

Company: Sol Infotech Pvt. Ltd. **Website:** www.courtkutchehry.com

Printed For:

Date: 09/11/2025

(2018) 02 CHH CK 0139

Chhattisgarh High Court

Case No: Miscellaneous Appeal (C) No. 1107 Of 2012

Remish Ekka And Ors

APPELLANT

Vs

Jora Singh And Ors

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Feb. 7, 2018

Acts Referred:

• Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 - Section 173

Hon'ble Judges: P. Sam Koshy, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: JK Saxena, Pankaj Agrawal

Final Decision: Allowed/Disposed Of

Judgement

P. Sam Koshy, J

1. The present appeal under Section 173 of the Motor Vehicles Act has been filed by the claimants seeking enhancement of compensation

against the award dated 29.09.2012 passed by the Additional Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Kunkuri (in short, the Tribunal) in Claim Case

No.55/2008. Vide the said impugned award, the Tribunal after assessing 50 percent contributory negligence, has awarded a compensation of

Rs.1,93,750/- to the claimants along with interest @ 6 percent per annum from the date of application.

2. Counsel for the appellants-claimant submits that the amount of compensation awarded by the Tribunal is unreasonably low inasmuch as the

income assessed so also the multiplier has not been properly applied. The claimants are also entitled for compensation under future prospects.

The amount awarded under conventional head is also unreasonably low. Thus, prayed for amount to be suitably enhanced.

3. The counsel for the insurance company, however opposing the appeal submits that there is clear finding of the Tribunal that the deceased in

the instant case was driving the vehicle without license and therefore, there is a clear breach of policy conditions and as such the insurance

company cannot be held liable to pay any compensation to the claimants. Even otherwise, the findings of the contributory negligence seems to

be justified. Therefore, the appeal does not have any merit and the same deserves to be rejected.

4. Considering the submissions put forth on either side and on perusal of records, what is undisputed is the date of accident 04.09.2008 and the

resultant death of Satish Ekka, aged around 20 years; the vehicle in which the deceased was travelling was a motorcycle bearing registration

No.CG-15-D-5435 and on the date of accident he was hit by Truck bearing registration No.CG-04-G-5659. Admittedly, the claimants in their

pleadings and evidence have accepted the fact that the deceased did not have a license. In the given circumstances, the findings of

contributory negligence cannot be found fault with and the same is therefore upheld.

5. So far as quantum of compensation is concerned, the date of accident is 04.09.2008. The income assessed by the Tribunal is Rs.3750/- per

month. Considering the period of accident, this court is of the opinion that at the relevant time even an unskilled labour would had been earning

more than Rs.150/- a day which would make minimum monthly income at Rs.4500/-. Therefore, this court has no hesitation in assessing the

income of the deceased at Rs.4500/- per month. In addition the claimants would also be entitled for 40 percent of the said amount towards

future prospects.

6. Accepting Rs.4500/- as monthly income, if 40 percent of it is added towards future prospects, the monthly income would reach to Rs.6300/-

i.e. Rs.75,600/-annually of which if 50 percent is deducted towards personal expenses, the amount left would be Rs.37,800/-, which if

multiplied by applying the multiplier of 18 instead of 15, the amount would become Rs.6,80,400/-. Since there is a finding of contributory

negligence of 50 percent against the deceased, the claimants as such would be entitled for 50 percent of the said amount i.e. Rs. 3,40,200/-

towards loss of dependency. In addition, the claimants shall also be entitled for an additional lump sum amount of Rs.40,000/-under the

conventional head to make the total compensation payable at Rs.3,80,200/- instead of Rs.1,93,750/- as awarded by the Tribunal.

- 7. The above enhanced amount of compensation shall also carry interest at the same rate as awarded by the Tribunal.
- 8. Accordingly, the appeal of the appellant-claimants stands allowed and disposed of.