



251

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

FAO-1816-2021 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 02.02.2026

Manpreet Kaur @ Amandeep Kaur and Another ... Appellants

Versus

Hardayal and Others ... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present : Mr. Ashok K. Sharma (Bhana), Advocate for the appellants.

Mr. Mayank Gupta, Advocate for

Mr. Vinod Gupta, Advocate for respondent No.3.

ALKA SARIN, J. (Oral)

CM-10627-CII-2021

1. For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed. The delay of 125 days in filing the present appeal is condoned. However, the claimants shall not be entitled to any interest for the period of delay in filing the present appeal.

FAO-1816-2021 (O&M)

2. The present appeal has been preferred by the claimant-appellants aggrieved by the quantum of compensation awarded by the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Fatehabad (hereinafter referred to as the 'Tribunal') vide award dated 13.08.2019 on account of death of Lakhwinder Kaur (hereinafter referred to as the 'deceased').

3. Since the factum of the accident is not in dispute, the facts, as

recorded in the impugned award passed by the Tribunal, are not being adverted to herein for the sake of brevity.

4. The Tribunal in the present case had awarded the following compensation :

Sr.No.	Heads	Compensation Awarded
1	Monthly Income	₹6,000/-
2	Annual Income	₹72,000/- [₹6,000 x 12]
3	Future Prospects - 25%	₹90,000/- [₹72,000 + ₹18,000]
4	Deduction - 1/3 rd	₹60,000/- [₹90,000 - ₹30,000]
5	Multiplier - 13	₹7,80,000/- [₹60,000 x 13]
6	Loss of estate	₹15,000/-
7	Funeral expenses	₹15,000/-
	Total Compensation	₹8,10,000/-
	Interest	7.5%

5. Learned counsel for the claimant-appellants would contend that though he does not challenge the deduction, multiplier and the future prospects as applied by the Tribunal however, he has contended that the deceased in the present case was a homemaker and the Tribunal has assessed her income as ₹6,000/- per month which is on the lower side inasmuch as at the relevant point of time, minimum wages for an unskilled worker were also more than the income assessed by the Tribunal. It is further contended that the income of the deceased ought to have been assessed as per the minimum wages applicable to a skilled worker at the relevant point of time. In support of his contention, learned counsel for the claimant-appellants has relied upon a judgment of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in case of **Kirti & Anr. vs. Oriental Insurance Company Ltd. [2021 (1) RCR (Civil) 478]**. It is further the contention of learned counsel for the claimant-appellants that the compensation awarded under the conventional heads is not in accordance with

the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and that no amount has been awarded under the head 'loss of consortium'. In support of his contention, learned counsel for the claimant-appellants has relied on judgments of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases of **National Insurance Company Ltd. vs. Pranay Sethi & Ors. [(2017) 16 SCC 680]**, **Magma General Insurance Company Limited vs. Nanu Ram alias Chuhru Ram & Ors. [(2018) 18 SCC 130]** and **N. Jayasree & Ors. vs. Chola mandalam M.S General Insurance Company Ltd. [2021(4) RCR (Civil) 642]**.

6. *Per contra*, learned counsel for respondent No.3-Insurance Company has vehemently argued that sufficient amount has already been awarded as compensation in the present case and that there is no scope of any enhancement. It is further the contention that the claimant-appellants are not entitled to enhancement @ 10% under the conventional heads based on the judgment in case of **Pranay Sethi (supra)** inasmuch as Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Hasina Yasmin & Ors. vs. National Insurance Co. Ltd. & Anr. [SLP (C) No.27285 of 2025]** vide order dated 17.12.2025 has referred this point to a Larger Bench.

7. Heard.

8. Admittedly, no appeal has been filed by the Insurance Company. Since there is no challenge to the deduction, multiplier and the future prospects as applied by the Tribunal, the same are maintained. The argument of the learned counsel for the claimant-appellants that the income of the deceased, who was a homemaker, ought to have been assessed as per the minimum wages applicable to a skilled worker at the relevant point of time, deserves to be accepted. In case of **Kirti (supra)**, Hon'ble Supreme Court while emphasizing upon the contribution made by a homemaker and the

services rendered by a woman in a household observed that there can be no exact calculation or formula that can ascertain the actual value provided by a homemaker gratuitously. In order to streamline the calculation of notional income for homemakers and the grant of future prospects with respect to them for the purposes of assessing the compensation, the following principles were laid by Hon'ble Supreme Court :

“42. Therefore, on the basis of the above, certain general observations can be made regarding the issue of calculation of notional income for homemakers and the grant of future prospects with respect to them, for the purposes of grant of compensation which can be summarized as follows:

- a. Grant of compensation, on a pecuniary basis, with respect to a homemaker, is a settled proposition of law.*
- b. Taking into account the gendered nature of housework, with an overwhelming percentage of women being engaged in the same as compared to men, the fixing of notional income of a homemaker attains special significance. It becomes a recognition of the work, labour and sacrifices of homemakers and a reflection of changing attitudes. It is also in furtherance of our nation's international law obligations and our constitutional vision of social equality and ensuring dignity to all.*

c. *Various methods can be employed by the Court to fix the notional income of a homemaker, depending on the facts and circumstances of the case.*

d. *The Court should ensure while choosing the method, and fixing the notional income, that the same is just in the facts and circumstances of the particular case, neither assessing the compensation too conservatively, nor too liberally.*

e. *The granting of future prospects, on the notional income calculated in such cases, is a component of just compensation.”*

9. In the present case, considering the extensive contribution of the deceased in the household and in the absence of any evidence regarding her exact income, this Court deems it appropriate to assess the income of the deceased as per the minimum wages applicable to a skilled worker at the relevant point of time, which were ₹9,880/- per month. Accordingly, the income of the deceased is assessed as ₹9,880/- per month.

10. The argument of learned counsel for respondent No.3-Insurance Company that the claimant-appellants are not entitled to enhancement @ 10% under the conventional heads based on the judgment in case of **Pranay Sethi** (*supra*), deserves to be rejected inasmuch the reference by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Hasina Yasmin** (*supra*) to a Larger Bench, pertains to the fact as to whether enhancement @ 10% under the conventional heads based on the judgment in case of **Pranay Sethi** (*supra*), is also required to be given in cases in which accidents had taken place prior to 2017. Whereas the

accident in the present case had taken place on 25.07.2018 hence in view of judgment in case of **Pranay Sethi** (*supra*), the claimant-appellants would be entitled to the first and second enhancement @ 20% under the conventional heads (i.e. @ 10% w.e.f. 25.07.2021 and 10% w.e.f. 25.07.2024).

12. Accordingly, in the present case the compensation awarded by the Tribunal under the conventional heads is not in consonance with the law laid down by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in the cases of **Pranay Sethi** (*supra*), **Magma General Insurance Company Limited** (*supra*) and **N. Jayasree** (*supra*). The Tribunal has also not awarded any compensation under the head ‘loss of consortium’. Hence, the claimant-appellants would be entitled to ₹18,000/- (₹15,000 + 20% increase) towards loss of estate and ₹18,000/- (₹15,000 + 20% increase) towards funeral expenses as also to ₹48,000/- each (₹40,000 + 20% increase) towards loss of parental consortium.

13. Accordingly, the reworked compensation is as under :

Sr. No.	Heads	Compensation Awarded
1	Monthly Income	₹9,880/-
2	Annual Income	₹1,18,560/- [₹9,880 x 12]
3	Deduction - 1/3rd	₹79,040/- [₹1,18,560 - ₹39,520]
4	Future Prospects - 25%	₹98,800/- [₹79,040 + ₹19,760]
5	Multiplier - 13	₹12,84,400/- [₹98,800 x 13]
6	Loss of estate	₹18,000/-
7	Funeral expenses	₹18,000/-
8	Loss of consortium (i) Parental [₹48,000/- x 2]	₹96,000/-
	Total Compensation	₹14,16,400/-

14. The amount in excess of and over and above the amount awarded by the Tribunal shall also attract interest @ 7.5% per annum from the date of filing of the claim petition till the realization of the entire amount. However,

the claimant-appellants shall not be entitled to any interest for the period of delay in filing the present appeal.

15. In view of the decision by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Parminder Singh vs. Honey Goyal & Ors. [AIR 2025 SC 1713 = 2025 SCC OnLine SC 567]**, after calculation of the enhanced amount, the same be transferred by the Insurance Company in the bank account(s) of the claimants within six weeks from today and the apportionment thereof shall be as per the percentage directed by the Tribunal. The particulars of the bank account(s) alongwith the requisite documents(s) in support thereof shall be furnished by the claimant-appellants to the Insurance company within a period of two weeks from the date of this order and needful shall be done by the Insurance Company after verification thereof within four weeks thereafter alongwith up-to-date interest. The compliance shall be reported by the Bank to the Tribunal concerned.

16. In view of the above discussion, the award passed by the Tribunal is modified and the present appeal stands allowed accordingly. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

02.02.2026
jk

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking
Whether reportable: YES/NO