



FAO-4919-2010 (O&M)

-1-

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

FAO-4919-2010 (O&M)

Reserved on : 17.09.2025

Date of Pronouncement : 17.10.2025

Rupinder Kaur and others

.....Appellants

Vs.

Shavinder Singh @ Captain and other

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present : Mr. Rishabh Gupta, Advocate,
for the appellants.

Mr. Jayant Singh Chauhan, Advocate, for
Mr. Vinod Chaudhri, Advocate,
for respondent No.3-Insurance Company.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA J.

1. The present appeal has been preferred assailing the award dated 07.02.2007 passed by the learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Kaithal (for short, 'the Tribunal') in a claim petition instituted under Section 166 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, whereby the claim petition filed by the appellants/claimants was allowed, however, the learned Tribunal held the deceased to be contributory negligent to the extent of 50%. The appellants/claimants have further sought enhancement of the compensation awarded, contending that the finding of contributory negligence is erroneous and that the amount of compensation assessed by the learned Tribunal is inadequate.

FACTS NOT IN DISPUTE

2. The brief facts of the case are that on the ill-fated day, i.e. 09.01.2009, the deceased Raja Singh, along with Jagsir Singh, was going from Village Amargarh to Village Mehma Sarja on Motorcycle bearing registration No.HR-33-9950 for collecting milk for its sale. They were riding on the extreme left side of the road, i.e. on the katcha portion. At about 6:30 A.M., when they reached in the revenue limits of Village Nahianwala, a truck bearing registration No.PB-03M-9592 was lying parked in the middle of the road in a rash and negligent manner by its driver (respondent No.1), without any lights, indicators, reflectors or warning signs either on the sides or rear portion of the truck. The motorcycle, which was being driven by the deceased Raja Singh, collided with the rear portion of the said stationary truck. As a result of the impact, both Raja Singh and Jagsir Singh sustained multiple injuries and Raja Singh succumbed to the injuries at the spot. Nathu Singh and Sukhmander Singh, who were following them on their respective vehicles, lodged FIR against respondent No.1. The motorcycle was also completely damaged in the accident.

3. Upon notice of the claim petition, the respondents appeared and filed their separate replies denying the factum of accident/compensation.

4. From the pleadings of the parties, the learned Tribunal framed the following issues:-

“1. Whether Raja Singh died on 09.01.09 at about 6:30 AM in the area of V. Nahianwala, due to rash and negligent driving of truck bearing No. PB-03M-9592 being driven by respondent No.1 in a rash and negligent manner? OPA

2. *Whether the claimants are legal heirs of deceased? OPA*
3. *If issues No.1 & 2 are proved then to what amount of compensation, the claimants are entitled and from whom? OPA*
4. *Whether respondent No.1 was not holding a valid and effective DL to drive the above said vehicle in his name at the time of alleged accident, if so, its effect? OPR*
5. *Whether the claim petition is not maintainable? OPR*
6. *Whether the claimant has got no locus standi or cause of action? OPR.*
7. *Relief.”*

5. After taking into consideration the pleadings and the evidence on record, the learned Tribunal awarded compensation to the tune of Rs.6,80,136/- along with interest at the rate of 6% per annum on account of death of Raja Singh. The learned Tribunal further held the deceased Raja Singh to be contributory negligent to the extent of 50% and respondent-Insurance Company as well as respondents No.1 & 2 (driver and owner of offending vehicle) held liable to pay the aforesaid amount of compensation to the extent of 50%, jointly and severally. Hence, the present appeal.

SUBMISSIONS OF LEARNED COUNSEL FOR THE PARTIES

6. The learned counsel for the appellants/claimants contends:-

- (i) that the learned Tribunal has wrongly held the case as of contributory negligence, however, the accident was occurred solely due to rash and negligent driving of offending vehicle bearing registration No.PB-03M-9592 by respondent-driver.
- (ii) that the compensation assessed by the learned Tribunal is on the lower side and deserves to be enhanced.

- (iii) that at the time of accident, deceased-Raja Ram was 29 years old; was a milk vendor and was earning Rs.15,000/- per month therefrom.
- (iv) that the learned Tribunal has wrongly assessed the income of the deceased as Rs.5,000/- per month.
- (v) that the learned Tribunal has awarded meager rate of interest i.e. 9% per annum, on the amount of compensation.
- (vi) that the learned Tribunal has awarded meager amount towards loss of estate, loss of consortium and funeral expenses.

Therefore, he prays that the present appeal be allowed and compensation be enhanced, as per latest law.

7. *Per contra*, learned counsel for respondent No.3-Insurance Company contends that the learned Tribunal has wrongly fastened liability upon the Insurance Company to the extent of 50% on account of contributory negligence, whereas the accident had solely occurred on account of the negligence of the deceased-Raja Ram. Therefore, he prays for dismissal of the appeal.

8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused whole record of this case with their able assistance.

9. The relevant portion of the award dated 02.04.2010 passed by the learned Tribunal is reproduced as under:-

“15. Since it has not been brought on record that the respondents No.1 and 2 have violated the terms and conditions of the insurance policy or any other factor on the basis of which it could have been taken that the recovery rights should have been granted in favour of respondent No.3 against the owner/driver of the offending vehicle, this Court is of the opinion that the amount of compensation has to be paid by non-else, but respondent No.3.

16. In the case in hand, it is required to be seen as to whether the deceased was himself negligent in driving the motorcycle or not.

17. May be, it is the case of the claimants that truck of the respondent was parked on the mettle portion of the road. Obviously, if a truck is parked on the mettled road, the persons, who is crossing the road, are themselves be vigilant while crossing that part of the road. On the Indian roads, extra caution is required while driving the motor vehicles. Whereas, the deceased himself was carrying four drums and two buckets on a two wheeler, which otherwise is meant for carrying two passengers. It is clear from the record that apart from the deceased himself driving the motor cycle, a pillion rider was also there apart from four drums and two buckets. It is clear from the photo copies that while overtaking/crossing the stationary truck, the deceased could not balanced his motorcycle, because it appears that he has observed the truck from the very near proximity. Since the motorcycle was over loaded, he could not balanced the same. The front tyre of the motor cycle appears to have over taken the truck. But the side drum, which stood loaded on the motorcycle, got entangled with the side of the stationary truck, which resulted into the fall of the motorcycle. It is clear that this is a case of contributory negligence.

18. Now coming to the quantum of compensation.

19. In the case in hand, it has been argued that the deceased was a milk vendor and accordingly, it has been submitted that his income can be adjudged from the view point of a milk vendor, who normally earns more than that of a labourer. It has been submitted that the milk vendor can be treated to be skilled labourer. Compensation has accordingly been sought.

20. On the other hand, learned counsel for insurance company submitted that the deceased was not a milk vendor. But, subsequently when the photographs were produced, it showed that the motor cycle which wrapped into the stationary truck is visible having drums and

buckets loaded on it. From it, it can be safely concluded that the deceased, who was driving the motor cycle in question, was a milk vendor. Obviously, a milk vendor would earn more than a labourer. On an average, a labourer earns Rs.3,000/- per month. A Judicial notice can be taken that the deceased, who was a milk vendor, must be earning more amount than a labourer. The income of the deceased accordingly can be taken to be Rs.5,000/- per month approximately. The base of the assessment can be taken to be the photographs as well as the cross-examination of the claimant herself, who, has, in the cross-examination, disclosed that at the time of accident, the deceased was having four drums and two buckets. Out of these four drums, two were of 40-40 K.G. and two drums were of 50-50 K.G capacity and the buckets were of 10 liter capacity each. That means the deceased was carrying 150/200 liters of milk at one go. Normally, the milk vendors vend milk twice a day. Accordingly, the assessment of the income at Rs.5,000/- is reasonable and cannot be taken on the higher or lower side. If one saves 1 rupee per liter, then on average, it can be assessed that deceased was earning Rs.300/- per day, meaning thereby it is 9,000/- per month. After deducting the maintenance charges of motorcycle and other over heads, this Court is of the opinion that Rs.5,000/- income per month is reasonable.

*21. The claimants have proved on record that deceased Raja Singh was aged 29 years at the time of his death. Even in the post mortem report, the age of the deceased has been mentioned as 27 years. The income of the deceased has been proved to be Rs.5,000/- per month. It is obvious that the deceased must have been spending about Rs.1666/- approximately on his own self, meaning thereby that 1/3 rd deduction has to be made while computing the dependency. Computing the dependency @ Rs.3334/- per month, as it has been proved that the claimants were dependent upon the income of the deceased, it comes out to be Rs.40008/- per annum. It has come on record that deceased Raja Singh was 29 years of age and as per revised second schedule provided for the compensation for 3d party fatal accident claim cases, in **Sarla Verma and others Vs Delhi Transport Corporation & Anr., reported in (2009) 6 SCC, Page-121** passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, it has been shown that when the age of the victim varies from 26 to 30 years, then multiplier which would be applicable is 17. After applying the multiplier of 17, the amount of compensation comes to Rs.6,80,136/-. Out of the said*

amount of Rs.6,80,136/-, Rs.340068/- is deducted as contributory negligence to the tune of 50%. Accordingly, the claimant is entitled to Rs.340068/-. Since it was husband of Rupinder Kaur, claimant No.1, who has expired, she is entitled to Rs.5,000/- on account of loss of consortium. Rs.10,000/- allowed on account of funeral expenses and another amount of Rs.5,000/- on account of loss of estate of deceased to claimants. Total amount of compensation comes to Rs.360068/- which is payable with 9% per annum interest from the date of filing of the claim petition i.e. 4.3.2009 till realization. Since the offending vehicle was insured with respondent No.3 at the relevant time, therefore, respondent No.3 is liable to pay the aforesaid amount. However, it is made clear that out of the said amount of Rs.360068/-, claimant No.1 Rupinder Kaur is entitled to get 1 lac, whereas claimant No.3 Mohinder Kaur is entitled to Rs.60,000/- and claimant No.2 Inderdeep Singh is entitled to Rs.200068/-. Share of the minor is ordered to be deposited in the Nationalized Bank in the shape of FDRs having interest, which shall be payable to him on attaining majority. This issue is accordingly decided in favour of the claimants and against the respondents.”

ANALYSIS OF RECORD

10. A perusal of the impugned award reveals that the learned Tribunal has fallen into error in holding the deceased, Raja Singh, contributory negligent to the extent of 50%. The said finding is wholly unsustainable in law as well as on facts, being unsupported by any cogent evidence on record.

11. The testimony of AW-1 Jagsir Singh, the sole eye-witness to the occurrence, assumes great evidentiary significance. He categorically narrated the sequence of events leading to the accident both in his duly sworn affidavit (Ex. AW-1/A) and during his deposition before the learned Tribunal. His version remained entirely consistent. He clearly deposed that the accident occurred solely due to the rash and negligent conduct of the

driver of Truck bearing registration No.PB-03M-9592, which had been parked right in the middle of the road without any lights, indicators, reflectors, or warning signs either on its rear or by its side. He further stated that the motorcycle, being driven by the deceased Raja Singh, was proceeding on the extreme left side of the road at a moderate and safe speed when it collided with the stationary truck.

12. Significantly, despite a detailed and searching cross-examination, the testimony of AW-1 remained firm, cogent, and unshaken. He categorically denied the suggestion that the accident had occurred due to the negligence of the deceased. Such unimpeachable ocular testimony, which finds complete corroboration from the FIR and the overall circumstances of the case, could not have been brushed aside without any cogent or legally sustainable reasoning. Yet, the learned Tribunal, without referring to any contrary evidence, chose to disbelieve this credible witness on presumptive and conjectural grounds.

13. A careful scrutiny of the award further reveals that there is no material whatsoever on record to suggest negligence on the part of the deceased. On the contrary, the claimants have maintained a consistent stand throughout the proceedings that the accident occurred solely due to the negligent act of respondent No.1, the truck driver, who had left his heavy vehicle parked in the middle of the metalled road without any warning or reflective signs, thereby creating an unforeseen and hazardous obstruction.

14. The Tribunal, however, without any evidentiary foundation, proceeded to infer contributory negligence merely on conjecture, observing

that the deceased was carrying drums and buckets on the motorcycle. Such observation, even if taken at face value, does not *ipso facto* establish negligence, much less contributory negligence, unless it is shown that the said act was the proximate or efficient cause of the accident. The learned Tribunal overlooked the settled principle that mere carriage of goods on a two-wheeler does not *per se* constitute negligence unless it has a direct nexus with the occurrence.

15. The finding of contributory negligence, thus, rests not on evidence but on surmise and assumption. The record is devoid of any evidence documentary or oral to demonstrate that the deceased was driving rashly or negligently. In the absence of such material, the conclusion of the learned Tribunal attributing 50% negligence to the deceased is perverse, contrary to law, and cannot be sustained.

16. It is a settled proposition that where a stationary vehicle is left on the metalled portion of a public road during the hours of darkness without any signal, light, or warning, the negligence of the driver of such vehicle stands established. In such a case, the principle of *res ipsa loquitur* squarely applies. The burden, therefore, was on the respondents to rebut the presumption of negligence, which they have failed to discharge. The learned Tribunal, instead of applying this settled principle, chose to dilute the culpability of the respondent without any legal justification.

17. Accordingly, the finding of the learned Tribunal holding the deceased guilty of contributory negligence to the extent of 50% is wholly unsustainable, being contrary to the weight of evidence and settled principles

of law. The said finding deserves to be set aside, and the claimants are entitled to full compensation as claimed.

18. With respect to determination of compensation, the record contains evidence, the earning of the deceased and expenses incurred for medical treatment and hospitalization. Consequently, this Court shall adjudicate the compensation in accordance with the documented evidence on the record.

SETTLED LAW ON COMPENSATION

19. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Sarla Verma Vs. Delhi Transport Corporation and Another** [(2009) 6 Supreme Court Cases 121], laid down the law on assessment of compensation and the relevant paras of the same are as under:-

“30. Though in some cases the deduction to be made towards personal and living expenses is calculated on the basis of units indicated in Trilok Chandra, the general practice is to apply standardised deductions. Having a considered several subsequent decisions of this Court, we are of the view that where the deceased was married, the deduction towards personal and living expenses of the deceased, should be one-third (1/3rd) where the number of dependent family members is 2 to 3, one-fourth (1/4th) where the number of dependent family members is 4 to 6, and one-fifth (1/5th) where the number of dependent family members exceeds six.

31. Where the deceased was a bachelor and the claimants are the parents, the deduction follows a different principle. In regard to bachelors, normally, 50% is deducted as personal and living expenses, because it is assumed that a bachelor would tend to spend more on himself. Even otherwise, there is also the possibility of his getting married in a short time, in which event the contribution to the parent(s) and siblings is likely to be cut drastically. Further, subject to evidence to the contrary, the father is likely to have his own income and will not be considered as a dependant and the mother alone will be considered as a dependant. In the absence

of evidence to the contrary, brothers and sisters will not be considered as dependants, because they will either be independent and earning, or married, or be dependent on the father.

32. Thus even if the deceased is survived by parents and siblings, only the mother would be considered to be a dependant, and 50% would be treated as the personal and living expenses of the bachelor and 50% as the contribution to the family. However, where the family of the bachelor is large and dependent on the income of the deceased, as in a case where he has a widowed mother and large number of younger non-earning sisters or brothers, his personal and living expenses may be restricted to one-third and contribution to the family will be taken as two-third.

* * * * *

*

42. We therefore hold that the multiplier to be used should be as mentioned in Column (4) of the table above (prepared by applying Susamma Thomas³, Trilok Chandra and Charlie), which starts with an operative multiplier of 18 (for the age groups of 15 to 20 and 21 to 25 years), reduced by one unit for every five years, that is M-17 for 26 to 30 years, M-16 for 31 to 35 years, M-15 for 36 to 40 years, M-14 for 41 to 45 years, and M-13 for 46 to 50 years, then reduced by two units for every five years, that is, M-11 for 51 to 55 years, M-9 for 56 to 60 years, M-7 for 61 to 65 years and M-5 for 66 to 70 years.

20. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **National Insurance Company Ltd. Vs. Pranay Sethi & Ors. [(2017) 16 SCC 680]** has clarified the law under Sections 166, 163-A and 168 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, on the following aspects:-

- (A) Deduction of personal and living expenses to determine multiplicand;
- (B) Selection of multiplier depending on age of deceased;
- (C) Age of deceased on basis for applying multiplier;
- (D) Reasonable figures on conventional heads, namely, loss of estate, loss of consortium and funeral expenses, with escalation;
- (E) Future prospects for all categories of persons and for different ages: with permanent job; self-employed or fixed salary.

The relevant portion of the judgment is reproduced as under:-

*“52. As far as the **conventional heads** are concerned, we find it difficult to agree with the view expressed in Rajesh². It has granted Rs.25,000 towards funeral expenses, Rs 1,00,000 towards loss of consortium and Rs 1,00,000 towards loss of care and guidance for minor children. The head relating to loss of care and minor children does not exist. Though Rajesh refers to Santosh Devi, it does not seem to follow the same. The conventional and traditional heads, needless to say, cannot be determined on percentage basis because that would not be an acceptable criterion. Unlike determination of income, the said heads have to be quantified. Any quantification must have a reasonable foundation. There can be no dispute over the fact that price index, fall in bank interest, escalation of rates in many a field have to be noticed. The court cannot remain oblivious to the same. There has been a thumb rule in this aspect. Otherwise, there will be extreme difficulty in determination of the same and unless the thumb rule is applied, there will be immense variation lacking any kind of consistency as a consequence of which, the orders passed by the tribunals and courts are likely to be unguided. Therefore, we think it seems to fix reasonable sums. It seems to us that reasonable figures on conventional heads, namely, loss of estate, loss of consortium and funeral expenses should be Rs.15,000, Rs.40,000 and Rs.15,000 respectively. The principle of revisiting the said heads is an acceptable principle. But the revisit should not be fact-centric or quantum-centric. We think that it would be condign that the amount that we have quantified should be enhanced on percentage basis in every three years and the enhancement should be at the rate of 10% in a span of three years. We are disposed to hold so because that will bring in consistency in respect of those heads.*

* * * * *

59.3. While determining the income, an addition of 50% of actual salary to the income of the deceased towards future prospects, where the deceased had a permanent job and was below the age of 40 years, should be made. The addition should be 30%, if the age of the deceased was between 40 to 50 years. In case the deceased was between the age of 50 to 60 years, the addition should be 15%. Actual salary should be read as actual salary less tax.

59.4. In case the deceased was self-employed (or) on a fixed salary, an addition of 40% of the established income should be the warrant where the deceased was

below the age of 40 years. An addition of 25% where the deceased was between the age of 40 to 50 years and 10% where the deceased was between the age of 50 to 60 years should be regarded as the necessary method of computation. The established income means the income minus the tax component.

59.5. For determination of the multiplicand, the deduction for personal and living expenses, the tribunals and the courts shall be guided by paras 30 to 32 of Sarla Verma⁴ which we have reproduced hereinbefore.

59.6. The selection of multiplier shall be as indicated in the Table in Sarla Verma¹ read with para 42 of that judgment.

59.7. The age of the deceased should be the basis for applying the multiplier.

59.8. Reasonable figures on conventional heads, namely, loss of estate, loss of consortium and funeral expenses should be Rs 15,000, Rs 40,000 and Rs 15,000 respectively. The aforesaid amounts should be enhanced at the rate of 10% in every three years.”

21. Hon’ble Supreme Court in the case of **Magma General Insurance Company Limited Vs. Nanu Ram alias Chuhru Ram & Others [2018(18) SCC 130]** after considering **Sarla Verma (supra)** and **Pranay Sethi (Supra)** has settled the law regarding consortium. Relevant paras of the same are reproduced as under:-

“21. A Constitution Bench of this Court in Pranay Sethi² dealt with the various heads under which compensation is to be awarded in a death case. One of these heads is loss of consortium. In legal parlance, "consortium" is a compendious term which encompasses "spousal consortium", "parental consortium", and "filial consortium". The right to consortium would include the company, care, help, comfort, guidance, solace and affection of the deceased, which is a loss to his family. With respect to a spouse, it would include sexual relations with the deceased spouse.

*21.1. **Spousal consortium** is generally defined as rights pertaining to the relationship of a husband-wife which allows compensation to the surviving spouse for loss of "company, society, cooperation, affection, and aid of the other in every conjugal relation".*

21.2. **Parental consortium** is granted to the child upon the premature death of a parent, for loss of "parental aid, protection, affection, society, discipline, guidance and training".

21.3. **Filial consortium** is the right of the parents to compensation in the case of an accidental death of a child. An accident leading to the death of a child causes great shock and agony to the parents and family of the deceased. The greatest agony for a parent is to lose their child during their lifetime. Children are valued for their love, affection, companionship and their role in the family unit.

22. Consortium is a special prism reflecting changing norms about the status and worth of actual relationships. Modern jurisdictions world-over have recognised that the value of a child's consortium far exceeds the economic value of the compensation awarded in the case of the death of a child. Most jurisdictions therefore permit parents to be awarded compensation under loss of consortium on the death of a child. The amount awarded to the parents is a compensation for loss of the love, affection, care and companionship of the deceased child.

23. The Motor Vehicles Act is a beneficial legislation aimed at providing relief to the victims or their families, in cases of genuine claims. In case where a parent has lost their minor child, or unmarried son or daughter, the parents are entitled to be awarded loss of consortium under the head of filial consortium. Parental consortium is awarded to children who lose their parents in motor vehicle accidents under the Act. A few High Courts have awarded compensation on this count. However, there was no clarity with respect to the principles on which compensation could be awarded on loss of filial consortium.

24. The amount of compensation to be awarded as consortium will be governed by the principles of awarding compensation under "loss of consortium" as laid down in *Pranay Sethi*². In the present case, we deem it appropriate to award the father and the sister of the deceased, an amount of Rs 40,000 each for loss of filial consortium.

22. A perusal of the impugned award further reveals that learned Tribunal had rightly assessed the income of the deceased as Rs.5,000/- per month on the basis of prevailing government notifications for daily wage

earners, in the absence of proof of the alleged monthly income of Rs.15,000/-. Hence, the computation of income, as undertaken by the learned Tribunal, warrants no interference. A perusal of the award further reveals that learned Tribunal had rightly awarded the compensation towards the heads of future prospects to the tune of 40%, and rightly deducted 1/3 of income towards personal expenditure. A perusal of the award further reveals that the learned Tribunal has rightly applied the multiplier of 17 in view of the settled law. However, the amount granted under the heads of loss of estate, funeral expenses and loss of consortium is on lower side. Therefore, the award requires indulgence of this Court.

RELIEF

23. In view of the law laid down by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in the above referred to judgments, the present appeal is **allowed** and the award dated 02.04.2010 is set aside. The appellants/claimants are held entitled to the compensation as per the calculations made here-under:-

<i>Sr. No.</i>	<i>Heads</i>	<i>Compensation Awarded</i>
1	Monthly Income	Rs.5,000/-
2	Future prospects @ 40%	Rs.2,000/- (40% of 5,000)
3	Deduction towards personal expenditure 1/3	Rs.2,333/- {(5,000 + 2,000) X 1/3}
4	Total Income	Rs.4,667/- (7,000 – 2,333)
5	Multiplier	17
6	Annual Dependency	Rs.9,52,068/- (4,667 X 12 X 17)
7	Loss of Estate	Rs.18,150/-
8	Funeral Expenses	Rs.18,150/-
9	Loss of Consortium Spousal : Rs. 48,400 x 1	Rs.1,45,200/-

	Parental : Rs. 48,400 x 1 Filial : Rs. 48,00 x 1	
	Total Compensation	Rs.11,33,568/-
	Amount awarded by the Tribunal	Rs.3,60,068/-
	Enhanced amount of compensation	Rs.7,73,500/- (Rs.11,33,568 – 3,60,068)

24. 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 amount of compensation from the date of filing of claim petition till the date of its realization.

25. 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 the date of receipt of copy of this judgment. The Tribunal is further directed to disburse the amount of compensation along with interest equally in the accounts of the claimants/appellants. The claimants/appellants are directed to furnish their bank account details to the Tribunal.

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

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

17.10.2025
Virender

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