



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

224

FAO-8303-2017
Date of decision : 16.01.2026

Lalita Appellant

versus

Union of India Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present: Mr. S.R. Chaudhary, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Arshad Ali, Advocate
for the respondent-UOI.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. The precise issue that needs to be decided by this Court is:-
- (i) *Whether the injury suffered by the appellant would be covered in item No.28 of schedule appended to the Railway Accidents and Untoward Incidents Rules, 1990.*
2. The injury suffered by the appellant reads as under:-
- “The applicant suffered degloving injury + crush injury foot ® with traumatic partial amputation 1st tod with 1st Metatarso and 4, 5th Metatarsal fracture.”
3. The scheduled injury at item No.28 of the Act provides as under:-

(28)	For loss of all toes of one foot through the metatarso-phalangeal joint.	1,60,000
------	--	----------

4. Tribunal has held the injury suffered by the appellant to be a non-scheduled injury and has granted a sum of Rs. 1 lakh as



compensation. Perusal of the injury suffered by the appellant would show that appellant suffered a crush injury on foot that led to amputation of her first toe including first metatarso. Fourth and fifth metatarso were also fractured.

5. Thus, owing to the injury suffered by the appellant, she has lost three toes, lost first metatarso and fractured fourth and fifth metatarso. In view of above, this Court is of the considered opinion that the injury suffered by the appellant would be covered within the ambit of item No.28 and cannot be said to be non-scheduled injury.

6. In view thereof, the present appeal is allowed. The compensation payable to the appellant is enhanced from Rs.1,00,000/- to 1,60,000/-. The amount is ordered to be released along with interest @ 7% on the enhanced amount.

7. Ordered accordingly.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

16.1.2026
Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No