

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

FAO-5781-2009 (O&M)

UMED SINGH AND ANR.

.....Appellants

vs.

RAVINDER KUMAR AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Reserved on : 07.05.2026

Pronounced on: 11.05.2026

Uploaded on: 14.05.2026

Whether only the operative part of the judgment is pronounced? NO*Whether full judgment is pronounced?* YES**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA**Present: Mr. Kulbhushan Sharma, Advocate
for the appellants.Mr. Chandarhas Yadav, Advocate
for respondent Nos.1 and 2.Mr. Balraj Singh Dhull, Advocate and
Mr. Pardeep Dhull, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA J.

1. The present appeal has been preferred by the appellants-registered owners of the offending vehicle against the award dated 19.09.2009 passed in the claim petition filed under Section 166 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 by the learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Rewari (for short, 'the Tribunal') whereby the learned Tribunal while awarding compensation to the claimants/respondent Nos.1 and 2, fastened the liability to pay the compensation upon the appellant and respondent Nos.3 (jointly and severally), on account of death of Smt. Shanti Devi in a Motor Vehicular Accident, occurred on 09.01.2000.



2. As sole issue for determination in the present appeal is confined to the liability of compensation fastened by the learned Tribunal upon the present appellants-registered owners of the offending vehicle, a detailed narration of the facts of the case are not reproduced for the sake of brevity.

SUBMISSIONS OF LEARNED COUNSEL FOR THE APPELLANT

3. Learned counsel for appellants/registered owners of the offending vehicle contends that on the date of accident respondent No.3-Baljit Singh was in the possession of the offending vehicle, therefore, he is solely liable to pay compensation to respondent Nos.1 and 2. He, therefore, prays that the present appeal be allowed and liability to pay compensation be solely fixed upon respondent No.3-Baljit Singh.

4. The learned counsel for the respondent No.3-Baljit Singh contends that he has wrongly been made liable to pay the compensation to the claimants/respondent Nos.1 and 2, since in his written statement as well as while arguing before the learned Tribunal, he had continuously been pleading that neither he was not the registered owner of the offending vehicle bearing No.HR-47-5001 on the date of accident. Despite this fact, the learned Tribunal while ignoring the submission made by the appellant, made him liable to pay the compensation. He furthermore contends that he has filed separate appeal bearing ***FAO-5649-2009***, titled as ***“Baljit Singh Vs. Ravinder Kumar and others”***, challenging liability to pay compensation affixed upon him and appellants (jointly and severally). He, therefore, prays that the present appeal be dismissed.

5. Per contra, learned counsel for respondent Nos.1 and 2/claimants contends that learned Tribunal has rightly decided the issue of liability to pay compensation. He furthermore contends that compensation awarded by learned Tribunal is on the lower side. He has preferred separate appeal bearing



no.FAO-754-2010 titled as “Ravinder Kumar and another Vs. Umed Singh and others” seeking its enhancement. He, therefore, prays that the present appeal be dismissed.

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

7. At the very outset, it is pertinent to note that **FAO-5649-2009**, titled as **“Baljit Singh Vs. Ravinder Kumar and others”** filed by the respondent No.3-Baljit Singh has already been allowed by this Court vide order of even date detailing therein regarding every aspect of the arguments raised in the present appeal.

8. In view of the above, the present appeal is **dismissed**.

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

11.05.2026

Ayub/Sahil

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

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