



**IN THE COURT OF II ADDL. SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AND ADDL. MACT., HUBBALLI**

PRESENT:- SMT. DEEPA G. MANERKAR,
B. Com., LL.B., (Spl.)

II ADDL. SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE AND
Addl. MACT., HUBBALLI

DATED THIS 16th DAY OF JULY 2026

MVC No.404/2023

PETITIONER : 1. Smt. Renavva W/o Madevappa
Harijan
Age: 44 yrs, Occ: Housewife,
R/o: 84, Harijanakeri,
Now at K.B. Nagar,
C.B.T., Hubballi

(By Sri. S.K. Patil, Adv.)

V/S.

RESPONDENTS : 1. Managing Director,
NWKRTC Central Office,
Gokul Road, Hubballi
(Hubballi Division)
(Owner of bus bearing No.
KA-42/F-319)

2. Self Insurance Fund
NWKRTC,
Central Office, Hubballi

(by Sri. A.R.Athani, Adv.)



1. Nature of the proceedings : Grant of compensation on account of death caused in the Motor Vehicle accident.
2. Institution of the petition : 05-07-2023
3. Recording of the evidence : 01-06-2024
4. Pronouncement of judgment : 16-07-2026
5. Total duration: : Year/s month/s Day/s
03 00 11

JUDGMENT

This is a petition U/s.166 of I.M.V. Act against the respondents seeking compensation of Rs.45,00,000/- on account injuries sustained by the petitioner in road traffic accident.

2. The case of the petitioner in brief is:-

That on 14-04-2023 at about 16.30 hours, Sri. Bhimappa Mahadevappa Harijan was going on motor cycle bearing No.KA-25/EH-1833 as on rider from Hindasageri towards Kalghatagi at that time KSRTC Bus bearing No.KA-42/F-319 came from Hindasageri towards Kalghagati in a great speed, in rash and



negligent manner without observing the traffic rules and lost control and dashed to the motor cycle which was over taking the bus as a result of which Bhimappa fell down along with motor cycle and sustained grievous injuries and died on the spot. His post mortem was conducted at Government Hospital, Kalghatagi.

3. Prior to the accident the deceased was hale and healthy and was working as a student and doing coolie work at Malakanakoppa and Kalghatagi and was earning Rs.25,000/- per month and maintaining his family consisting of his widowed mother. The entire responsibility of the family was on the deceased Bhimappa and his earnings. The deceased could have lived a full life if he had not met with the accident. Due to the sudden and untimely death of the deceased, the petitioner is terribly and mentally shocked. The petitioner has lost love and affection of deceased and only earning member of the family. The accident took place due to rash and negligent driving of the Bus by its driver. The respondent No. 1 is the owner of the KSRTC Bus bearing Regn. No. KA-42-F-319 and the same is self insured with respondent No.2. hence, the



respondents are jointly and severally liable to pay compensation to the petitioner. Hence the petition.

4. After service of notice, the respondent No.1 and 2 have appeared through counsel and filed objection contending that the bus bearing No. KA 42/F-319 has been implanted in the alleged accident by the police in active connivance with petitioner. That one Mr Bhimappa S/o Mahadevappa Harijan under influence of alcohol was riding a uninsured motorcycle bearing No. KA 25- EH 1833 in a rash and negligent manner without possessing driving license and sustained fatal head injuries due to non-wearing of helmet/protective head gear. The police in order to make unlawful gain with respondents have filed this vexatious and frivolous claim petition. The present petition is bad for non-joinder and mis-joinder of necessary parties. The petitioner with ulterior motive has not pleaded and made owner and insurance company of the motor cycle bearing No. KA-KA 25 EH-1833 as party to this proceeding. Hence on this ground alone the petition deserves to be dismissed as the petitioner has not come up with clean hands before this court.



5. That one Bhimappa S/o Mahadevappa Harijan under influence of alcohol was riding a uninsured motorcycle bearing No. KA 25- EH 1833 in a rash and negligent manner without possessing driving license and sustained fatal head injuries due to non-wearing of helmet/protective head gear while overtaking the bus bearing No KA 42F-319 in high speed as well as in a rash and negligent manner and lost control over his bike and got his vehicle skid when he saw a motorcycle from opposite side and sustained fatal injuries due to his own negligence. Later in order to make unlawful gain from this respondent the petitioners in active connivance with police have implanted bus bearing KA 42 F-319 in the alleged accident. Since Bhimappa S/o Mahadevappa Harijan himself being tortfeasor the claim petition is not at all maintainable under law or facts of the case on hand against this respondent.

6. The police inspite of receipt of complaint from driver of bus bearing No. KA 42/F-319 have failed to conduct proper investigation. This very fact itself is shatters the very authenticity of the alleged accident as narrated in the claim petition by filing a belated police



complaint. The petitioner even not supplied till this date the documents intended to be relied before this Hon'ble Court with ulterior motive. The damages mentioned in MV report clearly reveal that the bus bearing No KA 42/F-319 is implanted. The petitioner with oblique motive has filed this claim petition based on frivolous allegation against the respondent. Hence, on this ground alone the petition deserves to be dismissed.

7. The petitioner is not entitled to payment of any interest whatsoever for the period of delay caused by the petitioner in furnishing the medical documents with respect the exact cause of death of Mr Bhimappa S/o Mahadevappa Harijan and legal heirship certificate or any other documents. Further, period of any delay which was not caused by this respondent or was beyond the control of the respondent must be excluded from payment/ levy of interest. As per section 158(6) of M.V Act, it is mandatory duty of the concerned police station to forward all the relevant document to the concerned within 30 days from the date of the information. But the concerned jurisdictional Police station have failed to forward the document till this



date and not complied with the statutory demand and as such the claim may be dismissed. That the petitioner if found entitled for any Interest, then it should be payable as per the prevailing interest rate which is payable on deposit and as per the provisions of section 34 of CPC and section 147 of MV Act or in case there is some local amendment to rules in regard to interest it should be inserted here suitably. The rate of interest as claimed in the petition is exorbitant and not in accordance with the provisions of motor vehicles act. Hence prayed for dismissal of the petition.

8. On the basis of the rival pleadings, the following issues have been framed :-

ISSUES

1. Whether the petitioner proves that Bhimappa Mahadevappa Harijan was succumbed/died in the Road Traffic Accident that occurred on 14-04-2023 at about 4.30 hours, on Hindusageri Kalghatagi Road, Near Hindasgeri, Kalghatagi by the rash and negligent driving of the Bus bearing Registration No.KA-42/F-319?



2. Whether the petitioner proves that she is the legal heirs of deceased Sri. Bhimappa Mahadevappa Harijan ?
3. Whether the respondent No.2 proves that the deceased Bhimappa consumed Alcohol and he was riding a uninsured motor cycle bearing Reg. No.KA-25/EH-1833 and he was not having any valid and effective D.L. and non wearing of helmet to protective head gear as on the date of alleged accident?
4. Whether the petition filed by the petitioner is suffers from non-joinder and mis joinder of necessary parties?
5. Whether the petitioner is entitled for the compensation as prayed for ? If yes, what is the quantum and from whom ?
6. What order or award?

9. To prove the case of the petitioner, the petitioner got examined herself as PW.1 and placed reliance on Ex-P1 to 9 documents. To substantiate the defence, driver of the bus examined as RW.1 and got marked Ex-R.1 and 2 documents.



10. Heard arguments from petitioner and respondents counsel and perused the records.

11. My findings on the above issues is as follows:

Issue No.1	: Partly in the Affirmative
Issue No.2	: In the Negative
Issue No.3	: Partly in the Affirmative
Issue No.4	:In the Negative
Issue No.5	: Partly in the Affirmative
Issue No.6	: As per the final order for the following :-

~:: REASONS ::~

12. **Issue No.1 and 3:-** As per the petitioner, on 14-04-2023 at about 16.30 hours, Sri. Bhimappa Mahadevappa Harijan was going on motor cycle bearing No.KA-25/EH-1833 as rider from Hindasageri towards Kalghatagi at that time KSRTC Bus bearing No.KA-42/F-319 came from Hindasageri towards Kalghagati in a great speed, in rash and negligent manner without observing the traffic rules and lost control and dashed to the motor cycle which was over



taking the bus as a result of which Bhimappa fell down along with motor cycle and sustained grievous injuries and died on the spot.

13. On the contrary the respondents contend that the bus bearing No. KA 42/F-319 has been implanted in the alleged accident by the police in active connivance with petitioner. That deceased Bhimappa under influence of alcohol was riding a uninsured motorcycle bearing No. KA 25- EH 1833 in a rash and negligent manner without possessing driving license and sustained fatal head injuries due to non-wearing of helmet/protective head gear and while overtaking the bus bearing No KA 42F-319 in high speed as well as in a rash and negligent manner and lost control over his bike and his vehicle was skid when he saw a motorcycle from opposite side and sustained fatal injuries due to his own negligence.

14. The counsel for the petitioner argued that the accident did not occur due to the negligence of the deceased but the bus driver himself caused the accident and even if the deceased was not having driving license or had consumed alcohol no negligence can be attributed against the deceased.



15. On the other hand, the counsel for the respondent argued as per RFSL report, deceased was found intoxicated. That the deceased had consumed alcohol he was not wearing helmet and not possessing driving license. Hence, he himself caused the accident therefore, when deceased himself is tortfeasor, the legal heirs are not entitled for any compensation. In support of his contention he relied upon decisions reported in:-

1. AIR (SC) 2018 in Civil Appeal No.9100/2018 dt:31-08-2018 in between National Insurance Co. Ltd., Vs. Ashalata Bhowmik and others.

2. AIR (SC) 2021 in Civil Appeal No.2021 (Arising out of SLP No.12489/2020 dt:12-04-2021 in between IFFCO Tokio Gen. Ins. Com. Ltd., Vs. Pearl Beverages Ltd.,

3. The Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka at Dharwad Bench in MFA No.103027/2016 (MV) dt:14-11-2025 in between Mallappa S/o Bhimappa



Harinan and another Vs. Nagesh S/o
Kuberappa Hesrambi and others.

4. The Hon'ble High Court of
Karnataka at Dharwad Bench in MFA
No.2850/2017 (MVD) 23-11-2024 in
between G. Nagarathna W/o late N.S.
Ravisha and others Vs. G.
Manjunatha S/o Gurusiddaiah and
another

16. In order to prove the case of petitioner, the petitioner herself examined as PW1, in her chief affidavit she has reiterated the manner of accident and death of deceased. In support of the same she has relied on Ex.P.1 to 9 documents. So far as this issue is concerned, Ex.P.1 to 7 are relevant documents. Ex.P1 is the certified copy of FIR, Ex.P2 is the certified copy of of complaint, Ex.P3 is the certified copy of spot panchanama, Ex.P4 is the certified copy of Inquest Mahazar, Ex.P5 is the certified copy of Post mortem examination report, Ex.P.6 is the certified copy of IMV Report, Ex.P7 is the certified copy of of charge sheet.



17. On perusal of FIS at Ex.P.2, same is lodged by one Yallappa S/o Basappa Harijan alleging that he along with deceased Bhimappa Mahadevappa Harijan had gone to Kalghatagi on his motorcycle bearing Reg. No.KA25/EH1833 on 14.04.2023 and when they were returning back on the said motorcycle which was rode by Bhimappa, when they reached near Hindasgiri Lake, one KSRTC bus was coming on the said road and when deceased was overtaking the said bus though the bus driver gave way, but he suddenly came towards right side and dashed against the motorcycle rode by the deceased. As a result of which the right side of bus dashed against the head of deceased and the deceased along with Yallappa fell down on the road. The deceased succumbed to injuries on the spot itself where as said Yallappa sustained injuries on his right hand, wrist right leg and knee and little finger. The accident occurred due to sole rash and negligent driving of bus bearing Reg. No.KA-42/F319 by its driver.

18. The respondents in order to prove their defence has examined one driver of KSRTC Bus by name Dyamanna Bolannavar as R.W.1. The said



witness in his chief examination has reiterated the contention taken up in the objections. In his cross-examination it was suggested to said witness that since he took his bus towards right side the accident occurred and said reason is mentioned as cause of accident in the charge-sheet, though R.W.1 stated that the said charge-sheet is false. Though he stated that he has challenged the said charge-sheet and also filed complaint, no any documents are produced by the said witness. However, he stated that after getting down from the bus he recorded three minutes video. He denied the suggestion that in video pillion rider has stated that since bus driver gave way the rider tried to overtake but bus driver himself suddenly took the bus towards right side hence accident occurred however same is denied by R.W.1 he stated that since the bus is the big vehicle police told him that they will lodge complaint against big vehicle. On perusal of the video certain people are stating that the negligence is on the part of the rider of the motorcycle since he tried to overtake and while overtaking lost control and struck into the bus the said video recorded by R.W.1 himself. Respondents have not examined any witnesses over



present at the spot of incident or clicking the video by R.W.1. Under such a circumstances based on Ex.R.1 video it cannot be concluded that the negligence is only on the part of deceased in the accident. On perusal of Ex.P.7 charge-sheet the driver of bus i.e., R.W.1 has been chargesheeted for the offences punishable U/Sec.279, 337 and 304(A) of IPC and the owner of motorcycle bearing No.KA-25/EH-1833 has been chargesheeted for the offences punishable U/Sec.5 R/w 180, 186 of MV Act for handing over his motorcycle to deceased who was not possessing driving license. Similarly, Sec.3 R/w 181 and 185 has been invoked against deceased Bhimappa for riding the motorcycle under the influence of alcohol and without possessing driving license.

19. On perusal of Ex.P.5 PM Report, one final report is attached to it which is mentioned that blood alcohol concentration in the body of deceased was 187.60 mg/100 ml+1.139 detected. Therefore, considering the sketch produced at Ex.P.3 and also considering the RFSL Report at Ex.R.8 it can be held that since the deceased was under the influence of alcohol, he has come inside the road because of which



he has also contributed for the cause of accident. Admittedly, Ex.P.8 charge sheet has been filed against the driver bus bearing Reg. No.KA-42/F319 for the offences punishable under Sec.279, 337 and 304A of IPC. Therefore the main cause of accident is rash and negligent driving of bus by its driver. Since deceased Bhimappa Harijan was not having driving license and had consumed Alcohol he has also contributed for the cause of accident. Considering the facts of present case and evidence on record it can be concluded that, deceased has contributed 40% for the cause of accident and the accident also occurred due to negligence on the part of driver of bus bearing Reg. No.KA-42/F319 hence, above issues are answered **partly in the affirmative.**

20. **Issue No.2:-** The respondents in their objections have contended that, the petitioner has not produced any documents to show that she is LR of deceased. However, the petitioner herein have produced their Aadhar cards at Ex.P.8 and 9 to prove their relationship deceased. Ex.P.8 is the aadhar card of deceased in which name of his father is shown as Madevappa and on perusal of Ex.P.9 it can be seen



that, the name of husband of petitioner is shown as Madevappa. No doubt, the petitioner is not able to produce Varasa certificate, but the relationship of petitioner with deceased Bhimappa Harijan is not seriously disputed. As respondent failed to prove this issue, hence, this issue is answered in the **Negative**.

21. **Issue No.4:** The respondents in their objections at para No.3 have contended that the petition is bad for non-joinder and misjoinder of necessary parties and the petitioner with ulterior motive has not pleaded and made owner and insurance company of motorcycle bearing No.KA-25/EH-1833 as party to the proceedings hence the petition is not maintainable. However the counsel for the petitioner argued that the petitioner is a third party and accident is caused only due to sole negligence of bus driver. As such the owner and insurance company of the motorcycle in which was rode by the deceased is not necessary party and in their absence the petition can be decided. In support of his arguments he relied upon decision reported in **Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka at Bengaluru in WP No.24449/2024 C/w 23821/2024 dt:22-04-2025 in between the**



**Manager, ICICI Lombard General Ins. Co. Ltd., Vs.
Mr. Rahul R.M. S/o Rajan M.T. and another.**

22. It is pertinent to make mention that though the deceased was riding motorcycle bearing Reg. No.KA-25/EH-1833 the petitioner is a third party and in respect of death caused in the accident which was due to rash and negligent driving of bus by its driver and by the rider himself the petition is filed. Therefore, the owner and insurance company of said motorcycle are not necessary parties and in their absence also the present petition can be very well decided. As such as respondents failed to prove this issue same is answered in the **negative**.

23. **Issue No.5:** So far as entitlement of compensation is concerned, the petitioners have claimed Rs.45,00,000/- as compensation under different heads.

Basically, only three factors need to be established by the claimant for assessing compensation in case of death: a) age of the deceased, b) income of the deceased and c) the number of



Dependents. The other issues to be determined by the tribunal to arrive at the loss of dependency are: i) additions/deductions to be made for arriving at the income, ii) The deduction to be made towards the personal leaving expenses of the deceased, and iii) The multiplier to be applied with reference to the age of the deceased.

24. Before ascertaining the income of the deceased, it is necessary to determine the age of the deceased. In the petition the age of the deceased at the time of accident is shown as 22 years. In the P.M report at Ex.P-5 the age of the deceased is shown as 22 years. In the aadhar card of the deceased at Ex.P.8 his date of birth is shown as 08-07-2001 and accident occurred in the year 2023. Therefore, it can be concluded that at the time of accident the deceased was aged about 22 years.

25. In the petition, it is stated that, the deceased was student and working coolie and was earning Rs.25,000/- per month. However, in order to prove the same, the petitioner has not produced single iota of evidence. In the absence of same, the income of the deceased has to be ascertained by following the



guidelines issued by KALSA. Admittedly deceased succumbed to injuries on 01-11-2023. Therefore the notional income fixed by KALSA for the year 2023 has to be taken into consideration to determine monthly income of deceased. As per KALSA guidelines the monthly notional income of an individual for the year 2023 is Rs.15,250/-. Therefore, the monthly income of the deceased is taken as Rs. 15,250/-.

26. So far as loss of dependency is concerned, it can be gathered from cause title of the petition that, the petitioner is the mother of the deceased. Therefore she is the dependent of the deceased at the time of accident the deceased was unmarried.

27. The next question is about multiplier. In Sarla Varma case, at paragraph-19 a two-judge Bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court dealt with this aspect in step 2. To quote:

Step 2 (Ascertaining the multiplier)

“Having regard to the age of the deceased and period of active career, the appropriate multiplier should be selected. This does not mean ascertaining the number of years he would have lived or worked but



for the accident. Having regard to several imponderables in life and economic factors, a table of multiplier with reference to the age has been identified by this court. The multiplier should be chosen from the said table with reference to the age of the deceased”.

28. Keeping in mind the dictum stated above, multiplier 18 has to be applied in case of persons aged between 21 to 25 years. Admittedly, deceased is having only one dependent and he was unmarried hence, as per the decision of Sarla Varma Case 1/2 has to deducted towards personal and living expenses of the deceased.

29. Where the deceased was aged below 40 years, who was self employed 40% of established income should warrant towards future prospects as per decision reported in **(2017)16 Supreme Court Cases 680 in between National Insurance Company Limited Vs. Pranay Sethi and Others.** This court has already calculated the monthly income of the deceased as Rs.15,250/- per month if 40% of same is taken, then it comes to Rs.6,100/- hence said amount



has to be added towards future prospects. Thus, the petitioners are entitled to compensation of Rs. **Rs.23,05,800/-** towards loss of dependency, which calculated as follows:

CALCULATION

TOTAL (IN RS.)

Rs.15,250/- (Monthly Income) add [40% of Rs.6,100/- (Future prospects) $15,250 + 6,100 = 21,350$ /-
 -(Deductions)] $1/2$ of Rs.21,350 = (Rs.21,350-
 10,675/-) = 10,675/-
 [Rs.10,675/-] multiplied by [12(Annual Income)]
 1,28,100/- this is the annual income of the deceased.
 [Rs.1,28,100/-] multiplied by [18 (Multiplier)]
 $1,28,100 \times 18 = \text{Rs.23,05,800/-}$.

30. **TOWARDS CONSORTIUM:-** In the decision reported in (2017) 16 SCC 680 in a case between National Insurance Company Limited V/s Pranay Sethi and others, the Hon'ble Apex court has held that reasonable figures on conventional heads namely loss of estate, loss of consortium and loss of funeral expenses should be paid as Rs.15,000/-,



40,000/- and 15,000/- respectively. As per the above decision so also in view of other decisions reported in:-

1) 2026 ACJ 51 in the Supreme court of India at New Delhi in CA No.14857/2025 dt:17-11-2025 in between Kirokata Devi and others Vs. Ram Ji Lal and others

2) 2025 ACJ 1841 in the Supreme court of India at New Delhi in CA No.9538/2025 dt:17-07-2025 in between Sunita and others Vs. United India Insurance Co. Ltd and others.

3) 2025 ACJ 414 in the Supreme court of India at New Delhi in CA No.3763/2025 dt:24-01-2025 in between Sadhana Tomar and others Vs. Ashok Kushwaha and others

The aforesaid amount should be enhanced at the rate of 10% in every three years. Therefore, the petitioner is entitled for Rs.48,400/- towards loss of consortium.



31. Towards loss of Estate and Funeral and transportation of dead body of deceased: In the above decisions itself an amount of Rs.18,500/- is ordered to be paid towards loss of estate and Rs.18,150/- is ordered to be paid towards funeral expenses by increasing the said amount at 10% for every 3 years from 2017. Hence, considering above decisions if conventional amount of Rs.18,500/- is awarded under the head of loss of estate and Rs.18,150/- is awarded under the head of funeral expenses it would be reasonable. Hence, petitioner is entitled for Rs.18,500/- and Rs.18,150/- under above heads.

32. As already discussed, the petitioner is entitled to get total compensation under the following heads:

1	Loss dependency	Rs. 23,05,800/-
2	Loss of estate	Rs. 18,500/-
3	Transportation of dead body & funeral expenses	Rs. 18,150/-
4	Loss of consortium	Rs. 48,400/-
	Total	Rs.23,90,850/-



33. However, it is already concluded on issue No.1 that deceased has also contributed for the cause of accident and it is held that he has contributed about **40%** for the cause of accident. Therefore, proportionate amount has to be deducted from total amount of **Rs.23,90,850 /-** which comes to **Rs.9,56,340/-** if said amount is deducted from **Rs.23,90,850/-** it comes to **Rs.14,34,510/-** $(23,90,850 - 9,56,340) = 14,34,510/-$ Therefore the petitioner is entitled for **Rs.14,34,510 /-** as compensation on account of death of her son Bhimappa.

34. Pertaining to interest on the award amount, in the decision between **Vijay Ishwar Jadhav and others V/s Ulrich Belchior Fernandes and another in MFA No.100090/2014 dated: 07-03-2018**, the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, Dharwad Bench has held that “ In the absence of any other law relating to interest on judgments, the MACT has to follow the provisions of Sec.34 of CPC. Thus, in the given circumstances of the case, interest at the rate of more than 6% could not have been awarded”. Thus it is clear that an interest at the rate of 6% can only be awarded on the compensation amount as per the above ruling.



35. **LIABILITY TO PAY COMPENSATION:** The next question is who has to pay compensation to the petitioner.

As already discussed on issue No.1, the accident in question occurred due to rash and negligent driving of driver of KSRTC Bus bearing No.KA-42/F-319 by its driver so also the deceased was consuming alcohol and it is concluded that and he has also contributed for the cause of accident. The respondent No.1 is the owner of the KSRTC Bus bearing No.KA-42/F-319 and same is self insured. Therefore, the respondents have to indemnify the petitioner. Accordingly issue No.5 is answered **partly in the affirmative** holding that the petitioner is entitled for compensation of **Rs.14,34,510/-** with interest at rate of 6% from the date of petition till its realization.

36. **Issue No.6:-** In view of my findings on issue No.1 to 5, this court proceeds to pass the following:

~:: ORDER ::~

The petition filed by the petitioners U/
Sec. 166 of M.V. Act claiming the



compensation is hereby allowed in part with costs.

The petitioner is entitled to the compensation of **Rs.14,34,510/-** with future interest at the rate of 6% p.a., from the date of petition till its realization.

The respondents are directed to deposit the award amount before this Tribunal within 3 months.

On deposit being made 40% of the amount awarded to the share of petitioner is ordered to be released in her favour and remaining 60% is ordered to be deposited in fixed deposit in the name of petitioner in any nationalized bank of her choice for the period of 3 years.

Advocate fee is fixed at Rs.500/-.

Draw award accordingly.

(Dictated to the Stenographer directly on computer and typed by her, corrected by me and then pronounced in the open court on this the 16th day of July 2026.)

Sd/-

(Smt. Deepa G Manerkar)
II Addl. Senior Civil Judge &
Addl. MACT, Hubballi.



~:: ANNEXURE ::~

I. Witnesses examined for the Petitioner:

PW.1 : Smt. Renavva M. Harijan

II. Documents exhibited by the Petitioners :

Ex.P1 : C.C. of F.I.R.
Ex.P2 : C.C. of Complaint
Ex.P3 : C.C. of Spot Panchanama
Ex.P4 : C.C. of Inquest panchanama
Ex.P5 : C.C. of Post mortem Report
Ex.P6 : C.C. of MVA Report
Ex.P7 : C.C. of charge sheet
Ex.P8 & 9 : C.C. of Aadhar cards

III. Witnesses examined for the Respondents :

RW.1 : Sri. Dyamanna N. Bolannavar

IV. Documents exhibited by the Respondents :

Ex.R1 : Pen drive
Ex.R1(a) : Affidavit conforming Sec.65B of Indian Evidence Act.
Ex.R1(b) : Authorization letter
Ex.R2 : C.C. of Free Travel pass card

Sd/-

**(Smt. Deepa G Manerkar)
II Addl. Senior Civil Judge &
Addl. MACT, Hubballi.**