

KA32020029732022



**IN THE COURT OF PRL. SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE AND THE MOTOR
ACCIDENT CLAIMS TRIBUNAL AT: KALABURAGI.**

PRESENT: Sri, K.S.Rotter, B.Com. LL.B (Spl),
Prl. Senior Civil Judge and CJM,
Kalaburagi.

Dated This 29th Day of June-2026

M.V.C.No.1572/2022

PETITIONER:

Raju S/o Shamrao Nadugeri,
deceased through his Lrs,

1. **Smt. Siddamma W/o Shamrao Nadugeri,**
Age: 56 Years, Occ: Household.
2. **Sri. Shamrao S/o Tukappa Nadugeri,**
Age: 58 years, Occ: Coolie,
R/o: Vaijapur, Tq. Aland,
District: Kalaburagi.

(By Shri S.C. Sirnoorkar, Advocate)

-Versus -

RESPONDENTS:

1. **Saiphansab S/o Chandsab Nadap,**
Age: Major, Occ: Business & Owner of motorcycle
bearing Reg. No.KA-32/EW-0768 Splendor,
R/o at Vaijapur, Post: Bommanahalli,
Tq. Aland, Dist. Kalaburagi-585213.

2. TATA AIG General Insurance Company Ltd.

Through its Manager, Legal IT building,
near High Court Complex, Akkamahadevi layout,
Kalaburagi, policy No.3190676534/000000/00
valid from 30.09.2019 to 29.09.2024.

(R.1 Remained Ex-parte)

(R.2 by Shri C.S. Kalaburagi, Advocate)

=====

DATES OF:

1. Date of Accident : 16.07.2022
2. Petition Presented on : 23.12.2022
3. Petition Registered on : 27.12.2022
4. Petition Decided on : 29.06.2026

Total Duration : 03 years, 06 month, 02 Days

-Sd/-

(K.S. Rotter)

Prl. Senior Civil Judge and MACT,
Kalaburagi.

J U D G E M E N T

The Claimant herein has filed this claim petition Under Section 166 of I.M.V. Act for grant of compensation of Rs.31,99,000/- for the injuries sustained by him in a road traffic accident.

2. Brief facts of this case are as under:

On 16.07.2022, the petitioner and one Nagesh together went for a walk towards Vaijapur cross at their Vaijapur village and after finishing the walk while they were returning back, near Vaijapur to Station Ganagapur Pattan Cross Road, at about 06.45 P.M, the rider of the offending motorcycle bearing Reg.No.KA-32/EW-0768 came from their back side by riding his motorcycle in high speed, rash and negligent manner endanger to human life and dashed to the petitioner from his behind and caused the accident. Due to the accident, petitioner fell down on the road and sustained grievous injuries and fractures, such as, fracture of left clavicle displaced and posterior left 2nd to 8th ribs and other injuries on internal and external parts of the body. Immediately after the accident, the petitioner was shifted to Dr. Kural Hospital, Kalaburagi, wherein he was admitted as inpatient from 16.07.2022 to 25.07.2022 and during the course of treatment, the

petitioner has undergone surgeries on 20.07.2022. After the discharge from the hospital also petitioner was taking follow-up treatment and till filing of the petition, he has spent more than of Rs.4,75,000/- towards his medical expenses and he is also in need of another Rs.2,50,000/- towards medical expenses. Further petitioner stated that, prior to the accident, he was hale and healthy person, aged about 28 years and earning Rs.4,00,000 per annum from his agriculture work and Rs.22,000/- per month by doing labour work. However due to the accidental injuries, the petitioner is unable to do his work as he was doing prior to the accident and after the accident, the petitioner has become unemployed person due to the accidental injuries and he is suffering from intolerable severe pain, shock and mental agony losing amenities and expectation of life. Further it is stated that, due to the accidental injuries, petitioner was attended by 02 attendants, which resulted in loss of earning not only of the petitioner and also his attendants. Apart from that, the petitioner has spent huge amount towards boarding, lodging and convenience for himself and his attendants and in spite of good treatment, petitioner became permanent disabled person apart from loss of his future income of rest of his life and the accidental injuries preventing him from doing his

said avocation of private work and the doctors, who treated him are stated that, petitioner has to live with the said disabilities for his life time. Further petitioner stated that, the alleged accident was occurred due to the rash and negligent driving of the offending motorcycle bearing Reg.No.KA-32/EW-0768 by its rider and in this respect, criminal case was registered by the Nimbarga Police in their PS Cr.No.77/2022. Further it is stated that, respondent No.1 is the owner and respondent No.2 is the insurer of the offending motorcycle bearing Reg.No.KA-32/EW-0768 and as on the date of accident, insurance policy of the offending vehicle was in force covering 3rd party risk. Therefore, both respondents are jointly and severally liable to pay compensation to the petitioner. Further it is stated that respondent No.2-insurance Company is having its office at Kalaburagi and this Court is having jurisdiction to adjudicate the matter. Therefore with these among other averments, the claimant prayed for awarding compensation of Rs.31,99,000/- with interest at the rate of 12% P.M. from the date of petition till its realization.

3. Notices of the claim petition were ordered to be issued to the respondents No.1 & 2. After service of notices, the respondent No.2-

Insurance Company appeared through its counsel and filed written statement contesting the claim of petitioner. But the respondent No.1-Owner of the offending vehicle remained absent and placed ex-parte.

4. The respondent No.2-TATA AIG General Insurance Company Ltd, in its written objections contended that, the contents of the petition are false and baseless and not maintainable either in law or facts of the case. The respondent No.2 also denied the age, occupation and income of the petitioner as averred in the petition. The respondent No.2 denied that, prior to the accident, petitioner was hale and healthy and aged about 28 years and doing agriculture work and earning Rs.4,00,000/- per annum and earning Rs.22,000/- by doing labour work and called upon the petitioner to prove the same with strict proof. The respondent No.2 denied that, on 16.07.2022, when petitioner and one Nagesh went for walk towards Vijaypur cross and when they were returning back, on Vijaypur to Station Ganagapur cross Road, the rider of offending motorcycle bearing No.KA-32/EW-0768 came from their backside in high speed, rash and negligent manner and dashed to the petitioner from his behind and caused the

accident as stated in the claim petition. It is also denied that, due to the accident, the petitioner fell down on the road and sustained grievous injuries and taken treatment at Kural Hospital, Kalaburagi as inpatient as stated in the claim petition. Further respondent No.2 denied the involvement of offending motorcycle bearing Reg. No.KA-32/EW-0768 in the said accident and stated that, the petitioner in collusion with respondent No.1 and police authorities has got created false police records and filed this false claim petition. Further respondent No.2 specifically denied that, due to the accident petitioner has sustained permanent disablement and he was unable to do his work as he was doing prior to the accident and he has lost his future income as stated in the claim petition. Further the compensation claimed by the petitioner is false and baseless, and the complainant is not entitled to any compensation from the respondent No.2. The respondent No.2 has admitted that, the offending motorcycle bearing Reg.No.KA-32/EW-0768 was insured with their insurance company and the policy is valid for the period from 30.09.2019 to 29.09.2024, however, their liability if any is subject to the terms and conditions, limitations, of the insurance policy and also subject to compliance of mandatory provisions of MV Act by the respondent No.1. The respondent No.2

stated that, the driver of the offending vehicle was not holding a valid driving license as on the date of alleged accident and he was driving the same unauthorisedly and in contravention of the terms and conditions of the policy. Hence, this respondent is not liable to pay any compensation. Further the respondent No.2 stated that, the respondent No.1 was playing the said vehicle on a public road without valid registration and fitness certificate and thereby violated the terms and conditions of the policy and mandatory provisions of MV Act. Further, the respondent No.2 reserves its right to defend the claim on various grounds, which are all available under Section 170 of the Motor Vehicles Act, if the owner of the said vehicle fails to contest the case at all stages of the proceedings. Further respondent No.2 seeks the protections under sections 147 and 149 of MV act and stated that, the respondent No.1 has not furnished particulars of policy, date, time and place of the accident, name of the injured, driver of the vehicle in the question and particulars of driving licence and has not complied the mandatory provisions of Section 134(c) of the Motor Vehicles Act. Further concerned police have also failed to forward all the relevant documents to the insurer within 30 days from the date of the information and the Jurisdictional police have not complied the

mandatory provisions of Section 158(6) of Motor Vehicles Act. The respondent No.2 contended that, the amount of compensation and rate of interest as claimed by the petitioners is highly excessive, exorbitant, and baseless. Therefore, with these and among other averments respondent No.2-Insurance Company sought for dismissal of the petition.

5. On the basis of the rival pleadings, the following Issues were framed.

I S S U E S

1. *Whether the petitioner proves that on 16.07.2022 at about 06.45 P.M., near Vaijapur to Station Ganagapur, Pattan Cross road, near Vaijapur cross, he met with an accident and sustained the injuries, due to rash and negligent riding by the riders of Splendor motorcycle bearing No.-32/EW-0768?*
 2. *Whether the petitioner is entitled for the compensation amount? If so, to what extent, from whom?*
 3. *What order or award?*
6. It is seen from records that, after framing the issues, the injured petitioner/ Raju S/o Shamrao Nadugeri has got examined himself as PW.1 and produced 11 documents, which are marked at Ex.P.1 to P.11 and when the case is fixed for further chief examination of PW.1, the petitioner/Pw-1 was reported as dead. Thereafter, his legal heirs

are brought on record as petitioners No.1 & 2. Thereafter, the petitioner No.1, i.e. the mother of the deceased petitioner by name Smt. Siddamma W/o Shamrao Nadugeri has got examined herself as PW.2 and also produced 06 documents, which are marked at Ex.P12 to 17. On the other hand, the respondent No.2 got examined its Chief Manager as RW.1 and produced 01 document, which is marked at Ex.R.1.

7. Thereafter I have heard arguments.
8. My findings on the above Issues are as under:

Issue No.1: In the Affirmative.

Issue No.2: Partly in the Affirmative.

Issue No.3: As per final order for the following:

REASONS

9. **Issue No.1:-** It is specific case of the claimant that, on 16.07.2022, when he and one Nagesh together went for a walk towards Vaijapur cross at their Vaijapur village and after finishing the walk while they were returning back, near Vaijapur to Station Ganagapur Pattan Cross Road, at about 06.45 P.M, the rider of the offending motorcycle bearing Reg.No.KA-32/EW-0768 came from their back side by riding

his motorcycle in high speed, rash and negligent manner endanger to human life and dashed to the petitioner from his behind and caused the accident. It is also specific case of the claimant that, in the accident he has sustained grievous injuries and fractures. These material propositions of facts have been specifically denied by the respondent No.2. Therefore, the claimants are expected to prove this issue.

- 10.** As stated above, the injured petitioner/Raju Shamrao Nadageri has got examined himself as PW.1. In his chief examination deposed about the accident, manner in which the accident took place, rash and negligent driving of offending vehicle by its rider as the cause for the accident. PW.1 further deposed that due to the accident injuries sustained to him such as fracture of left clavicle displaced and posterior left 2nd to 8th ribs and injuries over other internal and external parts of the body. PW1 further deposed that, prior to the accident, he was hale and healthy and he was doing agriculture and thereby earning Rs.4,00,000/- per annum and earning Rs.22,000/- by doing labour work, but due to the accidental injuries he was unable to do work as he was doing prior to the accident and spending his entire income towards the welfare of his family. Pw-1 also deposed that, the

accident in question occurred due to rash and negligent riding of the motorcycle bearing Reg. No.KA-32/EW-0768, but at the stage of further chief-examination of PW.1, injured petitioner was reported as dead and his legal heirs brought on record. The petitioner No.1 is the mother of deceased petitioner by name Smt. Siddamma W/o Shamrao Nadugeri has got examined herself as PW.2. In her chief examination Pw-2 specifically deposed about the accident, manner in which the accident took place, rash and negligent driving of offending vehicle by its driver as the cause for the accident. PW.2 further deposed about the injuries caused to her son due to the accident, treatment taken for those injuries and disability caused to him. PW1 further deposed that, prior to the accident, deceased petitioner was hale and healthy and he was doing agriculture and thereby earning Rs.4,00,000/- per annum and also earning Rs.22,000/- by doing labour work. Pw-2 also deposed that, the accident in question occurred due to rash and negligent driving of the driving of the motorcycle bearing Reg. No.KA-32/EW-0768. Rest she deposed as stated by the injured petitioner. I have perused the cross-examination of PW.2 carefully but, nothing material was elucidated in favour of the defence of the respondent No.2 and so as to disbelieve her evidence. In her

examination the Pw.2 specifically denied suggestions that, the alleged accident not occurred due to the rash and negligence of the rider of offending motorcycle and in order to get the compensation they have created false police records in collusion with respondent No.1 and police authorities and filed this false claim petition. It is well settled that, when the suggestions are made and it was denied, it has no evidence on behalf of the party making such suggestion. Apart from that, PW.2 in her cross-examination is very much consistent in respect of the rash and negligent driving of the offending motorcycle bearing Reg. No.KA-32/EW-0768 by its rider.

11. Further Pw-1 and 2 in support of their contention have produced 17 documents which are marked at Ex.P1 to 17. Ex.P1 is the certified copy of FIR. Ex.P2 is the certified copy of complaint. Ex.P3 is the certified copy of charge sheet. Ex.P4 is the wound certificate of Pw-1. Ex.P.5 is the certified copy of crime details Form. Ex.P.6 is the certified copy of MVI report. Ex.P.7 is the discharge summery of Pw.1. Ex.P.8 is the disability certificate of Pw-1 issued by Raju S/o Shamrao Nadagi. Ex.P.9 is the certified copy of Aadhar card of Pw-1. Ex.P.10 is the X-ray report. Ex.P.11 is the X-ray film. Ex.P.12 is the

certified copy of Aadhar card of PW.2. Ex.P.13 is the certified copy of the PAN card of PW.2. Ex.P.14 and 15 are the copies of the Aadhar card and PAN card of father of deceased petitioner. Ex.P.16 is the death certificate of injured petitioner and Ex.P.17 are 18 the medical bills pertaining to deceased petitioner. On going through the contents of the above police records at Ex.P1 to 6, it is categorically stated that, accident in question occurred due to rash and negligent riding of the offending motorcycle bearing Reg. No.KA-32/EW-0768 by its rider. Further the Contents of motor vehicle report Ex.P-6 disclose that, accident was not due to any mechanical defect of the vehicle. It is not the case of head-on-collusion. The rider of motorcycle bearing Reg. No.KA-32/EW-0768 has been charge sheeted by the police for the offence punishable under Sections 279 and 338 of Indian Penal Code. The Contents of Ex.P-3-Charge sheet disclose that, the very Rider of the motorcycle bearing Reg. No.KA-32/EW-0768 has driven his vehicle in rash and negligent manner and caused accident to the petitioner. Even contents of charge sheet disclose that, there are allegations against rider of said Motorcycle about his rashness and negligent driving.

- 12.** On the other hand, the respondent No.2-insurance company, who is insurer of the offending motorcycle bearing Reg. No.KA-32/EW-0768 denied that, the alleged accident occurred due to rash and negligent riding of the said Motorcycle and contended that, no such accident involving said Motorcycle has occurred and the claimants in collusion with respondent No.1 and police authorities got managed to implant the said vehicle in the alleged accident by lodging the complaint with a delay to get compensation. In support of their contentions, the respondent No.2 got examined its Chief Manager by name Yankanagouda as RW.1 and produced Authorization letter at Ex.R.1. I have perused the evidence of Rw-1 carefully and no doubt Rw-1 in his evidence deposed as per their written objections but to substantiate their contentions, Rw-1 has not produced cogent and reliable documents. Further, for determining the negligence of driver of the offending vehicle, in catena of judgments of the Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Apex Court, it has been held that, registration of a criminal case against the driver of offending vehicle is enough to record the finding that the driver of the offending vehicle is responsible for causing the accident. Apart from that, the respondent No.2 has not challenged the charge sheet filed against the driver of

offending Car and they have also not produced any documents for showing that, petitioner has file false case to get the compensation. Further, the respondent No.2 has not taken any action against the petitioner, owner/respondent No.1 and police for registering a false case involving the offending motorcycle in the alleged accident. So looking to the facts that, the offending vehicle really not caused the alleged accident to the deceased petitioner, in the normal course, the respondent No.2 would not have remained silent without taking legal action against the petitioner. Therefore, no importance can be attached to the above contentions of respondent No.2.

- 13.** Further the respondent No.2 in its objections also contended that, the rider of offending vehicle was not holding valid driving license as on the date of accident and respondent No.1 has violated the terms and conditions of the insurance policy, thus respondent No.2-Insurance Company is not liable for payment of compensation amount to the petitioners. But the respondent No.2-Insurance Company in order to prove these contentions also not produced any reliable material. Apart from that, respondent No.2 has not issued any notice to the respondent No.1 for producing driving license. This respondent No.2

has not examined the RTO or investigating officer. It is also on record that, concerned police have not charged sheeted the driver of respondent No.1 for not having DL at the time of accident. Even there is no any conclusive proof that the rider of the offending motorcycle was not possessing valid and effective driving licence. In this case, the contents of charge sheet disclose that, there are allegations against driver of the offending Motorcycle about his rashness and negligent driving. These documents are not disputed by the respondents. Such being the case, no importance can be attached to the contentions of the respondent No.2-insurance company. Therefore, without much discussion, I can safely come to the conclusion that, the driver of offending motorcycle bearing Reg. No.KA-32/EW-0768 was really rash and negligent in driving his vehicle on that day which has resulted in accident.

- 14.** Even I have gone through the evidence of P.W.2 with contents of Ex.P.4/wound certificate of deceased petitioner, so far as injuries are concerned. On perusal of Ex.P-4 it appears that, on the date of accident itself the deceased claimant was hospitalized at Kural Hospital Kalaburagi, where he took treatment for the injuries which

he sustained in the accident. The Contents of Ex.P-4 are conclusive proof of sustaining injuries by the deceased claimant. In the accident deceased claimant sustained grievous injuries such as, Abrasion over the right forehead and left foot, Acute SDH and SAH along left parietal temporal region, Fracture of left Zygomatic arch and Fracture of left clavicle and left 2 to 8 ribs. It also indicates that injuries are grievous in nature. Pw-2 in her evidence, stated about these injuries. Even in claim petition also deceased claimant disclosed the injuries which he suffered in the accident. Under these circumstances I am of the opinion that, injuries sustained by deceased claimant are because of accident only. Hence, I have come to the conclusion that claimant has proved this issue. Accordingly, I answer issue No.1 in affirmative.

- 15. Issue No.2:** This issue is regarding the quantum of compensation to be awarded to the petitioners and liability to pay the same. As stated above, during the pendency of this petition, the injured-petitioner, Raju S/o Shamrao Nadugeri reported as dead and his legal heirs were brought on record as petitioner No.1 and 2. The Pw-2 in her evidence nowhere stated that, due to the accidental injuries, the deceased

petitioner died. The LRs of petitioner have not produced any documents for showing that, due to non-healing of the accident injuries deceased petitioner died. Pw-2 in her cross examination admitted that that, they have not got amended the claim petition by stating that, due to the accidental injuries her son died. Pw-2 in her cross examination also admitted that, they have not produced any documents for showing that, due accidental injuries deceased petitioner died. She also admitted that, after the death of her son, they have not conducted the post mortem of his dead body and they have also not given information to the concerned police regarding the death of her son. She stated that, her son died after 2 years of accident. Further PW1 stated that, during the time of treatment her son was dead but she has not produced any documents for showing that, after 2 years of accident they have got admitted her son to the hospital. Further death of the original petitioner was subsequent to the filing of this petition and which is about two years after the accident. When the death of the original petitioner is about 2 years after the accident, heavy burden lies upon the present petitioners to prove that, the death of the original petitioner was due to the accidental injuries. However even though, Pw-2 in her cross examination asserted that, the death of

the original petitioner was due to the accidental injuries, but they have not made any attempt to subject the dead body of the deceased petitioner for post mortem examination to ascertain the actual cause for the death. Absolutely, no explanation is forthcoming from the petitioners for not offering the dead body of the original petitioner for post mortem report. In fact, best evidence, which can prove the cause of death of any human being, is the post mortem report. In this particular case, there is no such post mortem report, to say that the death of the original petitioner was due to the accidental injuries or to know actual cause for his death. The petitioners on record has not produced any reliable evidence and documents for showing that, the death of the deceased petitioner was due to the accidental injuries. The charge sheet filed against the driver of the offending vehicle was only for the offence punishable under Sec.279 and 338 of IPC and no charge sheet was filed against the rider of offending vehicle for the offence punishable under Sec.304(A) of IPC, which is also one of the strong circumstances, which comes in the way of this Tribunal in accepting the version of these petitioners.

- 16.** In spite of there being no post-mortem report and no charge sheet for the offence punishable under Sec. 304(a) of IPC, still the petitioners able to independently prove that, the death of deceased petitioner was due to the accidental injuries, by leading evidence of independent witnesses and by leading the evidence of the medical officers who were treated the deceased petitioner for his accidental injuries. However the petitioners have not taken any steps in this way. As I said earlier, death of the deceased was about 2 years after the accident and sustaining of injuries. The evidence let in by the petitioners would not prove that, the death of the original petitioner was due to the accidental injuries. The petitioners failed to prove and establish the nexus between the accidental injuries and the death of original petitioner. Under such circumstances, I have to say that, the petitioners have not proved that, the death of the deceased original petitioner was due to the accidental injuries.
- 17.** However, in view of my finding on issue No.1, it is proved that, the deceased original petitioner sustained grievous injuries and fractures due to the accident and the said accident was due to the rash and negligent riding of the offending motorcycle bearing Reg. No.KA-

32/EW-0768 by its rider. Since, the original petitioner died during the pendency of this petition, his Legal heirs are entitled for the compensation towards medical expenses and other expenses incurred by them to provide the treatment to the deceased petitioner for injuries caused due to the accident. The petitioners have produced 18 medical bills as per Ex.P.17. Therefore, on careful perusal of all the medical bills produced by the petitioners, it goes to show that, the petitioners have incurred medical expenses to the tune of Rs.1,77,563/-. Further the MLC records and medical case sheet of the deceased petitioner got summoned by the respondent No.2 from the Kural Hospital, Kalaburagi goes to show that, the deceased petitioner has taken treatment as inpatient from 16.07.2022 to 25.07.2022 and during the course of treatment, the petitioner has undergone surgeries on 20.07.2022. So, the deceased petitioner has taken treatment as inpatient for the period of 10 days. Hence, I feel it is just and proper to award a sum of Rs.20,000/- to the petitioners towards attendant charges, extra nutritious food and transportation charges. So, the total expenses incurred by these petitioners to provide treatment to the deceased petitioner are Rs.1,97,563/-, which can be rounded off to Rs.2,00,000/-. Hence, the petitioners are entitled for total

compensation of **Rs.2,00,000/-**. Further, claimants are also entitled for interest @ 6% per annum on such compensation amount from the date of petition till realization of entire amount.

- 18.** Now, the point for consideration is who is liable to pay compensation. It is admitted fact that, the respondent No.1 is the owner of the offending motorcycle bearing Reg.No.KA-32/EW-0768 and the respondent No.2 is Insurance Company. The respondent No.2 admitted that, the offending motorcycle bearing Reg.No.KA-32/EW-0768 was insured with their insurance company and the policy is valid for the period from 30.09.2019 to 29.09.2024 and it is in force since the date of accident is 16.07.2022. Further, in this case there is no proof on record that the owner of the offending vehicle/respondent No.1 has violated the terms and conditions of the insurance policy. Therefore, both respondents No.1 and 2 are jointly and severally liable for payment of compensation amount with interest as ordered above. **Since, the respondent No.2 is Insurance Company it is primarily liable for payment of compensation amount.** Accordingly I answer issue No.2 *partly in the Affirmative*.

19. **Issue No.3:** In view of my findings on the above issues, claim petition is deserves to be allowed in part, with cost. Being of that opinion I proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

The Claim petition filed by the petitioner U/Sec.166 of M.V. Act is hereby allowed, in part with cost, as under:

An amount of **Rs.2,00,000/-** (Rupees Two Lakhs only) is awarded as compensation to the LR's of petitioner. Further the LR's of petitioner are also entitled for interest on such compensation amount at the rate of Rs.6% per annum from the date of petition till its realization.

The Respondents No.1 and 2 are jointly and severally liable for payment of compensation amount with interest as ordered above. **Respondent No.2 being the Insurance Company is primarily liable for payment of compensation amount.** Accordingly respondent No.2- insurance Company is hereby directed to deposit compensation amount with interest as ordered above within one month from this day.

In the event of deposit of award amount, the entire compensation amount with proportionate interest shall be released to the petitioners No.1 and 2 equally at the ratio of 1/2 share each.

The amount shall be disbursed as per guidelines laid down by Hon'ble High Court in MFA No.2509/2019 (ECA) and General Circular No.2/2019 dated 19-08-2019, after collecting the PAN Card/Adhar Card and Bank Account particulars.

The Advocate fee is fixed at Rs.500/-
Office to Draw Award accordingly.

(Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed and typed by her, corrected by me, then pronounced in the Open Court this 29th day of June 2026)

-Sd/-

(K.S.Rotter)

Prl. Senior Civil Judge and
MACT, Kalaburagi.

ANNEXURE

1. **WITNESSES EXAMINED ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:**

P.W.1: Shri Raju S/o Shamrao Nadageri

P.W.2: Smt. Siddamma S/o Shamrao Nadugeri

2. **DOCUMENTS PRODUCED BY THE CLAIMANT/PETITIONER:**

Ex.P.1: Certified copy of FIR

Ex.P.2: Certified copy of complaint

Ex.P.3: Certified copy of Charge sheet

Ex.P.4: Wound certificate

Ex.P.5 : Certified copy of Crime details

- Ex.P.6 : Certified copy of MVI report
Ex.P.7: Discharge summery
Ex.P.8: Disability certificate
Ex.P.9: Certified copy of Aadhar card of Pw-1
Ex.P.10: X-ray report
Ex.P.11: X-ray film
Ex.P.12: Certified copy of Aadhar card of PW.2
Ex.P.13: Certified copy of PAN card of PW.2
Ex.P.14: Certified copy of Aadhar card of LR No.2
Ex.P.15: Certified copy of PAN card of LR. No.2
Ex.P.16: Certified copy of death certificate of injured petitioner
Ex.P.17: 18 Medical bills of petitioner

3. WITNESSES EXAMINED ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS.

Ex. RW.1 Yankangouda S/o Sharangouda

4. DOCUMENTS PRODUCED BY THE RESPONDENTS:

Ex.R.1 Authorization letter

-Sd/-
(K.S.Rotter)
Prl. Senior Civil Judge and
MACT, Kalaburagi.