

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

FAO-5744-2012 (O&M)

USHA GOYAL

.....Appellant

vs.

TEHAL SINGH AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Reserved on:- 12.03.2025

Pronounced on:- 19.03.2026

Uploaded on :- 24.03.2026

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. Dheeraj Narula, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Animesh Sharma, Addl.A.G. Punjab

SUDEEPTI SHARMA J.

1. The present appeal has been preferred against the award dated 17.04.2012 passed by the learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Sirsa, Haryana in the claim petition filed under Section 166 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (for short, 'the Tribunal') for enhancement of compensation granted to the claimants to the tune of Rs.4,62,000/- along with interest @7.5% per annum, on account of death of Goverdhan Das Goyal in a Motor Vehicular Accident, occurred on 26.12.2010.

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 claimant-appellant 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-State, 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 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 impugned award reveals that the deceased was stated to be 60 years of age at the time of the accident, which fact stands duly proved from the post-mortem report (Ex.P-1). The learned Tribunal has, therefore, rightly assessed the age of the deceased as 60 years and rightly applied the multiplier of 9 according to the settled law. Furthermore, the learned Tribunal has assessed the income of the deceased as Rs.6,000 per month as of a skilled person for the relevant year.

10. A further persual of the award reveals that the deceased was stated to be a practicing Advocate and was also working as a Notary Public, which stands duly proved from Ex.PC (Notary Licence). Further, as per Ex.P4 (Certificate of the Bar) the deceased had been in continuous legal practice for a period of past 36 years. Such long standing professional experience clearly




indicates that the deceased had an established practice and a steady source of income. However, the learned Tribunal failed to appreciate the true import of these documents and did not make a realistic assessment of the income arising from his legal profession and notarial work.

11. Furthermore the award reveals that as per Ex.P8 (Jamabandi) placed on record, the deceased was stated to be owner of agricultural land measuring 6 acres (being 1/3rd share out of 18 acres). The learned Tribunal has completely ignored this aspect and has not assessed any income from agricultural sources, despite the same being duly proved on record. The omission to consider agricultural income has resulted in an undervaluation of the total earning capacity of the deceased.


12. The learned Tribunal has primarily relied upon the Income Tax Return for the year 2004–2005 to assess the income of the deceased, whereas admittedly the accident took place in the year 2010. In the absence of any subsequent returns, the Tribunal ought to have made a reasonable estimation keeping in view the passage of time, the experience of the deceased at bar, and the nature of his avocation. Merely, because the income tax return has not filed after the year 2005 does not mean that the deceased was not earning specially when the certificate of the bar (Ex.P-4) clearly establish that the deceased was in continuing practice from past 36 years.

13. It is pertinent to note that Apex Court in the case of ***Shailaja and Others Vs. Pavan B. Udupudi and Another***, Law Finder Doc Id #2709101, has held as under:-

“5. Having considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties and by taking into consideration the date of accident was on 11.05.2012, the



ceiling limit of the income tax at the relevant point of time was Rs.1,80,000/- the income of the deceased from profession is accordingly taken or in other words we accept the income of the deceased from profession to said extent as he was an advocate with 17 years of standing. Absence of income proof cannot be a ground to deny just and reasonable compensation, particularly when there is no dispute that deceased was having a standing of 17 years at the Bar. The Courts below concurrently has accepted that deceased owned around 3 acres of agricultural land as evident from Ex.P.W-13 and 14 and yet was not persuaded to construe the income generated from the agricultural operations, for reasons best known. To maintain the said agricultural land and carry on the operations, the claimants have to necessarily expend an amount and Rs.3,000/- per acre and same would be required to be spent for carrying on the agricultural operations or in other words at least a sum of Rs.10,000/- per month will have to be paid towards supervision charges for maintaining 3 acres of agricultural land, necessarily this amount has to be construed as the loss of income to the dependents of the deceased. The supervision charges which claimants will have to spend would be Rs.10,000/- per month (Rs.1,20,000/- per year). Hence total earning of the deceased comes to Rs.3,00,000/- per year. If we add 10% towards future prospects, the annual income comes to Rs.3,30,000/-. Taking note of the number of dependents, if we deduct 1/4th, the amount would be Rs.2,47,500/- per year. Corresponding to the age of the deceased (51 years), multiplier of 11 would be applicable. Thus, the amount of compensation to which claimants would be entitled towards loss of income would be Rs.27,22,500/- (2,47,500 X 11). If we further add Rs.2,40,000/- towards loss of love and affection and filial



compensation and Rs.75,000/- under the head of transportation of dead body and funeral expenses, total amount of compensation to which claimants would be entitled to would be Rs. 30,37,500/-. After deducting the amount of compensation awarded by the High Court i.e., Rs.15,76,800/- the enhanced compensation payable would be Rs. 14,60,700/-.”

14. Thus as referred to the above judgment the learned Tribunal has failed to take into consideration all source of income of the deceased, consequently, the income assessed is on the lower side and calls for reassessment so as to award just and fair compensation to the claimant which is reassessed as Rs.10,000/- per month from the profession of advocate and Rs.8,000/- from the business of agriculture in the interest of justice which comes to the totality of Rs.18,000/- per month.

15. A further perusal of the award reveals that the learned Tribunal has rightly deducted 1/3rd towards personal and living expenses of the deceased as per the settled law.

16. A further perusal of the award reveals that learned Tribunal has not added anything towards future prospects to the income of the deceased. As per the settled law on compensation, therefore, **10%** has to be added as future prospects.

17. Additionally, the learned Tribunal has failed to award any amount towards loss of estate and meager amount has been awarded towards the heads of funeral expenses and loss of consortium, therefore, the award requires indulgence and interference of this Court.



CONCLUSION

18. 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 17.04.2012 is modified accordingly. The appellants-claimants are entitled to enhanced compensation as per the calculations made hereunder:-

Sr. No.	Heads	Compensation Awarded
1	Monthly Income	Rs.18,000/-
2	Future prospects @ 10%	Rs.1,800/- (10% of 18,000)
3	Deduction towards personal expenditure 1/3	Rs.6,600/- (19800 X 1/3)
4	Total Income	Rs.13,200/- (19800-6600)
5	Multiplier	9
6	Annual Dependency	Rs.14,25,600/- (13200 X 12 X 9)
7	Loss of Estate	Rs.15,000/-
8	Funeral Expenses	Rs.15,000/-
9	Loss of Consortium Spousal : 1 x 40,000	Rs.40,000/-
10	Total	Rs.14,95,600/-
11	Deduction Amount Awarded by the Tribunal	Rs.4,62,000/-
12	Enhanced amount	Rs.10,33,600/- (14,95,600-4,62,000)

20. 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 Nadu 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.

21. The respondent-State is directed to deposit the enhanced amount along with interest at the rate of 9% with the Tribunal within a period of two



months from the date of receipt of copy of this judgment. The Tribunal is directed to disburse the same to the appellants-claimants in their bank account as per ratio settled in award dated 17.04.2012. The appellants-claimants are directed to furnish their bank account details to the Tribunal.

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

19.03.2026

Ayub/Saahil

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

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