

**MEMBER MOTOR ACCIDENT CLAIM TRIBUNAL SHILLONG
EAST KHASI HILLS DISTRICT**

MAC Case No 19 of 2019

Shri Lorence Nongrum
Son of Smt Kamla Nongrum,
Resident of House No. 195, Thembasuk Veng,
Madanrting, Shillong
District East Khasi Hills, Meghalaya.

..... Claimant

vs.

1. Shri. Piwin Siangshai
S/o Shri Krin Talang,
Resident of Markasa Nongstoin,
District West Khasi Hills, Meghalaya

2. Shri Risuk Rabon,
C/O La-Ardawanki Kharsati,
Resident Of Mawryngkneng,
District East Khasi Hills, Meghalaya
(Driver Of The Truck Bearing Registration No AS-01-Cc-8849)
New Registration No. ML-06-9352.

..... Opp. Parties

Present :

**Shri. B. Laitmon (MHJS), Addl. Deputy Commissioner (J)
East Khasi Hills District, Shillong.**

Counsel for Claimant	: Ld. Counsel Shri P. C. Das, Adv.
Counsel for Opp. Party No. 1	: Ex-parte
Counsel for Opp. Party No. 2	: Ex-parte
Date of Institution	: 19.12.2019
Date of hearing	: 23.10.2025
Date of Judgment/Order	: 28.11.2025

JUDGMENT & ORDER

01. The Claimant by an application under Section 166 of the Motor Vehicle Act 1988 has approached this Tribunal for award of compensation on account of grievous injury sustained by the Claimant resulting Amputation of left leg below knee in a motor vehicular Accident, for convenience and reference Section 166 of the Motor Vehicle Act is reproduced hereinunder :

S. 166. Application for compensation.—(1) An application for compensation arising out of an accident of the nature specified in sub-section (1) of section 165 may be made—

(a) by the person who has sustained the injury; or

(b) by the owner of the property; or

(c) where death has resulted from the accident, by all or any of the legal representatives of the deceased; or

(d) by any agent duly authorised by the person injured or all or any of the legal representatives of the deceased, as the case may be:

Provided that where all the legal representatives of the deceased have not joined in any such application for compensation, the application shall be made on behalf of or for the benefit of all the legal representatives of the deceased and the legal representatives who have not so joined, shall be impleaded as respondents to the application.

Facts in brief Pleaded by the Claimant

02. The facts pleaded by the Claimant is that he was a young healthy energetic person about 35 years of age was running his piggery Business and was earning a sum of Rs. 40,000/- (Rupees Forty Thousand) per month and the only earning member in his family consisting his minor son master Jonathan Lorence Nongrum aged about 11 years, who is heavily dependent on the claimant for his livelihood.

03. Claimant further pleaded that on 19.09.2017 about 6.25. am one truck Bearing Registration No. AS01CC-8849 New Registration No. ML-06-9352.

driven by Shri Risuk Rabon coming from Laitkor towards Mawkyrwat in a rash and negligent manner on reaching at Malki/ Dhankheti petrol pump knock down the claimant in which he sustain injury on his left leg thereafter he was shifted to Civil Hospital by 108 Ambulance, the attending Medical Officer at Civil Hospital Dr. K. Z. Sangma opined that the victim had a lacerate over left eyebrow, crush injury near amputation of left foot and metatarsal and later the victim referred to NEIGRIHMS for further treatment from where he was taken to Super care Hospital, resuting in his left leg below knee being amputated and thereafter follow-up treatment continued at Woodland Hospital under treatment of Dr Ajay kumar.

04. Claimant further pleaded for award of compensation for Rs. 87,12,125.50/-(Rupees Eighty Seven Lakhs twelve Thousand One Hundred Twenty Five Point fifty Paisa) to the claimant along with interest @18% per annum from the date of filing of the claim petition

Discussion, Reason and Decision

05. The claim petition was placed before this Tribunal on 19.12.2019, OP No. 1 & 2 entered appearance through Ld. Counsel Smt. P. Sharma, Adv, thereafter claim petition was amended on 11.02.2022 with service copy supplied to OP No. 1 & 2 through the Counsel on 13.05.2022, however as no written statement was filed by OP No. 1 & 2, consequently the case proceeded ex-parte. On 31.05.2024 the Claimant adduced evidence by filing deposition in affidavit and exhibited relevant documents. Thereafter on 07.03.2025 Dr. K. Z. Sangma was examined as CW3 and UBC2605 KE Thabah was examined on 11.04.2025 as CW4 and inspector W. Ch. Sangma was examined as CW5 on 16.05.2025 and accordingly evidence was closed and final argument concluded on 23.10.2025.

06. This Tribunal did not frame issues during trial, however, in exercise of the power conferred under Order XIV Rule 5 CPC this Tribunal accordingly framed the following issues

- 1. Whether the claim petition is maintainable?*
- 2. Whether the accident occurred due to the rash and negligent driving of the driver of truck B/R No. AS01CC-8849, New Registration No. ML06-9352?*
- 3. Whether the Claimant was injured in the said accident? If so, what is the extent of the injury?*
- 4. Whether is the extent of relief entitle to the Claimant?*

Issue No. 1

Whether this claim petition is maintainable ?

Testimony of the Claimant on issue No. 1

07. On the issue of maintainability of the Claim petition it is the testimony of the Claimant that he was a victim to a motor accident that occurred on 19.09.2017 about 6:25 am when a truck Bearing Registration No. AS01CC-8849 driving by Shri Risuk Rabon coming from Laitkor towards Mawkyrwat on reaching at Malki/ Dhankheti petrol pump knock down the claimant who was a pedestrian walking by the road to which he suffered injury on his left leg thereafter he was shifted to Civil Hospital resulting in amputation of his left leg below the knee.

Testimony of the CW4 on issue No. 1

08. CW4 UBC2605 Kenneth E. Thabah corroborated the evidence of the Claimant and testified that on September 2017, he was posted at Laitumkhrah Police Station, Shillong as a Constable and information was received on 19.09.2017 at 8:30 am from 108 Ambulance about an accident which took place at Malki involving a truck bearing registration no. AS01CC-8849 loaded with cement. On received of the information he accompanied the I/O of the case UBSI W. Ch. Sangma to the spot and found that the involved was at the spot but the victim was already shifted

by 108 Ambulance to Civil Hospital, Shillong and thereafter to NEIGRIHMS Hospital, Mawdiangdiang, Shillong.

Testimony of the CW5 on issue No. 1

09. CW5 Inspector Walning Ch. Sangma similarly testified that in the year 2019, she was posted at Laitumkhrah, Shillong, Traffic Branch as Attached Officer, on 19.09.2017 she was on duty and got telephonic information from 108 staff that there was an accident took place at Malki near Petrol pump. On receiving the information she along with Constable K. E. Thabab left for the place of occurrence (PO) for enquiry and report. On reaching at the spot i.e., Malki near Petrol pump the victim was already shifted to Civil Hospital, Shillong and conducted enquiry, visited the PO, photographs was taken and visit Civil Hospital, Shillong, where the victim Shri Lorence Nongrum was found with injury on his left leg and later victim was shifted to NEIGRIHMS Hospital. Shillong for further treatment as referred by Civil Hospital, Shillong and seized the vehicle involved in the accident bearing registration no. AS01CC-8849 loaded with full bags of cement.

10. The evidence of the claimant and CW4 and CW5 therefore illustrates that an accident took place involving the truck bearing registration no. AS01CC-8849 New Registration No. ML-06-9352 which resulted in fatal injury to the Claimant, and claimant has accordingly present the claim petition u/S 166 MV Act before this Tribunal for compensation to the injury sustain in the motor accident, issue No. 1 is accordingly answered in the affirmative.

2. Whether the accident occurred due to the rash and negligent driving of the driver of truck B/R No. AS01CC-8849, New Registration No. ML06-9352?

3. Whether the Claimant was injured in the said accident? If so, what is the extent of the injury?

4. Whether is the extent of relief entitle to the Claimant?

11. For the purpose of convenience and to avoid repetition of facts, issue No. 2, 3 & 4 involving similar question of fact and law are dealt herewith jointly.

Testimony of the Claimant on issue No. 2, 3 & 4

12. The evidence of CW1 illustrates that on 19.09.2017 about 6.25. am a truck Bearing Registration No. AS01CC-8849 driven Shri Risuk Rabon coming from Laitkor proceeding Mawkyrwat in a rash and negligent manner on reaching at Malki/Dhankheti petrol pump knock the Claimant down and he suffered injury on left leg thereafter, he was shifted to Civil Hospital by 108 Ambulance, the attending medical officer of Civil Hospital Dr. K.Z. Sangma opined that he had a lacerate over left eyebrow, crush injury near amputation of left foot and metatarsal and later he was referred to NEIGRIHMS for further treatment from where he was taken to Super care Hospital, where his left leg below knee was amputated and thereafter continued further treatment at Woodland Hospital by Dr. Ajay Kumar and was still under treatment of Dr Ajay Kumar till the time of filing the Claim Petition.

13. The evidence of the Claimant further illustrated the he was a young healthy energetic person aged about 35 years at the time of the Accident running a piggery Business and was earning a sum of Rs, 40,000/- (Rupees Forty Thousand) per month and is the only earning member in the family consisting a minor son master Jonathan Lorence Nongrum aged about 11 years at the time of filing a claim Petition, who is heavily dependent on the claimant for his livelihood.

14. Claimant in supported of the evidence produced the following documents Exhibit-1 Original Copy of the Election Photo Identity Card wherein his date of birth is reflected as 26.12.1982

Exhibit-2 permanent Account Number Card

Exhibit-3 Disability Certificate Issued by the Joint Director of health Services (S.S) Civil hospital Shillong.

Exhibit-4 Original copy of the Income Certificate issued by the Office of Rangbah Shnong Madanrting Shillong dated 12.10.2017.

Paper Mark-1 Photo copy of the Birth Certificate of Claimants son

15. The claimant to further support that his case exhibit and produced the following documents

Exhibit-5 Police Report issued by Superintendent of Police East Khasi Hills Shillong.

Paper Mark-2 and 3 are the Xerox copies of the extract of Laitumkhrah Traffic Branch, GDE No. 02 of 19.09.2017.

Paper Mark-4 photo copy of the Emergency Room Record Dated 19.09.2017 issued by Civil Hospital Shillong

Paper Mark-5 Photo copy of the Seizure List Dated 19.09.2017 in respect of the Seizure made of the Truck Bearing Vehicle No. AS01CC-8849.

Paper Mark-6 Photo copy of the Zimmanama dated 19.09.2017

Paper Mark-7 Photo copy of the Zimmanama dated 20.09.2017

Paper Mark-8 is the Discharge Summary issued by Super Care Hospital.

Exhibit-6 (A) & 5 (B) is the Hospital/Pharmacy Bill/ Invoice No. along with the Bill Date and Amount.

Paper Mark-9 the photo copy of the Final Inpatient Bill Dated 06.10.2017 issued by Super Care Hospital, Shillong

Exhibit-7 Original 36 Nos. of Cash Receipt paid by the claimant in respect of my treatment at Woodland Hospital Shillong from the period of 07.10.2017 to 31.01.2019.

Paper Mark-10 is the photo copy of the Registration Certificate issued in the name of the registered owner Piwin Shiangshai in respect of the Vehicle Truck Bearing Registration No. ML. 06 9352 issued by District Transport Officer, West Khasi Hills, Nongstoin, Registration Date 22.09.2010.

16. Claimant further testified that he have claimed for an award of compensation for an amount of Rupees Rs. 87,12,125.50/- (Rupees Eighty Seven Lakhs twelve Thousand One Hundred Twenty Five Point fifty Paia) and arrived at the following calculation

Rs. 40,000 x 12 x 17 : Rs. 81,60,000/-

Pain and suffering : RS. 5,00,000/-

Medical expenses : Rs. 1,52,125.50/-

Total : Rs. 87, 12,125.50/- (Rupees Eighty Seven Lakhs Twelve Thousand One Hundred Twenty Five Point fifty Paia)

17. Testimony of **CW3 Dr. Kevin Z. N. Sangma** on issue No. 2, 3 & 4 CW3 corroborated the evidence of the claimant and testified that on September 2017, he was posted at Civil Hospital, Shillong. Shri Lorence Nongrum aged 35 years he was brought to emergency department on 19.09.2017 at 6:35 am in the morning, who came with a history of crush injury of left foot found lying at Malki brought by 108 ambulance, on local examination laceration over the left eye brow, crush injury with near amputation of left foot with fracture of metatarsals, dry dressing was done with necessary treatment and referred to NEIGRIHMS for further management and identified Paper Mark-4 as the medical legal record of

Civil Hospital. Shillong and Paper Mark 4/1 is his signature on Paper Mark 4.

18. Testimony of the CW2 Dr. Ajay Kumar Thakur on issue No. 2, 3 & 4

CW2 similarly corroborated the evidence of the Claimant and testified that he is a Plastic Surgeon at Supercare Hospital, Shillong and had treated the injured namely Shri Lorence Nongrum at Supercare Hospital, Shillong who was admitted on 21.09.2017 consequent to a road accident on 19.09.2017 at Dhankheti, Shillong and was initially treated at Civil Hospital, Shillong, thereafter referred to NEIGRIHMS and underwent Debridement K-wire fixation of left foot on 19.09.2017.

19. According to CW2 the claimant underwent left foot amputation for gangrene of left foot on 22.09.2017 performed by him, who remained admitted till 02.10.2017, Thereafter underwent regular dressings on OPD basis at Woodland Hospital dressing room as well as at Supercare Hospital, Shillong and confirmed Paper Mark-8 as the discharged summary issued by Supercare Hospital, Shillong and Paper Mark-9 as the Final in-patient bill dated 06.10.2017 and Exhibit-7 as the original copy of Cash receipts issued by the Woodland Hospital.

Testimony of CW No.4 UBC2605 Kenneth E. Thabah on issue No. 2, 3 & 4

20. According to CW4 on September 2017, he was posted at Laitumkhrah Police Station, Shillong as a Constable and information was received on 19.09.2017 at 8:30 am from 108 Ambulance about an accident which took place at Malki involving a truck bearing registration no. AS01CC-8849 loaded with cement. On received of the information he accompanied the I/O of the case UBSI W. Ch. Sangma to the spot and found that the involved was at the spot but the victim was already shifted by 108 Ambulance to Civil Hospital, Shillong and thereafter to NEIGRIHMS Hospital, Mawdiangdiang, Shillong.

Testimony of CW5 Inspector Walning Ch. Sangma on issue No.2, 3 & 4

21. CW5 corroborated the evidence of the claimant and CW4 and testified that in the year 2019, she was posted at Laitumkhrah, Shillong, Traffic Branch as Attached Officer when on 19.09.2017 she got telephonic information from 108 staff that there was an accident took place at Malki near Petrol pump. On receiving the information she along with Constable K. E. Thabab left for the place of occurrence (PO) for enquiry and report. On reaching at the spot i.e., Malki near Petrol pump the victim was already shifted to Civil Hospital, Shillong and conducted enquiry, visited the PO, photographs was taken and visit Civil Hospital, Shillong, where the victim Shri Lorence Nongrum was found with injury on his left leg and later victim was shifted to NEIGRIHMS Hospital. Shillong for further treatment as referred by Civil Hospital, Shillong and seized the vehicle involved in the accident bearing registration no. AS01CC-8849 loaded with full bags of cement.

22. CW5 further testified that the victim was trying to cross the road from one side to another side the vehicle which was coming from Mawryngkneng side towards Mawkyrwat to unload the cement, drove in a rash and negligent manner at a high speed knock down the victim who lost his left leg and according to her investigation the accident took place due to the fault of the driver of the vehicle (truck bearing registration no. AS01CC-8849) and CW5 identified Exhibit-8 and Exhibit-8/A as the photographs of the victim and the truck involved in the accident.

23. CW5 identified Paper Mark-2 as the extract of Laitumkhrah Traffic Branch GDE No.02 of 19.09.2017. Paper Mark-3 as the extract copy of Laitumkhrah Traffic Branch East Khasi Hills. Shillong GDE No. 22 dated 19.09.2017. Exhibit 5 as the police report given by the Superintendent of Police Fast Khasi Hills, Shillong vide memo no.CB/SR/Misc/2019/844 dated Shillong 25.06.2019 and identified Exhibit 5/1 as the signature of Smti C.A. Lyngwa IPS Superintendent of Police East Khasi Hills, Shillong

and also testified that during the course of investigation shw arrested the driver of the truck and seized the vehicle involved in the accident.

Argument by the Ld. Counsel for the claimant

24. Ld. Counsel for the claimant in support of his case relied in Kajal vs. Jagdish Chand & Ors. Civil Appeal No. 735/2020 arising out of SLP(C) No. 15504/2019

Kajal v. Jagdish Chand, (2020) 4 SCC 413 : (2020) 2 SCC (Cri) 577 : (2020) 3 SCC (Civ) 27 : 2020 SCC OnLine SC 127 at page 421

13.McGregor's Treatise on Damages, 14th Edition, Para 1157, referring to heads of damages in personal injury actions states:

“The person physically injured may recover both for his pecuniary losses and his non-pecuniary losses. Of these the pecuniary losses themselves comprise two separate items viz. the loss of earnings and other gains which the plaintiff would have made had he not been injured and the medical and other expenses to which he is put as a result of the injury, and the courts have sub-divided the non-pecuniary losses into three categories viz. pain and suffering, loss of amenities of life and loss of expectation of life.”

14. In Concord of India Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Nirmala Devi [Concord of India Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Nirmala Devi, (1979) 4 SCC 365 : 1979 SCC (Cri) 996 : 1980 ACJ 55] , this Court held : (SCC p. 366, para 2)

“2. ... the determination of the quantum must be liberal, not niggardly since the law values life and limb in a free country in generous scales.”

15. In *R.D. Hattangadi v. Pest Control (India) (P) Ltd.* [*R.D. Hattangadi v. Pest Control (India) (P) Ltd.*, (1995) 1 SCC 551 : 1995 SCC (Cri) 250] , dealing with the different heads of compensation in injury cases this Court held thus : (SCC p. 556, para 9)

“9. Broadly speaking while fixing the amount of compensation payable to a victim of an accident, the damages have to be assessed separately as pecuniary damages and special damages. Pecuniary damages are those which the victim has actually incurred and which are capable of being calculated in terms of money; whereas non-pecuniary damages are those which are incapable of being assessed by arithmetical calculations. In order to appreciate two concepts pecuniary damages may include expenses incurred by the claimant : (i) medical attendance; (ii) loss of earning of profit up to the date of trial; (iii) other material loss. So far as non-pecuniary damages are concerned, they may include : (i) damages for mental and physical shock, pain and suffering, already suffered or likely to be suffered in the future; (ii) damages to compensate for the loss of amenities of life which may include a variety of matters i.e. on account of injury the claimant may not be able to walk, run or sit; (iii) damages for loss of expectation of life i.e. on account of injury the normal longevity of the person concerned is shortened; (iv) inconvenience, hardship, discomfort, disappointment, frustration and mental stress in life.”

16. In *Raj Kumar v. Ajay Kumar* [*Raj Kumar v. Ajay Kumar*, (2011) 1 SCC 343 : (2011) 1 SCC (Civ) 164 : (2011) 1 SCC (Cri) 1161] , this Court laid down the heads under which

compensation is to be awarded for personal injuries : (SCC p. 348, para 6)

“6. The heads under which compensation is awarded in personal injury cases are the following:

Pecuniary damages (Special damages)

(i) Expenses relating to treatment, hospitalisation, medicines, transportation, nourishing food, and miscellaneous expenditure.

(ii) Loss of earnings (and other gains) which the injured would have made had he not been injured, comprising:

(a) Loss of earning during the period of treatment;

(b) Loss of future earnings on account of permanent disability.

(iii) Future medical expenses.

Non-pecuniary damages (General damages)

(iv) Damages for pain, suffering and trauma as a consequence of the injuries.

(v) Loss of amenities (and/or loss of prospects of marriage).

(vi) Loss of expectation of life (shortening of normal longevity).

In routine personal injury cases, compensation will be awarded only under heads (i), (ii)(a) and (iv). It is only in

serious cases of injury, where there is specific medical evidence corroborating the evidence of the claimant, that compensation will be granted under any of the heads (ii)(b), (iii), (v) and (vi) relating to loss of future earnings on account of permanent disability, future medical expenses, loss of amenities (and/or loss of prospects of marriage) and loss of expectation of life.”

Loss of earnings

20. Both the courts below have held that since the girl was a young child of 12 years only notional income of Rs 15,000 p.a. can be taken into consideration. We do not think this is a proper way of assessing the future loss of income. This young girl after studying could have worked and would have earned much more than Rs 15,000 p.a. Each case has to be decided on its own evidence but taking notional income to be Rs 15,000 p.a. is not at all justified. The appellant has placed before us material to show that the minimum wages payable to a skilled workman is Rs 4846 per month. In our opinion, this would be the minimum amount which she would have earned on becoming a major. Adding 40% for the future prospects, it works to be Rs 6784.40 per month i.e. 81,412.80 p.a. Applying the multiplier of 18, it works out to Rs 14,65,430.40, which is rounded off to Rs 14,66,000.

24. This Court has reaffirmed the multiplier method in various cases like *MCD v. Subhagwanti* [*MCD v. Subhagwanti*, AIR 1966 SC 1750 : 1966 ACJ 57] , *U.P. SRTC v. Trilok Chandra* [*U.P. SRTC v. Trilok Chandra*, (1996) 4 SCC 362] , *Sandeep Khanuja v. Atul Dande* [*Sandeep Khanuja v. Atul Dande*, (2017) 3 SCC 351 : (2017) 2 SCC (Civ) 276 : (2017) 2 SCC (Cri) 178] . This Court has also recognised that Schedule II of the Act can be used as a guide for the multiplier to be applied

in each case. Keeping the claimant's age in mind, the multiplier in this case should be 18 as opposed to 44 taken by the High Court.

Analysis by the Tribunal

Standard of Proof

25. In a Claim application the stand of proof required is preponderance of probability and as held in similarly placed facts in **Sunita v. Rajasthan SRTC, (2020) 13 SCC 486** extract reproduce as follows

*that the cases of the parties before us will have to be examined from the perspective of the principles and propositions laid down in Bimla Devi case [(2009) 13 SCC 530 : (2009) 5 SCC (Civ) 189 : (2010) 1 SCC (Cri) 1101] and Shila Datta [(2011) 10 SCC 509 : (2012) 3 SCC (Civ) 798 : (2012) 1 SCC (Cri) 328]. While it is correct that the pillion rider could have best unfolded the details of the accident what cannot be lost sight of is the fact that while the accident occurred on 29-6-1997 the evidence before the Tribunal was recorded after seven years i.e. in the year 2004. **Keeping in view the nature of the jurisdiction that is exercised by a Claims Tribunal under the Act we do not think it was correct on the part of the learned Tribunal to hold against the claimants for their failure or inability to examine the pillion rider Rosario Antao as a witness in the case.** Taking into account the hapless condition in which the claimants must have been placed after the death of their sole breadwinner and the sufficiently long period of time that has elapsed in the meantime, the learned Tribunal should not have treated the non-examination of the pillion rider as a fatal and fundamental law to the claim made before it by the appellant.*

Findings by the Tribunal

26. The evidence discussed above as such illustrates that on 19.09.2017 about 6.25 am claimant was walking on the road at Malki Dhankheti petrol pump when he was hit by a truck B/R No. AS01CC-8849 owned by OP No. 1 driven in a rash and negligent manner by OP No. 2 Shri Risuk Rabon as a result thereof claimant suffered grievous injury resulting in amputation of his left leg and incurred medical expenses and suffered 65% disability (Exhibit-3). The offending vehicle as per the Registration Certificate dated 27.09.2017 brought on record by the Counsel for OP No.1 & 2 stood in the name of OP No.1 Shri. Piwin Siangshai, (Paper Mark 10) accordingly claim petition amended.

27. The fact that Claimant was born on 25.12.1982 is supported by exhibit-1 & 2 as such claimant at the time of the accident was about 34 years 8 months of age. The fact that claimant suffered 65% permanent locomotive disability is also supported by Exhibit-3. The contention that claimant was earning Rs. 4,80,000/- per annum is supported by Exhibit-4 and the contention that he has a minor son is also supported by Paper Mark-1. According to the Police report dated 25.06.2019 (Exhibit-5) under the signatory of the then SP East Khasi Hills District, it substantiate the evidence of the Claimant that OP No. 2 was negligent. The fact that claimant was hospitalised and incurred medical expenditure for treatment to the tune of Rs. 1,52,125.50/- is also supported by the Tabular Table Exhibit-6 and Medical Receipts Exhibit-7.

Findings as the income of the Claimant

28. The evidence and claim presented by the claimant is not challenged by the Opp. Party, however, the view of this Court is that although it is the contention of the claimant the he was running a piggery Business and was earning a sum of Rs. 40,000/- (Rupees Forty Thousand) per month, however, there is no evidence led to show that he was running such business and although produced his PAN card, however, no bank transaction or Income Tax Return was produced to substantiate the income of the claimant and moreover it is the view of this Court that the income

certificate Exhibit-4 issued by the Headman is not admissible as a proof of income, as the Headman is not the competent authority under law to issue a certificate of income other than the Office of the Deputy Commissioner. The Claimant has also made no mention of his educational qualifications.

29. In Manusha Sreekumar v. United India Insurance Co. Ltd., (2022) 17 SCC 321 held as follows :

*21. This Court in Chandra v. Mukesh Kumar Yadav [Chandra v. Mukesh Kumar Yadav, (2022) 1 SCC 198 : (2022) 1 SCC (Civ) 359 : (2022) 1 SCC (Cri) 204] , has aptly held that **in the absence of a salary certificate, the minimum wages notification along with some amount of guesswork that is not completely detached from reality shall act as a yardstick to determine the income of the deceased.** In this context, keeping in view the import of Section 57 of the Evidence Act, 1872, we take judicial notice of the provisions of the Kerala Fair Wages Act, especially Section 2 thereof which defines the following expressions:*

30. In Sidram v. United India Insurance Co. Ltd., (2023) 3 SCC 439 held as follows

*59. Thus, we are of the view, more particularly keeping in mind the dictum of this Court in Kirti [Kirti v. Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd., (2021) 2 SCC 166 : (2021) 1 SCC (Civ) 704 : (2021) 1 SCC (Cri) 731] that **it is not necessary to adduce any documentary evidence to prove the notional income of the victim and the Court can award the same even in the absence of any documentary evidence.** In Kirti [Kirti v. Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd., (2021) 2 SCC 166 : (2021) 1 SCC (Civ) 704 : (2021) 1 SCC (Cri) 731] it was stated that the Court should ensure while choosing the method and fixing the notional income that the same is just in the facts and*

circumstances of the particular case, neither assessing the compensation too conservatively, nor too liberally.

31. In view of the Judgment discussed aforesaid it is the view of this Court that even if Exhibit-4 is not admitted and discarded, the Tribunal can award compensation on notional income, The state of Meghalaya vide notification No. LE&SD.9/2023/Pt/14 dated 21.07.2025 notified the minimum wage for unskilled labour @ Rs. 541/-, Semi-skilled @ Rs. 583/- and skilled @ Rs. 624 and highly skilled @ Rs. 665/- per day, therefore in view of the judgment of the Apex Court in Chandra (Supra) it is in the opinion of this Tribunal that from the evidence adduce by the Claimant it is reasonable and justified to assessed the claimant under the minimum wage for semi-skilled labour at Rs. 583 per day.

32. In a similarly positioned facts, the case for assessment of injury was comprehensively dealt with in **Sidram v. United India Insurance Co. Ltd., (2023) 3 SCC 439** held as follows

*60. In the overall view of the matter, we are convinced that we should determine the notional income of the appellant herein at Rs 8000 per month. **The same would result in the compensation being enhanced as under: Rs 8000 × 12 × 18 × 45% = INR 7,77,600***

(2) Loss of earning for 6 months

*61. Compensation under the aforesaid head was awarded by the Tribunal and the High Court. The Tribunal awarded only Rs 40,000 under this head. **The High Court enhanced it to Rs 42,000.***

62. We uphold the payment towards loss of earning for six months as awarded by the High Court and applying the revised income, enhance the same as under:

$Rs\ 8000 \times 6 = INR\ 48,000$

(3) Medical expenses

63. The appellant claims Rs 2,00,000 towards medical expenses. In this regard, the appellant adduced documentary evidence in the form of medical bills/receipts **to the tune of Rs 1,54,931, as stated in the order of the Tribunal.**

64. The Tribunal in its order dated 21-1-2014 held:

“Medical Expenses : The claimant submitted that he has taken treatment at Lakeview Hospital, Belgaum and was indoor patient. He has produced the hospital bill and medical bills to the tune of Rs 1,54,931. The same has been rounded to Rs 1,50,000 and the petitioner is entitled to Rs 1,50,000 under this head.”

(emphasis supplied)

65. The High Court in para 11 of its impugned judgment [Sidram v. Siddu Mahadev Bhosale, 2018 SCC OnLine Kar 4197] , held : (Sidram case [Sidram v. Siddu Mahadev Bhosale, 2018 SCC OnLine Kar 4197] , SCC OnLine Kar)

“11. The compensation awarded under the head of pain and suffering, medical expenses, conveyance, special diet, etc. loss of amenities in life and marriage prospects is just and proper and same is not disturbed.”

66. In view of the aforesaid, we grant compensation of Rs 1,55,000 towards medical expenses.

(4) Future medical expenses

67. At the outset, we may state that the ***“Future Medical Expenses”*** and ***“Attendant Charges”*** would fall within the

ambit of pecuniary expenses. In *Abhimanyu Partap Singh v. Namita Sekhon* [*Abhimanyu Partap Singh v. Namita Sekhon*, (2022) 8 SCC 489 : (2022) 4 SCC (Civ) 466 : (2022) 3 SCC (Cri) 473] , this Court held : (SCC p. 496, para 19)

*“19. In view of the said legal position, the compensation can be assessed in **pecuniary heads** i.e. the **loss of future earning, medical expenses including future medical expenses, attendant charges and also in the head of transportation including future transportation.** In the **non-pecuniary heads**, the compensation can be computed for the **mental and physical pain and sufferings in the present and in future, loss of amenities of life including loss of marital bliss, loss of expectancy in life, inconvenience, hardship, discomfort, disappointment, frustration, mental agony in life, etc.**”*

69. Dr Anil B. Patil (PW 2) has deposed categorically that the appellant would require future medical expenses to the tune of Rs 2,50,000. We are of the view that having regard to the evidence on record that the appellant would be incurring costs towards medical expenses in future along with physiotherapy and nursing and considering that the appellant at the time of accident was 19 years old, today his age would be around 29 years, even if a bare minimum of **Rs 1000 is spent per month, then it comes to:**

$Rs\ 1000 \times 12 \times 18 = Rs\ 2,16,000$

(5) Attendant charges

73. So far as this head is concerned, neither the Tribunal nor the High Court thought it fit to award anything. The evidence on record indicates that the appellant is unable to stand, walk, sit or bend his body or lift anything heavy. It is not in dispute that the appellant will not be able to work in the same manner as he used to prior to the accident. Indisputably, the appellant

*has suffered from paraplegia on account of the accident and requires an attendant throughout the day. **According to the claimant, the cost of keeping the attendant would be Rs 4500 per month. We fix it at Rs 2000 per month. As a result, we award the attendant charges as under:***

Rs 2000 × 12 × 18 = Rs 4,32,000

*77. The Tribunal thought it fit not to award anything towards the litigation expenses. The High Court took the view that the appellant is entitled to the amount of **Rs 20,000 towards the litigation expenses. The appellant claims Rs 50,000 towards the litigation expenses.***

Non-pecuniary expenses

(8) Pain and suffering

91. The High Court of Judicature at Allahabad in Virendra Kumar v. Vijay Kumar [Virendra Kumar v. Vijay Kumar, 2020 SCC OnLine All 499 : ILR (2021) 3 All 272] , while discussing the distinction between pecuniary and non-pecuniary damages held as under : (SCC OnLine All para 9)

*“9. The law with respect to the grant of compensation in injury cases is well-settled. The injured is entitled to pecuniary as well as non-pecuniary damages. Pecuniary damages also known as special damages are generally designed to make good the pecuniary loss which is capable of being calculated in terms of money whereas non-pecuniary damages are incapable of being assessed by arithmetical calculations. The pecuniary or special damages, generally include the expenses incurred by the claimants on his treatment, special diet, conveyance, cost of nursing/attending, loss of income, loss of earning capacity and other material loss, which may require any special treatment or aid to the insured for the rest of his life. **The general damages or the non-pecuniary loss include***

the compensation for mental or physical shock, pain, suffering, loss of amenities of life, disfiguration, loss of marriage prospects, loss of expected earning of life, inconvenience, hardship, disappointment, frustration, mental stress, dejection and unhappiness in future life, etc.”

92. The Tribunal awarded a sum of **Rs 40,000 for the pain and suffering**. The High Court affirmed the amount of Rs 40,000. However, the appellant is seeking enhancement of Rs 40,000 to make it Rs 1,00,000 towards compensation for the pain and sufferings.

93. Pain and suffering would be categorised as a non-pecuniary loss as it is incapable of being arithmetically calculated. Therefore, **when compensation is to be awarded for pain and suffering, special circumstances of the claimant have to be taken into account including the victim's age, the unusual deprivation the victim has suffered**, the effect thereof on his or her future life. This Court in *R.D. Hattangadi [R.D. Hattangadi v. Pest Control (India) (P) Ltd., (1995) 1 SCC 551 : 1995 SCC (Cri) 250]*, while discussing this aspect held that : (SCC pp. 556 & 559, paras 10 & 17)

“10. It cannot be disputed that because of the accident the appellant who was an active practising lawyer has become paraplegic on account of the injuries sustained by him. It is really difficult in this background to assess the exact amount of compensation for the pain and agony suffered by the appellant and for having become a lifelong handicapped. No amount of compensation can restore the physical frame of the appellant. That is why it has been said by courts that whenever any amount is determined as the compensation payable for any injury suffered during an accident, the object

is to compensate such injury “so far as money can compensate” because it is impossible to equate the money with the human sufferings or personal deprivations. Money cannot renew a broken and shattered physical frame.

*17. ... When compensation is to be awarded for pain and suffering and loss of amenity of life, the special circumstances of the claimant have to be taken into account including **his age, the unusual deprivation he has suffered, the effect thereof on his future life.** The amount of compensation for non-pecuniary loss is not easy to determine but the award must reflect that different circumstances have been taken into consideration.”*

94. This Court in Mahadeva Shetty [Karnataka SRTC v. Mahadeva Shetty, (2003) 7 SCC 197 : 2003 SCC (Cri) 1722] , while discussing the factors to be taken into consideration while awarding compensation for pain and suffering held that : (SCC p. 205, para 18)

“18. A person not only suffers injuries on account of accident but also suffers in mind and body on account of the accident throughout his life and a feeling is developed that he is no more a normal man and cannot enjoy the amenities of life as another normal person can. While fixing compensation for pain and suffering as also for loss of amenities of life, features like his age, marital status and unusual deprivation he has undertaken in his life have to be reckoned.”

95. In another case of this Court in Nizam's Institute of Medical Sciences v. Prasanth S. Dhananka [Nizam's Institute of Medical Sciences v. Prasanth S. Dhananka, (2009) 6 SCC 1 : (2009) 2 SCC (Civ) 688], this Court granted a very high

amount of Rs 10,00,000 on account of the pain and suffering of the victim. That was a case of engineering student aged 20 years, who was a victim of medical negligence. The case before this Court was of a young student who being the victim of paraplegia was confined to wheelchair, and who pursued career in education and ultimately got employed as IT engineer at a handsome salary.

96. This Court has awarded compensation for pain and suffering by looking into the circumstances of the case. Therefore, considering that the appellant was only 19 years at the time of the accident and suffered a permanent disability of 45%, he ought to be awarded compensation under this head.

97. Furthermore, the decision of this Court in Nagappa [Nagappa v. Gurudayal Singh, (2003) 2 SCC 274 : 2003 SCC (Cri) 523], holds that there is no embargo in awarding compensation more than that claimed by the claimant.

98. In view of the aforesaid, we award an amount of Rs 1,00,000 towards pain and suffering.

105. This Court in Pappu Deo Yadav [Pappu Deo Yadav v. Naresh Kumar, (2022) 13 SCC 790 : 2020 SCC OnLine SC 752] , observed : (SCC para 6)

“6. The principle consistently followed by this court in assessing motor vehicle compensation claims, is to place the victim in as near a position as she or he was in before the accident, with other compensatory directions for loss of amenities and other payments. These general principles have been stated and reiterated in several decisions. (Govind Yadav v. New India Insurance Co. Ltd. [Govind Yadav v. New India

Insurance Co. Ltd., (2011) 10 SCC 683 : (2012) 3 SCC (Civ) 1082 : (2012) 1 SCC (Cri) 82 : (2012) 1 SCC (L&S) 422])”

106. In *R.D. Hattangadi [R.D. Hattangadi v. Pest Control (India) (P) Ltd., (1995) 1 SCC 551 : 1995 SCC (Cri) 250]* it has been held : (SCC pp. 557 & 559, paras 12 & 17)

“12. In its very nature whenever a tribunal or a court is required to fix the amount of compensation in cases of accident, it involves some guesswork, some hypothetical consideration, some amount of sympathy linked with the nature of the disability caused. But all the aforesaid elements have to be viewed with objective standards.

17. ... *When compensation is to be awarded for pain and suffering and loss of amenity of life, the special circumstances of the claimant have to be taken into account including his age, the unusual deprivation he has suffered, the effect thereof on his future life.”*

107. This Court in *Raj Kumar [Raj Kumar v. Ajay Kumar, (2011) 1 SCC 343 : (2011) 1 SCC (Civ) 164 : (2011) 1 SCC (Cri) 1161]* held : (SCC p. 347, para 5)

*“5. ... A person is not only to be compensated for the physical injury, but also for the loss which he suffered as a result of such injury. This means that **he is to be compensated for his inability to lead a full life, his inability to enjoy those normal amenities which he would have enjoyed but for the injuries, and his inability to earn as much as he used to earn or could have earned.**”*

108. In *Laxman* [*Laxman v. Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd.*, (2011) 10 SCC 756 : (2012) 3 SCC (Civ) 1095 : (2012) 1 SCC (Cri) 108] , this Court observed : (SCC p. 762, para 15)

*“15. The ratio of the abovenoted judgments is that if the victim of an accident suffers permanent or temporary disability, then efforts should always be made to award adequate compensation not only for the physical injury and treatment, but also for the pain, suffering and trauma caused due to the accident, **loss of earning and the victim's inability to lead a normal life and enjoy amenities, which he would have enjoyed but for the disability caused due to the accident.**”*

109. This Court in *Govind Yadav* [*Govind Yadav v. New India Insurance Co. Ltd.*, (2011) 10 SCC 683 : (2012) 3 SCC (Civ) 1082 : (2012) 1 SCC (Cri) 82 : (2012) 1 SCC (L&S) 422] held : (SCC p. 693, para 18)

*“18. In our view, the principles laid down in *Arvind Kumar Mishra v. New India Assurance Co. Ltd.* [*Arvind Kumar Mishra v. New India Assurance Co. Ltd.*, (2010) 10 SCC 254 : (2010) 4 SCC (Civ) 153 : (2010) 3 SCC (Cri) 1258] and *Raj Kumar v. Ajay Kumar* [*Raj Kumar v. Ajay Kumar*, (2011) 1 SCC 343 : (2011) 1 SCC (Civ) 164 : (2011) 1 SCC (Cri) 1161] must be followed by all the Tribunals and the High Courts in determining the quantum of compensation payable to the victims of accident, who are disabled either permanently or temporarily. **If the victim of the accident suffers permanent disability, then efforts should always be made to award adequate compensation not only for the physical injury and treatment, but also for the loss of earning and his inability to lead a normal life and enjoy amenities, which he would have enjoyed but for the disability caused due to the accident.**”*

33. In Raj Kumar v. Ajay Kumar, (2011) 1 SCC 343 the Apex Court assessed compensation as follows:

28. As the income of the appellant is assessed at Rs. 18,000 per annum, the loss of earning due to functional disability would be 20% of Rs. 18,000 which is Rs. 3600 per annum. As the age of the appellant at the time of the accident was 25, the multiplier applicable would be 18. Therefore, the loss of future earnings would be Rs. 3600 × 18 = Rs. 64,800 (as against Rs. 55,080 determined by the Tribunal). We are also of the view that the loss of earning during the period of treatment (1-10-1991 to 16-6-1992) should be Rs. 12,750 at the rate of Rs. 1500 for eight-and-half months instead of Rs. 3600 determined by the Tribunal. The increase under the two heads is rounded off to Rs. 20,000.

34. Another important question relevant to this case is that the accident occurred prior to the amendment, as such can the present case law be applicable to the case at hand and whether the multiplier can be applied to the present case, this question was answered accordingly in the affirmative in **Maitri Koley v. New India Assurance Co., (2003) 8 SCC 718** although in the present the calculation of multiplier do not arise as the percentage of disability could not be assessed with the absence of evidence adduce by the claimant.

4. On behalf of the appellants, it is contended that the Tribunal had applied a wrong multiplier. It was submitted that on the date the Tribunal gave the award the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 had already come into force. It was submitted that the schedule for payment of compensation should have been applied. It was submitted that the multiplier should have been 16. We are unable to accept the submission. It has been held by this Court in the case of Padma Srinivasan v. Premier Insurance Co. Ltd. [(1982) 1 SCC 613 : 1982 SCC (Cri) 330 : AIR 1982 SC 836] that the law prevailing on the date of the

accident has to apply. On the date of the accident the 1988 Act had not come into force. Under the old Act there was no schedule. Thus the multipliers then being applied were on the basis of the ratio laid down by this Court in various cases. It could not be said that the multiplier of 14, which was applied, was unreasonable.

34. For the reasons discussed above, the compensation is assessed in the following terms, keeping in mind the principles on the above mentioned case laws

Sl. No.	Heads Compensation	Amount Claim in ₹	Amount awarded in ₹
1.	Past Medical Expenditure	₹ 1,52,125.50/-	₹1,52,125.50/-
2.	Pain, Suffering & trauma	₹ 5,00,000/-	₹ 2,00,000/-
3.	Future Medical Expenses	NIL	₹50,000/-
4.	Lost of earnings during the period of treatment	NIL	₹583 per day x 60 days ₹34,980/-
5.	Loss of future earning due to disability	₹ 81,60,000/-	₹ 583/- x 26 days ₹ 15,158/- x 12 ₹ 1,81,896/- x 65% ₹1,18,232.4/-x 16 ₹ 18,91,718.4/-
6.	Incidental Hospital expenses Miscellaneous	NIL	₹ 35,000/-
7.	Litigation charges	NIL	₹ 10,000/-
8.	Attendant Charges	NIL	₹1,00,000/-
9.	Loss of conveyance	NIL	₹ 50,000/-

10.	Loss of future amenities	NIL	₹ 15,158/- x 6 ₹ 90,948/-
Total			₹26,14,771.9/-

35. The total amount of compensation is rounded off to ₹ **26,14,772/- (Rupees Twenty Six Lakhs Fourteen thousand Seven Hundred and Seventy Two) only,**

36. The other factor for consideration is who is liable to pay the compensation *In 2025 SCC OnLine AP 1085 Pulavarthi Daniyelu v. Kollam Sudhakara Babu Prakasam District and Others*

*10. The evidence on record amply established that the claimant was an unauthorized passenger in a Government vehicle. It Is also not in dispute that the driver of the offending vehicle was not supposed to carry any such unauthorized passenger, but he carried him. That the offending vehicle belonged to R 2 herein is undisputed. The doctrine of respondeat superior (let the master answer) holds the owner liable for the actions of the driver. **This doctrine is based on the idea that the owner has control over the driver and is responsible for ensuring that the driver acts responsibly. In fact, holding the owner liable for accidents caused by the driver serves public policy purposes. The driver is considered as agent of the owner and the owner is responsible for the drivers actions. Therefore, owner is vicariously liable for the actions of the driver.** In Pushpabai Purshottam Udeshi v. Ranjit Ginning and Pressing Company Private Limited, the facts that were available before their Lordships of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India were that the owner of the vehicle employed a driver on the car and during its use the driver gave lift to the passenger and he did it without the knowledge of the owner. Out of rash or negligent driving of the driver, the accident took place and this unauthorized passenger*

suffered injuries and died. An argument was advanced before their Lordships that the driver without obtaining permission from the owner carried the passengers and therefore the liability could not be fastened to the owner. Rejecting that argument, their Lordships held that owner was liable to pay compensation. **Their Lordships further stated that the recent trend in law is to make the master liable for acts of his servant which may not fall within the expression “in the course of his employment” as formerly understood.** The extended principle is to the effect that the owner is not only liable for the negligence of the driver if the driver is his servant acting in the course of his employment but also when the driver is driving the car on the owner's business or for the owner's purposes. In cases of unauthorized passengers, the indemnifier/insurance company may not be liable as that would amount to breach of conditions of insurance policy. However, the liability of the owner in such cases is still available as held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in *National India Insurance Company Limited v. Baljit Kaur*³. In the case at hand, whatever the breach that may have been there between the owner and the driver, the fact remained that the driver was driving the offending vehicle at the material point of time for the purpose of owner. No owner ever granted any permission to any driver to drive the vehicle negligently or rashly and cause an accident. Therefore, no accident is ever authorized by any owner. Could it be said that when a driver acted negligently in discharging his function, it amounted breach of contract between the driver and the owner thereby absolving the owner from any liability especially when the accident cause death or physical impairment or injuries to the third party. **The Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 fastens liability on the owner though owner never drove the vehicle by himself.** The ruling cited by the learned

counsel for respondent No. 2 has no application to the case at hand in view of the discussion made above.

11. Earlier contentions used to be raised by the Government on the premise of sovereign immunity. All that is now no more available as held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in N. Nagendra Rao & Co. v. State of AP.

ORDER

38. In view of the discussion above the claim petition succeeds, the Claimant is awarded compensation to the a sum of **26,14,772/- (Rupees Twenty Six Lakhs Fourteen thousand Seven Hundred and Seventy Two) only**, with interest at the rate of 6% from the date of institution of the Claim Petition i.e. 09.04.2008 till full and final realization of the amount, interest is excluded for future medical expenses.

39. The Opp. Party No. 1 Shri. Piwin Siangshai is liable to compensate the claimant and accordingly directed to deposit the awarded compensation within a period of 30 days from the date of this Judgment.

40. Copy of this Judgment shall be made available to the Opp. Party No. 1 for compliance as mandate u/S 168(2)(3) Motor Vehicle Act, 1988.

41. BA to notify copy of the Judgment to OP No. 1

42. Case accordingly stands disposed.

Given under the hand and seal of this Court on this the **28th day of November, 2025 at Shillong.**

Type and corrected by the undersigned

Shri B. Laitmon, (MHJS)
Member Motor Accident Claim Tribunal,
East Khasi Hills District, Shillong

APPENDIX

A. EXHIBITS

Exhibit-1 : Original Copy of the Election Photo Identity Card issued in my name dated 20th January 2018 issued by Electoral Registration Officer Assembly Constituency No.& Name 22- Nongkrem.

Exhibit-2 : Permanent Account Number Card issued in my name by the Income Tax Department Government of India

Exhibit-3 : Disability Certificate Issued by the Joint Director of health Services (S.S) Civil hospital Shillong.

Exhibit-4 : Original copy of the Income Certificate issued by the Office of Rangbah Shnong Madanrting Shillong dated 12th October 2017.

Exhibit-5 : Police Report issued by Superintendent of Police East Khasi Hills Shillong.

Exhibit-6 : (A) & 5 (B) is the Hospital/Pharmacy Bill/ Invoice No. along with the Bill Date and Amount.

Exhibit 7 : Original Copy of the 36 Nos. of Cash Receipt paid by me in respect of my treatment at Woodland Hospital Shillong from the period of 07.10.2017 to 31.01.2019.

B. Paper Marks

Paper mark-1 : Birth Certificate of Jonathan Lorence Nongrum

Paper Mark-2 : Xerox copies of the extract of Laitumkhrah Traffic Branch, GDE No. 02 of 19.09.2017.

Paper Mark-4 : Xerox copy of the Emergency Room Record or Medical Legal Report of the Claimant Dated 19.09.2017 issued by Civil Hospital Shillong

Paper Mark-5 : Xerox copy of the Seizure List Dated 19.09.2017 in respect of the Seizure make of the Truck Bearing Vehicle No. AS01CC-8849.

Paper Mark-6 : Xerox copy of the Zimmanama dated 19.09.2017 and

Paper Mark-7 : Xerox copy of the Zimmanama dated 20.09.2017.

Paper Mark-8 : Discharge Summary issued by Super Care Hospital.

Paper Mark-9 : Xerox copy of the Final Impatient Bill Dated 06/10/2017 issued by Super Care Hospital, Shillong

Paper Mark-10 : Xerox copy of the Registration Certificate issued in the name of the registered owner Piwin Shiangshai in respect of the Vehicle Truck Bearing Registration No. ML. 06 9352 issued by District Transport Officer, West Khasi Hills, Nongstoin, Registration Date 22.09.2010.

C. CLAIMANT WITNESSES

CW1 : Shri Lorence Nongrum

CW2 : Dr. Ajay Kumar Thakur

CW3 : Dr. Kevin R. N. Sangma

CW4 : UBC/2605 Kenneth E. Thabah

CW5 : Inspector Walning Ch. Sangma

D. OPPOSITE PARTY WITNESSES

NIL

Shri B. Laitmon, (MHJS)
Member Motor Accident Claim Tribunal,
East Khasi Hills District, Shillong