KADW200001982024

*IN THE COURT OF THE I ADDL. SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE AND M.A.C.T., HUBBALLI.*

*Present:*
*SMT. SARVAMANGALA K.M.,*
*B.A.LL.B.,*

*I Addl.Senior Civil Judge and MACT.,*
*Hubballi.*

*Dated this the 17th day of August, 2026*

*M.V.C. No.82/2024*

*Petitioner/s :*

1. *Smt. Renuka @ Sharadha W/o Pruthviraj Kiragi, Age:37 years, Occ:Housewife, R/o.H.No.62, Teachers Colony, Bengeri, Ext Hubballi.*

2. *Kum. Arjun S/o Pruthviraj Kiragi, Age:07 years, Occ:Student, R/o.H.No.62, Teachers Colony, Bengeri, Ext Hubballi.*

3. *Kum. Surya S/o Pruthviraj Kiragi, Age:02 years, Occ:Nil, R/o.H.No.62, Teachers Colony, Bengeri, Ext Hubballi.*

4. *Shridevi W/o Shivalingappa Kiragi, Age:57 years, Occ:Nil, R/o.H.No.62, Teachers Colony, Bengeri, Ext Hubballi.*

*(Since petitioner No.2 and 3 are minors represented by natural guardian mother petitioner No.1)*

*(By Sri. S.K. Patil, Advocate)*

***V/s***

*Respondents:*

1. *K. Ganapathi S/o K Ganapathi Kamath, Age:45 years,*

*Occ:Business, R/o.Ganesh Travels Old Bus Stand, Hampankatta Mangalore Dakshina Kannada.*

*(Owner of the Bus bearing No.KA-51-AH-9503)*

2. *National Insurance Co. Ltd., Division Officer, Branch Office Kusugal Road, Hubballi.*

   *(Policy No.61430131221000915 5 valid from 15.02.2023 to 14.02.2024)*

*(R.1 -Exparte*
*R.2 by Sri. P.H. Patil, Advocate)*

******

***JUDGMENT***

*The petitioner has filed this Petition U/Sec.166 of IMV Act, seeking compensation for the death of the husband of petitioner No.1, father of petitioner Nos.2 and 3 and son of petitioner No.4 in the Road Traffic Accident.*

***2. Brief facts of the case of the petitioner is as under:-***

*On 01.01.2024, at about 00.30 hours, when Pruthviraj (deceased) was proceeding in the car* *bearing Reg. No.KA-25-MB-3824 from Mishrikoti cross towards Hubballi on NH63 highway, near Bidnal water world Hubballi, at that time, the driver of the bus bearing Reg. No.KA-51-AH-9503 came from Hubballi towards Karwar in a high speed, rash and negligent manner and dashed against the deceased car. As a result of which, the deceased sustained grievous injuries and died on the spot. Soon after the accident, the deceased was shifted to shifted to KIMS Hospital, Hubballi, wherein postmortem was conducted and the petitioners have spent more than Rs.1,00,000/- towards transportation and funeral expenses.*

*Prior to the accident, deceased was hale and healthy and working as Business Development Executive in Puro Wellness Pvt. Ltd., at Hubballi, and was earning Rs.26,109/- salary and Rs.15,000/- incentive plus bonus per month. As per the company rules including service increments if he would have been alive, he would have been drawing salary of*

*Rs.1,00,000/- per month till the end of the service along with all benefits. He is the only earning member in the family. The entire family was depending on the income of deceased. Due to the sudden and untimely death of the deceased, the petitioners are terrible and mentally shocked. The petitioners have lost love and affection of deceased.*

**3.** *It is further submitted that, a case has been registered by Hubballi Rural Police in Crime No.1/2024 against the driver of the Bus for the offences punishable U/s 279, 338 and 304A of IPC and Sections 134 and 187 of IMV Act. After the Investigation, the Investigating Officer has filed the Chargesheet against the driver of the bus for the offences punishable under Sections 279, 338 and 304A of IPC and Sections 134 and 187 of IMV Act.*

**4.** *After service of notice, the respondent No.2 has appeared before the Court and filed its objections. The respondent No.1 placed exparte.*

*4.01. The respondent No.2 in its objection has denied the entire petition averments and admitted that the respondent No.1 is the owner of the bus and he has insured his bus with respondent No.2 and as on the date of accident policy is in force. He specifically contended that the accident was not occurred due to rash and negligent act of driving of the driver of the bus, but it was occurred due to negligent act of driver of the car. Further contended that as on the date of accident, the driver of the bus was not having valid and effective driving license to drive the bus, the respondent No.1 knowing fully well that the driver of the bus was not having valid license, has allowed him to drive the vehicle and hence the respondent No.1 has violated the terms and conditions of the policy. The driver and owner of the car is also necessary parties to the petition. Further denied the age and income of the deceased. Hence, prays to dismiss the petition.*

*__5.__ On the basis of pleadings of both the parties, following issues are framed :*

***ISSUES***

*1) Whether the petitioners prove that Pruthviraj S/o Shivalingappa Kiragi was succumbed/died in the Road traffic accident occurred on 01.01.2024 at 12.30 a.m., at Hubballi – Karwar NH 63 Road, near Bidnal water world Hubballi by rash and negligent driving of the driver of the bus bearing Reg. No.KA-51-AH-9503 ?*

*2) Whether the 2nd respondent proves that the driver of the offending vehicle does not possessed the driving license as on the date of accident as alleged ?*

*3) Whether the petitioners are entitled for the compensation as prayed for ? If yes, what is the quantum and from whom ?*

*4) What order or award ?*

*__6.__ In order to prove the case of the petitioners, the petitioner No.1 herself examined as PW.1 and got marked documents at Ex.P.1 to P.14. On the other* *hand, the respondent No.2 has not produced any documents and not led any evidence.*

***7.*** *Heard the arguments of Learned Counsel for Petitioners and respondents.*

***8.*** *My findings on the above said issues are as under:*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *Issue No.1* | : | *In the Affirmative.* |
| *Issue No.2* | : | *In the Negative;* |
| *Issue No.3* | : | *Partly in the affirmative;* |
| *Issue No.4* | : | *As per final order, below for the following:* |

## ***R E A S O N S***

***9. Issue No.1:*** *It is the specific case of the petitioners that, on 01.01.2024, at about 00.30 hours, when Pruthviraj (deceased) was proceeding in the car bearing Reg. No.KA-25-MB-3824 from Mishrikoti cross towards Hubballi on NH63 highway, near Bidnal water world Hubballi, at that time, the driver of the bus bearing Reg. No.KA-51-AH-9503 came from Hubballi towards Karwar in a high speed, rash and negligent manner and dashed against the* *deceased car. As a result of which, the deceased sustained grievous injuries and died on the spot. Soon after the accident, the deceased was shifted to shifted to KIMS Hospital, Hubballi, wherein postmortem was conducted and the petitioners have spent more than Rs.1,00,000/- towards transportation and funeral expenses. Prior to the accident, deceased was hale and healthy and working as Business Development Executive in Puro Wellness Pvt. Ltd., at Hubballi, and was earning Rs.26,109/- salary and Rs.15,000/- incentive plus bonus per month. As per the company rules including service increments if he would have been alive, he would have been drawing salary of Rs.1,00,000/- per month till the end of the service along with all benefits. He is the only earning member in the family. The entire family was depending on the income of deceased. Due to the sudden and untimely death of the deceased, the petitioners are terrible and mentally shocked. The petitioners have lost love and* *affection of deceased. Hence, prays to award compensation.*

*9.01. Per contra, the respondent No.2 has specifically contended that the accident was not occurred due to rash and negligent act of driving of the driver of the bus, but it was occurred due to negligent act of driver of the car; that as on the date of accident, the driver of the bus was not having valid and effective driving license to drive the bus, the respondent No.1 knowing fully well that the driver of the bus was not having valid license, has allowed him to drive the vehicle and hence the respondent No.1 has violated the terms and conditions of the policy. The driver and owner of the car is also necessary parties to the petition. Hence, prays to dismiss the petition.*

*9.02. To prove their contention the petitioner No.1 is examined as PW1 by filing her affidavit in lieu of her chief examination and reiterated petition averments and also produced the documents at*

*Ex.P1 to Ex.P14. Ex.P1 is the FIR. On perusal of the said document, it can be seen that Hubballi Rural PS has registered a case at Crime No.1/2024, against the driver of the bus for the offence punishable U/Secs 279, 338 and 304A of IPC and Sections 134 and 187 of IMV Act. Further the said document also speaks that the deceased is the injured persons. Ex.P2 is the complaint, Ex.P3 is the spot panchanama, Ex.P4 is the IMV Report, wherein it can be seen that the accident was not occurred due to any mechanical defect of the vehicle; Ex.P5 is the inquest report, Ex.P6 is the postmortem report, wherein the Doctor has opined that the death of the deceased is due to hemorrhage and shock as a result of injuries sustained. Ex.P6 is the charge sheet. On perusal of the said document, it can be seen that after completion of Investigation, the Investigating Officer has filed the Chargesheet against the driver of the bus i.e., Himakar Janardan Shettigar as accused for the offence punishable under Sections 279, 338* *and 304A of IPC and Sections 134 and 187 of IMV Act; Ex.P8 to Ex.P10 are the Aadhaar cards of the petitioners. Ex.P11 is the employment agreement, wherein it can be seen that the employment of the deceased with effect from 16.05.2022 and the deceased was working as Business Development Executive and the salary of the deceased is Rs.26,550/- per month. Ex.P12 is the certificate issued by Bangalore Institute of Technological Science, Ex.P13 is the bank statement, Ex.P14 is the consoldiated/transcript certificate issued by Mangalore Institute of Technological Science.*

***10.*** *In this case on perusal of all the documents more specifically Ex.P1 to Ex.P7, it clearly shows that, the accident was taken place on 01.01.2024 and in that regard the Hosapete Rural Police have registered a case in CR.No.1/2024 against the driver of the bus and thereafter, after investigation, Investigating Officer has filed Chargesheet against the driver of the bus, as Accused for the offences* *punishable U/Sec.279, 338 and 304A of IPC and Sections 134 and 187 of IMV Act wherein it is also mentioned that due to the negligent act of driver of the bus, the accident was taken place and on perusal of the PM report it shows that the deceased was died due to haemorrhage and shock as a result of injuries sustained. Hence, it shows that due to the negligent act of driver of the bus, the accident was taken place. On the other hand the respondents have not denied the accident and involvement of the vehicle in the accident.* ***Hence, I answer Issue No.1 in the Affirmative.***

***11. Issue No.2:*** *This issue is regarding the driver of the offending vehicle was holding valid and effective driving license at the time of accident or not. The said contention has taken by the respondent No.2 in his objection. In order to prove that the driver of the offending vehicle is having valid and effective driving license, none of the parties have not produced any document before the Court. But on careful* *perusal of the charge sheet/Ex.P7, it can be seen that the Investigating Officer after completion of investigation, has filed the charge sheet against the driver i.e., Himakar Janardan Shettigar for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 279, 338 and 304A of IPC and Sections 134 and 187 of IMV Act. If really, the driver of the vehicle was not having valid and effective driving license, then definitely the Investigating Officer would have include Section 181 of IMV Act in the charge sheet. Hence, it can be clearly come to the conclusion that as on the date of accident, the driver of the offending vehicle is having valid and effective driving license as no the date of accident. Hence, I answer* ***Issue No.2 in the negative.***

***12.*** ***<u>Issue No.3:</u>*** *This issue is regarding petitioners are entitlement for the compensation as claimed in the Petition on account of death of deceased Pruthviraj in road accident. The petitioner No.1 is the wife, petitioner Nos.2 and 3 are the* *children and petitioner No.4 is the mother of deceased Pruthviraj. The respondents have not denied the relationship of petitioners with deceased Pruthivaraj. Therefore, petitioners are entitled to get compensation under the following heads.*

*12.01.* ***<u>LOSS OF DEPENDENCY:-</u>*** *Now the question is to be determined is quantum of compensation to which the petitioners are entitled for compensation on account of death of Pruthivaraj in road accident. The petitioner No.1 who is wife, petitioner Nos.2 and 3 who are children and petitioner No.4 who is mother of deceased Pruthivaj have stated that, they lost the earning member of their family. They are fully depended upon the earnings of the deceased who is working as Business Development Executive and getting income of Rs.26,109/- per month and Rs.15,000/- incentive plus bones per month. In support of the said contention, the petitioners have produced Ex.P11 employment agreement, wherein it can be seen that* *the deceased was working as Business Development Executive and getting salary of Rs.26,550/- per month. Though the petitioners have produced the said document, but they have not come forward to examine the person who issued the said document. In the absence of evidence of the person who issued the Ex.P11, the said document cannot be considered at all.*

*Further it was claimed that deceased was aged about 33 years and he was hale and healthy and was looking after the family. In order to prove the age of the deceased, the petitioners have not produced any document before the Court. Hence, in the absence of the same, the age mentioned in the postmortem report/Ex.P6 is looked into. The age mentioned in the postmortem report of the deceased is 33 years. Hence, the age of the deceased can be taken as 33 years.*

*Further in this case though the petitioners are claimed that the deceased was earning Rs.26,550/-*

*per month, by producing Ex.P11, but they have failed to prove the said document. Hence, in the absence of such material the income of the deceased is to be fixed notionally. It is pertinent to state here that, the Hon'ble Karnataka State Legal Service Authority prepared chart of notional income. At this juncture, it is profitable to refer Division Bench decision of Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka reported in* ***2017 ACJ 2436, (Krishnabai and others Vs Fedex Express Transportation and supply chain services (India) Pvt., Ltd., and another,*** *wherein at paragraph No.11 it is held as under:*

> *"Repeatedly it has come to the notice of this court that, while this court has framed a chart or taking the notional income of the injured/deceased, the said chart is not been followed by the learned Tribunal. As mentioned in the case of Iqbalahamed Vs Vice Chairman, M/S Patel integrated Logistics Ltd., and another (MFA No.101018/2015 decided on 06.01.2017), the consequences of not following the chart by the learned Tribunal is that in variably the claimants approach this court with the plea that the income of the injured/deceased has not been assessed properly by the learned*

> *Tribunal. Considering the fact that, the chart prepared by this court has been followed by this court in its judgment, considering the fact that, a judgment of this court is binding on the learned tribunals, the learned tribunals are also duty bound to follow the chart prepared by this court.*

*Further the said preposition of law has also been reiterated by Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in another decision reported in* ***2018 SCC ONLINE KAR 2862, (LEGAL MANAGER IFFCO TOKIO GIC LTD., VS SRINIVASA AND OTHERS)****. Wherein at paragraph 6 it is held as under;*

> *"6. However, the court cannot ignore the notional income chart of the lok-adalath when there is no material evidence to prove the actual income. Going by the said chart for the accident year 2012, the notional income of the deceased ought to have been taken at Rs.7,000/-. Therefore, the notional monthly income stands upwardly altered from Rs.5,000 to Rs.7,000/-.*

*In this case also, on perusal of the record it shows that the deceased was aged about 33 years and the accident was taken place in the year 2024. Hence, by considering the fact that there is no proof* *of income of deceased, by relying upon the guidelines issued by the Hon'ble KSLSA, though the petitioners have claiming Rs.26,550/- per month, but the Hon'ble KSLSA has fixed the notional income for the year 2024 as Rs.17,000/-. As the accident was occurred in the year 2024, hence, this tribunal has considered the notional income as per the KSLSA guidelines and this Tribunal is of the opinion that notional income of the deceased could be assessed at Rs.17,000/- per month.*

*12.01.01. As per the judgment reported in the case of* ***National Insurance Company Limited V/s Pranay Sethi and others 2017 ACJ 2700****, claimants are entitled to the compensation under the head, loss of future prospects. In the said judgment, it was held that;*

> *"(iv) In case the deceased was self-employed or on a fixed salary, an addition of 40% of the established income should be the warrant where the deceased was below the age of 40 years. An addition of 25% where the deceased was between the age of 40 to 50 years and 10% where*

> *the deceased was between the age of 50 to 60 years should be regarded as the necessary method of computation. The established income means the income minus the tax component".*

*Thus, it is clear that future prospects is to be added while assessing the income of the deceased. In the present case, deceased was aged 33 years at the time of the death and comes below the age of 40 years. Hence, 40% is to be added to the income of the deceased. In view of taking the notional income of the deceased as Rs.17,000/- per month, 40% is to be added to the said income. 40% of Rs.17,000/- is Rs.6,800/-. Accordingly, income of the deceased is to be taken as Rs.17,000/- plus Rs.6,800/- which comes to Rs.23,800/- per month.*

*12.01.02. As per the judgment reported in the case of* ***Sarla Verma and others V/s Delhi Transport Corporation and another (2009) 6 SCC 121,*** *the appropriate multiplier applicable is 16, as the age of the deceased was 33 years and he comes in the age group of 31 to 35. In view of the* above judgment, if the dependents are 4 to 6 in number, then $1/4^{th}$ is to be deducted towards personal and living expenses of the deceased. As the claimants i.e., petitioner Nos.1 to 4 are treated as dependents and they are 4 in numbers, hence $1/4^{th}$ income of the deceased is to be deducted towards personal expenses. $1/4^{th}$ of the income of Rs.23,800/- means Rs.5,950/- and remaining amount i.e., Rs.17,850/- is the income of the deceased per month for the purpose of calculating the loss of dependency. Hence, the total loss of dependency will be Rs.17,850 x 12 months x 16 (Multiplier) = Rs.34,27,200/-.

12.02. **<u>TOWARDS LOSS OF ESTATE</u>:-** Since compensation is awarded under the head loss of dependency, only nominal amount could be awarded under this head. Having regard to the age of the deceased and expectancy of future life, it is just and proper to award Rs.10,000/- to the petitioners under this head.

*12.03.* ***__TOWARDS CONSORTIUM__:-*** *In the case of* ***United India Insurance Co. Ltd., V/s Satinder Kaur @ Satwinder Kaur and Ors, 2020 SCC Online SC 410,*** *it was held as under;*

> ***"b) Loss of Consortium***
>
> *55. Loss of Consortium, in legal paralance, was historically given a narrow meaning to be awarded only to the spouse i.e., the right of the spouse to the company, care, help, comfort, guidance, society, solace, affection and sexual relations with his or her mate. The loss of companionship, love, care and protection etc., the spouse is entitled to get, has to be compensated appropriately. The concept of non-pecuniary damage for loss of consortium is one of the major heads for awarding compensation in various jurisdictions such as the United States of America, Australia, etc. English Courts have recognized the right of a spouse to get compensation even during the period of temporary disablement.*
>
> *56. In* ***Magna General Insurance Co. Ltd. V. Nanu Ram & Ors,*** *this Court interpreted "consortium" to be a compendious term, which encompass spousal consortium, parental consortium, as well as filial consortium. The right to consortium would include the*

*company, care, help, comfort, guidance, solace and affection of the deceased, which is a loss to his family. With respect to a spouse, it would include sexual relations with the deceased spouse.*

*57. Parental consortium is granted to the child upon the premature death of a parent, for loss of parental aid, protection, affection, society, discipline, guidance and training.*

*58. Filial consortium is the right of the parents to compensation in the case of an accidental death of a child. An accident leading to the death of a child causes great shock and agony to the parents and family of the deceased. The greatest agony for a parent is to lose their child during their lifetime. Children are valued for their love and affection, and their role in the family unit.*

*59. Modern jurisdictions world-over have recognized that the value of a child's consortium far exceeds the economic value of the compensation awarded in the case of the death of child. Most jurisdictions permit parents to be awarded compensation under the loss of consortium on the death of a child. The amount awarded to the parents is the compensation for loss of love and affection, care and companionship of the deceased child.*

> *60. The Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 is a beneficial legislation which has been framed with the object of providing relief to victims, or their families, in cases of genuine claims. In case where a parent has lost their minor child, or unmarried son or daughter, the parents are entitled to be awarded loss of consortium under the head of Filial Consortium.*
>
> *61. Parental Consortium is awarded to the children who lose the care and protection of their parents in motor vehicle accidents.*
>
> *62. The amount to be awarded for loss of consortium will be as per the amount fixed in **Pranay Sethi** (supra)".*

*In the above referred to judgment, there were 3 petitioners and accordingly, the Hon'ble Apex court awarded compensation of Rs.40,000/- each under the head of consortium. Therefore, as per the above judgment and in view of the law laid down in **Pranay Sethi**, the petitioners being the wife, children and mother of the deceased are entitled to consortium at the rate of Rs.1,60,000/- (Rs.40,000/- x 4).*

*12.04.* ***<u>TOWARDS TRANSPORTATION AND FUNERAL EXPENSES</u>:-*** *In so far as funeral expenses is concerned, the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of* ***Rajesh V/s Rajbir Singh (2013) 9 SCC 54,*** *has held that;*

> *"18. We may also take judicial notice of the fact that the Tribunals have been quite frugal with regard to award of compensation under the head "funeral expenses". The "price index", it is a fact has gone up in that regard also. The head "funeral expenses" does not mean the fee paid in the crematorium or fee paid for the use of space in the cemetery. There are many other expenses in connection with funeral and, if the deceased is a follower of any particular religion, there are several religious practices and conventions pursuant to death in a family. All those are quite expensive. Therefore, we are of the view that it will be just, fair and equitable, under the head of "funeral expenses". In the absence of evidence to the contrary for higher expenses, to award at least an amount of Rs. 25,000/-".*

*Hence, looking to the status of the parties and attending circumstances, it appears that the claimants have spent minimum amount of Rs.25,000/- towards shifting of the injured to the* *hospital, transportation of dead body, funeral and obsequies ceremonies. Thus petitioners are entitled to be awarded an amount of Rs. 25,000/- under this head.*

***13.*** *Accordingly, compensation payable to the claimants herein is determined as:-*

| Sl. No. | Particulars | Amount |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Income | Rs.17,000/- p.m., |
| 2. | Future prospects. | 40% of Rs.17,000/- p.m. i.e., Rs.6,800/- = in total Rs.23,800/- |
| 3. | Deductions towards personal expenses of the deceased. | 1/4th of Rs.23,800/- =Rs.5,950/-, remaining amount is Rs.17,850/- |
| 4 | Total income per year | Rs.17,850/- x 12 = 2,14,200/- |
| 5 | Multiplier | 16 |
| 6 | Loss of dependency | Rs.2,14,200/- X 16 = Rs.34,27,200/-. |
| 7 | Loss of estate | Rs.10,000/- |
| 8 | Funeral expenses | Rs.25,000/- |
| 9 | Loss of parental consortium Rs.40,000/- x 4 | Rs.1,60,000/- |
| | **Total** | **Rs.36,22,200/-.** |

***14. <u>INTEREST:</u>*** *As per the judgment in the case of* ***Sarala Verma and others V/s Delhi Transport Corporation (2009) 6 SCC 121,*** *it is just and proper to award interest at the rate of 6% p.a. on the compensation awarded from the date of filing of the claim petitions till realization.*

***15. <u>LIABILITY</u>:*** *In this case as per the Issue No.1 already this court held that, the accident has taken place due to the rash and negligent driving of the driver of the bus. Further the charge sheet filed by the Police itself is sufficient to hold that the accident was occurred due to rash and negligent driving of the driver of the bus. The respondent No.1 is the owner of the bus and he has insured his vehicle with respondent No.2 and as on the date of accident, the policy is in force. Even the respondent No.2 in his objection has clearly admitted that the respondent No.1 has taken policy with respondent No.2 under policy No.604301312210009155 and it is valid from 15.02.2023 to 14.02.2024. Hence, the* *respondent No.2 is liable to pay the compensation to the petitioners.*

*Accordingly,* ***Issue No.3 is answered partly in the affirmative.***

***16. <u>ISSUE No.4</u>:*** *In view of answering the Issue Nos. 1 to 3 as above, I proceed to pass the following;*

***<u>O R D E R</u>***

*The petition filed by the petitioners under Sec.166 of M.V. Act is hereby partly allowed with costs.*

*The petitioners are entitled for compensation amount Rs.36,22,200/- (Rupees Thirty Six Lakhs Twenty Two Thousand Two Hundred only) along with interest at the rate of 6% per annum from the date of petition till deposit of the compensation amount.*

*The respondent No.2 is directed to deposit the said compensation amount within 30 days from the date of this award.*

*Out of the total compensation, the Petitioner No.1 is entitle for 40% of compensation amount and petitioner*

Nos.2 to 4 are entitle for 20% each of the compensation amount.

After deposit, office is directed to release 50% of the compensation amount infavour of petitioner Nos.1 and 4 on proper identification through K2 challan, without waiting for further orders. Remaining 50% of compensation shall be kept in F.D in any of the Nationalized Bank of the choice of Petitioner Nos.1 and 4 for a period of 3 years.

As far as compensation in respect of petitioner Nos.2 and 3 are concerned, as they are minors, the entire compensation amount of petitioner Nos.2 and 3 are kept in FD in any nationalized bank of the choice of petitioner No.1 till they attain majority.

Advocate fee is fixed at Rs.1,000/-.

Draw award accordingly.

*(Dictated to the Stenographer directly on Computer and typed by her. The same is corrected and then pronounced by me in the open court on this the* ***17th day of August, 2026****)*

(Smt. Sarvamangala K.M.)
I Addl. Senior Civil Judge and MACT,
Hubballi.

***ANNEXURE***

*1.List of witnesses examined for the Petitioner/s:*

| | |
|---|---|
| *P.W.1* | *Smt. Renuka @ Sharadha W/o Pruthviraj Kiragi.* |

*2.List of documents exhibited for the Petitioner/s:*

| | |
|---|---|
| *Ex.P.1* | *FIR.* |
| *Ex.P.2* | *Complaint.* |
| *Ex.P.3* | *Spot Panchanama.* |
| *Ex.P.4* | *Motor Vehicles Accident Report.* |
| *Ex.P.5* | *Inquest Panchanama.* |
| *Ex.P.6* | *Post-Mortem Report.* |
| *Ex.P.7* | *Charge Sheet.* |
| *Ex.P.8 to P.10* | *Aadhaar Cards.* |
| *Ex.P.11* | *Employment Agreement.* |
| *Ex.P.12* | *Certificate.* |
| *Ex.P.13* | *Statement of Account.* |
| *Ex.P.14* | *Consolidated/ Transcript.* |

*3.List of witnesses examined for the respondent/s:*

*-NIL-*

*4.List of documents exhibited for the Respondent/s:*

*-NIL-*

SARVAMANGALA K M

Digitally signed by SARVAMANGALA K M

*(Smt. Sarvamangala K.M.)*
*I Addl. Senior Civil Judge and MACT,*
*Hubballi.*