



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

137

FAO-4065-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision:14.01.2026

AMANDEEP KAUR AND ANOTHER

...APPELLANTS

VERSUS

JAGDISH SINGH AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARMOD GOYAL

Present: Mr. Gaurav, Advocate for
Mr. Sanjeev Goyal, Advocate
for appellants.

PARMOD GOYAL, J. (ORAL)

Appellant-claimant is aggrieved by impugned award dated 06.03.2025 passed by Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Sangrur (hereinafter referred to as '**Tribunal**') vide which compensation of Rs.16,67,360/- has been awarded to the claimants who are parents of deceased, who had died in accident dated 08.04.2023 caused by respondent No.1 by his rash and negligent while driving offending vehicle bearing registration No.DL08CZ0343.

2. The primary argument raised on behalf of appellant-claimant for enhancement of compensation awarded by Tribunal is that Tribunal has erred in taking income of deceased as equivalent to minimum wages payable to unskilled labourer.

3. It is the case of appellant-claimant that deceased was intermediate passed and had also qualified IELTS examination and had applied for study visa. It was asserted that deceased was brilliant student and therefore, his income ought to have considered at least Rs.30,000/- per month. No material has been placed on record to show in what location, college and to which country deceased had applied for study visa. Mere passing of IELTS which is an English language proficiency test by itself cannot lead to conclusion that deceased could



have earned more than unskilled worker on the date of accident in the facts and circumstances of present case, where deceased was just intermediate pass with no vocational training to his credit.

4. In these circumstances, keeping in view nature of qualification of deceased, the conclusion of Tribunal to take income of deceased equivalent to minimum wages payable to unskilled labourer cannot be faulted with.

5. Admittedly, deceased was aged 20 years, therefore, the Tribunal has rightly applied multiplier of 18 and has also granted 40% towards future prospects. After taking into consideration future prospects and making deduction of 50% towards personal expenses as deceased was unmarried and claim petition was preferred by his parents, the total amount of compensation was found to be Rs.16,67,360/-. Awarded compensation, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, cannot be held to be not in accordance with law. Therefore, I do not find any ground to interfere in present appeal.

6. Appeal is dismissed.

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

(PARMOD GOYAL)
JUDGE

14.01.2026
Sunil Chander

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