

GJBK010034932024



Ex-

Received On: 23.08.2024

Registered On: 23.08.2024

Decided On: 08.04.2026

Yrs.Mths.Days

**BEFORE THE MOTOR ACCIDENTS CLAIMS TRIBUNAL
[MAIN],BANASKANTHA DISTRICT, AT PALANPUR.**

M.A.C.Petition No.205/2024

Nanabhai Premabhai Dhrangi
(Adivasi), Age: 31 years,
Occu: Nothing at present,
(Before accident Tiles Fitting),
R/o Kanpura, Virampur,
Tal. Amirgadh, Dist. Banaskantha.

...Claimant

Versus

- 1) Mithun Balchand Garasiya,
Age - 20 years, Occu. Driving,
R/o Chittora Chhani, Udaipur,
Rajasthan - 313804.
(Driver of Pick Up Dala
No.GJ-08-AU-4717)
- 2) Mohanbhai Gulabbhai Dhrangi,
Age - Adult, Occu. Driving,
R/o Pedcholi, Virampur,
Tal. Amirgadh, Dist. Banaskantha.
(Owner of Pick Up Dala
No.GJ-08-AU-4717)
- 3) Shriram General Insurance Co.Ltd.
201, BBC Tower, Opp. Law Garden,
Ahmedabad - 380006 (Gujarat).
(Insurer of Pick Up Dala
No.GJ-08-AU-4717)

...Opponents

APPEARANCE:

Mr.B.M. Rajput, L.A. for the Claimant.
Mr.R.J. Barad, L.A. for the Opponents No.1 and 2.
Mr.D.K.Thakor, L.A. for the Opponent No.3.

**Claim Petition for Compensation of Rs.56,10,000/- under
Section 166 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988.****JUDGMENT**

[1] The petitioner has filed the present claim seeking compensation to the tune of Rs.56,10,000 from the opponents on account of injuries sustained in an accident that took place on 24.6.2024 at the time and place specified in para 7 of the petition involving Pick Up Dala No.GJ-08-AU-4717 which was being driven in a rash and negligent manner by opponent No.1, which was of the ownership of opponent No.2, and which, according to the claim petition, was duly insured by opponent No.3, the insurance company, and therefore, it is urged that the opponents No.1 to 3 be held jointly and severally liable to pay the amount of compensation so required to be awarded herein.

[2] It is the case of the petitioner that he has sustained permanent disabling nature of injuries on account of the accident, and therefore, is required to be properly compensated. It is also the case of the petitioner that the petitioner was having monthly income of Rs.30,000/- per month by doing Tiles Fitting work. The age of the applicant at the time of accident is also claimed to be 31 years.

[3] The factual matrix leading to the present petition is required to be underlined as follows:

On 24.06.2024 the petitioner was riding his Motorcycle No.GJ-08-DE-3442 and after completion of his work at Palanpur

returning home. It is also case that he was plying his motorcycle slowly and correct side of the road and at that time the opponent No.1 driver of the Pick Up Dala No.GJ-08-AU-4717 came driving the said vehicle from Ambaji side at a very high and excessive speed, in rash and negligent manner and dashed with the motorcycle of the petitioner from wrong side. Hence, in the said accident the petitioner had suffered serious injuries over right leg and his right leg below knee was amputated and he was also operated for the injuries suffered in the accident. The accident occurred due to the sole negligence on part of driver of Pick up dala. In this accident the petitioner had suffered serious injuries over right leg and amputation was done and also suffered injuries over various parts of the body, which mandated hospitalization, and on account thereof the applicant was admitted in the Civil Hospital, Palanpur, but due to serious injuries he was admitted in the Hind hospital, Palanpur where he was operated and his right leg below knee was amputated. The medical papers issued by the said Hospital are on the record of the proceedings. The applicant, according to the petition, has gone through grave trauma and has suffered grave pain, shock and suffering on account of the injuries sustained in the accident, and furthermore the applicant has been deprived of his usual source of income during the time he was disabled and bedridden on account of the injuries sustained. It is further claimed that the permanent disability sustained by him has reduced future scope of income and prospects of the present applicant, and therefore, the applicant is required to be suitably compensated, and more particularly to the extent sought for in the present petition.

[4] All the opponents are duly served.

[5] The opponents No.1 and 2 driver and owner of the Pick Up Dala No.GJ-08-AU-4717 has appeared on the record of the proceedings and contested the petition by filing written statement which is on the record of the proceedings at Ex-8. The opponents No.1 and 2 have taken up all available defences and, generally speaking, denied any liability to pay any amount much less the amount of compensation claimed. The opponents have contended that the facts of the accident are not true and correct. It is also denied that accident occurred due to the negligence on part of driver of the Pick Up Dala. But it is submitted that actually the alleged accident occurred due to the sole negligence on part of petitioner himself who had driven his motorcycle at a very high and excessive speed and in rash and negligent manner and came before the Pick Up Dala and at that time the opponent No.1 had applied breaks, but the petitioner had lost control over the motorcycle and he himself fell down on the road. Hence, the opponents No.1 and 2 are not liable for the accident. It is also contended that in this case as the said Pick Up Dala No.GJ-08-AU-4717 is duly insured with the opponent No.3, and hence, the opponent No.3 is liable to pay compensation. The opponents No.1 and 2 have, generally speaking, sought for a dismissal and rejection of the present application.

[6] The opponent No.3 insurance company of the Pick Up Dala No.GJ-08-AU-4717 has appeared on the record of the proceedings and contested the petition by filing written statement which is on the record of the proceedings at Ex-12. The opponent No.3 has taken up all available defences and, generally speaking, denied any liability to pay any amount much less the amount of

compensation claimed. The opponent No.3 has contended that the driver of the vehicle was not holding valid driving licence. It is denied that the accident occurred due to the involvement of the vehicle Pick Up Dala No.GJ-08-AU-4717 in the accident because the complaint is lately filed on 29.6.2024, but the accident occurred on 24.06.2024 and hence, the petitioner had planted the vehicle to get the compensation falsely from the opponent No.3 because the petitioner did not mention about the cause to file late complaint. It is also submitted that actually the alleged accident occurred due to the sole negligence on part of petitioner himself. The age, income and occupation of the petitioner is also denied by this opponent. It is also submitted that there is breach of policy conditions therefore the opponent No.3 is not liable to pay compensation. The opponent No.3 has, generally speaking, sought for a dismissal and rejection of the present application.

[7] It is in the background of such rival pleadings that this Tribunal was pleased to frame the issues as follows at Ex.13:

- (i) Whether the applicant proves that he sustained injuries due to rash and/or negligent driving of the vehicle involved in accident?
- (ii) Whether the applicant proves that he is entitled to get compensation? If yes, who is responsible to pay compensation and to what extent?
- (iii) What award?

[8] My findings on each of the issues are as hereinafter follows:

- (i) In the affirmative. Driver of the Pick Up Dala No.GJ-08-AU-4717 was solely liable for causing the accident.
- (ii) In the affirmative and as per the amount quantified.
- (iii) As per final judgment and award.

[9] The petitioner has relied both on oral and documentary evidence in an effort to establish his entitlement to the claim. It would be necessary, at the outset, and before ascribing my reasons for arriving at the findings above, to refer to the documentary evidence which are in the shape of :-

Sr. No.	Description	Exh.
1	Copy of the F.I.R.	30
2	Panchnama of place of accident	31
3	Injury certificate of Hind Hospital	32
4	Discharge card of Hind Hospital	33
5	Medical Bills	34
6	Disability certificate	29

[10] The oral evidence on the record of the proceedings is as under:

Sr. No.	Description	Exh.
1	PW1, Nanabhai Premabhai Dhrangi, Petitioner	21
2	PW2, Dr.Ashish Rajeshbhai Purohit, Orthopedic Surgeon	28

[11] This set of evidence is required to be considered to decide the fate of the present petition.

REASONS

Issues No.1 and 2:

[12] Since the evidence, both documentary and oral, is germane and common to both issues, both are dealt with together for the sake of convenience.

[13] I have heard learned counsels for the parties, perused the record and considered the written submissions placed on record at Ex.52 on behalf of opponent No.3 and on behalf of petitioner.

[14] The petitioner has pleaded negligence on the part of driver of the Pick Up Dala No.GJ-08-AU-4717. He has deposed before this Tribunal same as his pleadings. In his cross examination he has denied that in the accident the motorcycle and Pick Up Dala is damaged on front side. He has denied that at the time of accident he was plying motorcycle in rash and negligent manner and dashed his motorcycle from wrong side. He has denied that the driver of the Pick up Dala was not negligent for causing the accident. Thus, nothing adverse has come out from his cross-examination.

[15] L.A. for the opponent No.3 has argued that looking to the complaint, panchnama of place of accident and the road on which the accident occurred, it can be said that there is head on collision between both the vehicles and hence, in this case drivers of both the vehicles are equally liable for causing the accident and accordingly it may also be held that the petitioner is also liable for the accident to the extent of 50%. He has also argued that as per the deposition of the doctor and also in view of the reference of the Book of the Henry H. Kessler, in this case the disability assessed by the doctor is required to be considered at 35% for body as a whole. He has further argued that in this case

there is no proof of income of the petitioner is produced on record. So, the notional income of the petitioner can be assessed at Rs.8000/- per month. Thus, he has submitted that accordingly the just compensation may be awarded to the petitioner.

[16] On the other hand L.A. for the petitioner has also submitted that in this case the accident occurred due to the sole negligence on part of driver of the Pick up Dala No.GJ-08-AU-4717 and in this accident the petitioner had lost his right leg below knee. Hence, in this case the doctor has assessed total 70% disability and as per the deposition of the doctor the said disability cannot be said as half body as a whole. But he has sated that the said disability is permanent disability. He has also relied upon the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Erudhya Priya Vs. State Express Transport Corporation Ltd. AIR 2020, 4284** wherein, the victim aged about 23, who sustained 31.1% permanent disability, the Hon'ble Apex Court granted 50% rise in the income of the claimant. Further in another recent judgment in case of **Karthik Subramanian Vs. B. Sarath Babu & Anr. reported in 2021 ACJ 993**, the Hon'ble Apex Court has assessed compensation adding 50% amount of the actual income of the injured claimant. In the case before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the injured claimant was aged about 34 years and had sustained permanent partial disablement to an extent of 40%. Hence, it is submitted that as the petitioner was doing Tile fitting work and hence, now he cannot able to do the said work and therefore, in this case the functional disability of the petitioner is required to be assessed at 100%. Therefore, it is submitted that the petitioner is entitled to get compensation of Rs.56,10,000/- from the opponents.

[17] In this case the Driver and Owner of the Pick Up Dala No.GJ-08-AU-4717 have not entered into the witness box in order to deny allegations of negligence made against the driver of the Trailer. Complaint at Exh.30 is filed against the driver of the Pick Up Dala No.GJ-08-AU-4717 and in the complaint the complainant had clearly mentioned that the driver of the Pick Up Dala No.GJ-08-AU-4717 had driven his vehicle at a very high and excessive speed and in negligent manner and dashed with the motorcycle of his son and hence, his son had suffered serious injuries and due to the accident his right leg below knee was amputated. He has also stated that at the place of accident the bumper of the pick up dala was broken down and fallen at the place of accident in which the number plate of the said vehicle is shown as No.GJ-08-AU-4717. Thus, it is clearly mentioned that the accident occurred due to the sole negligence on part of driver of the Pick up Dala. Now on perusal of the Panchnama of place of accident in which it is mentioned that at the place of accident one motorcycle No.GJ-08-DE-3442 is lying on the side of the road which is damaged in the accident. But the offending vehicle Pick Up Dala No.GJ-08-AU-4717 was not lying at the place of accident. Thus, this is a clear case of hit and run. It is also mentioned that as the driver of the Pick up Dala fled away from the place of accident. Thus, the complaint it lodged against the driver of the Pick Up Dala No.GJ-08-AU-4717.

[18] Therefore, it appears that the complaint was filed against the driver of the Pick Up Dala and on completion of investigation police have filed charge-sheet against the opponent No.1 driver for causing the accident. So, in the conclusion it appears that this is a case of hit and run. Thus, in view of the aforesaid complaint

and panchnama, deposition and charge-sheet, it is crystal clear that the accident taken place due to the sole negligence on part of driver of the Pick Up Dala No.GJ-08-AU-4717 and no negligence is required to be attributed to the petitioner.

[19] In any case, the documentary evidence in the shape of certified copies of the FIR, Panchnama of place of accident, charge-sheet and the treatment papers, clearly establish that the applicant sustained injuries in an accident that took place at the time and place, and in a manner specified in the petition.

[20] Furthermore, the disability certificate issued by Dr. Ashish Purohit also establishes that the injuries sustained by the applicant were of a permanently disabling nature. The disability certificate quantifies permanent whole physical disability of the applicant at 70%. It is in the background of such facts and circumstances that I am required to answer the Issue No.1 in the affirmative, which I hereby do so.

[21] As a natural consequence, and since having found issue No.1 in favour of the petitioner and in the affirmative, it necessarily follows that the petitioner is entitled to the compensation as claimed. The only question that now remains is computing and assessing the quantum of compensation which is required to be awarded herein. Each of the learned advocates for the contesting parties have made submissions in this regard, which I propose to deal with as hereinafter follows, and after considering the rival submissions, I propose to make a specific award under each head as hereinafter follows:

[22] At the outset, the age of the petitioner is pleaded as 31 years in the petition. The petitioner has produced his Aadhar card on record at mark 5/7/1 which shows his date of birth as

01.06.1993. The present accident occurred on 24.06.2024. Therefore, on the date of accident age of the claimant was about 31 years.

[23] With regard to income, it is claimed to be Rs.30,000/-per month by doing Tile Fitting work. To prove this fact the claimant has not produced any proof of income. In his cross-examination this witness has denied that he was not earning such income. But he has admitted that he has not produced any proof of income on record. Thus, in view of the aforesaid deposition of the witness, work of the petitioner and also looking to the year of accident i.e. 2024, income of the claimant may safely be assessed at Rs.15,000/- per month Rs.1,80,000/- in absence of any cogent evidence.

[24] It is urged by learned advocate for the applicant that the applicant has sustained multiple injuries and his right leg below knee was amputated. It is submitted that as a natural consequence the applicant was unable to get up and attend to his routine activities, and more particularly his economic activity for 6 months and the applicant should be compensated for a period of 6 months for loss of income under this count. Looking to the extent and nature of the injuries, there is, no doubt, there is fracture injury sustained by the applicant and also there is amputation below right knee. It is natural that healing would take some time, and therefore, I am of the opinion that it is required to be presumed and accepted that the applicant was unable to do his daily routine work for a period of 4 months. Accepting the monthly income of the applicant at Rs.15,000/-, an amount of Rs.60,000/- is awarded under this head.

[25] Now, for calculation of future loss of income, we have to calculate disability of the applicant due to the accident. The applicant has produced disability certificate on record at Ex.29. There is Disability Certificate which is issued by Dr.Ashish Purohit, Assistant Professor, Department of Orthopedics, General Hospital, Palanpur, which speaks that applicant had suffered Locomotor disability and there was below knee amputation right and hence, has given total 70% disability and the nature of certificate is Permanent.

[26] The claimant has examined Dr. Ashish R. Purohit at Ex.28 who had given the disability certificate to the applicant at Ex.29 he had given 70% disability. According to this doctor, he had examined the claimant for the purpose of disability on 4.6.2025 whose right leg below knee was amputated and he was operated for the injuries. In his cross-examination this witness has admitted that he had not treated the claimant and first time seen the patient on 4.6.2025. He did not take X'ray of the petitioner. He had seen the X'ray which the petitioner brought with him. He has admitted that his right leg below knee was amputated except this there was no other injuries. He has admitted that when there is injury only over one leg, it can be referred only for the said limb. He cannot able to say that the disability assessed by him of 70% cannot be said as permanent partial disability. He has stated that this is permanent disability. He has stated that it is true about the disability half body as a whole in the Page-46 of Kessler book. He has denied that he has given excessive disability. It is an admitted fact that the right leg below knee of the petitioner was amputated and he had suffered 70% disability. Further in view of the disability certificate and deposition of the doctor, I am of the view

that ends of justice would meet if the disability of the petitioner is assessed at 50% body as a whole.

[27] Further as per the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Raj Kumar Vs. Ajay Kumar and another reported in 2011 ACJ 1** in which the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that *"Words and phrases. Permanent disability. What is. Permanent disability refers to residuary incapacity or loss of use of some part of body, found at the end of treatment and recuperation, which is likely to remain for rest of life of the injured. It can be either partial or total."* It is also held by Hon'ble Supreme Court in in Para-6 that *"Disability refers to any restriction or lack of ability to perform an activity in the manner considered normal for a human being. Permanent disability refers to the residuary incapacity or loss of use of some part of the body, found existing at the end of the period of treatment and recuperation, after achieving the maximum bodily improvement or recovery which is likely to remain for the remainder life of the injured. Temporary disability refers to the incapacity or loss of use of some part of the body on account of the injury, which will cease to exist at the end of the period of treatment and recuperation. Permanent disability can be either partial or total. Partial permanent disability refers to a person's inability to perform all the duties and bodily functions that he could perform before the accident, though he is able to perform some of them and is still able to engage in some gainful activity. Total permanent disability refers to a person's inability to perform any avocation or employment related activities as a result of the accident. The permanent disabilities that may arise from motor accidents injuries, are of a much wider range when compared to the physical disabilities which are enumerated in the*

Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995 ('Disabilities Act' for short). But if any of the disabilities enumerated in section 2(i) of the Disabilities Act are the result of injuries sustained in a motor accident, they can be permanent disabilities for the purpose of claiming compensation." Thus, considering the aforesaid citation of the Hon'ble Apex Court, considering avocation of claimant his functional disability is required to be assessed. Thus, considering the loss of earning capacity of claimant and functional disability because right leg upper knee of the claimant is amputated due to the injuries and the disability of the claimant is assessed at 50% for body as a whole. Now, this Tribunal, in order to calculate and work out just compensation, shall follow the ratio laid down by the **Constitution Bench** of the **Honourable Supreme Court** in the case of **National Insurance Co. Ltd. V/s Pranay Sethi & Ors. [2017 ACJ 2700]** as well as the judgment delivered by the **Honourable Supreme Court** in the case of **Sarla Verma V/s Delhi Transport Corporation & Anr.,(2009 (6) SCC 121)**. It appears that the claimant has lost his right leg in the accident and therefore, for calculation of future prospective income, taking the age of the applicant is required to be added. It appears that the claimant has lost his right leg in the accident and therefore, for calculation of future prospective income, taking the age of the applicant between 31 to 35 years, I add income of 50% to calculate future prospects. So it would be Rs.21,000/- per month (i.e. Rs.15000 + 6000 (40% of Rs.15000) and Rs.2,52,000/- per year. So to award the just compensation, if permanent partial disablement body as a whole is considered 50%, it will be just and

proper and hence, the claimant would be entitled to Rs.20,16,000/- (Rs.2,52,000 x 50% x 16 years) as against future loss of income.

[28] An amount of Rs.80,000/- has been claimed by the applicant towards attendance allowance, special diet and for transportation. There is obviously no evidence to support such claim. No supporting witnesses have also been examined to support the claim of there being attendants who have continuously attended to the applicant and as a result have been deprived of their earnings on account of such attendance. There is also no medical or expert opinion which suggested any special diet for the treatment of the injuries sustained by the present applicant. In my opinion, no doubt, some amounts might have been spent by the applicant towards the transportation, medical expenses and for the follow-up treatment, the same naturally is not supported by any documentary evidence. However, looking to the nature of injuries and extent of disability and also in view of the fact that the right leg above knee was amputated, I propose to award an amount of Rs.30,000/- as a global lumpsum amount covering all such heads as claimed on behalf of the claimant.

[29] Now, the claimant has stated that he has spent huge amount towards medical expenditure. In support of this claim for medical expenses, the applicant has produced medical bills on record at Ex.35 which are worth Rs.1,73,855/-. Therefore in this case the medical bills in round figure of Rs.1,74,000/- is awarded to the claimant.

[30] Further it is also argued that in view of the amputation of right leg above knee, the claimant is entitled to get

Rs.1,00,000/- towards pain, shock and sufferings. In view of the nature of injury and as also the right leg of the claimant below knee was amputated, and also looking to the disability suffered by the claimant, for pain, shock and sufferings, Rs.50,000/- could be awarded, considering the fact that the applicant had sustained injuries including amputation of the right leg.

[31] Under the circumstances, the claimant is entitled to the following amount of compensation:

Rs.	
20,16,000	Loss of Future Income (Rs.2,52,000 x 50% x 16)
60,000	Loss of Current Income (Rs.15000 x 4 months)
50,000	Pain, Shock & Suffering
30,000	Special Diet, Attendance, Medical & Transportation
1,74,000	Medical expenditure

23,30,000	Total Amount
=====	

[32] The petitioner has claimed an amount of Rs.56,10,000 only. But, in view of the foregoing discussion, the petitioner is entitled to get compensation of Rs.23,30,000/- only.

Liability:

[33] The insurance policy mark 39/1 issued by the opponent No.3 shows that it is issued in the name of the opponent No.2 for the Pick Up Dala No.GJ-08-AU-4717 for the period from 27.02.2024 to 26.02.2025, covering the date of accident 24.06.2024. The opponent No.1 was the driver of the said vehicle at the time of accident. Therefore, opponents No.1 to 3, who are respectively driver, owner and insurer of Pick Up Dala No.GJ-08-

AU-4717, are held jointly and severally liable to pay compensation to the claimants.

Rate of Interest

[34] Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the 18% interest may please be awarded on the awarded amount. On the other hand learned counsel for the respondent No.3 submitted that 6% interest be granted on the awarded amount of compensation.

[35] I have gone through the records. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in *Abati Bezbaruah v. Dy. Director General, Geological Survey of India*, reported in [(2003) 3 SCC 148], after considering the catena of judgments held that "The rate of interest must be just and reasonable depending upon the facts and circumstances of each case and taking all relevant factors including inflation, change of economy, policy being adopted by Reserve Bank of India from time to time, how long the case is pending, permanent injuries suffered by the victim, enormity of suffering loss of future income, loss of enjoyment of life etc., into consideration."

[36] In this case, the accident took place in the year 2024. In the year 2024, the rate of interest was at higher side. Thus, having regards to the facts and circumstances of the case, in the light of the judgment of *Abati Bezbaruah (supra)*, it would be just and proper to award the simple interest at the rate of 9% p.a. Accordingly, the petitioners shall be entitled to get simple interest at the rate of 9% p.a. on the awarded amount of compensation from the date of filing of claim petitions till payment of awarded amount.

Tax to be Deducted at Source

[37] In *Hansaguri Prafulchandra Ladhani v. Oriental Insurance Company Limited*, reported as 2007 ACJ 1897, the Division Bench of Hon'ble Gujarat High Court has laid down the guidelines regarding the Tax Deducted at Source. In this judgment, the Hon'ble High Court directed that if amount of interest calculated on the awarded amount does not exceeds Rs.50,000 per year per petitioner, then no TDS shall be deducted by the Insurance Company/ Respondents at the time of depositing the awarded amount along with interest in the Tribunal, therefore, in view of this Judgment, the Respondents/ Insurance company is hereby directed not to deduct the TDS if the amount of interest does not exceeds Rs.50,000/- per year per petitioner.

[38] In the event, and in light of my findings above, following final order is passed:

FINAL ORDER

- (i) The petition is partly allowed.
- (ii) The opponents No.1 to 3 do jointly and severally pay an amount of Rs.23,30,000/- (Rupees Twenty Three Lacs Thirty Thousand Only), less the compensation paid u/s 140 of the MV Act, if any, within 30 days with interest at the rate of 9% per annum from the date of petition till the date of payment to the petitioner.

- (iii) The opponents No.1 to 3 do pay costs of the claimant and all the opponents bear that of their own.
- (iv) It is further directed that compensation amount shall be deposited directly into the bank account maintained by this Tribunal by RTGS or NEFT mode within 30 days in compliance with the directions given by Hon'ble Supreme Court in Bajaj Alliance General Insurance Co. v. Union of India, Writ Petition (s) (Civil) No. 534 of 2020 as well as directions given by Hon'ble High Court of Madras in Civil Misc. Appeal No.428 of 2016 decided on 11th March, 2016 titled as Divisional Manager, The Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Rajesh & Ors.
- (v) The aforesaid opponent/s is/are directed to deposit the amount of compensation through RTGS / NEFT in Bank account details of **Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Banaskantha at Palanpur**, as under:
- Name of Bank :**STATE BANK OF INDIA**
Name of Account : **MACT, DISTRICT COURT, PALANPUR**
Bank Branch Name : **OPP. OLD GANZ BAZAR, MAIN BRANCH, PALANPUR**
Bank Account No.: **40902081331**
Bank IFSC Code No.:**SBIN0000443**
Email address: **mact-palanpur@gujarat.gov.in**
- (vi) On such realization of the above said amount, after deducting deficit Court fees if any, **30%** amount shall be paid in cash by RTGS or NEFT

mode to the petitioner, while remaining 70% amount be deposited in her name in Fixed Deposit Receipt for a period of 5 years in any nationalized bank with liberty to withdraw interest periodically by the applicant. The bank shall not allow any loan or advances against the above said Fixed Deposit Receipt without previous permission of this Tribunal.

(vii) Award be drawn accordingly.

Pronounced in the open Tribunal today this 8th day of April, 2026.

PALANPUR.

Date:08/04/2026

(Shubhada Krishnakant Baxi)

Chairman

M.A.C. TRIBUNAL (MAIN)
B.K.DISTRICT, PALANPUR.
(Code : GJ00377)

SNJ