CGHC010391992026 2026:CGHC:43949

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCC No. 945 of 2026

1 - The New India Insurance Company Limited Through Divisional Manager, The New India Insurance Company Limited, Office At Sada Complex, Taxi Stand, T.P. Nagar, Korba, District Korba (C.G.) (Insurer). (Insurer Of The Offending Vehicle),

RAVVA UTTEJ KUMAR RAJU

... Applicant

Versus

1 - Smt. Manmoti Nishad W/o Late Ram Singh Nishad Aged About 40 Years R/o. Village Barpali, P.S. Shyang, Tahsil And District Korba (C.G.),

2 - Ajay, S/o Late Ram Singh, Aged About 22 Years R/o. Village Barpali, P.S. Shyang, Tahsil And District Korba (C.G.)

3 - Minor Sanjay, S/o Late Ram Singh, Aged About 15 Years Minor Through Natural Guardian Mother Manmoti Nishad, R/o. Village Barpali, P.S. Shyang, Tahsil And District Korba (C.G.)

4 - Minor Dinesh, S/o Late Ram Singh, Aged About 12 Years Minor Through Natural Guardian Mother Manmoti Nishad, R/o. Village Barpali, P.S. Shyang, Tahsil And District Korba (C.G.)

5 - Minor Ku. Karisha, D/o. Ram Singh, Aged About 10 Years Minor Through Natural Guardian Mother Manmoti Nishad, R/o. Village Barpali, P.S. Shyang, Tahsil And District Korba (C.G.).

6 - Irfan Ali S/o Usman Ali, Aged About 27 Years R/o. Village Barpali, P.S. Shyang, Tahsil And District Korba (C.G.) (Owner of the Offending Vehicle).

7 - Prashant Sharma S/o R.S. Sharma, R/o. Lig-86, Sharda Vihar Korba, Tahsil And District Korba (C.G.) (Owner of the offending vehicle).

... Respondents

(Cause title is downloaded from CIS Periphery.)

For Applicant	:	Mr. Deepak Gupta, Advocate.
For Respondents	:	Mr. Praveen Dhurandhar, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Amitendra Kishore Prasad

Order On Board

12.10.2026

1. Heard.
2. This MCC has been filed by the applicants seeking modification of the order dated 27.11.2025 passed in MAC No. 1567 of 2018, insofar as it relates to the compensation mentioned in paragraph 11 thereof.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant had preferred an appeal seeking enhancement of compensation awarded by the learned Claims Tribunal vide award dated 22.01.2018 passed in Claim Case No. 30/2017, whereby compensation of Rs.10,47,445/- was awarded. He next contends that this Court, vide judgment dated 27.11.2025, upon consideration of the evidence and material available on record, enhanced the compensation to Rs.12,53,445/- along with interest from the date of filing of the claim application till its realization. Learned counsel further submits that, as evident from the

computation of compensation made in paragraph 10 of the aforesaid judgment, the total compensation has been reassessed at Rs.12,53,445/-. However, in paragraph 11 of the judgment, due to an inadvertent arithmetical error, the enhanced amount has been calculated by deducting Rs.9,77,445/- from Rs.12,53,445/-, thereby reflecting the enhanced compensation as Rs.2,76,000/-. It is humbly submitted that the original award passed by the learned Claims Tribunal was for Rs.10,47,445/- and, therefore, the actual enhancement in compensation is Rs.2,06,000/- (Rs.12,53,445/- minus Rs.10,47,445/-). Accordingly, he prays that the aforesaid inadvertent arithmetical error in paragraph 11 of the judgment dated 27.11.2025 be corrected by substituting the figure of Rs.9,77,445/- with Rs.10,47,445/- and the enhanced amount of Rs.2,76,000/- with Rs.2,06,000/-, so as to bring the computation in conformity with the original award and the reassessment of compensation made by this Hon'ble Court.

4. No objection has been raised from other side to the modification sought for.

5. I have gone through the impugned order including the record and the mistake appears to be *bona fide* on the face of record, which needs to be rectified. Therefore, para 11 of the order dated 27.11.2025 be read as under:-

> "11. Accordingly, the total compensation is **enhanced to Rs.12,53,445/-** from **Rs. 10, 47, 445/-**. Thus, there is an **enhancement of Rs.**

2,06,000/-, which shall carry interest at the same rate as awarded by the Tribunal (7% p.a.) from the date of claim petition till realization."

6. Copy of this order be supplied to learned counsel for the respondents.

7. Accordingly, the MCC stands **allowed** in the aforesaid terms.

Sd/-
(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)
Judge

U.K. Raju