



244

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

FAO-1635-2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 21.01.2026

Debo Devi & Anr

... Appellant(s)

Versus

Jagir Singh & Ors

... Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present : Ms. Veenus Malik, Advocate for the appellants.

Mr. Rajbir Singh, Advocate for respondent No.3.

Mr. Parmod Chauhan, Advocate for respondent Nos.4 and 5.

Mr. Pradeep Kumar, Advocate for respondent No.6.

ALKA SARIN, J. (Oral)

CM-5379-CII-2017

1. For the reasons mentioned therein, the application seeking condonation of delay of 44 days in filing the appeal is allowed and the delay of 44 days in filing the appeal is condoned.

FAO-1635-2017

2. The present appeal has been preferred by the claimant-appellants aggrieved by the quantum of compensation awarded by the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Yamuna Nagar (hereinafter referred to as 'Tribunal'), vide the impugned award dated 17.12.2015 in a motor vehicle accident which occurred on 26.06.2012.

3. Since the factum of the accident is not in dispute, the facts are not being adverted to for the sake of brevity.

4. The Tribunal in the present case had awarded the following compensation :

Sr. No.	Heads	Compensation Awarded
1	Monthly Income	₹6,000/-
2	Annual Income	₹72,000/- [₹6,000 x 12]
3	Deduction - 50%	₹36,000/- [₹72,000 - ₹36,000]
4	Multiplier - 18	₹6,48,000/- [₹36,000 x 18]
5	Loss of love and affection	₹50,000/-
6	Medical expenses	₹1,65,000/-
	Total Compensation	₹8,63,000/-
	Interest	8%

5. Learned counsel for the claimant-appellants submits that she does not challenge the income @ ₹6,000/- and 50% deduction applied by the Tribunal. She, however, states that no addition has been made towards future prospects which ought to have been 40% inasmuch as the deceased was 18 years of age at the time of the accident. It is contended that though the age of the deceased was 18 years however, a multiplier of 16 was applied which should have been 18. However, while making the calculations the Tribunal has applied a multiplier of 18. It is further the contention of the learned counsel that the compensation awarded under the conventional heads as well as under the head ‘loss of consortium’ is not in accordance with the law laid down by the Hon’ble Supreme Court. In support of her contentions, she has relied upon the judgments of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in the cases of **National Insurance Company Ltd. vs. Pranay Sethi & Ors. [(2017) 16 SCC 680]**, **Magma General Insurance Company Limited vs. Nanu Ram alias Chuhru Ram & Ors. [(2018) 18 SCC 130]** and **N. Jayasree & Ors. vs. Cholamandalam M.S General Insurance Company Ltd. [2021(4) RCR (Civil) 642]**.

6. *Per contra*, the learned counsel for the respondent-Insurance Company has vehemently argued that sufficient amount has already been awarded as compensation in the present case and that there is no scope of any enhancement.

7. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

8. Admittedly, no appeal has been preferred by the Insurance Company. In the present case, since no challenge has been laid by the learned counsel for the claimant-appellants to the income @ ₹6,000/- and 50% deduction applied by the Tribunal, the same are maintained accordingly. However, the Tribunal has not made any addition towards future prospects. The deceased was admittedly 18 years of age, hence, as per the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Pranay Sethi** (supra), 40% addition is made towards future prospects. The age of the deceased was 18 years however, the Tribunal has applied a multiplier of 16, which ought to be 18, though while calculating the compensation the multiplier applied is 18. Keeping in view the fact that the age of the deceased, it is clarified that the multiplier applicable would be 18, the finding stands modified accordingly. Further, the compensation awarded under the conventional heads and under the head 'loss of consortium' is not as per the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases of **Pranay Sethi** (supra), **Magma General Insurance Company Limited** (supra) and **N. Jayasree** (supra), hence, the claimants would be entitled to ₹18,000/- (₹15,000+20% increase) towards loss of estate and ₹18,000/- (₹15,000+20% increase) towards funeral expenses and the claimants (parents of the deceased) would also be entitled to ₹48,000/- each (₹40,000+20% increase) towards loss of consortium. An amount of ₹1,65,000/- awarded by the Tribunal towards medical expenses is maintained.

Accordingly, the reworked compensation is as under :

Sr.No.	Heads	Compensation Awarded
1	Monthly Income	₹6,000/-
2	Annual Income	₹72,000/- [₹6,000 x 12]
3	Deduction - 50%	₹36,000/- [₹72,000 - ₹36,000]
4	Future Prospects - 40%	₹50,400/- [₹36,000 + ₹14,400]
5	Multiplier - 18	₹9,07,200/- [₹50,400 x 18]
6	Loss of estate	₹18,000/-
7	Funeral expenses	₹18,000/-
8	Medical expenses	₹1,65,000/-
9	Loss of consortium (i) Filial [₹48,000/- x 2]	₹96,000/-
	Total Compensation	₹12,04,200/-

9. The amount in excess of and over and above the amount awarded by the Tribunal shall also attract interest @ 7.5% per annum from the date of filing of the claim petition till the realization of the entire amount.

10. In view of the decision by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in **Parminder Singh Vs. Honey Goyal & Ors. [AIR 2025 SC 1713 = 2025 SCC OnLine SC 567]**, after calculation of the enhanced amount, the same be transferred by the Insurance Company in the bank account(s) of the claimants within six weeks from today and the apportionment thereof shall be as per the direction of the Tribunal. The particulars of the bank account(s) alongwith the requisite documents(s) in support thereof shall be furnished by the claimants to the Insurance company within a period of two weeks from the date of this order and needful shall be done by the Insurance Company after verification thereof within four weeks thereafter alongwith up-to-date interest. The compliance shall be reported by the Bank to the Tribunal concerned.

11. In view of the above discussion, the present appeal is allowed and the award passed by the Tribunal stands modified accordingly. Pending

applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

21.01.2026

Yogesh Sharma

(ALKA SARIN)

JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking

Whether reportable: YES/NO