



FAO-2742-2018 (O&M)

-1-

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

**FAO-2742-2018 (O&M)
Reserved on : 26.09.2025
Date of Pronouncement : 07.11.2025**

National Insurance Company LimitedAppellant

Vs.

Smt. Vidya Devi and othersRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present : Mr. Deepak Suri, Advocate, and
Mr. Brij Bhushan Sharma, Advocate,
for the appellant-Insurance Company.

Mr. Saurav Tyagi, Advocate, for
Mr. Gaurav Tyagi, Advocate,
for respondents No.1 to 4.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA J. (ORAL)

1. The present appeal has been preferred against the award dated 24.10.2017 passed in the claim petition filed under Sections 166 and 140 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 by the learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Karnal (for short, 'the Tribunal'), whereby the appellant-Insurance company was held liable to pay the compensation to the claimants/respondents No.1 to 4 to the tune of Rs.16,05,608/- along with interest @ 9% per annum.

**BRIEF FACTS OF THE CASE**

2. The brief facts of the case are that on 16.11.2014, the deceased Bijender along with conductor Pardeep and other passengers had started from the Bus Stand, Karnal, in a bus bearing registration No. HR45A-9756, which was being driven by the deceased himself (Bijender Singh). When the bus reached near Nirmal Kutia Chowk on G.T. Road, Karnal, a bus belonging to Indo Canadian Transport Company, bearing registration No. PB01A-4949, being driven by respondent No.1 in a rash and negligent manner, came from the side of Panipat and struck against the bus of the deceased. As a result thereof, the driver and the conductor of the said bus died at the spot and the passengers of both the buses sustained injuries. In this regard, FIR No.905 dated 16.11.2014 under Sections 279, 336, 337 and 304-A IPC was registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Karnal.

3. Upon notice of the claim petition, respondents appeared and contested the claim petition by filing their separate written replies and denied the factum of the accident/compensation.

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

“1. Whether the motor vehicular accident, which took place on 16.11.2014 was caused on account of rash and negligent driving of vehicle bearing registration No.PB-01A-4949 by respondent No.1 Beer Singh resulting into the death of Bijender and Pardeep Singh and damage to the Haryana



Roadways Bus bearing registration No. HR45A9756? If so, its effect? OPP

2. *If issue No.1 is proved, whether the claimants are entitled to claim any compensation. If so, how much and from whom?OPP.*
3. *Whether respondent No.1 was driving the offending vehicle in violation of terms and conditions of policy of insurance? OPR*
4. *Whether the claim petition is not maintainable? OPR*
5. *Whether the present claim petition has been filed by the claimants in collusion with driver and owner i.e. respondents No.1 & 2. If so, its effect? OPR*
6. *Relief.”*

5. In support of their pleadings, both the parties led their respective evidence.

6. After taking into consideration the pleadings and the evidence on record, the learned Tribunal awarded compensation to claimants/respondents No.1 to 4 to the tune of Rs.16,05,608/- along with interest @ 9% per annum and appellant-Insurance Company was held liable to pay compensation. Hence, the present appeal.

SUBMISSIONS OF THE LEARNED COUNSELS FOR THE PARTIES

7. Learned counsel for the appellant-Insurance Company contends that the learned Tribunal has erred in concluding that the accident in question occurred solely due to the negligence of the driver of the



offending Indo-Canadian bus. He further contends that the present case involves a head-on collision between two buses, one belonging to Indo-Canadian Travels (the offending vehicle) and the other being a Haryana Roadways bus bearing registration No. HR-45-A-9756, therefore, the accident is a clear instance of contributory negligence on the part of both drivers.

8. He further contends that the learned Tribunal has failed to properly appreciate and evaluate the evidence available on record, and has arrived at its findings without due consideration of the material aspects indicating negligence on the part of the Haryana Roadways bus driver as well.

9. The learned counsel also argues that the compensation awarded to the claimant is excessive, being disproportionate to the facts and circumstances of the case and not in consonance with settled principles governing assessment of compensation under the Motor Vehicles Act.

10. On these grounds, it is prayed that the impugned award dated 24.10.2017 be set aside or suitably modified, by holding the case to be one of contributory negligence and by reducing the quantum of compensation accordingly.

11. *Per contra*, learned counsel for claimants/respondents No.1 to 4 submits that the learned Tribunal has rightly returned the finding on the issue of negligence and the same calls for no interference. However, it is



urged that the compensation awarded is on the lower side and, therefore, warrants enhancement.

12. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and carefully perused the record of this Court with their able assistance.

13. Before proceeding further, it is relevant to reproduce the relevant portion of the award dated 24.10.2017 passed by the learned Tribunal:-

“Issue No.1:-

15. The claimants have submitted that the accident in question had taken place on 16/11/2014 due to the rash and negligent driving of the offending vehicle by respondent no.1 as a result of which Bijender and Pardeep Singh had died and the Haryana Roadways bus bearing registration number HR45A9756 had been damaged. In order to prove this issue, the claimants have examined Bahadur Singh as PW7, who was travelling in the aforesaid bus of Haryana Roadways and had witnessed the said accident. The said witness has given a detailed account of the said accident including the rash and negligent driving of respondent No. 1 and the death of Bijender and Pardeep Singh in the said accident. PW7 has submitted that the Haryana Roadways bus was being driven by the deceased Bijender Singh on his due left-hand side of the road by observing traffic rules and at a moderate speed whereas the offending bus was being driven by respondent No. 1 in a rash, negligent and careless manner as a result of which the offending bus hit against the Haryana Roadways bus causing death of Bijender and Pardeep. The claimants Shobha Rani and Soni Devi have also stepped into the witness-box as PW4 and PW6 respectively in support of their case. Claimants have also placed on record a copy of the FIR as Ex.P14, copy of the challan presented to the court as Ex.P15, and post-mortem reports of the deceased Bijender and Pardeep Singh as Exhibits P35 and P17 respectively. Therefore, there is no doubt regarding the said accident



having been caused by the rash and negligent driving of the bus bearing registration number PB01A4949.

16. Respondent No. 1 had also stepped into the witness-box as RW1 and had submitted that the Haryana Roadways bus was being driven by its driver in a rash and negligent manner without observing the traffic rules and the said bus came on the GT Road without caring for the traffic coming on the road and hit his bus against the front door of the private bus towards the conductor side and caused the accident. However, RW1 has admitted in his cross examination that he had not moved any application to any higher authority regarding his alleged false implication. He has also admitted that the Indo Canadian company also did not move any claim petition in the court regarding the damage caused to the bus bearing registration number PB01A4949. It is now settled that registration of criminal case against the driver of the offending vehicle for causing accident by rash and negligent driving is a prima facie proof that the accident was a result of rashness and negligence on his part as settled in Girdhari Lal Vs. Radhey Shyam & Ors. 1993 (2) P.L.R. 109. It is further settled proposition of law that in motor vehicle accidents claim cases, the approach to find out who was rash and negligent in causing the accident is different from the one when a person is challaned in a criminal court on a culpable charge. The burden of proof on the petitioners is not that heavy as is required to prove a criminal charge for rash and negligent driving of the vehicle.

17. In the present case, the fact that the police had challaned respondent no.1 for the commission of offenses punishable under Sections 279, 336, 337 and 304-A IPC as evident from Ex.P15, shows that the investigating agency had reached the conclusion that respondent no.1 had caused the accident by his rash and negligent driving of the offending vehicle. Respondent no.1 did not make any complaint to the concerned SHO or higher police officers regarding his false implication.

18. In the aforesaid circumstances, it is held that the said accident was caused due to the rash and negligent driving of the vehicle bearing registration no. PB01A4949, which was being driven by respondent no.1 at the relevant time which resulted in causing death of Bijender and Pardeep Singh and damage to the Haryana Roadways bus bearing registration number HR45A9756.



As such, issue no.1 is decided in favour of the claimants and against the respondents.”

14. A perusal of the record reveals that the learned Tribunal has rightly held that the accident in question occurred due to the sole negligence of Beer Singh @ Veer Singh, the driver of the offending Indo-Canadian Bus bearing registration No.PB-01-4949 (hereinafter referred to as the offending vehicle).

15. The testimony of PW-1, Bahadur Chand, assumes considerable importance. He has categorically deposed to the entire sequence of events leading to the accident and has clearly stated that the same occurred due to the rash and negligent driving of the driver of the offending vehicle. His testimony remained unimpeached and unshaken during cross-examination, thereby lending full credibility to his version. The learned Tribunal has, therefore, rightly placed reliance on such trustworthy and consistent testimony.

16. Similarly, PW-2, Vikas Singh, has fully corroborated the statement of PW-1. His evidence has also withstood the rigours of cross-examination and remained consistent in all material particulars, thereby further reinforcing the conclusion drawn by the Tribunal regarding the cause of the accident.

17. It is well settled that in proceedings before the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, the standard of proof is that of preponderance of probabilities and not proof beyond reasonable doubt as required in criminal



proceedings. Applying this settled principle, the Tribunal has rightly concluded that the preponderance of evidence unmistakably points towards the rash and negligent act of the driver of the offending vehicle.

18. Furthermore, the record discloses that the said driver, Beer Singh @ Veer Singh, had also faced criminal prosecution arising out of the same accident. It is a settled proposition of law that the initiation of criminal proceedings against a driver in respect of an accident constitutes prima facie evidence of negligence, unless rebutted by cogent evidence to the contrary.

19. The findings of the learned Tribunal are further fortified by the site plan (Ex. R11). A bare perusal of the site plan clearly indicates that the manner of the collision and the positioning of the vehicles at the site unequivocally point towards rash and negligent driving on the part of the offending Indo-Canadian bus.

20. There is, moreover, no material on record to indicate any negligence, contributory or otherwise, on the part of the driver of the Haryana Roadways bus. The defence plea of contributory negligence is thus devoid of merit and unsupported by any cogent evidence.

21. In view of the foregoing discussion, it is evident that the findings of the learned Tribunal on the issue of negligence are based on a sound appreciation of evidence and are in conformity with the settled principles of law. There is no infirmity or perversity warranting interference by this Court. Accordingly, the finding of the learned Tribunal holding that



the accident occurred solely due to the rash and negligent driving of the driver of the offending Indo-Canadian bus is hereby affirmed.

22. Adverting now to the second limb of the argument advanced by the appellant-Insurance Company that the compensation awarded by the learned Tribunal is on higher side, the Court proceeds to examine the matter.

23. A perusal of the record satisfies this Court that the learned Tribunal correctly accepted the age of the deceased as 39 years, a fact which is not in dispute between the parties and is supported by the documents placed on record. The assessment of the learned Tribunal regarding monthly income of the deceased arrived at from the gross salary reflected in the payslip (Ex. P-23), less income tax accords with the principles laid down by the Apex Court and with the settled law on computation of loss of dependency. For these reasons the approach of the learned Tribunal to ascertaining the income of the deceased and its application of the relevant deductions of income tax is hereby affirmed.

24. The next contentious question is **“whether the amount of Rs. 46,30,752/-, representing compassionate financial assistance received by the claimants under the Haryana Compassionate Assistance to Dependents of Deceased Government Employees Rules, 2006 (for short, ‘the Rules 2006’), is deductible from the compensation awarded under the Motor Vehicles Act”**.



25. This issue has been authoritatively settled by a larger Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Reliance General Insurance Company Limited v. Shashi Sharma, 2016 (9) SCC 627**, wherein the Apex Court, speaking through Justice A.M. Khanwilkar, categorically held that amounts receivable by dependents under the Rules 2006 are liable to be taken into account and are deductible while computing the net compensation payable. The relevant extract of the said judgment is reproduced as under:-

“16. The principle discernable from the exposition in Helen C. Rebello's case (supra) is that if the amount "would be due to the dependants of the deceased even otherwise", the same shall not be deductible from the compensation amount payable under the Act of 1988. At the same time, it must be borne in mind that loss of income is a significant head under which compensation is claimed in terms of the Act of 1988. The component of quantum of "loss of income", inter alia, can be "pay and wages" which otherwise would have been earned by the deceased employee if he had survived the injury caused to him due to motor accident. If the dependents of the deceased employee, however, were to be compensated by the employer in that behalf, as is predicated by the Rules of 2006 - to grant compassionate assistance by way of ex-gratia financial assistance on compassionate grounds to the dependents of the deceased Government employee who dies in harness, it is unfathomable that the dependents can still be permitted to claim the same amount as a possible or likely loss of income to be



suffered by them to maintain a claim for compensation under the Act of 1988.

17. A perusal of the scheme of Rules of 2006 would reinforce the position that the dependents of the deceased Government employee are suitably compensated for a specified period by way of financial assistance in the form of ex-gratia payment on compassionate grounds equivalent to the pay and other allowances that was last drawn by the deceased employee in the normal course without raising a specific claim. Here, we may advert to the recital of the Rules of 2006, which reads thus:

"No. G.S.R. 19/Const./Art. 309/2006.-In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution of India, The Governor of Haryana hereby makes the following rules to grant the compassionate assistance by way of ex-gratia financial assistance on compassionate grounds to members of the family of a deceased Government employee who dies while in service/missing Government employee, namely:-

(emphasis supplied)

Rule 2 stipulates the objects of the Rules, namely, to assist the family of a deceased/missing Government employee of Group C and D category, in tiding over the emergent situation, resulting from the loss of the bread-earner while in regular service by giving financial assistance. Rule 3 of the said Rules provides for eligibility to



receive financial assistance under the Rules. As per Rule 4, the eligible family members are required to submit an application in Form A for compassionate financial assistance. Rule 5, is of some significance which provides for the extent of financial assistance. The same reads thus:

"5.(1) On the death of any Government employee, the family of the employee would continue to receive as financial assistance a sum equal to the pay and other allowances that was last drawn by the deceased employee in the normal course without raising a specific claim.,-

(a) for a period of fifteen years from the date of death of the employee, if the employee at the time of his death had not attained the age of thirty- five years;

(b) for a period of twelve years or till the date the employee would have retired from Government service on attaining the age of superannuation, whichever is less, if the employee at the time of his death had attained the age of thirty-five years but had not attained the age of forty-eight years;

(c) for a period of seven years or till the date the employee would have retired from Government service on attaining the age of superannuation, whichever is less, if the employee had attained the age of forty-eight years.



(2) The family shall be eligible to receive family pension as per the normal rules only after the period during which he receives the financial assistance as above is completed.

(3) The family of a deceased Government employee who was in occupation of a Government residence would continue to retain the residence on payment of normal rent/license fee for a period of one year from the date of death of the employee.

(4) Within fifteen days from the date of death of a Government employee, an ex-gratia assistance of twenty five thousand rupees shall be provided to the family of the deceased employee to meet the immediate needs on the loss of the bread earner.

(5) House Rent Allowance shall not be a part of allowance for the purposes of calculation of assistance."

18. Rule 6 pertains to pending cases of ex-gratia assistance, with which we are not concerned in the present appeals. But to complete the narrative, we may refer to the said provision. It postulates that all pending cases of ex-gratia assistance shall be covered under the new Rules (i.e. Rules of 2006). Further, the calculation of the period and payment shall be made to such cases from the date of notification of the new Rules. It further provides that the families will have the option to opt for the lump sum ex-gratia grant provided in the Rules,



2003 or 2005, as the case may be, in lieu of the monthly financial assistance provided under the new Rules.

19. Reverting back to Rule 5, sub-clause (1) provides for the period during which the dependents of the deceased employee may receive financial assistance equivalent to the pay and other allowances that was last drawn by the deceased employee in the normal course without raising a specific claim. Sub-rule (2) provides that the family shall be eligible to receive family pension as per the normal Rules only after the period during which they would receive the financial assistance in terms of sub-rule (1). Sub- rule (3) guarantees the family of a deceased Government employee of a Government residence in occupation for a period of one year from the date of death of the employee, upon payment of normal rent/license fee. By virtue of sub-rule (4), an ex-gratia assistance of 25,000/- is provided to the family of the deceased employee to meet the immediate needs on the loss of the bread earner. Sub-rule (5) clarifies that house rent allowance shall not be a part of allowance for the purposes of calculation of assistance.

20. Rule 5 broadly deals with two aspects. Firstly, to compensate the dependents of the deceased Government employee by granting ex-gratia financial assistance on compassionate grounds for the loss of pay and other allowances for a specified period. The second part of Rule 5 is to compensate the dependents of the deceased Government employee by way of allowances and concessions - of retaining occupation of the Government residence on specified terms, of family pension and other



allowance. As regards the second part, it deals with income from other source which any way is receivable by the dependants of the deceased Government employee. That cannot be deducted from the claim amount, for determination of a just compensation under the Act of 1988.

21. The claimants are legitimately entitled to claim for the loss of "pay and wages" of the deceased Government employee against the tortfeasor or Insurance Company, as the case may be, covered by the first part of Rule 5 under the Act of 1988. The claimants or dependents of the deceased Government employee (employed by State of Haryana), however, cannot set up a claim for the same subject falling under the first part of Rule 5 - "pay and allowances", which are receivable by them from employer (State) under Rule 5 (1) of the Rules of 2006. In that, if the deceased employee was to survive the motor accident injury, would have remained in employment and earned his regular pay and allowances. Any other interpretation of the said Rules would inevitably result in double payment towards the same head of loss of "pay and wages" of the deceased Government employee entailing in grant of bonanza, largesse or source of profit to the dependants/claimants. Somewhat similar situation has been spelt out in Section 167 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, which reads thus:

"167. Option regarding claims for compensation in certain cases.--- Notwithstanding anything contained in the Workmen's Compensation Act,



1923 (8 of 1923) where the death of, or bodily injury to, any person gives rise to a claim for compensation under this Act and also under the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1923, the person entitled to compensation may without prejudice to the provisions of Chapter X claim such compensation under either of those Acts but not under both."

(emphasis supplied)

22. Indeed, similar statutory exclusion of claim receivable under the Rules of 2006 is absent. That, however, does not mean that the Claims Tribunal should remain oblivious to the fact that the claim towards loss of Pay and wages of the deceased has already been or will be compensated by the employer in the form of ex-gratia financial assistance on compassionate grounds under Rule 5 (1). The Claims Tribunal has to adjudicate the claim and determine the amount of compensation which appears to it to be just. The amount receivable by the dependants/claimants towards the head of pay and allowances in the form of ex-gratia financial assistance, therefore, cannot be paid for the second time to the claimants. True it is, that the Rules of 2006 would come into play if the Government employee dies in harness even due to natural death. At the same time, the Rules of 2006 do not expressly enable the dependents of the deceased Government employee to claim similar amount from the tortfeasor or Insurance Company because of the accidental death of the deceased Government employee. The harmonious approach for determining a



just compensation payable under the Act of 1988, therefore, is to exclude the amount received or receivable by the dependents of the deceased Government employee under the Rules of 2006 towards the head financial assistance equivalent to "pay and other allowances" that was last drawn by the deceased Government employee in the normal course. This is not to say that the amount or payment receivable by the dependents of the deceased Government employee under Rule 5 (1) of the Rules, is the total entitlement under the head of "loss of income". So far as the claim towards loss of future escalation of income and other benefits, if the deceased Government employee had survived the accident can still be pursued by them in their claim under the Act of 1988. For, it is not covered by the Rules of 2006. Similarly, other benefits extended to the dependents of the deceased Government employee in terms of sub-rule (2) to sub-rule (5) of Rule 5 including family pension, Life Insurance, Provident Fund etc., that must remain unaffected and cannot be allowed to be deducted, which, any way would be paid to the dependents of the deceased Government employee, applying the principle expounded in Helen C.Rebello and Patricia Jean Mahajan's cases (supra).

23. A Priori, appellants must succeed only to the extent of amount receivable by the dependents of the deceased Government employee in terms of Rule 5(1) of the Rules 2006, towards financial assistance equivalent to the loss of pay and wages of the deceased employee for the period specified."



26. Furthermore, the aforesaid ratio has been reaffirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in a subsequent decision in **Krishna & Ors. v. Tek Chand & Ors., 2024 ACJ 443**, wherein the Court reiterated the principles laid down in Shashi Sharma's case (supra) and observed as follows:-

“5. We have perused closely the judgment of this Court in Sebastiani Lakra (supra) and we find that the three-judge Bench of this Court in the said case has clearly distinguished the reasoning of this Court in Shashi Sharma (supra) and in paragraphs 18 and 20 thereof has observed in that case it was a employers' family benefit scheme which was totally different from the Rules under consideration in Shashi Sharma (Supra).

6. We find that the observations of this Court in Sebastiani Lakra (supra) distinguishing the case of Shashi Sharma (supra) clearly applies to the case in hand. It is observed that the amount of Rs. 31,37,665/- (Rupees Thirty One Lakhs, Thirty Seven Thousand and Six Hundred and Sixty Five only) was paid to the dependents of the deceased-employee who are the petitioners herein under the aforesaid Rules since the said Rule was by way of compassionate assistance owing to the sudden death of the employee in harness for any reason whatsoever including as a result of a road traffic accident. This is in order to compensate the loss of the bread earner of the family who dies in harness.

In the case of a motor vehicle accidents, when negligence is proved, loss of dependency is compensated



for the very same reason. In our view, there cannot be a duplication in payments or a windfall owing to a misfortune. In another words, on the death of the person in harness, owing to a road traffic accident the dependents of a deceased cannot be doubly benefited as opposed to those who are dependents of a deceased who dies owing to illness or any other reason under the Rules formulated by the Haryana Government.”

27. In view of the settled legal position, the deduction of Rs. 46,30,732/- made by the learned Tribunal was in consonance with law and, therefore, deserves to be upheld.

28. Adverting next to the contention raised by learned counsel for the appellant-insurer that the compensation awarded under the head of loss of consortium is on the higher side and contrary to the law laid down by the Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court in ***National Insurance Company Ltd. Vs. Pranay Sethi & Ors.*** [(2017) 16 SCC 680, this Court finds substance in the said argument. The amount awarded under this head must be in conformity with the parameters prescribed by the Apex Court so as to maintain uniformity and proportionality. Having regard to those guiding principles, the quantum granted by the Tribunal appears to be excessive and warrants moderation.

29. Similarly, the compensation awarded under the head of funeral/last rites is also on higher side. It is also pertinent to note that no amount has been awarded under the head of loss of estate. Accordingly, the award requires modification only to the limited extent indicated above,



namely, by rationalising the amounts awarded for loss of consortium and funeral/last rites, while the remaining findings and calculations of the learned Tribunal call for no interference.

30. The recalculated compensation is, therefore, determined as under:-

<i>Sr. No.</i>	<i>Heads</i>	<i>Compensation Awarded</i>
1.	Monthly Income	Rs.29,068/-
2.	Future prospects @ 50%	Rs.14,534/- (50% of 29,068)
3.	Deduction towards personal expenditure 1/4	Rs.10,900/- {(29,068 + 14,534) X 1/4}
4.	Total Income	Rs.32,702/- (43,602 – 10,900)
5.	Multiplier	15
6.	Annual Dependency	Rs.58,86,360/- (32,702 X 12 X 15)
7.	Total amount of ex gratia financial assistance provided by the Government of Haryana	Rs.46,30,752/-
8.	Amount of compensation payable after deducting financial assistance	Rs.12,55,608/- (Rs.58,86,360 – Rs.46,30,752)
9.	Funeral Expenses	Rs.18,150/-
10.	Loss of Estate	Rs.18,150/-
11.	Loss of consortium	Rs.1,93,600/- (48,400 X 4)
	Total Compensation	Rs.14,85,508/-
	Amount Awarded by the Tribunal	Rs.16,05,608/-
	Reduced amount	Rs.1,20,100/- (Rs.16,05,608 - Rs.14,85,508)



FAO-2742-2018 (O&M)

-21-

31. 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 compensation amount i.e. **Rs.14,85,508/-** from the date of filing of claim petition till the date of its realization.

32. Consequently, the present appeal is **partly allowed**.

33. 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.

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

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

07.11.2025

Virender

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