



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

FAO-3408-2022 (O&M)

INDRAWATI AND ORS

.....Appellants

Vs.

JAIDEEP @ JAGDEEP AND ANR

.....Respondents

Reserved on: 19.12.2025

Pronounced on: 13.02.2026

Uploaded on : 17.02.2026

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. Varun Sharma, Advocate
for the appellants.

Mr. Balraj Singh Rathee, Advocate
for respondent No.1.

Ms. Manvi Verma, Advocate
for Mr. Rajneesh Malhotra, Advocate
for respondent No.2-Insurane Company.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA J.**CM-9571-CII-2022**

1. This is an application filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 for condonation of delay of 1021 days in filing the appeal.
2. Notice in the application.
3. Mr. Balraj Singh Rathee, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1 and Ms. Manvi Verma, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of



respondent No.2-Insurance Company and contends that they have no objection if the application is allowed.

4. Learned counsel for the appellants contends that appellants would not ask for interest for the delayed period.

5. For the reasons mentioned in the application for condonation of delay which is supported by an affidavit, the application is allowed.

6. The delay of 1021 days in filing the appeal is condoned.

FAO-3408-2022

1. The present appeal has been preferred against the award dated 27.07.2017 passed in the claim petition filed under Section 166 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (in short '1988 Act'), by the learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Sonapat (for short, 'the Tribunal') for enhancement of compensation granted to the claimants to the tune of Rs.11,05,000/- along with interest @ 7% per annum, on account of death of Ram Dhari in a Motor Vehicular Accident, occurred on 24.12.2015.

2. As sole issue for determination in the present appeal is confined to quantum of compensation awarded by the learned Tribunal, a detailed narration of the facts of the case is not required to be reproduced here for the sake of brevity.

SUBMISSIONS OF LEARNED COUNSEL FOR THE PARTIES

3. The learned counsel for the claimants-appellants contends that the amount assessed by the learned Tribunal is on the lower side and deserves to be enhanced. Therefore, he prays that the present appeal be allowed and amount of compensation be enhanced as per latest law.

4. Per contra, learned counsel for respondent No.2-Insurance Company, however, vehemently argues that the award has rightly been passed



and the amount of compensation, as assessed by the learned Tribunal has rightly been granted. Therefore, they pray for dismissal of the appeal.


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

SETTLED LAW ON COMPENSATION

6. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Sarla Verma Vs. Delhi Transport Corporation and Another** [(2009) 6 Supreme Court Cases 121], laid down the law on assessment of compensation and the relevant paras of the same are as under:-

“30. Though in some cases the deduction to be made towards personal and living expenses is calculated on the basis of units indicated in Trilok Chandra, the general practice is to apply standardised deductions. Having a considered several subsequent decisions of this Court, we are of the view that where the deceased was married, the deduction towards personal and living expenses of the deceased, should be one-third (1/3rd) where the number of dependent family members is 2 to 3, one-fourth (1/4th) where the number of dependent family members is 4 to 6, and one-fifth (1/5th) where the number of dependent family members exceeds six.

31. Where the deceased was a bachelor and the claimants are the parents, the deduction follows a different principle. In regard to bachelors, normally, 50% is deducted as personal and living expenses, because it is assumed that a bachelor would tend to spend more on himself. Even



otherwise, there is also the possibility of his getting married in a short time, in which event the contribution to the parent(s) and siblings is likely to be cut drastically. Further, subject to evidence to the contrary, the father is likely to have his own income and will not be considered as a dependant and the mother alone will be considered as a dependant. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, brothers and sisters will not be considered as dependants, because they will either be independent and earning, or married, or be dependent on the father.

32. Thus even if the deceased is survived by parents and siblings, only d the mother would be considered to be a dependant, and 50% would be treated as the personal and living expenses of the bachelor and 50% as the contribution to the family. However, where the family of the bachelor is large and dependent on the income of the deceased, as in a case where he has a widowed mother and large number of younger non-earning sisters or brothers, his personal and living expenses may be restricted to one-third and contribution to the family will be taken as two-third.

** * * * **

42. We therefore hold that the multiplier to be used should be as mentioned in Column (4) of the table above (prepared by applying Susamma Thomas³, Trilok Chandra and Charlie), which starts with an operative multiplier of



18 (for the age groups of 15 to 20 and 21 to 25 years), reduced by one unit for every five years, that is M-17 for 26 to 30 years, M-16 for 31 to 35 years, M-15 for 36 to 40 years, M-14 for 41 to 45 years, and M-13 for 46 to 50 years, then reduced by two units for every five years, that is, M-11 for 51 to 55 years, M-9 for 56 to 60 years, M-7 for 61 to 65 years and M-5 for 66 to 70 years.

7. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **National Insurance Company Ltd. Vs. Pranay Sethi & Ors.** [(2017) 16 SCC 680] has clarified the law under Sections 166, 163-A and 168 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, on the following aspects:-

- (A) Deduction of personal and living expenses to determine multiplicand;
- (B) Selection of multiplier depending on age of deceased;
- (C) Age of deceased on basis for applying multiplier;
- (D) Reasonable figures on conventional heads, namely, loss of estate, loss of consortium and funeral expenses, with escalation;
- (E) Future prospects for all categories of persons and for different ages: with permanent job; self-employed or fixed salary.

The relevant portion of the judgment is reproduced as under:-

*“52. As far as the **conventional heads** are concerned, we find it difficult to agree with the view expressed in Rajesh². It has granted Rs.25,000 towards funeral expenses, Rs*



1,00,000 towards loss of consortium and Rs 1,00,000 towards loss of care and guidance for minor children. The head relating to loss of care and minor children does not exist. Though Rajesh refers to Santosh Devi, it does not seem to follow the same. The conventional and traditional heads, needless to say, cannot be determined on percentage basis because that would not be an acceptable criterion. Unlike determination of income, the said heads have to be quantified. Any quantification must have a reasonable foundation. There can be no dispute over the fact that price index, fall in bank interest, escalation of rates in many a field have to be noticed. The court cannot remain oblivious to the same. There has been a thumb rule in this aspect. Otherwise, there will be extreme difficulty in determination of the same and unless the thumb rule is applied, there will be immense variation lacking any kind of consistency as a consequence of which, the orders passed by the tribunals and courts are likely to be unguided. Therefore, we think it seemly to fix reasonable sums. It seems to us that reasonable figures on conventional heads, namely, loss of estate, loss of consortium and funeral expenses should be Rs.15,000, Rs.40,000 and Rs.15,000 respectively. The principle of revisiting the said heads is an acceptable principle. But the revisit should not be fact-centric or quantum-centric. We think that it would be condign that the amount that we



have quantified should be enhanced on percentage basis in every three years and the enhancement should be at the rate of 10% in a span of three years. We are disposed to hold so because that will bring in consistency in respect of those heads.

* * * * *

59.3. While determining the income, an addition of 50% of actual salary to the income of the deceased towards future prospects, where the deceased had a permanent job and was below the age of 40 years, should be made. The addition should be 30%, if the age of the deceased was between 40 to 50 years. In case the deceased was between the age of 50 to 60 years, the addition should be 15%. Actual salary should be read as actual salary less tax.

59.4. In case the deceased was self-employed (or) on a fixed salary, an addition of 40% of the established income should be the warrant where the deceased was below the age of 40 years. An addition of 25% where the deceased was between the age of 40 to 50 years and 10% where the deceased was between the age of 50 to 60 years should be regarded as the necessary method of computation. The established income means the income minus the tax component.

59.5. For determination of the multiplicand, the deduction for personal and living expenses, the tribunals and the



courts shall be guided by paras 30 to 32 of Sarla Verma⁴ which we have reproduced hereinbefore.

59.6. The selection of multiplier shall be as indicated in the Table in Sarla Verma¹ read with para 42 of that judgment.

59.7. The age of the deceased should be the basis for applying the multiplier.

59.8. Reasonable figures on conventional heads, namely, loss of estate, loss of consortium and funeral expenses should be Rs 15,000, Rs 40,000 and Rs 15,000 respectively. The aforesaid amounts should be enhanced at the rate of 10% in every three years.”

8. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Magma General Insurance Company Limited Vs. Nanu Ram alias Chuhru Ram & Others [2018(18) SCC 130]** after considering **Sarla Verma (supra)** and **Pranay Sethi (Supra)** has settled the law regarding consortium. Relevant paras of the same are reproduced as under:-

“21. A Constitution Bench of this Court in Pranay Sethi² dealt with the various heads under which compensation is to be awarded in a death case. One of these heads is loss of consortium. In legal parlance, "consortium" is a compendious term which encompasses "spousal consortium", "parental consortium", and "filial consortium". The right to consortium would include the company, care, help, comfort, guidance, solace and affection of the deceased, which is a loss to his family.



With respect to a spouse, it would include sexual relations with the deceased spouse.

*21.1. **Spousal consortium** is generally defined as rights pertaining to the relationship of a husband-wife which allows compensation to the surviving spouse for loss of "company, society, cooperation, affection, and aid of the other in every conjugal relation".*

*21.2. **Parental consortium** is granted to the child upon the premature death of a parent, for loss of "parental aid, protection, affection, society, discipline, guidance and training".*

*21.3. **Filial consortium** is the right of the parents to compensation in the case of an accidental death of a child. An accident leading to the death of a child causes great shock and agony to the parents and family of the deceased. The greatest agony for a parent is to lose their child during their lifetime. Children are valued for their love, affection, companionship and their role in the family unit.*

22. Consortium is a special prism reflecting changing norms about the status and worth of actual relationships. Modern jurisdictions world-over have recognised that the value of a child's consortium far exceeds the economic value of the compensation awarded in the case of the death of a child. Most jurisdictions therefore permit parents to be awarded compensation under loss of



consortium on the death of a child. The amount awarded to the parents is a compensation for loss of the love, affection, care and companionship of the deceased child.

23. The Motor Vehicles Act is a beneficial legislation aimed at providing relief to the victims or their families, in cases of genuine claims. In case where a parent has lost their minor child, or unmarried son or daughter, the parents are entitled to be awarded loss of consortium under the head of filial consortium. Parental consortium is awarded to children who lose their parents in motor vehicle accidents under the Act. A few High Courts have awarded compensation on this count. However, there was no clarity with respect to the principles on which compensation could be awarded on loss of filial consortium.

24. The amount of compensation to be awarded as consortium will be governed by the principles of awarding compensation under "loss of consortium" as laid down in Pranay Sethi². In the present case, we deem it appropriate to award the father and the sister of the deceased, an amount of Rs 40,000 each for loss of filial consortium.

9. A perusal of the award reveals that the deceased was 50 years of age at the time of the accident. He was stated to be an agriculturist and was stated to be earning Rs.30,000/- per month by agriculture work. The appellants/claimants have placed on record jamabandi (Ex.P-3 and Ex.P-4), which proves that deceased was owner of about 6 acres of agricultural land.



10. A perusal of award further reveals that learned Tribunal erred in assessing the monthly income of the deceased as Rs.10,000/- per month by doing guess work.

11. Despite this clear and cogent evidence establishing that the deceased was engaged in agriculture and belonged to a family owning substantial agricultural land, the Learned Tribunal ignored these material facts and mechanically assessed the income of the deceased. Such an approach is legally unsustainable.

12. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **K. Ramya v. National Insurance Co. Ltd. (Law Finder Doc ID No. 2042849)**, held that the Motor Vehicles Act is a beneficial legislation and envisages the grant of just and fair compensation so as to meet the ends of justice. Further the Apex Court has held that the claimants/appellants may be required to engage persons to look after agriculture, therefore, compensation for managerial skills should be granted.

13. The relevant portion of the award is reproduced as under:

“11. At the outset, it is pertinent to reiterate the concept of 'just' compensation under Section 168 of the Act. It is a settled proposition, now through a catena of decisions[4] including the one rendered by the Constitution Bench in Pranay Sethi[5*] that compensation must be fair, reasonable and equitable. Further, the determination of quantum is a fact-dependent exercise which must be liberal and not parsimonious. It must be emphasized that compensation is a more comprehensive form of pecuniary relief which involves a broad-based approach unlike damages as noted by this court in Yadava Kumar v. Divisional Manager, National Insurance Co. Ltd (2010) 10 SCC 341, para 17. The discussion in the*



abovementioned cases highlights that Tribunals under the Act have been granted reasonable flexibility in determining 'just' compensation and are not bound by any rigid arithmetic rules or strict evidentiary standards to compute loss unlike in the case of damages. Hence, any interference by the Appellate Courts should ordinarily be allowed only when the compensation is 'exorbitant' or 'arbitrary'.

12. Furthermore, Motor Vehicles Act of 1988 is a beneficial and welfare legislation that seeks to provide compensation as per the contemporaneous position of an individual which is essentially forward-looking.[8] Unlike tortious liability, which is chiefly concerned with making up for the past and reinstating a claimant to his original position, the compensation under the Act is concerned with providing stability and continuity in peoples' lives in the future.[9*] Keeping the abovementioned principles in the backdrop, we now move on to the facts at hand.*

19. As per the audit reports, the Deceased used to draw all his rental income from the share he held in a commercial building known as 'Lakshmi Complex' and the remaining income was from his agricultural lands, which have been bequeathed to his legal heirs on his death. The audit reports indicate the amounts under the 'Income from House Property and Agricultural Land' as per follows - (i) for FY 2000-2001 is Rs. 6,90,396/- (ii) for FY 2001-2002 is Rs. 6,47,127/- (iii) for FY 2002- 2003 is Rs. 6,14,329/- and (iv) for FY 2003-2004 is Rs. 4,78,240/-. The average of these amounts comes up to Rs. 6,07,523/-.

*20. At this juncture, we must note the decision in **Shashikala v. Gangalakshamma (2015) 9 SCC 150**. whereby this court deducted the entire amount earned as income from house property while determining the compensation under the Act. The decision in **Shashikala**[13*] was a split decision because of*



disagreement between the bench on whether future prospects are to be considered for awarding compensation when the deceased is a self-employed person. Accordingly, the matter was tagged and heard along with Pranay Sethi[14], wherein this court had conclusively decided the abovementioned issue regarding future prospects. After that, the matter was remitted back to a three-judge bench for redetermination of compensation, wherein this court again deducted the entire amount earned as income from house property.*


*21. Now, the sole issue which remains before this court is whether the entire amount under 'Income from House Property and Agricultural Land' should be deducted or not. In this respect, we are guided by the observations of this court in **State of Haryana v. Jasbir Kaur (2003) 7 SCC 484**, wherein it was noted that -*

8. x-x-x-x

The land possessed by the deceased still remains with his legal heirs. There is however a possibility that the claimants may be required to engage persons to look after agriculture. Therefore, the normal rule about the deprivation of income is not strictly applicable to cases where agricultural income is the source. Attendant circumstances have to be considered.

(Emphasis Applied)

In our opinion, the abovementioned observations, though made in the context of agricultural land, would also be applicable to rent received from leased out properties as the loss of dependency arises mainly out of loss of management capacity or efficiency. As a rule of prudence, computation of any individual's managerial skills should lie between 10 to 15 per cent of the total rental income but the acceptable range can be increased in light of specific



circumstances. The appropriate approach, therefore, is to determine the value of managerial skills along with any other factual considerations.”

14. In view of the above referred to judgment and considering the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court deems it appropriate to reassess the income of the deceased at **₹20,000/- per month**.

15. A further perusal of the award reveals that learned Tribunal has erred in applying multiplier of 11 instead of 13. Furthermore, no amount was granted for future prospects and loss of estate. Therefore, the award requires indulgence of this Court.

CONCLUSION

16. In view of the law laid down by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in the above referred to judgments, the present appeal is allowed. The award dated 27.07.2017 is modified accordingly. The appellants-claimants are entitled to enhanced compensation as per the calculations made hereunder:-

<i>Sr. No.</i>	<i>Heads</i>	<i>Compensation Awarded</i>
1	Monthly Income	Rs.20,000/-
2	Future prospects @ 25%	Rs.5,000/- (25% of 20000)
3	Deduction towards personal expenditure 1/3	Rs.8,333/- (25000 X 1/3)
4	Total Income	Rs.16,667/- (25000-8333)
5	Multiplier	13
6	Annual Dependency	Rs.26,00,052/- (16667 X 12 X 13)
7	Loss of Estate	Rs.15,000/-
8	Funeral Expenses	Rs.15,000/-
9	Loss of Consortium Parental : 2 x 40,000 Spousal : 1 x 40,000	Rs.1,20,000/-
10	Total Compensation	Rs.27,50,052/-
11	Deduction Amount Awarded by the Tribunal	Rs.11,05,000/-
12	Enhanced amount	Rs.16,45,052 /-(27,50,052-11,05,000)



17. So far as the interest part is concerned, as held by Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Dara Singh @ Dhara Banjara Vs. Shyam Singh Varma* 2019 ACJ 3176 and *R.Valli and Others VS. Tamil Nandu State Transport Corporation (2022) 5 Supreme Court Cases 107*, the appellants-claimants are granted the interest @ 9% per annum on the enhanced amount from the date of filing of claim petition till the date of its realization.

18. So far as the liability to pay the compensation, the same has been already dealt by this Court vide order of even date passed in FAO-5396-2017, titled as "Jaideep @ Jagdeep Vs. Indrawati and others" arising from the same award dated 27.07.2017, has held respondent-Insurance Company solely liable to pay compensation to the claimant.

19. Consequently, respondent No.2-Insurance Company is directed to deposit the enhanced amount along with interest with the Tribunal (**excluding the period of delay of 1021 days in filing the appeal**) within a period of two months from the date of receipt of copy of this judgment. The Tribunal is directed to disburse the enhanced amount of compensation along with interest to the appellants-claimants.

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

13.02.2026

Ayub/Saahil

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

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