


CNR No. GJJN220013152018 	Received on	:	11 th December 2017		
	Registered on	:	11 th December 2017		
	Decided on	:	17 th March 2026		
	Duration	:	YY	MM	DD
			8	3	6

**BEFORE THE MOTOR ACCIDENT CLAIMS TRIBUNAL
(AUX.) AT VANTHALI**

**M.A.C.P. No.235 of 2018
(Old MACP No. 220/17)**

Exh. :

CLAIMANT : **Paras Dineshbhai Tajpara**
(Age:23 years, Occupation: Private Service)
Residing At: Near Aazad Chok,
Vanthali, District Junagadh.

VERSUS

OPPONENTS:

[Driver-Owner and Ins. Co. of Car No. GJ.1.KA.4391]

- (1) **Driver/Owner : Ripesb Arvindbhai Baraiya**
Age : Adult, Occupation : Driving,
R/o.: Pipleshvar Faliya,
Vanthali, District Junagadh.
(Joined vide order below Exh.75)
- (2) **Insurer : The United India Insurance Co. Ltd.**
College Road, Junagadh.

**Subject : Claim petition for compensation of Rs.20,00,000/-
under Section-166 of Motor Vehicle Act.**

APPEARANCE:

Mr. K.L.Sanchela, Ld. Advocate for the claimant.

Mr. V.S.Jethwa, Ld. Advocate for the opponent no.2.

No one has appeared on behalf of opponent no. 1.

:: JUDGMENT ::

- 1) The claimant has filed the present claim petition under Section 166 of M.V.Act, seeking compensation of Rs. 20,00,000/- (Rs. Five Lakhs Only) for the injuries sustained by the claimant above named, in vehicular accident. The claim petition is initially filed before Hon'ble MACT (Main), Junagadh, which was registered as MACP No.220/2017, thereafter as per the notification no. GK/38/2018/CCA/102017/3350/D, dated 04/09/2018 of Legal Department, Additional District Court is established at Vanthali and the said case is received by by this Tribunal on 16/09/2018 and re-registered as MACP No.235/2018.
- 2) The factual aspects of road accident for claiming compensation averred in the Claim Petition can be succinctly narrated as under:
 - (I) On 23/03/2015, claimant, along with his relatives, had hired a car bearing Registration No. GJ-1-KA-4391 owned and driven by Opponent No. 1 to travel from Vanthali to Diu. It was alleged that near Madh village in Una Taluka, Opponent No. 1 was driving the vehicle at an excessive speed

and in a rash and negligent manner and upon reaching Madh village, the driver made a sudden, sharp turn, causing him to lose control of the vehicle. Consequently, the car struck small stones on the road, leading to a tire burst and causing the vehicle to overturn.

- (II) As a result of this accident, the claimant sustained injuries. The applicant sustained life-altering injuries due to the driver's inexcusable negligence. Regarding the nature of the injuries and resulting disability, the applicant reported severe trauma, most notably the amputation of the left arm above the elbow. Additionally, the applicant suffered a serious fracture in the right arm and multiple blunt-force injuries across the body.
- (III) The First Information Report of the above noted road accident was registered at Una Police Station vide CR No. II 145/2015.
- (IV) It is averred that this claimant was initially taken to Lifecare Hospital in Una. Due to the severity of the injuries, he was shifted to Sterling Hospital in Rajkot as an inpatient for three months. Despite surgical intervention, the bones in the left arm were completely crushed and could not be salvaged, necessitating amputation.

- (V) In background of the above facts, the claimant has claimed that he was of 23 years at the relevant time and earned about Rs.7,000/- per month by doing private service.
- (VI) He has further averred that he had incurred expenses for medical treatment, special diet, transportation charges etc. and had also suffered substantial pain, shock and suffering and was compelled to remain bed-ridden. As an aftermath of the injuries sustained in the road accident and disablement thereof, the claimant is unable to do day-to-day routine work and therefore, he has claimed above stated compensation.
- 3) The summons of the claim petition were served upon the opponents. Resultantly, the opponent no.2 has appeared through Id. Advocate Mr.V.S.Jethwa and has placed Written Reply vide **Exh:24**. By way of this Written Reply, he has denied most of the facts mentioned in the claim petition and stated that the the present claimant is not entitle for any compensation due to breach of policy terms and non compliance of provisions of M.V.Act; the driver of the car was not holding valid license at the time of the accident; stated that the statements made in the application like age, income of the applicant, time place and date of accident, involvement of Vehicle No. GJ-01-KA-4391 in the accident, names and address of driver, occupation and

income of the applicant, nature of injuries sustained by the applicant, hospitalisation, treatment, expenses toward treatment, attendant, nutritional and other expenses are not within its personal knowledge hence not admitted; Hence prayed to reject the present claim petition. While summons-notice was served upon opponent no. 1. Looking to the rojkam dated 12/11/2024, it reveals that the opponent no.1 remained present on that date and submitted that he does not wish to engage an advocate, does not intend to file a written reply or objections, and does not wish to conduct the case on his own behalf.

Ld. Advocate for the opponent no.2 filed additional written statement vide Exh.72 and stated that interest of Ripesbhai Arvindbhai Bariya in vehicle no. GJ-01-KA-4391 was covered at the material time under the policy of insurance issued by opponent no.2 subject to the terms and conditions and the said policy is Liability only Policy and the applicant was travelling as an occupant in the alleged vehicle and Liability Only Policy does not cover the risk of occupant, hence opposing the petition of the claimant Ld. Advocate for the opponent no.2 has prayed to dismiss the claim petition of the claimant.

- 4) The Tribunal upon the pleadings of the parties, framed the following issues vide **Exh:26**.

:: ISSUES ::

1. Whether it is proved that the applicant sustained injuries on account of the rashness and negligence on

the part of the driver of the vehicle involved in the accident ?

2. What amount, if any, the claimant is entitled to by way of compensation and from which of the opponents ?
 3. What order ?
- 5) The findings to the above issues are as under :
- (1) In the Negative.
 - (2) As per final order.
 - (3) As per final order.
- 6) In support of the claim petition, the claimant has laid the following oral and documentary evidence:

Sr. No.	Oral Evidence	Exh./ Marks
1	Affidavit of the claimant	30
2	Deposition of claimant's witness Jasabhai Jesingbhai Parmar	46
3	Deposition of claimant's witness Dr. Divyakanth Dayaljibhai Solanki	52
Sr. No.	Documentary Evidence	Exh./ Marks
1	Indoor case papers of Life care Hospital	53
2	True copy of complaint	56
3	Copy of of Injury Certificate	57
4	Discharge Summary report of Sterling Hospital	58

5	Copy of Appointment letter of Backbone Co.	59
6	Copy of Salary Slips for the month May-2015 & June-2015	60, 61
7	Medical Papers of Sterling Hospital & Medical Bills	62
8	Letter of Life care hospital	63
9	Copy of Disability Certificate	64

- 7) In support of the defense, the opponent no.2 has laid the following documentary evidence:

Sr. No.	Documentary Evidence	Exh./ Marks
1	Insurance Policy with conditions	70

- 8) Herein the case on hand, after filing of Closing Pursis vide **Exhs:65 & 66**, on behalf of the claimant and opponent no.2, this Tribunal has taken into consideration the written argument of claimant produced at Ex.74 and written argument of opponent no.2 produced at Ex.75 and heard Ld. Advocates for both the parties at length. Ld. Advocate for the claimant has relied upon the following case laws, However, in the present claim petition, there are multiple contradictions in the pleadings as well as in the evidence of the claimant; therefore, the said citations have not been discussed here

1. New India Assurance Co. Ltd. Vs. Velu & Anr., Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, Special Leave to appeal (c) No. 32138/2018.
2. Janabhai & others Vs. ICICI Lombard General Ins. Co. Ltd., reported in 2022 ACJ 2003.
3. Hitesh Nagjibhai Patel Vs. Bababhai Nagjibhai Rabari & Anr., Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, Civil Appeal No. 10278 of 2005.
4. Sovanji Gamaji Thakor Vs. Naveenkumar Devsinhbhai Solanki, Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat, First Appeal No. 4525 of 2022.
4. Ezazbeg Azimbeg Mirza Vs. Sandip Kamaldip Yadav & Ors., Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat, First Appeal No. 2326 of 2020.
5. Salim Ismail Luhar Vs. Kanji Asha Dungariya(Maheshwari) & Anr., Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat, First Appeal No. 2980 of 2018.
5. Kasamaben Titiyabhai Muniya Vs. Sarvaiya Rameshbhai Jagabhai & Ors., Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat, First Appeal No. 2657 of 2014.
6. S.Ettiappan Vs. D. Kumar & Anr., Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, Special Leave Petition (C) No. 15621/2025.
7. Sunita Vs. United India Insurance Col Ltd., reported in 2025(o) AIJEL-SC 75595.
8. The New India Assurance Co. Ltd. Vs. Kalubha Alias Pratapsinh Balvantsinh Sarvaiya & Ors., Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat, First Appeal No. 995/2022 with 998/2022.
9. Vasuki and another Vs. Santhi and another, reported in 2022 ACJ 244.
10. Royal Sundaram Alliance Insurance Col Ltd. Vs. Smt. Honnamma & Ors., Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, Special Leave Petition(Civil) No. 2135 of 2023.

While Ld. Advocate for the opponent no.2 has relied upon following case laws, which are perused and taken into consideration :

1. Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd. Vs. Sudhakaran K.V. & Ors., reported in 2008 Legal Eagle 831.
2. Iffco Tokio GIC Ltd. Vs. Ramesh C.V., Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, Mis. First Appeal No. 9736 of 2018(MV-I).
3. Shriram Insurance Col Ltd. Vs. Vanita Wd/o Dhanaji Marekar, reported in Laws(Bom)-2019-9-110.
4. Vanita & Ors. Vs. M/s. Shriram Insurance Col Ltd., Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, Civil Appeal No. 6794 of 2025.
5. Kalpana Rajencra Kothari Vs. Santosh Arvind Jangam, reported in Laws(Bom)-2019-9-159.
6. Rajamma Vs. Reliance General Insurance Col. Ltd., reported in Laws(SC)-2025-9-90.

:: Reasons ::

9) Issue No.1

Before I proceed to record my findings on the issues framed at Exh.26, it is necessary to first appreciate the oral evidence led by the claimant and the opponent no.2 on record. The same is discussed herein below:

Herein the present case, the claimant Paras Dineshbhai Tajpara has been examined to prove the case of his side vide **Exh:30**. He has reiterated the facts as mentioned in the claim petition; the same are not reproduced herein for the sake of brevity. However, the claimant has stated certain contradictory facts in his affidavit at Exh. 30. The claimant has stated in his affidavit that he was travelling in the Car of Opponent No. 1, along with his relative and he strikeout the words "ભાડુ ઠેરાવીને" in his affidavit, whereas in the claim petition at Exh. 1 he has stated that he was travelling in a hired vehicle. Further, the claimant has stated in his affidavit that the said car was driven by the driver of the vehicle owned by Opponent No.

1, while in the claim petition at Exh. 1 he has stated that the said Car was driven by Opponent No. 1 himself.

The claimant has been cross-examined by Ld. Advocate for the opponent no.2. In the said cross-examination, the claimant has admitted that on 30/03/2015 he did not make any complaint to Police; he stated that the incident happened on 29/03/2015 and in complaint date of incident is mentioned as 30/08/2015 and for the same he wants to examine the person who lodged the complaint; he denied the fact that as per the MLC certificate, it is stated therein that the injuries were caused due to a fall as a result of slipping. He denied that he had hired the alleged car to travel in it. Apart from this nothing contrary facts came out.

Ld. Advocate for the claimant has examined witness Jasabhai Jesingbhai Parmar, retired A.S.I. vide Exh.46. the said witness deposed that he has undertaken investigation of offence registered with Una Police Station vide C.R.145/2015; he indentified letter produced vide Exh.12; he also identified police papers for the said offence which are jointly exhibited vide Exh.47; he stated that he has no inquired doctor about M.L.C. certificate; he also stated that it is not correct that the date in the FIR was written wrongly due to a clerical error.

This witness is cross-examined by Ld. Advocate for the opponent no.2, in the said cross examination the witness admitted that the complaint was

lodged after five months; complainant has stated incident happen on 30/03/2015 in the statement recorder in his presence; complainant has not given any clarification regarding delayed complaint; police station is not informed about the happening of accident from hospital; hospital has to inform about an accident to police station; all the documents which are produced vide Exh.47 were prepared on 31/08/2015 on same day; statements of the witnesses were recorded on the very same day when complainant has lodged the complaint and panchnama was drawn on 31/08/2015; panchnama was drawn in the presence of the complainant; place of incident is shown by the complainant; he has not recorded statements of the persons other than bring by the complainant; he has not recorded statement of the eye witnesses.

Ld. Advocate for the claimant has examined another witness Dr.Divyakanth Dayaljibhai Solanki vide Exh.52. the said witness in his examination in chief stated the fact of injuries and treatment to the claimant and identified medical certificate issued by him produced along with documents of Exh.47 and has produced indoor case papers vide Exh.53.

In his cross-examination conducted by Ld. Advocate for the opponent no.2, he admitted that in the certificate at Exh.53, mentions that the patient was injured in an accident because the vehicle slipped; that four-wheeler cannot slip; that certificate do not mention heavy

bleeding, but said that such injuries can still cause bleeding; that in Certificate at Exh. 53, the patient's name, date, and time were written first, and the rest of the details were written later after giving first treatment; that the MLC number is not written in this document; that in Certificate at Exh.57 does not mention in the history that the patient was traveling; that Exh.53 does not mention who gave the history; that the vehicle is mentioned as a Tavera in Exh.53; that his signature is not on this document and said that indoor papers usually do not have signatures; that as per the patient's history, the accident happened on the Veraval–Una road; that Exh.57 does not have the MLC number or date.

Ld. Advocate for the claimant has produced documentary evidence as shown herein-above in para 6. While Ld. Advocate for the opponent no.2 has not produced any oral evidence, but has produced documentary evidence as shown herein-above in para 7.

- 10) From the above evidence, it appears that the claimant has made contradictory statements in his affidavit at Exh. 30. In the affidavit, he has stated that he was travelling in the car of Opponent No. 1 along with his relative, and he has struck out the words “ભાડુ ઠેરાવીને”. However, in the claim petition at Exh. 1, he has stated that he was travelling in a hired vehicle. Furthermore, in his affidavit, the claimant has stated that the car was being driven by a driver of owner Opponent No. 1, whereas in the claim petition at

Exh. 1, he has stated that the car was being driven by Opponent No. 1 himself. Thus, these inconsistencies create doubt regarding the claimant's version of events. Further in his cross-examination, the claimant admitted that he did not lodge any police complaint on 30/03/2015. He further stated that the incident had actually occurred on 29/03/2015, whereas in the complaint, the date of the incident is mentioned as 30/08/2015. In this regard, he expressed his intention to examine the person who lodged the complaint. The said witness is examined by complainant vide Exh.46 and the witness stated that it is not correct that the date in the FIR was written wrongly due to a clerical error. The claimant also denied the suggestion that, as per the MLC certificate, the injuries were caused due to a fall resulting from slipping, but looking to the MLC produced at Exh.57, it states that "injury due to slipped fourwheeler vehicle" and Doctor in his deposition at Exh.52 admitted that in the certificate at Exh.53, mentions that the patient was injured in an accident because the vehicle slipped also admitted that four-wheeler cannot slip.

- 11) The claimant in his cross-examination at Exh.30 denied that he had hired the alleged car for the purpose of travel and has struck out the words “ભાડુ ઠેરાવીને” from his affidavit at Exh.30 but in his claim petition at Exh.1 he categorically states that he was travelling in a hired vehicle. In view of these inconsistencies and denials, the

conduct of the claimant raises serious doubts about the correctness and reliability of his version of events, thereby affecting his credibility.

- 12) On a careful perusal of the FIR and complaint (Exh. 47), it emerges that the complainant stated that at the time of the accident, he was travelling in the vehicle of his relative, i.e., Opponent No. 1, and that the said car was being driven by his friend, Amitbhai Jentibhai Vegad. However, in the claim application at Exh. 1, he stated that the car was driven by Opponent No. 1 himself. Further, in his affidavit at Exh. 30 and written argument at Exh. 74, the claimant changed his version and stated that the vehicle was being driven by a driver of the owner. In the FIR and complaint (Exh. 47), it is specifically mentioned that the complainant, along with his friend Amitbhai Jentibhai Vegad and other relatives, were travelling in the said vehicle and that it was being driven by Amitbhai Jentibhai Vegad. The name of the driver is consistently recorded as Amitbhai Jentibhai Vegad in the FIR, complaint, and even in the charge-sheet filed against him. Moreover, the statements of witnesses namely Rupaben W/o Jignesh Devji, Jigneshbhai Devjibhai Kantariya, and Amitbhai Jentibhai Vegad (Exh. 47) also support the version that the vehicle was driven by Amitbhai Jentibhai Vegad. Despite this, in the present claim application, the complainant has mentioned the name of the owner-cum-driver as Ripesb Arvindbhai Baraiya and has categorically stated in Exh. 1

that the vehicle was driven by Opponent No. 1. It is also pertinent to note that during the proceedings, the claimant initially filed an application at Exh. 13 seeking to implead Amitbhai Vegad as the driver of the vehicle, but subsequently did not press the said application. Thereafter, by filing a pursis at Exh. 17, he requested that Opponent No. 1 be treated only as the owner. However, in a complaint at Exh. 56 dated 04/06/2015, the claimant again mentioned the name of the driver as Ripeshkumar Arvindbhai Baraiya. In view of these material contradictions regarding the identity of the driver, it is evident that the claimant has taken shifting and inconsistent stands at different stages of the proceedings. Such conduct creates serious doubt about the genuineness of the claim and suggests that the version put forth by the claimant is unreliable and appears to have been tailored to suit his convenience.

- 13) It appears from the record that there is material inconsistency regarding the date of the alleged accident. As per the claimant's version in the claim petition at Exh.1, the accident is stated to have occurred on 29/03/2015 in paragraph 5; however, in paragraph 8 of the same document, the date of accident is mentioned as 23/03/2015. Further, in the affidavit in lieu of examination-in-chief at Exh.30, the claimant has again stated the date of accident as 29/03/2015. On the other hand, in the evidence produced at Exh.47, namely the complaint, FIR and

statements of witnesses viz. Rupaben W/o Jignesh Devji, Jigneshbhai Devjibhai Kantariya, Ripesbhai Arvindhbai Baraiya and Amitbhai Jentibhai Vegad, the date of accident is consistently mentioned as 30/03/2015. Moreover, in the subsequent complaint lodged by the claimant on 04/06/2015 at Exh.56, the date of accident is again stated to be 30/03/2015. It is further noteworthy that in the FIR at Exh.47, the column relating to the “date of happening of the incident” mentions the date as 30/08/2015. In order to clarify this discrepancy, the Investigating Officer, Jasabhai, was examined at Exh.46. In his deposition, he categorically denied the suggestion that the date mentioned in the FIR was recorded wrongly due to a clerical error. He further deposed that the complainant himself had stated the date of accident as 30/03/2015 in his presence at the time of lodging the complaint. Contrary to the above inconsistencies in the pleadings and police papers, the medical certificates produced at Exh.47 and Exh.53 reveal that the claimant was given medical treatment on 29/03/2015. Thus, the record discloses multiple and mutually contradictory dates of the alleged accident, namely 23/03/2015, 29/03/2015, 30/03/2015 and even 30/08/2015, appearing in the claimant’s own pleadings, subsequent complaint, police papers and FIR. Such material contradictions on a foundational fact like the date of accident create serious doubt about the reliability and credibility of the claimant’s version. The inconsistency is

not minor or technical in nature but goes to the root of the case, particularly when the Investigating Officer has not supported the theory of clerical mistake and has affirmed that the date was stated by the complainant himself. In these circumstances, although the medical papers indicate treatment on 29/03/2015, the overall evidence on record fails to present a consistent and trustworthy account regarding the actual date of occurrence of the accident. Therefore, this material discrepancy assumes significance while appreciating the claimant's case.

- 14) Further, the Investigating Officer in his deposition at Exh.46 has stated that the panchnama was prepared in the presence of the complainant and that the place of accident was shown by the complainant himself. He has also deposed that the statements of the witnesses who had accompanied the complainant were recorded during the course of investigation. However, it is significant to note that no independent witness or eyewitness was examined by the Investigating Officer to corroborate the occurrence of the alleged accident. It also emerges from the record that the panchnama was drawn at a belated stage on 31/08/2015, i.e. several months after the alleged date of accident. At the time of preparation of the panchnama, no vehicle involved in the accident was found at the spot and no material or physical evidence indicative of the occurrence of an accident was noticed or recorded.

- 15) There are further material contradictions regarding the

vehicle involved in the alleged accident. As per the version of the claimant, he was travelling in a Qualis car at the relevant time. However, the indoor case papers produced at Exh.53 describe the vehicle involved as a Tavera. Moreover, there is also discrepancy with regard to the registration number of the vehicle allegedly involved in the accident. In the claim petition at Exh.1, the claimant has mentioned the vehicle number as GJ-1-KA-4391. In contrast, in the FIR and complaint produced at Exh.47, as well as in the subsequent complaint lodged by the claimant at Exh.56, the vehicle number is consistently mentioned as Qualis Car No. GJ-1-AK-4391. The statements of the witnesses recorded during investigation (Exh.47) also refer to the vehicle number as GJ-1-AK-4391. Thus, the evidence on record reveals not only inconsistency regarding the type of vehicle whether a Qualis or a Tavera but also material contradiction in the registration number of the vehicle allegedly involved in the accident. Such discrepancies on crucial aspects of the occurrence cast serious doubt on the authenticity of the claimant's version and affect the overall credibility of the case put forth by him.

- 16) It is pertinent to note that despite due service of notice, Opponent No.1 did not choose to remain present before the Tribunal and has not contested the proceedings. As per the initial version put forth by the claimant in the claim petition, he was travelling in the vehicle owned by

Opponent No.1 and the same was being driven by Opponent No.1 at the relevant time. However, in absence of appearance and evidence from Opponent No.1, and in view of the subsequent inconsistencies in the claimant's own version regarding the identity of the driver and the nature of travel, the said pleading remains uncorroborated and cannot be accepted at its face value without reliable supporting evidence.

- 17) Further as per the version of the claimant, he was travelling in a car hired by him and opponent no.2 ie. insurance company has contended that the policy issued by it is an Act Only policy for a private car, and therefore the risk of an occupant of the car is not covered under the said policy.
- 18) In view of the aforesaid discussion, this Tribunal finds that the claimant has failed to establish the occurrence of the alleged accident in the manner as pleaded by him. The record reveals material and irreconcilable contradictions regarding the date of accident, which is variously stated as 23/03/2015, 29/03/2015, 30/03/2015 and even reflected as 30/08/2015 in the FIR. There is also unexplained delay in lodging the complaint and preparation of the panchnama, which came to be drawn on 31/08/2015, at which time no vehicle was found at the spot and no physical evidence of the accident was noticed. The evidence also discloses material discrepancies regarding the type of vehicle involved, being described as a Qualis by the claimant and

as a Tavera in the medical papers, as well as contradiction in the registration number of the vehicle, which is stated as GJ-1-KA-4391 in the claim petition but consistently shown as GJ-1-AK-4391 in the FIR, complaints and witness statements. The claimant has also failed to establish with certainty as to who was actually driving the alleged offending vehicle at the time of the accident. The claimant has taken shifting and inconsistent stands at different stages by alternatively stating that the vehicle was driven by Opponent No.1, by a driver of the owner, and as per police record, by Amitbhai Jentibhai Vegad. Despite such record, the claimant did not take effective steps to bring the alleged actual driver on record. Further, the claimant has also resiled from his own pleading regarding travelling in a hired vehicle by striking out the relevant words in his affidavit. Consequently, the involvement of the alleged vehicle and the manner of accident remain unproved. These multiple contradictions go to the root of the matter and create serious doubt about the very involvement of the alleged vehicle and the genuineness of the accident. In absence of cogent, consistent and reliable evidence to prove the foundational facts of the claim, the claimant has failed to discharge the burden of proof. Accordingly, **Issue No.1 is answered in the Negative.**

19) **Issue No.2**

As Issue No.1 has been answered in the negative, the claimant is not entitled to any compensation under the

Motor Vehicles Act. Hence Issue No.2 is also answered in Negative and to answer the Issue nos. 3, following final order is passed.

:: ORDER ::

- (I) The Motor Accident Claim Petition No.235/2018 is hereby **dismissed**.
- (II) Award to be drawn accordingly.
- (III) No order as to cost.

Signed and pronounced in open Court today
on this 17th day of March, 2026.

Date : 17/03/2026.

Place: Vanthali

(Salimbhai Babulal Mansuri)
3rd Additional District Judge &
M.A.C. Tribunal (Aux.),
Vanthali.
[Code No:GJ00698]