



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

FAO-3341-2018
Reserved on:-17.09.2025
Pronounced on:- 22.09.2025

Balbir Kaur and othersAppellants

vs.

Bikramjit Singh and othersRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Deepak Arora, Advocate
for the appellants.

Mr. Inderjit Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA J.

CM-12178-CII-2018

1. The present application has been filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963, for condonation of delay of 151 days in refiling the present appeal.

2. For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and the delay of 151 days in refiling the present appeal is condoned.

FAO-3341-2018

1. The present appeal has been preferred against the award dated 23.05.2017 passed by the learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Gurdaspur in the claim petition filed under Section 166 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (for short, 'the Tribunal') for enhancement of compensation granted to the claimants to the tune of Rs.8,85,000/- along with interest @ 7.5% per annum, on account of death of Amandeep Singh in a Motor Vehicular Accident, occurred on 05.09.2016.



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 is not required to be reproduced here for the sake of brevity.

SUBMISSIONS OF LEARNED COUNSEL FOR THE PARTIES

3. The learned counsel for the claimants-appellants contends that the amount assessed by the learned Tribunal is on the lower side and deserves to be enhanced. Therefore, he prays that the present appeal be allowed and amount of compensation be enhanced as per latest law.

4. He further contends that the liability is fastened upon respondent No.1 i.e. owner/driver & respondent No.2 i.e. registered owner, vide which they are held jointly and severally liable for the payment of compensation to the claimants. However, the liability for the said payment is to be fastened only on respondent No.2-registered owner.

5. Per contra, learned counsel for respondent, 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. Therefore, he prays for dismissal of the appeal.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the appellants and perused the whole record of this case with his able assistance.

SETTLED LAW ON COMPENSATION

7. 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 d 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.

8. 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 seemly 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.”

9. 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 Sethi². 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.

10. A perusal of the award shows that the deceased was stated to be of 22 years of age and was earning Rs.30,000/- per month. The deceased was asserted to be a BCA student, was doing agricultural work and was running a dairy farm. However, no documentary evidence was produced qua the alleged income. The learned Tribunal erred in arbitrarily assessing the income of the deceased at Rs.5,000/-. Moreover, the learned Tribunal failed to duly consider the pertinent facts and did not undertake a proper assessment of income of the deceased, by keeping in view his educational qualifications and future earning potential.

11. It is well settled that in cases involving young and qualified claimants, the Courts are empowered to assess notional income based on educational background and future prospects. In this regard, reliance is placed on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **"Yashodamma S. Vs. Regional Manager, Reliance General Ins. Co. Ltd. and another, 2023 ACJ 605"** decided on 13.09.2022, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court, while considering the case of an MCA student, assessed the monthly income of the claimant at Rs.20,000/-. The relevant para of **"Yashodamma's"** (supra) case are reproduced as under:-

"7. MACT, while taking note of this aspect, has arrived at a conclusion that from the evidence available on record, the deceased was a final year MCA student and as such, keeping in view the job prospects, the income is to be reckoned at Rs. 20,000 and taking note of the age of the deceased at 23 years, the future prospects at 50 per cent was reckoned. Thus, the loss of dependency was worked out on



applying the multiplier of '18' at Rs. 32,40,000. On adding the amount towards the compensation on conventional heads, the total compensation was arrived at."

12. In the present case, considering the status of the deceased as a BCA student, his academic excellence, and the resultant loss of employment opportunities, this Court deems it appropriate to assess the notional income of the deceased as **Rs.15,000/- per month**.

13. Furthermore, the learned Tribunal has erred in applying an addition of 50% towards future prospects instead of 40%. As per the settled position of law laid down in **Pranay Sethi's case** (supra), in case of self-employed persons below 40 years of age, the permissible addition is 40% and not 50% towards future prospects.

14. Further perusal of the award shows that the amount awarded for loss of estate and loss of consortium is on the lower side and deserves to be enhanced.

15. Adverting to the contention of the claimants regarding liability to be fastened only on the registered owner, it is settled principle of law that the person whose name is reflected in records of registering authority is the owner and liable to pay compensation. Reference can be made to the authoritative judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court titled as **"Naveen Kumar Vs. Vijay Kumar and others, 2018 (2) RCR (Civil) 74**, relevant portion of which is reproduced as under:-

"12. The consistent thread of reasoning which emerges from the above decisions is that in view of the definition of the expression 'owner' in Section 2(30), it is the person in whose name the motor vehicle stands registered who, for the purposes of the Act, would be treated as the 'owner'. However, where a person is a minor, the guardian of the minor would be treated as the owner. Where a motor vehicle is subject to an agreement of hire purchase, lease or hypothecation, the person in possession of the



vehicle under that agreement is treated as the owner. In a situation such as the present where the registered owner has purported to transfer the vehicle but continues to be reflected in the records of the registering authority as the owner of the vehicle, he would not stand absolved of liability. Parliament has consciously introduced the definition of the expression 'owner' in Section 2(30), making a departure from the provisions of Section 2(19) in the earlier Act of 1939. The principle underlying the provisions of Section 2(30) is that the victim of a motor accident or, in the case of a death, the legal heirs of the deceased victim should not be left in a state of uncertainty. A claimant for compensation ought not to be burdened with following a trail of successive transfers, which are not registered with the registering authority. To hold otherwise would be to defeat the salutary object and purpose of the Act. Hence, the interpretation to be placed must facilitate the fulfilment of the object of the law. In the present case, the First respondent was the 'owner' of the vehicle involved in the accident within the meaning of Section 2(30). The liability to pay compensation stands fastened upon him. Admittedly, the vehicle was uninsured. The High Court has proceeded upon a misconstruction of the judgments of this Court in Reshma and Purnya Kala Devi.

13. The submission of the Petitioner is that a failure to intimate the transfer will only result in a fine under Section 50(3) but will not invalidate the transfer of the vehicle. In Dr. T.V. Jose, this Court observed that there can be transfer of title by payment of consideration and delivery of the car. But for the purposes of the Act, the person whose name is reflected in the records of the registering authority is the owner. The owner within the meaning of Section 2(30) is liable to compensate. The mandate of the law must be fulfilled."

16. Therefore, in light of the above referred to judgment in **Naveen Kumar vs. Vijay Kumar and others, 2018 (2) RCR (Civil) 74**, the findings of the learned



Tribunal fastening joint and several liability upon respondent No.1 i.e. owner & driver & respondent No.2 i.e. registered owner are legally untenable in the eyes of law and liable to be set aside. The liability to pay compensation under the Motor Vehicles Act is squarely upon the person in whose name the vehicle remains registered on the date of the accident. Thus, the liability is only to be fastened upon respondent No.2-registered owner.

Therefore, the award requires indulgence of this Court.

CONCLUSION

17. In view of the law laid down by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in the above referred to judgments, the present appeal is allowed. The award dated 23.05.2017 is modified accordingly. The appellants-claimants are entitled to enhanced compensation as per the calculations made here-under:-

Sr. No.	Heads	Compensation Awarded
1	Monthly Income	Rs.15,000/-
2	Future prospects @ 40%	Rs.6,000/- (40% of 15,000)
3	Deduction towards personal expenditure 1/2	Rs.10,500/- (21,000 X 1/2)
4.	Total Income	Rs.10,500 (21,000-10,500)
4	Multiplier	18
5	Annual Dependency	Rs.22,68,000/- (10,500X12X18)
6	Loss of Estate	Rs.18,150/-
7	Funeral Expenses	Rs.25,000/-
8	Loss of Consortium Filial: Rs. 48,400/-x3	Rs.1,45,200/-
	Total Compensation	Rs.24,56,350/-
	Deduction Amount Awarded by the Tribunal	Rs.8,85,000/-
	Enhanced amount	Rs.15,71,350/-(24,56,350-8,85,000)



18. 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 Nandu 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.

19. In view of the above, respondent No.2-registered owner is directed to deposit the enhanced amount of compensation along with interest with the Tribunal within a period of two months from the receipt of copy of this judgment. The Tribunal is directed to disburse the enhanced amount of compensation along with interest in the accounts of the claimants/appellants, as per ration settled by the learned Tribunal, vide its award dated 23.05.2017. The claimants/appellants are directed to furnish their bank account details to the Tribunal.

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

22.09.2025
Sahil

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

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