

23
MACT 13/26
ANITA LRs
(DEC. RAJ KR.)(D)F
(296/25/DGNJ)SrC
Vs.
RANJIT KR(SBI)

21.04.2026

Present: Sh. Atul Rathi, Ld. Counsel for the petitioners with son of the deceased namely Mr. Dev in person.
Sh. Arshan Ahmed, Ld. Counsel for respondent nos. 1 & 2 through VC.
Sh. Vishal Kardam, Ld. Proxy Counsel for respondent no. 3.

Despite repeated calls none has appeared on behalf respondents no. 1 and 2. Even no WS has been filed on their behalf till date. **Hence, defence of respondents no. 1 and 2 to file the WS is struck off.**

Legal offer filed on behalf of respondent no. 3. Copy supplied.

Ld. Counsel for the petitioner submits that since the legal offer has been filed by respondent no. 3, it has admitted its liability. He also submits that the dispute is only regarding the quantum of compensation and thus, the issues be framed regarding the quantum of compensation. In view of the directions given in Form II of the new scheme of Motor Accident Claims formulated by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide judgment dated 08.01.2021 in FAO no. 842/2003, Rajesh Tyagi & others Vs. Jaibir Singh and others, Ld. Counsel for respondent no. 3 submits that he has no objection to the same.

In view of the submissions of Ld. Counsel for the petitioner and respondent no.3, the following issues are framed :

Contd.../-

1. Whether the petitioner(s) are entitled for compensation, if so, to what extent and from whom? OPP
2. Relief.

Ld. Counsel for the petitioners submits that the compensation may be awarded to the petitioners as per the minimum wages of Delhi as the deceased was residing and working in Delhi. Separate statement of Ld. Counsel for the petitioner is recorded to this effect.

List for filing of duly filled Form XIII, recording of financial statement and final arguments on **26.05.2026**.

(Ruchika Singla)
Presiding Officer, MACT-01 (Central)
THC/Delhi/21.04.2026