IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

RA-CR No.20 of 2026 in
FAO No.1033 of 2020 with
XOBJC No.32 of 2023

SMT. SUNITA DEVI AND ORS. …Appellants
Vs
NARINDER KUMAR AND ORS. …Respondents

1	The date when the judgment was reserved	07.04.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	21.05.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	21 .05.2026
4	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the full judgment is pronounced	Full
5	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof.	Not applicable

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA*

Present: Mr. Yogesh Gupta, Advocate for the applicants-appellants.

Mr. Punit Jain, Advocate for respondent No.3.

****

HARKESH MANUJA, J.

1. Present review application has been filed on behalf of the applicants/appellants seeking review/modification of judgment dated 16.01.2026 passed by this Court in FAO No.1033 of 2020 along with XOBJC No.32 of 2023, primarily on the ground that while reassessing the compensation, an inadvertent error apparent on the face of the record has occurred in assessing the monthly salary income of the deceased.

2. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that while deciding the appeal, this Court in paragraph No.8 of the judgment dated 16.01.2026 assessed the salary income of the deceased at Rs.55,437/- per month after statutory deductions, whereas the evidence available on record clearly established that the gross monthly salary of the deceased was Rs.89,772/- and the actual income tax

liability worked out to Rs.96,106/- for the period from April, 2018 to February, 2019, which comes to Rs.8,737/- per month only. It is contended that after deducting the aforesaid monthly tax liability, the net monthly salary of the deceased ought to have been assessed at Rs.81,035/- per month instead of Rs.55,437/-.

3. Learned counsel further submits that PW-2, the concerned official from Government School, Bhandal, Tehsil Saloni, District Chamba, specifically deposed that the deceased was drawing gross salary of Rs.89,772/- per month and only Rs.7,000/- per month was being deducted towards TDS from the monthly salary, whereas the balance amount of Rs.26,106/- was deducted at the end of the financial year. Reliance has also been placed upon Income Tax Statement Ex.P-20 for the financial year 2018-19 to contend that the total tax liability of the deceased was Rs.96,106/- only and thus, the computation made by this Court requires correction.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper-book as well as the judgment sought to be reviewed.

5. A perusal of paragraph No.8 of the judgment dated 16.01.2026 shows that while considering Ex.P-17, the salary of the deceased was assessed at Rs.55,437/- after statutory deductions. However, from the evidence led on record, particularly the deposition of PW-2 along with Ex.P-20, it emerges that the gross monthly salary of the deceased was Rs.89,772/- and the total annual income tax liability for the relevant financial year was Rs.96,106/-, which for 11 months comes to Rs.8,737/- per month.

6. Thus, after deducting the aforesaid monthly income tax liability from the gross monthly salary, the net monthly salary of the deceased comes to

Rs.81,035/- (Rs.89,772/- – Rs.8,737/-). Consequently, the monthly income assessed in paragraph No.10 of the judgment also requires modification.

7. The aforesaid discrepancy is clearly an inadvertent computational error apparent on the face of the record, which deserves to be corrected in exercise of review jurisdiction.

8. Consequently, paragraph Nos.8, 10 and 14 of the judgment dated 16.01.2026 are modified to the following extent:-

> "8. In the present case, deceased was a retired veteran of armed forces and was working as a Principal of Government School, Bhandal, Tehsil Saloni, District Chamba. Upon perusal of pension order and other related documents Ex.P-23 to Ex.P-26, it is evident that the deceased was receiving monthly pension of Rs.26,113/-. Further, on examining the latest salary statement Ex.P-17 as well as the Income Tax Statement Ex.P-20, it is clear that the deceased was drawing gross salary of Rs.89,772/- per month. The total income tax liability for the financial year 2018-19 was Rs.96,106/-, which for the relevant period comes to Rs.8,737/- per month. Accordingly, after deduction of income tax, the net monthly salary of the deceased is assessed at Rs.81,035/- per month."
>
> xxx xxx
>
> "10. Therefore, in view of the discussion made hereinabove, this Court deems it appropriate to assess the total monthly income of the deceased as Rs.1,07,148/- (Rs.26,113/- pension + Rs.81,035/- salary)."
>
> xxx xxx.
>
> **14.** Consequently, the compensation payable to the claimants is re-assessed as under:-

S.No.	Nature	Amount (in Rs.)
1.	Annual Income of Deceased (Rs. 1,07,148/- x 12)	12,85,776/-

2.	Future Prospects @ 15%	1,92,866/-
3.	Total Income (Rs. 12,85,776 + Rs. 1,92,866)	14,78,642/-
4.	Deduction (1/4th)	3,69,660/-
5.	Net Annual Dependency	11,08,982/-
6.	Income after applying multiplier of 9 as per age of 56 years (Rs. 11,08,982 x 9)	99,80,838/-
7.	Funeral Expenses	18,000/-
8.	Loss of Estate	18,000/-
9.	Loss of Consortium (Rs. 48,000 x 4)	1,92,000/-
	Total Compensation	1,02,08,838/-
	Amount already awarded by Tribunal	67,04,800/-
	Enhanced Amount	35,04,038/-

Accordingly, appellants/claimants shall be entitled to receive above enhanced compensation in the proportion already determined by the learned Tribunal.

9. The remaining directions contained in the judgment dated 16.01.2026 passed by this Court in FAO No.1033 of 2020 with XOBJC No.32 of 2023 shall remain unaltered.

10. Resultantly, the present review application stands allowed in the aforesaid terms. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any shall also stand disposed of.

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

May 21, 2026
Atik

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No
Whether reportable Yes/No

MOHMED ATIK
2026.05.21 19:48
I attest to the accuracy and authenticity of this order/judgment