

IN THE MOTOR ACCIDENTS CLAIMS TRIBUNAL, PALA

Present:- Sri. Pradeep K.P, The MACT

Friday, the 27th day of March, 2026
6th day of Chaithra 1948.

OP(MV) NO.917/2020 & OP(MV)924/2020.

OP(MV) NO. 917/2020

Petitioner:-

Tome Thomas, S/o T.T. Thomas, Thekkel
House, Kummannoor P.O., Kidangoor,
Pin:686 572.

By Adv. E.V. Mathew & Adv. M.K. Gopalakrishnan Nair.

Respondents :-

1. Shiny Sebastian, Vattamala House,
Athirampuzha P.O, Pin-686 562.
2. IFCO TOKIO General Insurance Company Ltd.,
Vypana Building, Erattupetta Road, Pala.
Pin:686 575.

R1 - By Adv. Biby John
R2 - By Adv. Benoy Jose Mathew.

OP(MV) NO.924/2020

Petitioner:-

Rija Jose, W/o Tome Thomas, Thekkel House,
Kummannoor P.O., Kidangoor. Pin:686572.

By Adv. E.V. Mathew & Adv. M.K. Gopalakrishnan Nair.

Respondents :-

1. Shiny Sebastian, Vattamala House,
Athirampuzha P.O, Pin-686 562.
2. IFCO TOKIO General Insurance Company Ltd.,
Vypana Building, Erattupetta Road, Pala.
Pin:686 575.

R1 - By Adv. Biby John

R2 - By Adv. Benoy Jose Mathew.

These O.Ps. having been finally heard on 10.03.26 and the Tribunal on 27.03.26 passed the following :-

COMMON AWARD

1. Petitions filed under section 166 of the Motor Vehicles Act 1988.

OP(MV)917/2020

2. The averments in the petition are that, on 15.01.2020 at about 8.45 a.m, petitioner (Tome Thomas, S/o T.T. Thomas) was riding his scooter bearing Reg. No KL-35-F-4723 through Ettumanoor - Pala public road, with his wife petitioner in OP(MV) 924/2020 as pillion rider and when the scooter reached the place of occurrence, a car bearing Reg. No KL-05-AR-3313 driven by 1st respondent in a rash and negligent manner came and hit against the petitioner's scooter. As a result of which petitioner fell down on the road and sustained severe injuries. The accident occurred due to rash and negligent driving of car by 1st respondent.

3. Immediately after the accident the petitioner was taken to Matha Hospital, Thellakom and thereafter he was treated at LLM Hospital, Kidangoor and treated there as inpatient for 13 days. Respondents 1 and 2 are the owner-cum-driver and insurer of the car. The petitioner was 'Senior Manager, Milma Ltd' at the time of accident and he used to earn Rs.1,89,245/- per month as income. Therefore both the respondents are jointly and severally liable to pay compensation to the petitioner.

4. The 1st respondent filed written statement by contending that age occupation and income mentioned in the petition are not correct. Amount claimed by the petitioner is exorbitant. The lorry had been insured with 3rd respondent Company. There was no negligence on the part of 1st respondent. The accident occurred due to negligence on the part of the petitioner. The car bearing Reg. No KL-05-AR-3313 had been validly insured with 2nd respondent at the time of accident.
5. The 2nd respondent filed written statement by contending that the car bearing Reg. No KL-05-AR-3313 had been insured with 2nd respondent Company at the time of accident. The age, occupation and income of the petitioner mentioned in the petition are not correct. The amount claimed under various heads is exorbitant. The petition was filed in collusion between the petitioner and other respondents. Petitioner has not sustained any disability due to accident. The accident occurred due to negligence of the petitioner. Hence 2nd respondent is not liable to pay compensation to the petitioner.

OP(MV)924/2020

6. The averments in the petition are that, on 15.01.2020 at about 8.45 a.m, petitioner (Rija Jose, W/o Tome Thomas) was travelling as pillion rider with her husband the petitioner in OP(MV) 917/2020 on a scooter bearing Reg. No KL-35-F-4723 through Ettumanoor -Pala public road and when the scooter reached the place of occurrence, a car bearing Reg. No KL-05-AR-3313 driven by 1st respondent in a rash and negligent manner came and hit against the petitioner's scooter. As a result of which

petitioner fell down on the road and sustained severe injuries. The accident occurred due to rash and negligent driving of car by 1st respondent.

7. Immediately after the accident the petitioner was taken to Matha Hospital and thereafter he was treated at LLM Hospital, Kidangoor and treated there as inpatient for 13 days. Respondents 1 and 2 are the owner-cum-driver and insurer of the car. The petitioner was teacher (UP ST) in St. Aloysius Higher Secondary School Athirampuzha at the time of accident and he used to earn Rs.64,800/- per month as income. Therefore both the respondents are jointly and severally liable to pay compensation to the petitioner.
8. The 1st respondent filed written statement by contending that age occupation and income mentioned in the petition are not correct. Amount claimed by the petitioner is exorbitant. The lorry had been insured with 3rd respondent Company. There was no negligence on the part of 1st respondent. The accident occurred due to negligence on the part of rider of the scooter. The car bearing Reg. No KL-05-AR-3313 had been validly insured with 2nd respondent at the time of accident.
9. The 2nd respondent filed written statement by contending that the car bearing Reg. No KL-05-AR-3313 had been insured with 2nd respondent Company at the time of accident. The age, occupation and income of the petitioner mentioned in the petition are not correct. The amount claimed under various heads is exorbitant. The petition was filed in collusion between the petitioner and other respondents. Petitioner has not

sustained any disability due to accident. The accident occurred due to negligence of the rider of the scooter. Hence 2nd respondent is not liable to pay compensation to the petitioner.

10. In view of the above said pleadings, the following issues have been raised for consideration:-

- (1) Whether the accident was occurred due to the rash and negligent driving of car bearing Reg. No KL-05-AR-3313 by the 1st respondent?
- (2) Whether the petitioners are entitled to compensation and if so, what is the quantum?
- (3) Who is liable to pay compensation ?
- (4) Reliefs and costs ?

11. As per order in I.A. No.3/2024 in OP (MV)917/2020 both cases were jointly tried. No oral evidence is adduced on the side of the petitioners. Exts. A1 to A22 have been marked on the side of the petitioners. No oral evidence is adduced on the side of the 2nd respondent.

12. Heard both sides.

13. **Issue No.(1) in both OPs :-** The case of the petitioners is that, on 15.01.2020 at about 8.45 a.m, petitioners were travelling on a scooter bearing Reg. No KL-35-F-4723 through Ettumanoor -Pala public road and when the scooter reached the place of occurrence, a car bearing Reg. No KL-05-AR-3313 driven by 1st respondent in a rash and negligent manner came and hit against the petitioner's scooter. As a

result of which petitioner fell down on the road and sustained severe injuries. The accident occurred due to rash and negligent driving of car by 1st respondent.

14. To prove the negligence on the part of the 1st respondent, the petitioners have produced Exts A1, A2, A4 and A5. Ext.A1 is the FIR in Crime No.94/2020 of Ettumanoor Police Station. Ext A2 is the copy of FIS. Ext A4 is the copy of AMVI report. Ext A5 is the copy of charge sheet. The offences alleged against the driver of car bearing Reg. No KL-05-AR-3313, 1st respondent (accused in the final report) are punishable U/Ss 279, 337 and 338 of IPC. The Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in **'New India Assurance Company Ltd Vs. Pazhaniammal and Others', cited in 2011(3) KHC 595**, has held as follows: *"Prima facie, charge sheet filed by a police officer after due investigation can be accepted as evidence of negligence against the indictee. If any one of the parties do not accept such charge sheet, the burden must be on such party to adduce oral evidence. If oral evidence is adduced by any party, in a case where charge sheet is filed, the tribunals should give further opportunity to others also to adduce oral evidence and in such a case the charge sheet will pale into insignificance and the dispute will have to be decided on the basis of the evidence."* In the absence of contra evidence, the above said evidence adduced by the petitioners, it is seen that the alleged incident took place due to rash and negligent driving of car bearing Reg. No KL-05-AR-3313 by the 1st respondent. Accordingly Issue No.(1) is answered.

15. **Issue No. (2) in OP(MV)917/2020:-** Ext.A3 is the copy of wound certificate issued from Matha Hospital, Thellakom. Ext A6 is the copy of discharge summary issued from Matha Hospital, Thellakom. Ext A7 is the copy of discharge summary issued from Little Lourdes Mission Hospital, Kidangoor. Ext A8 series are the medical certificates issued from Matha Hospital, Thellakom and LLM Hospital, Kidangoor. The above medical record reveals that the petitioner had sustained tenderness @ chest anteriorly and posteriorly with air entry R/L, Displaced fracture of @ clavicle middle 1/3, comminuted fracture neck and body of scapulla @, fracture 2nd to 6th ribs @ with haemothorax and segments 2 to 5 ribs and lacerated injury @ knee and left elbow.
16. Exts A10 is the disability certificate of the petitioner issued by Dr. O.T. Jacob.
17. Exts A11 and A12 series are claim discharge vouchers issued from from Healthindia Insurance TPA Services Pvt Ltd. Ext A13 series are the medical bills produced by the petitioner.
18. Ext.A15 is the copy of PAN card of the petitioner. In which the date of birth of the petitioner has been shown as 19.05.1963 hence he was 57 years of age at the time of accident. Ext.A14 is the copy of the pass book of the petitioner.
19. The petitioner claims that he is Senior Manager in MILMA Ltd,. Ext A9 is the certificate showing service details and pay particulars from 15.01.2020 to 30.4.2020. It was objected by

2nd respondent. As per Ext.A9 petitioner is working as General Manager, Ernakulam Dairy, Tripunithura in the capacity of Unit Head and is drawing actual salary of Rs.2,07,695/-. He had availed leave from 15.1.2020 to 30.4.2020 ie, a total of 105 days loss of pay leave. Since the per day income of the petitioner is Rs.6,923/-(2,07,695/30). After deducting income tax his per day salary is fixed at Rs.3,892/-

20. In **George V. Krishna Venu [2020 (4) KLT 239]** Hon'ble High Court has held that leave is a legal entitlement of an employee, but not a prerogative. Earned leave is granted to an employee for planned long leaves for the purpose of travel, vacation, etc. Leaves under other heads are also granted for specific purposes. When an employee is forced to avail those leaves consequent to a road traffic accident, he is losing his prerogative to the extent the leave availed for treatment and recuperation. Compensation for loss of leave can be granted when an employee meets with accident and is forced to undergo medical treatment for long, then even if the employee has availed eligible leave for undergoing treatment, for the purpose of calculating loss of earnings in a claim under Section 166A of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, a Claims Tribunal has to compensate the employee for the loss of leave period by awarding appropriate amount. Due to the injury sustained the petitioner had availed 105 days loss of pay leaves. Therefore, I am inclined to award an amount of ₹4,08,660/- (3,892 x 105) under the head 'loss of earning' for the said period of 105 days.

21. Considering his visits to hospital in connection with treatment, an amount of ₹7,000/- is awarded as 'Transportation expense'.
22. I am also inclined to award an amount of Rs.2,000/- as 'Damages to clothing'.
23. Considering the injury sustained by the petitioner, I feel it just and proper to award an amount of ₹3,000/- as Extra Nourishment expense.
24. Since the petitioner sustained grievous injuries, he was admitted in the hospital for 13 days and therefore he could not have performed his day to day activities without the help of others. Therefore, I am inclined to grant ₹5,850/- (450 x 13) as 'Bystander Expense for 13 days.
25. Ext.A13 series is the medical bills. Petitioner claims that she had spent Rs.37,184/- as medical expenses. It was admitted by the 2nd respondent and hence it is granted as compensation for Rs.37,184/- medical expenses.
26. Taking into account of the injuries sustained by the petitioner, I am inclined to award an amount of ₹95,000/- under the head 'Pain and suffering'.
27. Considering the discomfort, unhappiness and inconvenience, the petitioner faced on account of the said injuries sustained in the accident, an amount of ₹65,000/- is also awarded as compensation for 'loss of amenities of life'.

28. Here in this case at the time of accident he was 57 years of age and he has one year service more till his retirement at the age of 58. After the retirement the split multiplier can be applied and therefore the multiplier applicable is 8 (9-1) after deducted 1 from the multiplier 9. Here in this case petitioner was a Government employee and therefore till his retirement at the age of 58 he will not lose any future earnings. At the time of accident petitioner was 57 years of age and the multiplier applicable is 8. But for one year after the retirement he could have earned some income by engaging in some other avocation which may be adversely affected by the disability. To give compensation for disability sustained due to the accident after retirement, notional income is to be considered. Considering the facts and circumstances of this case, I am of the view that notional income can be fixed as Rs.22,000/-.

29. Ext A10 is the disability certificate issued by Dr. O.T. Jacob. Consultant Orthopaedic. He has assessed 20% disability due to the injury sustained. It was objected by the 2nd respondent. The disability certificate issued by the doctor cannot be as such accepted, because it was issued by a single doctor. If the petitioner had sustained any severe injuries in the accident and due to that he had sustained disability definitely he should have taken steps to get the disability certificate from the medical board constituted by the Medical College Hospital. The board is a group doctors which will be constituted to assess the disability of the patient. The group of doctors will examine the patient and the injuries sustained and thereafter

they will together assess the disability which has been caused in the accident and since it is a collective decision from the medical board, it cannot be discarded. Here in this case Ext.A10 was not issued by the medical board and therefore, considering the injuries sustained, other facts and circumstances of this case, I am of the view that disability can be fixed as 9% and there was no much dispute with regard to the same from the side of the petitioner as well as the 2nd respondent. Hence 9% disability is granted.

30. I have already fixed the notional income of the petitioner as ₹22,000/- per month. Thus, the annual income of the petitioner comes to the tune of ₹2,64,000/- (22,000 x 12). The loss of earning due to said functional permanent disability would be 9% of ₹2,64,000/- which is ₹23,760/- per annum. Both parties admitted that petitioner was 57 years of age. Though the multiplier applicable is '9' the same is considered as '8' because his service left is one year. Therefore, the loss of future earnings on account of said permanent disability would be **₹1,90,080/-** (23760 x 8).

31. The petitioner is thus entitled to get a total compensation of **₹8,13,800/- (Rupees Eight Lakhs Thirteen Thousand and Eight Hundred Only)**, as shown in the table below:-

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>Head of claim</i>	<i>Amount claimed (in Rupees)</i>	<i>Amount awarded (in Rupees)</i>	<i>(in Paise)</i>	<i>Basis-Vital Details in a nut shell</i>
<u>Part-I</u>					

1	Loss of earning	4,95,273	4,08,660	-	3892 x 105
2	Loss of earnings(partial)	Nil	Nil	-	-
3	Transportation charges including Ambulance charges	7,000	7,000	-	Travel to and from the hospital
4	Extra Nourishment	5,000	3,000	-	
5	Damage to Clothing	3,000	2,000	-	-
6	Medical expenses	37,184	37,184	-	As per Ext A13 medical bills
7	By stander expenses	5,000	5,850		450 x 13
8	For future treatment	50,000	Nil		
Part-II					
9	Pain and suffering	1,00,000	95,000	-	Considering the injury sustained by the petitioner
10	Compensation for continuing or permanent disability	2,00,000	1,90,080	-	22000 x 12 x 8 x 9%
11	Compensation for amenities of life	50,000	65,000		
	Compensation for loss of earning power, and loss of income after retirement	12,00,000	Nil		
		₹21,52,457/- =====			
Total award amount			₹8,13,774/- =====		
Rounded off			₹8,13,800/- =====		
(Rupees Eight Lakhs Thirteen Thousand and Eight Hundred Only)					

Accordingly Issue No.(2) is answered.

32. **Issue No.(2) in OP(MV) 924/2020:-** Ext A16 is the copy of wound certificate issued from Matha Hospital, Thellakom. Ext

A17 discharge summary and Ext A18 is the copy of medical certificate issued from Matha Hospital. The above medical record reveals that the petitioner had sustained tenderness back of chest, bilateral contusion calcaneum, lacerated wound on ® heal and abrasion (L) ankle ® knee and ® hand.

33. Ext A19 is the leave and salary details issued from the Headmaster, St. Aloysius Higher Secondary School, Athirampuzha.

34. Ext A20 is the discharge voucher cum claim settlement letter from Health Insurance TPA of India Ltd.

35. Ext.A22 is the copy of PAN card of the petitioner. The date of birth of the petitioner is 20.5.1969. Hence, she was 51 years of age at the time of accident. Ext A21 is the copy of bank passbook of the petitioner.

36. The petitioner claims that she is a teacher(UPST) at St. Aloysius Higher Secondary School, Athirampuzha and she used to earn ₹64,860/- as income per month. As per Ext.A19, she had availed half pay leave from 15.01.2020 to 18.2.2020 and had a salary loss of Rs.37,035/-.

37. In **George V. Krishna Venu [2020 (4) KLT 239]** Hon'ble High Court has held that leave is a legal entitlement of an employee, but not a prerogative. Earned leave is granted to an employee for planned long leaves for the purpose of travel, vacation, etc. Leaves under other heads are also granted for specific purposes. When an employee is forced to avail those leaves consequent to a road traffic accident, he is losing his

prerogative to the extent the leave availed for treatment and recuperation. Compensation for loss of leave can be granted when an employee meets with accident and is forced to undergo medical treatment for long, then even if the employee has availed eligible leave for undergoing treatment, for the purpose of calculating loss of earnings in a claim under Section 166A of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, a Claims Tribunal has to compensate the employee for the loss of leave period by awarding appropriate amount. As per Ext.A19, she had a salary loss of Rs.37,035/-. Hence I am inclined to grant an amount of Rs.37,035/- under the head of loss of earnings. It was not disputed by R2.

38. Considering her frequent visits to hospital in connection with treatment, an amount of ₹4,000/- is awarded as 'Transportation expense'.
39. I am also inclined to award an amount of ₹2,000/ as 'Damages to clothing'.
40. Considering the injury sustained by the petitioner, I feel it just and proper to award an amount of ₹1,000/- as Extra Nourishment expense.
41. Since the petitioner sustained grievous injury she was admitted in the hospital for 2 days and therefore she could not have performed her day to day activities without the help of others. Therefore, I am inclined to grant ₹900/- (450 x 2) as 'Bystander Expense for 2 days.

42. Ext.A20 series is insurance claim voucher shows that Rs.1050/- was disallowed by the insurance company. Hence it is granted as compensation for Rs.1050/- medical expenses.
43. Taking into account of the injuries sustained by the petitioner, I am inclined to award an amount of ₹20,000/- under the head 'Pain and suffering'.
44. Considering the discomfort, unhappiness and inconvenience, the petitioner faced on account of the said injuries sustained in the accident, an amount of ₹10,000/- is also awarded as compensation for 'loss of amenities of life'.
45. The petitioner is thus entitled to get a total compensation of **₹ 76,000/-(Rupees Seventy-six Thousand Only)** , as shown in the table below:-

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>Head of claim</i>	<i>Amount claimed (in Rupees)</i>	<i>Amount awarded (in Rupees)</i>	<i>(in Pa is e)</i>	<i>Basis-Vital Details in a nut shell</i>
<u>Part-I</u>					
1	Loss of earning	37,035	37,035		As per Ext A19
2	Loss of earnings(partial)	Nil	Nil	-	-
3	Transportation charges including Ambulance charges	4,000	4,000	-	Travel to and from the hospital
4	Extra Nourishment	1,000	1,000	-	Considering the injury sustained by the petitioner
5	Damage to Clothing	2,000	2,000	-	-
6	Medical expenses	1,000	1,050	-	Ext.A12 series medical bills
7	By stander expenses	1,000	900		(450 x 2)

<u>Part-II</u>					
8	Pain and suffering	50,000	20,000	-	Considering the injury sustained by the petitioner
9	Compensation for continuing or permanent disability	50,000	Nil	-	
10	Compensation for disfigurement, Loss of amenities of life and loss of earning power etc	50,000	10,000	-	Considering the injury sustained by the petitioner
		₹1,96,035/- =====			
Total award amount			₹75,985/- =====		
Rounded off			₹76,000/- =====		
(Rupees Seventy-six Thousand Only)					

46. Accordingly Issue No.(2) in both OPs are answered.

47. **Issue No.(3) in both OPs:-** I have already found that the accident took place due to the negligent driving of the car bearing Reg. No KL-05-AR-3313 by the 1st respondent who is owner-cum-driver of the car and hence he is vicariously liable to pay compensation to the petitioners. It is admitted by the 2nd respondent that the said car bearing Reg' No KL-05-AR-3313 had been insured with 2nd respondent at the time of accident. Therefore, the respondents 1 and 2 are liable to pay compensation. Since there was valid insurance policy, the 2nd respondent Company has to indemnify the 1st respondent and therefore, the company is liable to pay the compensation to the petitioner. Accordingly Issue No.(3) is answered.

48. **Issue No.(4)in both OPs:-** In view of my findings on Issue Nos.(1), (2) and (3), the petition is allowed and an award is passed as follows:-

OP(MV)917/2020

- (1) The 2nd respondent shall pay an amount of **₹8,13,800/- (Rupees Eight Lakhs Thirteen Thousand and Eight Hundred Only)** to the petitioner together with interest at the rate of 9% per annum from the date of petition [14.07.2020) till realization, with proportionate costs.
- (2) The 2nd respondent is directed to deposit the award amount together with interest and costs to the account of the petitioner ie, the Savings Bank Account of the petitioner, Account Number 912010067326131 of Axis Bank, Kottayam Branch with IFSC: UTIB000005 as per the details produced by the petitioner and compliance of the same shall be reported to the MACT, Pala.
- (3) The 2nd respondent shall produce cheques for ₹20,898/- and ₹21,525/- respectively as court fee and additional court fee towards legal benefit fund in the name of MACT, Pala, payable in the case.
- (4) The 2nd respondent is directed to file before the Tribunal a statement regarding compliance of the order along with a copy of transaction record certified by the bank concerned.
- (5) The office is directed to furnish a copy of said statement to the petitioner after due verification.
- (6) The office is directed to make necessary entries in the registers maintained in the office evidencing payment of amount to the claimant.

- (7) The 2nd respondent is directed to pay the amount within one month failing which the petitioner can recover the same in accordance with law.

OP(MV) 924/2020

- (1) The 2nd respondent shall pay an amount of **Rs. ₹76,000/- (Rupees Seventy-six Thousand Only)** , to the petitioner together with interest at the rate of 9% per annum from the date of petition [15.07.2020] till realization, with proportionate costs.
- (2) The 2nd respondent is directed to deposit the award amount together with interest and costs to the account of the petitioner ie, the Savings Bank Account of the petitioner, Account Number 20083952103 of State Bank of India, Ayarkunnam Branch with IFSC: SBIN0012882 as per the details produced by the petitioner and compliance of the same shall be reported to the MACT, Pala.
- (3) The 2nd respondent shall produce cheques for ₹1,334/- and ₹1,960/- respectively as court fee and additional court fee towards legal benefit fund in the name of MACT, Pala, payable in the case.
- (4) The 2nd respondent is directed to file before the Tribunal a statement regarding compliance of the order along with a copy of transaction record certified by the bank concerned.
- (5) The office is directed to furnish a copy of said statement to the petitioner after due verification.

- (6) The office is directed to make necessary entries in the registers maintained in the office evidencing payment of amount to the claimant.
- (7) The 2nd respondent is directed to pay the amount within one month failing which the petitioner can recover the same in accordance with law.

Dictated to the Confidential Assistant, transcribed and typed by her, corrected by me and pronounced in the open court on this the 27th day of March 2026.

Sd/-
K.P.PRADEEP
MOTOR ACCIDENTS CLAIMS TRIBUNAL.

APPENDIX

EXHIBITS MARKED FOR THE PETITIONER:-

- | | | |
|----|------------|---|
| A1 | 15.01.2020 | : The Copy of the FIR in Crime No.94/2020 of Ettumanoor Police Station |
| A2 | 15.01.2020 | : The copy of F I S given by Rija Jose. |
| A3 | 15.01.2020 | : The Copy of Accident Register cum-wound certificate issued from Matha Hospital Thellakom. |
| A4 | 21.01.2020 | : The copy of AMVI report of the car bearing Reg. No. KL-05 AR-3313. |
| A5 | 01.02.2020 | : The copy of Final Report. |
| A6 | 23.01.2020 | : Photo copy of discharge summary of Tome Thomas issued from Matha Hospital, Thellakom. |
| A7 | 15.02.2020 | : Photo copy of discharge summary of Tome Thomas issued from LLM Hospital, Kidangoor. |

- A8(series) - : Medical certificate of Tome Thomas issued from Matha Hospital Thellakom & LLM Hospital Kidangoor.
- A9 11.10.2021 : Revised certificate in the name of Tome Thomas issued from Ernakulam Regional Co. OP Milk producer's Union Ltd No. E-150 (D)E.
- A10 24.02.2024 : Disability certificate of Tome Thomas issued by Dr. O.T Jacob, Chief Consultant in Orthopaedics (Rtd), Kerala Health Service.
- A11 11.03.2020 : Photo copy of the discharge Voucher cum Claim settlement Letter in the name of Tome Thomas issued from Matha Hospital, Thellakom.
- A12 18.05.2020 : Photo copy of Claim discharge Voucher in the name of Tome Thomas issued from LLM Hospital, Kidangoor.
- A13 (series) : Medical Bills of Tome Thomas for Rs. 3,548/- (5 pages)
- A14 26.12.2022 : True copy of the Bank pass book of Tome Thomas issued from Axis Bank Ltd, Kottayam.
- A15 : Photo copy of the pan card of Tome Thomas.
- A16 15.01.2020 : The copy of Accident Register Cum-wound certificate issued from Matha Hospital, Thellakom.
- A17 16.01.2020 : Photo copy of the discharge summary of Rija Jose issued from Matha Hospital, Thellakom.
- A18 23.01.2020 : Medical certificate in the name of Rija Jose issued from Matha Hospital, Thellakom.
- A19 07.07.2020 : Leave salary certificate in the name of Rija Jose issued from St. Aloysius Higher Secondary School, Athirampuzha.

OP(MV) NO. 924/20
STATEMENT OF COSTS

Court Fee paid	:	753.00
Vakkalath		5.00
Process	:	60.00
Stamp for exhibits	:	38.00
Stamp for petitions	:	25.00
Senior Advocate fee	:	6200.00
Others		300.00
L.B.F	:	760.00
Total	:	Rs.8141.00/-

$$\text{Proportionate Costs} = \frac{8,141 \times 76,000}{1,96,035} = \text{₹}3156\text{- (Allowed)}$$

=====

// True Copy//

Typed by : Jobi
Compared By : Sreeja

Sd/-
K.P. Pradeep
Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal

"The parties should apply as soon as possible for the return of all documents which they may wish to preserve; as the record will be liable to be destroyed after twelve years from this date".

**COPY OF AWARD IN
OP (M.V) No.917/2020 &
924/2020
DATED 27.03.2026**