

Mangala Bai Katre And Anr. Vs Vikash Singh And Ors

Court: Chhattisgarh High Court

Date of Decision: Feb. 13, 2018

Acts Referred: Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 " Section 173

Hon'ble Judges: P. Sam Koshy, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Pawan Kesharwani, Raj Awasthi

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 23.03.2012 passed by the 5th Additional Chief Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Raipur (in short, the Tribunal) in Claim Case

No.134/2011. Vide the said impugned award, the Tribunal has awarded a compensation of Rs.2,46,000/-along with interest @ 9 percent per annum

from the date of application.

2. While passing the award, the Tribunal has exonerated the insurance company of its liability and has fastened the same upon the respondents

No.1&2, driver and the owner of the offending vehicle.

3. 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 applied all have not been done in accordance with the guidelines of the Supreme Court laid down in case of Sarla

Verma and Ors. Vs. Delhi Transport Corporation and Anr. 2009 (6)SCC 121. The claimants would also be entitled for future prospects. Thus, prayed

for amount to be suitably enhanced.

4. The counsel for the insurance company submits that since the insurance company has already been exonerated of its liability, he has no objection so

far as the appeal of the claimants seeking enhancement of compensation is concerned.

5. Having heard the counsel on either side and on perusal of records, the undisputed facts which erupts is the date of accident being 02.09.2010; the

deceased being Jitendra Katre aged about 30 years and the vehicle involved is a Bolero Jeep bearing registration No.CG- 04-HA 1590. Though the

claimants have pleaded that the deceased was earning Rs.11,500/-, but there was no substantial evidence to establish the same. Now, so far as fixing

the notional income is concerned, if we take into consideration the period of accident which is September, 2010, indisputably during the said period

even an unskilled labour would have been earning more than Rs.200/- a day which would bring the monthly income at Rs.6000/-. Therefore, this court

has no hesitation in assessing the income of the deceased at Rs.6000/- per month which brings annual income at Rs.72,000/-. In addition the claimants

would also be entitled for 40 percent of the said amount towards future prospects.

6. Accepting Rs.6000/- as monthly income, if 40 percent of it is added towards future prospects, the monthly income would reach to Rs. 8400/- and

Rs.1,00,800/-annually of which if 50 percent is deducted towards personal expenses as the deceased was a bachelor, the amount left would be

Rs.50,400/-, which if multiplied by applying the multiplier of 17, the amount would become Rs.8,56,800/-. It is ordered accordingly that the claimants

shall be entitled for loss of dependency at Rs.8,56,800/-. In addition, the claimants shall also be entitled for an additional lump sum compensation of

Rs.40,000/- under the conventional heads to make the total compensation payable at Rs.8,96,800/- instead of Rs.2,46,000/- 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 appellants-claimant stands allowed and disposed of. The liability of payment of compensation shall remain that upon

the respondents No.1&2-the driver and the owner of the offending vehicle.