

## Sukhdev Dhal Vs United India Ins. Co. Ltd.

**Court:** Delhi High Court

**Date of Decision:** Jan. 27, 2014

**Citation:** (2014) 3 ACC 307

**Hon'ble Judges:** Suresh Kait, J

**Bench:** Single Bench

**Advocate:** S.N. Parashar, Advocate for the Appellant; P.R. Sikka and Amet Sikka, Advocate for the Respondent

**Final Decision:** Allowed

### Judgement

Suresh Kait, J.

Instant appeal has been preferred against the impugned award dated 20.1.2010, whereby the learned Tribunal has granted

compensation for a sum of Rs. 2,82,000 with interest @ 9% per annum from the date of filing of the petition till realization of the amount. Vide the

present appeal, appellants are seeking enhancement of the compensation amount noted above.

2. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the appellants has argued that on the date of accident, the deceased was 25 years of age. He was a

bachelor and left behind his parents. He submitted that while calculating the loss of dependency, the learned Tribunal taking into consideration the

Minimum Wages Act, 1948 considered the salary of the deceased as Rs. 3,200, applicable to an unskilled person at the relevant time. Despite, the

learned Tribunal has not added any amount in the income of the deceased towards future prospects while calculating the compensation.

3. Learned Counsel further submitted that the compensation granted by the learned Tribunal on account of non-pecuniary damages like Rs. 50,000

for loss of love and affection and Rs. 10,000 for funeral expenses is also on a very lower side.

4. To support his submissions, learned Counsel has relied upon the case of Rajesh and Others Vs. Rajbir Singh and Others, .

5. On the other hand, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of respondent/Insurance Company while opposing the submissions made by learned

Counsel for the appellants/claimants has submitted that appellants have failed to establish that the deceased was in a permanent job, therefore, the

learned Tribunal has rightly not added anything towards future prospects.

6. This Court has considered the issue of future prospects in the case bearing MACA No. 846/2011 titled as ICICI Lombard General Insurance

Co. Ltd. Vs. Angrej Singh and Others, , decided on 30.9.2013 and consistently following the dictum of Rajesh & Ors. (supra), wherein the Full

Bench of the Apex Court has held that in the case of self-employed or persons with fixed wages, in case, the deceased victim was below 40 years,

there must be an addition of 50% to the actual income of the deceased while computing future prospects.

7. Therefore, keeping in view the settled position of law and that the age of deceased, i.e., 25 years at the time of the accident, I grant 50% of the

actual income of the deceased towards future prospects.

8. In the present case, at the time of the accident, the deceased was 25 years of age. He was a bachelor and his aged parents were dependent

upon him at that time. At the very young age, he lost his life and left his parents in lurch. Therefore, keeping into mind all the facts and

circumstances of the case and following the dictum of Rajesh & Ors. (supra), I enhance the compensation on account of loss of love and affection

from Rs. 50,000 to Rs. 1,00,000 and for funeral expenses from Rs. 10,000 to Rs. 25,000

9. Accordingly, the compensation amount comes as under:

10. Accordingly, the enhanced compensation amount comes to Rs. 1,69,800 (Rs. 4,51,800 - Rs. 2,82,000).

11. The enhanced compensation amount also shall carry interest @ 9% per annum from the date of filing of the claim petition till its realization.

12. Accordingly, the appellant/Insurance Company is directed to deposit the enhanced compensation amount with up-to-date interest accrued

thereon with the Registrar General of this Court within a period of five weeks from today, failing which, appellants/claimants shall be entitled for

penal interest @ 12% per annum on account of delayed payment.

13. On deposit, the Registrar General is directed to release the amount in favour of the appellants/claimants in terms of the award dated 20.1.2010

passed by the learned Tribunal. In view of the above, the appeal is allowed.