006 (O&M)

-6-

10. 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 Nadu 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.

11. Respondent No.3-Insurance Company is directed to deposit the enhanced amount of compensation along with interest with the Tribunal within a period of two months from today. The legal representatives of appellant-Gurdeep Kaur are directed to furnish their bank account details to the Tribunal. The Tribunal is further directed to disburse the enhanced amount of compensation along with interest in equal shares in the bank accounts of the legal representatives of appellant-Gurdeep Kaur.

12. Respondent No.3-Insurance Company is directed to disburse the current schedule fee to Mr. Pardeep Goyal, Advocate, within a period of 20 days from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

13. Disposed of accordingly.

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

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

10.01.2025

Virrendra

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