



C.M.A. NOS.434 AND 602 OF 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 05.02.2026

WEB COPY

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE R.SAKTHIVEL**

C.M.A. NOS.434 AND 602 OF 2025

AND

C.M.P. NO.4739 OF 2025 IN C.M.A. NO.602 OF 2025

CMA NO.434 OF 2025

1.R.Vasantham Mageshwari
W/o.K.Ravichandran

2.R.Paulraj
S/o. K.Ravichandran

3.R.Paul Vijay
S/o. K.Ravichandran
(Declared as major vide Order dated March 23,
2022 made in MP No.1 of 2022)

K.Sundarammal (Died)
W/o. Late Kuppusamy
(Amended as per Order dated June 9,
2022 made in MP No.3 of 2022)

All are residing at
No.73/192, Mettu Street, Gudur,
Chengalpet Taluk,
Kancheepuram District – 603 001.

... Appellants /
Petitioners

Versus

1.S.Oliarasu
S/o. Santhanam



C.M.A. NOS.434 AND 602 OF 2025

No.1/NA, Rettamangalam Village & Post,
Maduranthagam Taluk,
Kancheepuram District – 603 107.

2.National Insurance Company Limited
Motor Third Party Claims Hub
3rd Floor, Regina Mansiion,
Moore Street, Chennai – 600 001.

... Respondents /
Respondents

PRAYER: Civil Miscellaneous Appeal filed under Section 173 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, praying to enhance the compensation awarded in the Fair and Decretal Order dated August 20, 2024 passed in M.C.O.P. No.781 of 2018 on the file of the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal (In the III Court of Small Causes), Chennai.

For Appellants : Mr.K.Balaji

For Respondent-1 : No appearance

For Respondent-2 : Mrs.R.Sree Vidhya

CMA NO.602 OF 2025

National Insurance Company Limited
Motor Third Party Claims Hub
3rd Floor, Regina Mansion,
Moore Street, Chennai – 600 001.

... Appellant /
2nd Respondent

Versus

1.R.Vasantham Mageshwari
W/o.K.Ravichandran



C.M.A. NOS.434 AND 602 OF 2025

2.R.Paulajai
S/o. K.Ravichandran

3.R.Paul Vijay
S/o. K.Ravichandran

4.K.Sundarammal (Died)
W/o. Late Kuppusamy

All are residing at
No.73/192, Mettu Street, Gudur,
Chengalpet Taluk,
Kancheepuram – 603 001.

... Respondents 1-4/
Petitioners 1-4

5.S.Oliarasu
S/o. Santhanam
No.1/NA, Rettamangalam Village & Post,
Maduranthagam Taluk,
Kancheepuram District – 603 107.

... 5th Respondent /
1st Respondent

PRAYER: Civil Miscellaneous Appeal filed under Section 173 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, praying to set aside the Fair and Decretal Order dated August 20, 2024 passed in M.C.O.P. No.781 of 2018 on the file of the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal (III Judge, Court of Small Causes), Chennai and allow the Appeal.

For Appellant : Mrs.R.Sree Vidhya

For Respondents 1-3 : Mr.K.Balaji

For Respondent-5 : No appearance



COMMON JUDGMENT

(Judgment of the Court was made by R.Sakthivel, J.)

WEB COPY

Feeling aggrieved by the Award dated August 20, 2024 passed by 'the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal (III Judge, Court of Small Causes), Chennai' ['Tribunal' for short] in M.C.O.P. No.781 of 2018, the petitioners 1 to 3 therein have preferred C.M.A. No.434 of 2025 praying to enhance the compensation, while the second respondent therein / insurance company, has preferred C.M.A. No.602 of 2025 praying to set aside the Award.

2. This Common Judgment will now decide both the Civil Miscellaneous Appeals as they arise out of one and the same Award.

3. For the sake of convenience, hereinafter, the parties will be referred to as per their array in the Claim Petition.

PETITIONERS' CASE

4. The first petitioner is the wife of the deceased - K.Ravichandran. Second and third petitioners are their sons. Fourth petitioner is the mother of the deceased. To be noted, fourth petitioner who is the mother of deceased passed away pending the Claim Petition.



4.1. On December 15, 2017, at about 14:45 hours, when the deceased - K.Ravichandran was travelling as a pillion rider in a two wheeler bearing Registration No.TN-19-Y-4948, in GST Road, from Tindivanam to Chennai. At that time, first respondent's two wheeler bearing Registration No.TN-19-AZ-9598 rode by its driver in a very rash and negligent manner endangering public safety, hit against the two wheeler, in which the deceased was travelling and caused an accident. Due to the sudden impact, the deceased - K.Ravichandran sustained multiple severe head injuries and passed away on the spot.

4.2. In connection with the said accident, First Information Report (F.I.R.) in Crime No.513 of 2017 was registered on the file of the Padalam Police Station, for the offences punishable under Sections 279, 337 and 304(A) of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, against the driver of the first respondent's two wheeler bearing Registration No.TN-19-AZ-9598 and the same is pending before the learned Judicial Magistrate-I, Chengalpattu.

4.3. At the time of the accident, the petitioner was aged 45 years, working as Assistant Mazdoor, Grade – II, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Chengalpattu and was earning a sum of Rs.15,717/- as monthly income.



4.4. The respondents 1 and 2 are the owner and the insurer of the offending two wheeler respectively. It is the specific case of the petitioners that the accident occurred solely due to the rash and negligent act of the driver of the first respondent's two wheeler. Hence, both the respondents are jointly and severally liable to compensate the petitioners. Accordingly, the petitioners filed the Claim Petition seeking a compensation of Rs.49,00,000/- (Rupees Forty Nine Lakhs only).

FIRST RESPONDENT'S CASE IN BRIEF

5. The first respondent, owner of the two wheeler bearing Registration No.TN-19-AZ-9598, filed a counter statement disputing the manner of the accident. It is contended that it is the two-wheeler bearing Registration No.TN-19-Y-4948 in which the deceased was riding pillion, that dashed against the first respondent's two-wheeler owing to rash and negligent riding and caused the accident. In the said accident, the first respondent's two-wheeler was completely damaged and the first respondent also has sustained injuries. Further, as on the date of accident, the first respondent's two-wheeler was duly insured with second respondent and hence, any liability to pay compensation is upon the second



respondent. Stating so, the first respondent prayed for dismissal of the

Original Petition.

SECOND RESPONDENT'S CASE IN BRIEF

6. The second respondent filed a counter statement denying the petition averments. The manner of accident was also denied. It was contended that the accident occurred solely due to the rash and negligence of driver of the two-wheeler in which the deceased was travelling. Further, the driver of two-wheeler in which the deceased was travelling was drunk at the time of accident. There is no negligence on the part of the first respondent. In any case, the deceased has contributed to the accident.

6.1. Further, in the additional counter filed by the second respondent, it is stated that the first respondent obtained his licence only after the accident *i.e.*, on April 24, 2018. In other words, he did not hold a valid driving licence at the time of accident. It is further contended that the driver of the two-wheeler in which the deceased was travelling was drunk at the time of accident. Further, the criminal case filed against the first respondent with regard to the accident is pending before the learned Judicial Magistrate-I, Chengalpattu in C.C. No.800185/2018. Accordingly, the second respondent sought to dismiss the Claim Petition.



TRIBUNAL

WEB COPY

7. At trial, on the side of the petitioners, the wife of the petitioner - Mrs.R.Vasanth Mageswari (first petitioner herein) was examined as P.W.1 and Mr.K.Gunasekaran, an ocular witness to the accident was examined as P.W.2 and Ex-P.1 to Ex-P.17 were marked. On the side of the respondents, Mr.S.Rajesh, Senior Assistant of the second respondent / insurance company was examined as R.W.1 and Ex-R.1 to Ex-R.5 were marked.

8. The Tribunal, upon a careful consideration of the oral and documentary evidence available on record, relied on Ex-P.1 - F.I.R., Ex-P.2 -Charge Sheet and the evidence of P.W.2 / ocular witness, to hold the first respondent being the owner-cum-driver of the two wheeler bearing Registration No.TN-19-AZ-9598, responsible for causing the accident.

8.1. Further, it found that when the second respondent has not denied its liability to pay compensation, the first respondent has indulged in insurance policy violation by driving two-wheeler without a valid driving licence at the material point of time as it could be seen from Ex-R.1 - First respondent's Driving Licence Copy, Ex-R.2 - Status of first respondent's driving licence as shown in *Parivahansewa* and Ex-R.5 - Motor Vehicle Inspection Report [M.V.I. Report] of first respondent's motorcycle. Hence,



8.2. Further, the Tribunal awarded a sum of **Rs.22,50,000/-** (Rupees Twenty-Two Lakhs Fifty Thousand only) as compensation, as tabulated hereunder:

<i>S.No.</i>	<i>Head</i>	<i>Amount</i>
1	Total loss of dependency	Rs.21,00,000/-
2	Loss of Consortium	Rs.1,20,000/-
3	Loss of Estate	Rs.15,000/-
4	Funeral Expenses	Rs.15,000/-
<i>Total</i>		<i>Rs.22,50,000/-</i>

9. Seeking enhancement of the compensation awarded by the Tribunal, the petitioners 1 to 3 have preferred C.M.A. No.434 of 2025 and challenging the negligence as well as the quantum of compensation, the second respondent / insurance company has preferred C.M.A. No.602 of 2025.

10. Heard Mr.K.Balaji, learned Counsel appearing for the appellants in C.M.A. No.434 of 2025 / respondents 1 to 3 in C.M.A. No.602 of 2025 /



petitioners, and Mrs.R.Sree Vidhya, learned Counsel appearing for the appellant in C.M.A. No.602 of 2025 / second respondent in C.M.A. No.434 of 2025 / second respondent in claim petition - insurance company.

11. Mr.K.Balaji, learned Counsel would submit that the Tribunal rightly held that the first respondent is responsible for causing the accident by his rashness and negligence. As regards the contention of second respondent that the accident occurred due to the rashness and negligence on the part of the driver of the two-wheeler in which the deceased was travelling, in any case, even while assuming that the said contention is proved and true, it is to be noted that the deceased was riding pillion and hence, the deceased cannot be held vicariously liable for the contributory negligence of the said driver. As regards quantum of compensation, he would submit that the Tribunal erred in taking notional income when the petitioners have marked Ex-P.9 - Deceased's salary slip for the month of November 2017. The Tribunal ought to have taken the gross income of Rs.15,717/- as shown in Ex-P.9 for awarding a proper compensation. Further, he would rely on ***Krithi -vs- Oriental Insurance Company Limited***, reported in ***(2021) 2 SCC 166***, to contend that the Tribunal erred in deducting 1/3rd towards personal expenses instead of 1/4th. Accordingly,



he would pray to allow C.M.A. No.434 of 2025, dismiss C.M.A. No.602 of 2025 and enhance the Award amount.

12. *Per contra*, Mrs.R.Sree Vidhya, learned Counsel would submit that the Tribunal failed to appreciate the evidence in a proper manner. The rider of the two wheeler bearing Registration No.TN-19-Y-4948 was drunk during the material point of time and the deceased being aware of the said fact, voluntarily rode as a pillion rider in the motorcycle and thereby caused the accident. Further, the deceased was not wearing helmet at the time of accident. The Tribunal failed to consider the said aspects and erred in fixing entire negligence on the part of first respondent. Further, in any event, the deceased and the driver of the motorcycle in which he was travelling, contributed to the accident and the Tribunal ought to have at least deducted a proportionate sum from the compensation awarded to the petitioners on the account of contributory negligence of the deceased. Furthermore, the first respondent did not possess a valid driving license at the material point of time and hence, the Tribunal rightly used the pay and recovery principle. That apart, the Tribunal has taken a sum of Rs.15,000/- as monthly income of the deceased without any basis and the same is on the higher side. Hence, the notional monthly income of the deceased is to be reduced. Accordingly, she would pray to allow C.M.A. No.602 of 2025,



dismiss petitioners' C.M.A. No.434 of 2025 and modify/reduce the award amount.

POINTS FOR CONSIDERATION

13. This Court has considered both sides' submissions and perused the evidence available on record. The points that arise for consideration in both the Civil Miscellaneous Appeals are as follows:

- (i) Whether the accident occurred due to the rash and negligent driving of the first respondent, or is it the driver of the motorcycle in which the deceased was travelling who caused the accident ?
- (ii) Is there any contributory negligence on the part of the driver of the motorcycle in which the deceased was travelling ?
- (iii) If Point No.(ii) is answered in affirmation, whether the deceased being a pillion rider can be held liable for contributory negligence and whether the petitioners can be mulcted for the same ?



- (iv) Whether the finding of the Tribunal is justifiable in not relying on the pay slip of the deceased in Ex-P.9 and determining notional income at Rs.15,000/- per month ?
- (v) Whether the compensation awarded by the Tribunal is just, fair and reasonable ?

DISCUSSION

14. Point Nos.(i) to (iii) are taken up for discussion jointly as the issues are inter-twined. Case of the petitioners is that the accident solely occurred due to the rashness and negligence of the first respondent, who being the owner-cum-driver of the two-wheeler bearing Registration No.TN-19-AZ-9598, dashed against the two-wheeler in which the deceased was riding as a pillion rider. According to the petitioners, the first respondent is solely responsible for causing the accident. On the other hand, case of respondents is that the accident occurred solely due to the driver of the motorcycle in which the deceased was riding pillion; the said driver's rash and negligent riding in an inebriated mood led to the accident.

15. P.W.1 is the wife of the deceased and also the first petitioner in the Claim Petition. P.W.2 is an independent ocular witness to the accident



and hence, he is a competent person to depose about the accident. They both have supported the case of the petitioners on the aspects of manner of accident and negligence. Further, in this case, Ex-P.1 - F.I.R. has been registered against the first respondent. After investigation, Ex-P.2 - Charge Sheet also was laid against the first respondent. A bare perusal of the evidence of P.W.2 / Ocular Witness coupled with Ex-P.1 and Ex-P.2, would clearly establish the manner of the accident and the negligence on the part of the first respondent as alleged by the petitioners.

16. It is true that the criminal case against the first respondent ended in acquittal, as it could be seen from the final order copy of the criminal case in Ex-R.4. The acquittal was on the ground that the prosecution failed to prove the charges beyond reasonable doubt. As the standard of proof in a Motor Accident Claims Original Petition is preponderance of probabilities, Ex-R.4 does not have a binding effect. This Court is of the view that the evidence of P.W.2 / Ocular Witness coupled with Ex-P.1 - F.I.R. and Ex-P.2 - Charge Sheet establishes the case of the petitioners *qua* manner of accident and negligence by way of preponderance of probabilities.



17. At this juncture, the second respondent would contend that the driver of the motorcycle in which the deceased was riding on the pillion seat, was drunk at the time of accident; that the deceased being fully aware of his drunk state, consciously let him drive the two-wheeler and rode on the pillion seat, endangering his own life as well as the life of general public and thus, the principle of contributory negligence is applicable against the deceased and the driver of the two-wheeler in which he was riding pillion. Further, the second respondent would contend that the deceased by way of not wearing helmet at the time of accident, further contributed to the accident. All these contentions made by the insurance company are not supported by any evidence. The second respondent has neither marked any document nor raised any questions on these aspects to the witnesses that were presented by the petitioners during their cross-examination. No evidence was produced to show that the driver of the two-wheeler in which the deceased was travelling, was driving under the influence of alcohol. The second respondent failed to even successfully rebut the witnesses *viz.*, P.W.1 and P.W.2, on the aspect of manner of accident and negligence. Further, the accident occurred at about 14:45 hours *i.e.*, in the afternoon hours. The chances of a person being drunk in the afternoon are ideally less. It is to be noted that contributory negligence



cannot be inferred. It must be proved by adducing sufficient evidence and the burden is on the second respondent who allege the same. Hence, those contentions *qua* contributory negligence does not hold water. Point Nos.(i) and (ii) are answered accordingly and in view of the same, Point No.(iii) does not arise for consideration and pales into insignificance.

18. To be noted, the petitioners have mentioned in their Claim Petition that the first respondent's motorcycle was insured under Policy No.39010231176203712599 with second respondent and that the policy was valid from December 6, 2017 to December 05, 2018 and that the date of accident being December 15, 2017, the policy was in force at the material point of time. The second respondent did not dispute the same. The second respondent has been questioning its liability only on the ground that the second respondent violated the terms and conditions of the insurance policy by driving without holding a valid driving license. In support of the same, the second respondent has marked Ex-R.1, Ex-R.2 and Ex-R.5 which are the first respondent's driving licence, online status of the same from *Pariwahansewa* and M.V.I. Report of first respondent's motorcycle respectively. Bare reading of Ex-R.1 would show that the first respondent did not possess a valid driving license at the material point of time and that, while the accident occurred on December 15, 2017, his



license has been obtained after the accident on April 24, 2018. This means, the first respondent has violated the terms of the insurance policy as well as committed an offence under Section 181 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988. In these circumstances, in the absence of contra evidence, the finding of the Tribunal is justifiable in applying the principle of pay and recovery and directing the second respondent to pay compensation to petitioners and recover the same from first respondent.

19. As regards Point Nos.(iv) and (v), the petitioners' side has marked Ex-P.8 to Ex-P.10. Ex-P.8 is the appointment letter of the deceased as a Daily Wage Mazdoor at Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation Limited [TANGEDCO] in the year 2009. Ex-P.9 is his pay slip for the month of November, 2017 showing his gross monthly income as Rs.15,717/- and his net pay as Rs.12,121/-. It also shows that he was a Grade II Mazdoor at the material point of time. Ex-P.10 is a copy of his bank salary account passbook showing that Rs.12,121/- was credited as salary on December 1, 2017, which matches his net pay as mentioned in Ex-P.9. A conjoint reading of the documentary evidence in Ex-P.8 to Ex-P.10 would satisfactorily prove that the deceased last drew a monthly gross salary of Rs.15,717/-. The Tribunal ought to have considered Ex-P.8 to Ex-P.10 in a holistic perspective. Moreover, no serious objection was raised by



the respondents about Ex-P.8 to Ex-P.10. The Tribunal is not justifiable in rejecting Ex-P.9 and Ex-P.10 on the ground that they did not bear seal and signature of concerned authorities. Hence, this Court shall compute the compensation under the head of loss of income / dependency by taking the monthly income as Rs.15,717/-.

20. At this point, it is relevant to refer to ***Krithi's Case*** [cited *supra*] relied on by the learned Counsel for the appellants / petitioners 1 to 3, wherein Hon'ble Supreme Court while dealing with deduction of personal expenses, held that subsequent death of a dependent ought not to be a factor to reduce the compensation amount. Relevant extract reads thus:

"Analysis

I. Deduction for personal expenses

9. We have thoughtfully considered the rival submissions. It cannot be disputed that at the time of death, there in fact were four dependants of the deceased and not three. The subsequent death of the deceased's dependant mother ought not to be a reason for reduction of motor accident compensation. Claims and legal liabilities crystallise at the time of the accident itself, and changes post thereto ought not to ordinarily affect pending proceedings. Just like how the appellant-claimants cannot rely upon subsequent



increases in minimum wages, the respondent-insurer too cannot seek benefit of the subsequent death of a dependant during the pendency of legal proceedings. Similarly, any concession in law made in this regard by either counsel would not bind the parties, as it is legally settled that advocates cannot throw away legal rights or enter into arrangements contrary to law. [Director of Elementary Education v. Pramod Kumar Sahoo, (2019) 10 SCC 674, para 11 : (2020) 1 SCC (Civ) 38 : (2020) 1 SCC (L&S) 42]

10. Any compensation awarded by a court ought to be just, reasonable and consequently must undoubtedly be guided by principles of fairness, equity and good conscience. [See Helen C.Rebello v. Maharashtra SRTC, (1999) 1 SCC 90, para 28 : 1999 SCC (Cri) 197] Not only did the family of the deceased consist of septuagenarian parents, but there were also two toddler-girls, aged merely 3 and 4 years; each of whom requires exceptional care and expenditure till they reach the stage of self-dependency. Tragically, in addition to the married couple, the negligence of the driver also extinguished the life of the family's third child who was a foetus in Poonam's womb at the time of the accident. Thus, the appropriate deduction for personal expenses for both Vinod and Poonam ought to be 1/4th only, and not



1/3rd as applied by the Tribunal and the High Court, more so when there were four family members dependent on the deceased."

21. From *Kirthi's Case*, it is clear that the Tribunal is not right in deducting 1/3rd towards personal expenses, when the fourth petitioner being deceased's mother was very much alive as a dependant at the time of accident. The Tribunal ought to have deducted 1/4th towards personal expenses instead of 1/3rd. Otherwise, the computation of compensation under the head of loss of income / dependency by the Tribunal suffers no infirmity and there is no serious dispute with the same. Ex-P.4 to Ex-P.6, which are Death Report, Postmortem Certificate and Death Certificate of the deceased respectively shows that he was aged 45 years at the time of accident. The Tribunal has rightly applied 25% future prospects and the multiplier of 14, considering the fact that the deceased was a temporary employee aged 45 years at the time of accident; the same is in tune with ***Sarla Verma -vs- Delhi Transport Corporation***, reported in **(2009) 6 SCC 121** and ***National Insurance Company Limited -vs- Pranay Sethi***, reported in **(2017) 16 SCC 680**. The compensation towards loss of income / dependency is thus re-quantified as tabulated hereunder:



Compensation under the Head of Loss of Income / Dependency			
S. No.	Particulars	Calculation	Amount (Rs.)
1	Monthly Salary	-	15,717/-
2	Add: Future Prospects @ 25%	15,717 × 25%	3,929/-
3	Monthly Income (with Future Prospects)	15,717 + 3,929	19,646/-
4	Annual Income	19,646 × 12	2,35,752/-
5	Less: 1/4 th Deduction	2,35,752 × 1/4	58,938/-
6	Annual Income after Deduction	2,35,752 - 58,938	1,76,814/-
7	Applying Multiplier of 14	1,76,814 × 14	24,75,396/-
Total Compensation			Rs.24,75,396/-

22. This Court finds the compensation awarded by the Tribunal under the conventional heads namely loss of consortium, loss of estate and funeral expenses, in tune with *Pranay Sethi's Case* [cited *supra*]. Hence, there is no need to interfere with the same. *Point Nos.(iv) and (v) are answered accordingly.*

23. The total compensation as modified by this Court can be tabulated as below:

S.No.	Head	Amount awarded by the Tribunal	Amount re-quantified by this Court
1	Total loss of dependency	Rs.21,00,000/-	Rs.24,75,396/-
2	Loss of Consortium	Rs.1,20,000/-	Rs.1,20,000/-
3	Loss of Estate	Rs.15,000/-	Rs.15,000/-
4	Funeral Expenses	Rs.15,000/-	Rs.15,000/-
Total		Rs.22,50,000/-	Rs.26,25,396/-



CONCLUSION

24. Therefore, the second respondent / insurance company is directed to deposit the **enhanced award amount of Rs.26,25,396/- (Rupees Twenty Six Lakhs Twenty Five Thousand Three Hundred and Ninety Six only)** along with interest at the rate of 7.5% per annum from the date of claim petition till the date of deposit, to the credit of M.C.O.P. No.781 of 2018 on the file of Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal (III Judge, Court of Small Causes) Chennai, less the amount if any already deposited, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this Judgment. Further, the petitioners / claimants are entitled to proportionate costs throughout. On such deposit being made, the petitioners 1 to 3 are entitled to withdraw the same, by filing proper application.

25. In fine,

- (i)** The Civil Miscellaneous Appeal filed by the petitioners 1 to 3 in C.M.A. No.434 of 2025 is allowed in part with proportionate costs throughout.
- (ii)** The Civil Miscellaneous Appeal filed by the second respondent / Insurance Company in C.M.A. No.602 of 2025 is dismissed.



C.M.A. NOS.434 AND 602 OF 2025

(iii) Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, there shall be no order as to costs in C.M.A. No.602 of 2025.

(iv) Consequently, connected C.M.P. No.4739 of 2025 in C.M.A. No.602 of 2025 is closed.

[N.S.K., J.]

[R.S.V., J.]

05.02.2026

Index : Yes
Neutral Citation : Yes
Speaking Order : Yes
TK

Note to Registry : Fourth Petitioner in the Claim Petition namely K.Sundarammal W/o. Late Kuppusamy, passed away during the pendency of the Claim Petition. While she has been marked as 'died' in the cause title to C.M.A. No.434 of 2025 filed by the petitioners 1 to 3, it has not been done so in the cause title to C.M.A. No.602 of 2025 filed by the insurance company. Hence, the Registry is directed to carry out the necessary changes in the cause title to C.M.A. No.602 of 2025, before issuing Order Copy.

To

The Motor Accident Claims Tribunal
(III Judge)
Court of Small Causes
Chennai.



WEB COPY



C.M.A. NOS.434 AND 602 OF 2025

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.
AND
R.SAKTHIVEL, J.

TK

CMA NOS.434 AND 602 OF 2025

05.02.2026

Page No.24 of 24