

**SUBMISSIONS OF LEARNED COUNSEL FOR THE PARTIES**

3. The learned counsel for the appellant contends that the amount awarded by the learned Tribunal is on higher side. He further submits that the appellant is only pressing the quantum part and is not challenging the findings of the learned Tribunal qua the issue of negligence. Therefore, he prays that the present appeal be allowed and amount of compensation be reduced as per latest law.

4. *Per contra*, learned counsel for claimant/respondent No.1, however, vehemently argues that the compensation awarded is on lower side and claimant/ respondent No.1 has preferred **FAO-1650-2016**, titled as **‘Rahul Kumar Garg Vs. Ramesh Chand and others’** seeking enhancement of the compensation awarded to claimant/respondent No.1. Therefore, he prays for dismissal of the present appeal.

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

6. At the very outset, it is pertinent to note that **FAO-1650-2016**, titled as **‘Rahul Kumar Garg Vs. Ramesh Chand and others’** filed by claimant/respondent No.1 has already been allowed by this Court vide order of even date detailing therein regarding every aspect of the arguments raised in the present appeal. In view thereof, the adjudication of the present appeal no longer survives.

7. In view of the above, the present appeal is **dismissed**.



FAO-1221-2016 (O&M)

-3-

8. The statutory amount of Rs.25,000/- deposited by the appellant at the time of admission of the appeal, is ordered to be refunded to it.

9. Pending application (s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

29.11.2025

Virender

Whether speaking/non-speaking : Speaking

Whether reportable : Yes/No