

IN THE COURT OF THE MOTOR ACCIDENTS CLAIMS TRIBUNAL,
PERUMBAVOOR

Present: - Smt. Smitha George, Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal
Tuesday, the 11th day of June, 2024/ 21st day of Jyaishta 1946.

O.P. (MV) Nos. 2059/2019, 294/2020 and 1422/2021

OP(MV) No. 2059/2019

Claimant:-

Sujeesh K.V., aged 41 years, S/o Vijayan, Kainikudy House,
Panichayam, Asamannoor, Nedungapra P.O. (Aadhar No. 3842 7067
9782)

By Advs. K. Balachandran and Ajith Thomas

Respondents :-

- 1 Sajil Varkey, S/o Varkey K.S., Kolambakarayil House, Near Navodhaya School, Neriamangalam.
2. Subin Jacob, S/o Jacob, Kuzhikkattu House, Thadiyampadu P.O., Idukki
3. United India Insurance Co. Ltd., Prakash Building, T.B. Junction, Thodupuzha.

R1 & R2 - Exparte

R3 - By Adv. K.K. Saleema Beevi

OP(MV) No. 294/2020

Claimant:-

Omana Ravi, aged 56 years, W/o Ravi M., Modissery House,
Uppukandam P.O., Nathukallu, Erattayar. (Aadhar No. 5106 0347
5435)

By Advs. K. Balachandran and Ajith Thomas

Respondents :-

- 1 Sajil Varkey, S/o Varkey K.S., Kolambakarayil House, Near Navodhaya School, Neriamangalam.
2. Subin Jacob, S/o Jacob, Kuzhikkattu House, Thadiyampadu P.O., Idukki
3. United India Insurance Co. Ltd., Prakash Building, T.B. Junction, Thodupuzha.

R1 & R2 - Exparte
R3 - By Adv. K.K. Saleema Beevi

OP(MV) No. 1422/2021

Claimant:-

Sanju Arjunan, aged 30 years, S/o K.C. Arjunan, Kadalikunnel House, Colony P.O., Kochupainavu, Idukki District. (Aadhar No. 7492 6364 6566)

By Advs. K. Balachandran and Ajith Thomas

Respondents :-

- 1 Sajil Varkey, S/o Varkey K.S., Kolambakarayil House, Near Navodhaya School, Neriamangalam.
2. Subin Jacob, S/o Jacob, Kuzhikkattu House, Thadiyampadu P.O., Idukki
3. United India Insurance Co. Ltd., Prakash Building, T.B. Junction, Thodupuzha.

R1 & R2 - Exparte
R3 - By Adv. K.K. Saleema Beevi

These Original Petitions (MV) coming on this the 11th day of June, 2024 for final hearing before me and on the same day the Tribunal passed the following:

COMMON AWARD

O.P(MV) No.2059/2019 is filed for Rs.10,00,000/-, O.P(MV) No.294/2020 is filed for Rs.3,00,000/-, and OP(MV) 1422/2021 is filed for Rs.2,50,000/- U/s.166(1)

(a) of the M.V.Act for compensation, for the injuries sustained by the respective petitioners in the alleged motor vehicle accident.

2. Joint trial was allowed and all these petitions are tried together and common evidence was adduced in OP(MV) 2059/2019.

3. The common case of the petitioners as stated in the petitions is as follows:-

On 26.06.2017 at about 5.30 a.m., while the petitioners were travelling as passengers in the Bus bearing Reg.No.KL-06/H-1204 driven by the first respondent in a rash and negligent manner from south to north through Aluva – Perumbavoor road with high speed and hit on the electric post on the eastern side of the road and on the tree standing by the side of the road and the petitioners sustained serious injuries. On sustaining injuries, they were taken to Lakshmi Hospital, Aluva and were treated there and from there petitioner in OP(MV) 2059/2019 was taken to St.Joseph's Hospital, Dharmagiri and petitioner in OP(MV) 1422/2021 was taken to Rajagiri Hospital, Chunangamvely. According to the petitioners the accident occurred due to the rash and negligent driving of the Bus. The driver, registered owner and insurer of the Bus are shown as R1, R2 and R3 respectively.

4. R1 and R2 remained absent and were set exparte.

5. R3 appeared and filed separate written statements in all the cases, admitting the insurance of the Bus bearing Reg.No.KL-06/H-1204 but denying any negligence on the part of R1. It is contended that the accident occurred due to the collision of two vehicles and the owner and insurer of the other vehicle is not in the party array. It is

also contended that the bus was not holding valid permit at the time of accident. R3 also denied the claims under various heads.

6. On the pleadings, the issues raised for consideration are as follows:-

- (1) Whether the accident occurred due to the rash and negligent driving of R1?
- (2) Whether the petitioner in OP(MV) 2059/2019 is entitled for a compensation as claimed?. If so, what is the quantum?.
- (3) Whether the petitioner in OP(MV) 294/2020 is entitled for a compensation as claimed?. If so, what is the quantum?.
- (4) Whether the petitioner in OP(MV) 1422/2021 is entitled for a compensation as claimed?. If so, what is the quantum?.
- (5) Who is liable to pay the compensation?
- (6) Reliefs and costs.

7. No oral evidence is adduced and the evidence in this case consists of Exts.A1 to A17.

8. Issue No.1: Ext.A1 F.I.R, Ext.A2 F.I.Statement, Ext.A3 scene mahazar and Exts.A4 AMVI's report stand to prove the accident. Ext.A5 is the charge sheet, as per which R1 is charge sheeted for the offence punishable under Sections 279, 337 and 338 of the I.P.C. and 66 (1) r/w 197 of the MV Act. It is specifically stated in Ext.A5 that the accident occurred due to the rash and negligent driving of the Bus by the first respondent. There is nothing on record to go against the charge sheet. No evidence, either oral or documentary, is let in to attribute any negligence on the part of the

petitioners herein, who were travelling in the Bus. So, on perusal of records, it is proved that the accident occurred due to the rash and negligent driving of the Bus by R1. This issue is answered accordingly.

9. Issue No.2: Ext.A6 is the wound certificate issued from St.Joseph's Hospital, Dharmagiri which shows that the petitioner in OP(MV) 2059/2019 was brought there on 27.06.2017 with pain, stiffness lower back following RTA. On evaluation he was having fracture transverse process L1, L2, L3 (right), for which he was advised rest and analgesics. Ext.A9 is the medical bills for Rs.2,046/- and that amount is awarded towards treatment expenses.

10. As per the petition, the petitioner aged 41 years old at the time of accident was a KSRTC Driver Grade I, and his monthly income is shown as Rs.26,000/-. But no evidence is let in to prove the occupation and monthly income of the petitioner. So, relying on the decisions of the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Ramachandrappa v. Manager, Royal Sundaram Alliance Insurance Company Limited [(2011) 13 SCC 236]*** and ***Syed Sadiq v. Divisional Manager, United India Insurance Co. Ltd., [(2014) 2 SCC 735]*** and also the decisions of the ***Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in MACA No.3777/2019 and MACA No.3798/2019***, considering the year of accident and the socio-economic conditions prevailing over the period of accident, the notional income of the petitioner is to be fixed as Rs.11,000/- per month. In view of the nature of injuries sustained by the petitioner and treatment undergone, he would have taken complete rest for a

period of 6 months, and so a sum of Rs.66,000/- (Rs.11,000 x 6) is awarded towards loss of earnings of the petitioner for 6 months.

11. The petitioner was admitted in the hospital once and subsequent follow-up treatments. So a sum of Rs.3,500/- is awarded towards transportation expenses. The petitioner was admitted in the hospital for 1 day, and so a sum of Rs.500/- (Rs.500 x 1 day) each is awarded towards bystander expenses and extra nourishment. The petitioner is also entitled to a sum of Rs.1,000/- towards damage to clothing.

12. Considering the nature of injuries sustained by the petitioner and treatment undergone, a sum of Rs.80,000/- is awarded towards compensation for pain and suffering and Rs.70,000/- towards loss of amenities and enjoyment in life.

13. Ext.A7 is the disability certificate issued by Dr.Muhammed Ali, Orthopaedic Surgeon, as per which the permanent physical disability of the petitioner is assessed as 12%. Ext.A7 is marked subject to objection. It is seen issued by a doctor who has not treated the petitioner and it is issued in his private capacity. It is evident from Ext.A7 that the doctor had examined the petitioner clinically and radiologically and noted that the petitioner had fracture transverse processes of L1, L2, L3 right. He had pain back and stiffness. The learned counsel for R3 strongly objected the assessment of disability stating that the assessment is highly excessive. The signatory to the disability certificate was not examined to legally prove the disability certificate. Even then, considering the restriction of

movements, the permanent whole body disability of the petitioner is considered as 9%. Ext.A8 is the copy of Aadhar card which shows the year of birth of the petitioner as 1978, and as such the petitioner was 39 years old at the time of accident. Adopting '15' as the multiplier, the petitioner is entitled to a sum of Rs.1,78,200/- (Rs.11000 x 12 x 15 x 9%) towards 9% disability being suffered by him.

14. Considering the nature of injuries, treatment undergone, and other facts and circumstances of the case, I find that, the petitioner in OP(MV) 2059/2019 is entitled to get compensation as stated in the following table:

Sl. No.	Head of Claim Compensation for	Amount Claimed (in Rupees)	Amount Awarded	Basis – vital details in a nut shell
1	Loss of earnings	260000	66000	Rs. 11,000 x 6
2	Partial loss of earnings	25000	NIL	
3	Transport to Hospital	5000	3500	1 IP + reviews
4	Extra nourishment	15000	500	
5	Medical expenses	25000	2046	Actual medical bills
6	Pain & suffering	150000	80000	
7	Loss of amenities etc.	200000	70000	
8	Permanent disability	350000	178200	Rs.11000x12x15 x 9%
9	Attendance charge	15000	500	Rs.500 x 1 day
10	Damage to clothes etc	2500	1000	
11	Future treatment	20000	NIL	
	Total	11,17,500/- limited to 10,00,000/-	4,01,746/- =====	

15. Issue No.3:- Ext.A10 is the wound certificate issued from Lakshmi Hospital, Aluva which shows that the petitioner in OP(MV) 294/2020 had sustained injuries in RTA and she was brought to that hospital on 26.06.2017 with the following injuries:

- Pain right knee
- Abrasion over right knee

Ext.A10 further shows that the petitioner was treated as outpatient only. Ext.A11 is the discharge summary issued from District Hospital, Kattappana which shows that the petitioner was admitted there on 06.01.2021 with posterior horn of lateral meniscus tear, radial tear of anterior horn of medial meniscus right knee, peripheral tear of body of medial meniscus right knee. She was treated with arthroscopic meniscus balancing and joint lavage and knee brace applied and discharged from the hospital on 09.01.2021. Ext.A12 is the MRI scan report which shows the following impressions:-

- Mild narrowing of the medial tibio-femoral compartment joint space noted with diffuse thinning of the articular cartilage along the medial femoral condyle. Partial thickness cartilage loss is seen along the posteromedial aspect of the medial femoral articular surface (Grade II) – Features indicate mild medial compartment osteoarthritis
- Intrameniscal degenerative signals are seen in the posterior horn of the medial meniscus with major extrusion of the medial meniscus indenting the

medial collateral ligament. Partial thickness radial tear is seen in the posterior root ligament of the medial meniscus

- Mucoïd degeneration is seen in the mid and distal substance of the anterior cruciate ligament
- Anterior horn of the medial minscus and entire lateral meniscus, remaining ligaments cartilage, bones, muscles and tendons in the knee joint shows normal morphology and signal

Ext.A13 is the OP ticket issued from Retired Senior Orthopaedic Consultant, Kerala Health Services which shows that the petitioner was treated there on 08.03.2021, 3.04.2021, 24.04.2021 and 24.05.2021. Ext.A14 and A14(a) are medical bills for Rs.33,595/-, and that amount is awarded towards treatment expenses.

16. As per the petition, the petitioner aged 56 years old at the time of accident was a coolie, and her monthly income is shown as Rs.15,000/-. But no legally acceptable evidence is let in to prove the occupation and monthly income of the petitioner. So, relying on the decisions of the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Ramachandrappa v. Manager, Royal Sundaram Alliance Insurance Company Limited [(2011) 13 SCC 236]*** and ***Syed Sadiq v. Divisional Manager, United India Insurance Co. Ltd., [(2014) 2 SCC 735]*** and also the decisions of the ***Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in MACA No.3777/2019 and MACA No.3798/2019***, considering the

year of accident and the socio-economic conditions prevailing over the period of accident, the notional income of the petitioner is fixed as Rs.11,000/- per month. Considering the nature of injuries sustained by the petitioner and treatment undergone, she would have taken complete rest for a period of 3 months, and so a sum of Rs.33,000/- (Rs.11,000 x 3) is awarded towards loss of earnings of the petitioner for 3 months.

17. The petitioner was admitted in the hospital once and subsequent follow-up treatments. So a sum of Rs.5,000/- is awarded towards transportation expenses. The petitioner was admitted in the hospital for 3 days, and so a sum of Rs.1,500/- (Rs.500 x 3 days) each is awarded towards bystander expenses and extra nourishment. The petitioner is also entitled to a sum of Rs.1,500/- towards damage to clothing.

18. Considering the nature of injuries sustained by the petitioner and treatment undergone, a sum of Rs.50,000/- is awarded towards compensation for pain and suffering and Rs.40,000/- towards loss of amenities and enjoyment in life.

19. Considering the nature of injuries, treatment undergone, and other facts and circumstances of the case, I find that, the petitioner in OP(MV) 294/2020 is entitled to get compensation as stated in the following table:

Sl. No.	Head of Claim Compensation for	Amount Claimed (in Rupees)	Amount Awarded	Basis – vital details in a nut shell
1	Loss of earnings	50000	33000	Rs. 11,000 x 3 months
2	Partial loss of earnings	10000	NIL	
3	Transport to Hospital	1000	5000	1 IP + reviews

4	Extra nourishment	5000	1500	
5	Medical expenses	150000	33595	Actual medical bills
6	Pain & suffering	75000	50000	
7	Loss of amenities etc.	100000	40000	
8	Attendance charge	1000	1500	
9	Permanent disability	10000	NIL	
10	Damage to clothes etc	1500	1500	
11	Future medical expenses	10000	NIL	
	Total	3,73,500/- limited to 300,000/-	1,66,095/- =====	

20. Issue No.4:- Ext.A15 is the treatment summary issued from Rajagiri Hospital, Chunangamvely which shows that the petitioner in OP(MV) 1422/2021 had sustained injuries in RTA and he was brought to that hospital on 26.06.2017 with the following injuries:

- Lacerated wound over bridge of nose
- Abrasion over right side of face
- CT brain showed nasal bone cervical trauma fracture, right side displaced and left side undisplaced fracture

Ext.A16 is the OP ticket issued from ESI Hospital which shows that the petitioner had treated there on 07.07.2017. Ext.A17 is medical bills for Rs.6,509/-, and that amount is awarded towards treatment expenses.

21. As per the petition, the petitioner aged 30 years old at the time of accident was a salesman, and his monthly income is shown as Rs.10,000/-. But no legally acceptable evidence is let in to prove the occupation and monthly income of the

petitioner. So, relying on the decisions of the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Ramachandrappa v. Manager, Royal Sundaram Alliance Insurance Company Limited [(2011) 13 SCC 236]*** and ***Syed Sadiq v. Divisional Manager, United India Insurance Co. Ltd., [(2014) 2 SCC 735]*** and also the decisions of the ***Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in MACA No.3777/2019 and MACA No.3798/2019***, considering the year of accident and the socio-economic conditions prevailing over the period of accident, the notional income of the petitioner is fixed as Rs.11,000/- per month. Considering the nature of injuries sustained by the petitioner and treatment undergone, he would have taken complete rest for a period of 3 months, and so a sum of Rs.33,000/- (Rs.11,000 x 3) is awarded towards loss of earnings of the petitioner for 3 months.

22. The petitioner was admitted in the hospital once and subsequent follow-up treatments. So a sum of Rs.3,500/- is awarded towards transportation expenses. The petitioner was admitted in the hospital for 1 day, and so a sum of Rs.500/- (Rs.500 x 1 day) each is awarded towards bystander expenses and extra nourishment. The petitioner is also entitled to a sum of Rs.1,000/- towards damage to clothing.

23. Considering the nature of injuries sustained by the petitioner and treatment undergone, a sum of Rs.60,000/- is awarded towards compensation for pain and suffering and Rs.50,000/- towards loss of amenities and enjoyment in life.

24. Considering the nature of injuries, treatment undergone, and other facts and circumstances of the case, I find that, the petitioner in OP(MV) 1422/2021 is entitled to get compensation as stated in the following table:

Sl. No.	Head of Claim Compensation for	Amount Claimed (in Rupees)	Amount Awarded	Basis – vital details in a nut shell
1	Loss of earnings	50000	33000	Rs. 11,000 x 3 months
2	Partial loss of earnings	25000	NIL	
3	Transport to Hospital	5000	3500	1 IP + reviews
4	Extra nourishment	15000	500	
5	Medical expenses	25000	6509	Actual medical bills
6	Pain & suffering	75000	60000	
7	Loss of amenities etc.	50000	50000	
8	Attendance charge	15000	500	
9	Permanent disability	10000	NIL	
10	Damage to clothes etc	2500	1000	
11	Future medical expenses	20000	NIL	
	Total	2,92,500/- limited to 2,50,000/-	1,55,009/- =====	

25. Issue No.5: It has already been answered in Issue No.1 that the accident occurred due to the rash and negligent driving of R1. So R1 is primarily liable. R2 being the registered owner of the offending Bus is vicariously liable to compensate the petitioner. Admittedly, R3 is the insurer of the offending Bus. So being the insurer, R3 is liable to indemnify the owner/R2. Hence it is concluded that R1 to R3 are jointly and severally liable to compensate the petitioners.

26. It is submitted by the counsel for R3 that, the vehicle was not holding a valid permit at the time of accident, and a petition as I.A.2/2022 was filed in OP(MV)

1422/2021 for an order directing R2 to produce the permit of the vehicle before this Tribunal. Despite service of notice, the permit was not produced before this Tribunal, and therefore, the direction petition was closed holding that adverse inference can be drawn against R2, if so warranted. Hence, it is evident that the vehicle was not holding a valid permit at the time of accident. In the light of the above discussions, I hold that, there is violation of policy conditions, and R3 is entitled to recover the amount deposited, from R2/registered owner of the vehicle. This issue is answered accordingly.

27. Issue No.6: In the result, OP(MV) 2059/2019 is allowed in part, and an award is passed for an amount of Rs.4,01,746/- with interest @8% per annum from the date of petition till realisation, and the petitioner is entitled to get proportionate cost. R3 is directed to deposit the amount as aforesaid within one month from the date of this award as follows:

R3 is directed to make payment of Rs.9,373/- towards court fee, and Rs.10,000/- towards Legal Benefit Fund through e-payment facility to MACT, Perumbavoor

R3 shall pay the balance amount of the compensation with interest and costs to the petitioner by depositing by NEFT or RTGS or any other electronic mode to the credit of the Bank Account of the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Perumbavoor, details of which is furnished below:

Name	Name of Bank and Branch	Bank Account Number	Bank IFSC Code
Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal (MACT), Perumbavoor	State Bank of India, Perumbavoor	42795672395	SBIN0008661

The compensation amount due to the petitioner shall be disbursed by transferring directly to the petitioner's Bank Account by NEFT or RTGS or any other electronic mode. The third respondent shall submit a letter to this Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal enclosing a copy of the Bank Advice in prescribed format, as per which the deposit was made to the Bank Account of the Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal (MACT) Perumbavoor.

The Account details of the petitioner shall be appended with the original Award.

28. OP(MV) 294/2020 is allowed in part, and an award is passed for an amount of Rs.1,66,095/- with interest @8% per annum from the date of petition till realisation, to the petitioner, and the petitioner is entitled to get proportionate cost. R3 is directed to deposit the amount as aforesaid within one month from the date of this award as follows:

R3 is directed to make payment of Rs.2,373/- towards court fee, and Rs.3,000/- towards Legal Benefit Fund through e-payment facility to MACT, Perumbavoor

R3 shall pay the balance amount of the compensation with interest and costs to the petitioner by depositing by NEFT or RTGS or any other electronic

mode to the credit of the Bank Account of the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Perumbavoor, details of which is furnished below:

Name	Name of Bank and Branch	Bank Account Number	Bank IFSC Code
Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal (MACT), Perumbavoor	State Bank of India, Perumbavoor	42795672395	SBIN0008661

The compensation amount due to the petitioner shall be disbursed by transferring directly to the petitioner's Bank Account by NEFT or RTGS or any other electronic mode. The third respondent shall submit a letter to this Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal enclosing a copy of the Bank Advice in prescribed format, as per which the deposit was made to the Bank Account of the Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal (MACT) Perumbavoor.

The Account details of the petitioner shall be appended with the original Award.

29. OP(MV) 1422/2021 is allowed in part, and an award is passed for an amount of Rs.1,55,009/- with interest @8% per annum from the date of petition till realisation, to the petitioner, and the petitioner is entitled to get proportionate cost. R3 is directed to deposit the amount as aforesaid within one month from the date of this award as follows:

R3 is directed to make payment of Rs.1,873/- towards court fee, and Rs.2,500/- towards Legal Benefit Fund through e-payment facility to MACT, Perumbavoor

R3 shall pay the balance amount of the compensation with interest and costs to the petitioner by depositing by NEFT or RTGS or any other electronic

mode to the credit of the Bank Account of the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Perumbavoor, details of which is furnished below:

Name	Name of Bank and Branch	Bank Account Number	Bank IFSC Code
Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal (MACT), Perumbavoor	State Bank of India, Perumbavoor	42795672395	SBIN0008661

The compensation amount due to the petitioner shall be disbursed by transferring directly to the petitioner's Bank Account by NEFT or RTGS or any other electronic mode. The third respondent shall submit a letter to this Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal enclosing a copy of the Bank Advice in prescribed format, as per which the deposit was made to the Bank Account of the Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal (MACT) Perumbavoor.

The Account details of the petitioner shall be appended with the original Award.

Dictated to the Confidential Assistant, transcribed and typed by her, corrected by me and pronounced in open court on this the 11th day of June, 2024.

Sd/-

Smitha George
Judge

Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal.

APPENDIX

OP(MV) No. 2059/2019

Petitioners' Exhibits :-

- A1 - 26/06/2017 - Copy of FIR in Crime No. 2650/2017 of Aluva Police Station.
- A2 - 05/07/2017 - Copy of FIS in Crime No. 2650/2017 of Aluva Police Station.

- A3 - 27/06/2017 - Copy of scene mahazar in Crime No. 2650/2017 of Aluva Police Station.
- A4 - 29/06/2017 - Copy of AMVI report of vehicle No. KL-06-H-1204
- A5 - 02/08/2017 - Copy of charge sheet in Crime No. 2650/2017 of Aluva Police Station.
- A6 - 03/07/2017 - Certificate issued from St. Joseph's Hospital, Dharmagiri, Kothamangalam.
- A7 - 21/11/2022 - Disability Certificate
- A8 - - - Copy of aadhar card of the petitioner
- A9 - - - Medical Bills

OP(MV) No. 294/2020

- A10 - 26/06/2017 - Copy of wound certificate issued from Lakshmi Hospital, Aluva.
- A11 - 09/01/2021 - Discharge summary issued from District Hospital, Kattappana
- A12 - 23/02/2021 - MRI scan report
- A13 - - - OP Ticket
- A14 & - - - Medical Bills
A14(a)

OP(MV) No. 1422/2021

- A15 - - - Treatment summary issued from Rajagiri Hospital, Aluva.
- A16 - - - OP Ticket
- A17 - - - Medical Bills

Respondents' Exhibits :- Nil

Court Exhibits :- Nil

Witnesses for both sides :- Nil

Id/-
Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal.

MEMO OF COSTS

OP(MV) No. 2059/2019

Petitioner's side:

Court fee	:	₹	3390.00
Additional CF	:	₹	4017.00
Stamp for Vakkalath	:	₹	05.00
Stamp on documents	:	₹	30.00
Stamp on petitions	:	₹	35.00
Process Fee	:	₹	90.00
Senior Advocate Fee	:	₹	22487.00
Junior Advocate Fee	:	₹	11243.00
Writing Fee	:	₹	100.00

Total	:	₹	41397.00
			=====

Proportionate cost ₹ **41,397/-** allowed.

OP(MV) No. 294/2020

Petitioner's side:

Court fee	:	₹	1033.00
Additional CF	:	₹	1660.00
Stamp for Vakkalath	:	₹	05.00
Stamp on documents	:	₹	25.00
Stamp on petitions	:	₹	35.00
Process Fee	:	₹	90.00
Senior Advocate Fee	:	₹	10705.00
Junior Advocate Fee	:	₹	5352.00
Writing Fee	:	₹	100.00

Total	:	₹	19005.00
			=====

Proportionate cost ₹ **19,005/-** allowed.

OP(MV) No. 1422/2021

Petitioner's side:

Court fee	:	₹	923.00
Additional CF	:	₹	1550.00
Stamp for Vakkalath	:	₹	05.00
Stamp on documents	:	₹	25.00
Stamp on petitions	:	₹	30.00
Process Fee	:	₹	90.00
Senior Advocate Fee	:	₹	10150.00
Junior Advocate Fee	:	₹	5075.00
Writing Fee	:	₹	100.00

Total	:	₹	17948.00
			=====

Proportionate cost ₹ **17,948/-** allowed.

Sd/-
Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal
(By Order)
//True Copy//

Sheristadar

Jb
Compd by: sks

NB. The parties should apply as soon as possible for the return of all the documents which they may wish to preserve as the documents are liable to be destroyed after 12 years from this date.

Copy of COMMON AWARD

O.P.(MV)Nos. 2059/2019

294/2020 and 1422/2021

Dated: 11/06/2024