

**IN THE COURT OF THE MOTOR ACCIDENTS CLAIMS TRIBUNAL,
IRINJALAKUDA**

Present:- Sri.Vinod Kumar N., Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal
Tuesday, 31st March 2026 / 10th Chhaitra, 1948

OP(MV) 1396/2021

PETITIONERS:

1. Maphitha.M.J., aged 37 years, W/o. Late Assain,
Chelekodan House, Near Old Post Office,
Vellikulangara Desom, Village & P.O., Thrissur District,
Pin 680 699.
2. Anshahad.C.A., aged 19 years, S/o. Late Assain,
Chelekodan House, Near Old Post Office,
Vellikulangara Desom, Village & P.O., Thrissur District,
Pin 680 699.
3. Minor Asna.C.A., aged 16 years, (DOB: 30/09/2005),
D/o. Late Assain, Chelekodan House,
Vellikulangara Desom, Village & P.O., Thrissur District,
Pin 680 699.
Minor petitioner is represented by next friend and
natural guardian by mother, Maphitha.M.J.,
aged 37 years, W/o. Late Assain, Chelekodan House,
Near Old Post Office, Vellikulangara Desom, Village & P.O.,
Thrissur District, Pin 680 699.

(Majority is recorded as per order in IA.5/2025 dated
12/11/2025)
4. Minor Mohammed Hashim.C.A., aged 12 years,
DOB: 25/11/2008, S/o. Late Assain, Chelekodan House,
Vellikulangara Desom, Village & P.O., Thrissur District,
Pin 680 699.
Minor petitioner is represented by next friend and
natural guardian by mother, Maphitha.M.J.,
aged 37 years, W/o. Late Assain, Chelekodan House,
Near Old Post Office, Vellikulangara Desom, Village & P.O.,
Thrissur District, Pin 680 699.
5. Aleema Kunjalan, aged 81 years, W/o. Kunjalan &
M/o. Late Assain, Chelekodan House,
Vellikulangara Desom, Village & P.O.,
Thrissur District, Pin 680 699. **(Died)**
- Addl. C.K.Salam, aged 65 years, S/o. Kunjalan,
6 Chelekodan House, Vellikulangara Desom, Village & P.O.,
Thrissur District, Pin 680 699.

- Addl. Suhara, aged 62 years, D/o. Muhammedali,
7 Thottiyil House, Near Pradap Regency, Kodaly Desom,
Mattathur Village & P.O., Thrissur District, Pin 680 699.
- Addl. Naseema.C.K., aged 51 years, Kumbalaparambil House,
8 Pound, Velooppadam Desom, Varandarappilly Village &
P.O., Thrissur District, Pin 680 303.
- Addl. Sudheer.C.K., aged 51 years, S/o. Kunjalan,
9 Chelekodan House, Near Police Station,
Vellikulangara Desom, Village & P.O., Thrissur District,
Pin 680 699.
- Addl. Hussain, aged 47 years, S/o. Kunjalan, Chelekodan House,
10 Vellikulangara Desom, Village & P.O., Thrissur District,
Pin 680 699.

(Addl. Respondent Nos.6 to 10 are impleaded as per order
in IA.3/2025 dated 12/11/2025)

By Advs. S.Bose Kumar & Sumathy.K.

RESPONDENTS:

1. Pristo Francis, S/o. Francis, Manjaly House,
Vellikulangara Desom, Village & P.O., Thrissur District,
Pin 680 699.
(Regd.Owner of KL-13-Y-6888 LMV Goods Carriage)
 2. Lijesh Thambi, S/o. Thambi, Kadukappilly House,
Nambiyar Padam Desom, Vellikulangara Village & P.O.,
Thrissur District, Pin 680 699.
(Driver of KL-13-Y-6888 LMV Goods Carriage)
 3. The Manager, United India Insurance Co.Ltd.,
Branch Office, No.557, AJ-AN, II Floor, (B block),
Jayamohan Shopping Centre, Amballur, Thrissur,
Pin 680 302.
(Insurer of KL-13-Y-6888 LMV Goods Carriage)
- R1 & R2: Exparte.
R3: By Adv. L.J.Tony

This petition having come up before me for final hearing on 26/03/2026
and having stood over to this day for consideration this Tribunal passed
the following:-

AWARD

The above application is filed U/s 166(1)(c) of The Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 claiming compensation by the petitioners on account of the death of Mr. Assain in a motor vehicle accident.

2. According to the petitioners, on 11/07/2021 at about 06.45 am, when Mr. Assain was riding a motorcycle No. KL-45-G-6553, an LMV goods carriage No. KL-13-Y-6888 driven by the respondent No.2 came in a rash and negligent manner and hit the motorcycle and as a result of which Mr. Assain succumbed to injuries on 05/09/2021. The respondent Nos.1 to 3 being the owner, driver and the insurer respectively of the LMV goods carriage No. KL-13-Y-6888 are jointly and severally liable to pay the compensation of ₹75,00,000/-. During the pendency of the proceedings, petitioner No.5 died and additional petitioner Nos.6 to 10 being the legal representatives of the deceased petitioner No.5 were impleaded as per order in I.A.03/2025.

3. Notice was issued to the respondents. The respondent Nos.1 and 2 remained absent and they were set exparte. Respondent No.3 entered appearance and filed written statement admitting the policy coverage of the LMV goods carriage No. KL-13-Y-6888 involved in the accident. It is further contented that the compensation claimed is highly excessive. The respondent No.3 disputed the age, occupation and income etc of the deceased as stated in the petition and that the petitioners are not entitled to get compensation as claimed in the petition. It is further contented that the LMV goods carriage had no valid fitness certificate at the time of accident.

4. On the basis of the above pleadings, the following issues were framed for consideration.

(1) Whether the accident was caused due to the rash and negligent driving of respondent No.2 ?

(2) Whether Mr. Assain succumbed to the injuries in the accident and the petitioners are entitled to get the compensation and if so what is the quantum of compensation ?

(3) Who is liable to pay compensation to the petitioners?

(4) Relief and cost?

5. In order to prove the case of the petitioners, Exts.A1 to A25 documents were marked. No oral evidence was adduced by the petitioners. Ext.B1 was marked on the side of the respondent No.3.

6. Heard both sides.

7. **Issue No.1** : - To prove the rashness and negligence of the respondent No.2, the petitioners relied on Ext.A2 final report which would show that the accident took place due to the rash and negligent driving of the respondent No.2 and he committed the offences punishable u/s.279 and 304 of IPC. In *New India Assurance Company Limited Vs Pazhaniammal and Other (2011(3) KHC 595)*, the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala held that, *the final report submitted by the police can be considered as a prima facie case of negligence in a claim for compensation under the Motor Vehicles Act*. Considering the evidence available before the Tribunal, I find that the accident took place due to the rash and negligent driving of the respondent No.2. Issue No.1 is found in favour of petitioners.

8. **Issue No.2**:- Ext.A11, the copy of postmortem certificate would show that the alleged cause of death of Mr. Assain was due to multi organ failure as a sequelae of cervical spine injury and quadriplegia. According to the petitioners, they are the legal representatives of the deceased. Ext.A13 the family membership certificate would show that petitioner No.1 is the wife, petitioner No.2 to 4 are the children and petitioner No.5 is the mother of the deceased Mr. Assain. During the pendency of the proceedings, the petitioner No.5/mother died. Ext.A22 is the copy of death certificate of deceased

petitioner No.5. Ext.A23 copy of family membership certificate would show that petitioner Nos.6 to 10 are children of the deceased petitioner No.5. In the above circumstances, I hold that the petitioners are entitled to get just and reasonable compensation. Now the question to be decided is the quantum of compensation to be awarded to the petitioners.

9. The petitioners claimed ₹1,00,000/- towards transportation charges. Transportation charges would have been incurred when the deceased was taken to hospital and also when his body was brought back home. Considering these aspects, I am inclined to allow ₹15,000/- as compensation for transportation to hospital.

10. The petitioners claimed ₹10,000/- towards damage to clothing and articles and ₹20,00,000/- towards medical expenses. Exts.A7 and A8 discharge summaries would show that deceased was treated as an inpatient from 11/07/2021 to 12/08/2021 and from 23/08/2021 to 30/08/2021 in Jubilee Mission Medical College Hospital, Thrissur. Ext.A14 series medical bills for ₹3,46,573/- are produced. But, Serial Nos.7, 64, 87, 96, 113 and 133, for a total amount of ₹1,800/- were not issued to the deceased Assain. So, excluding ₹1,800/-, I am inclined to allow ₹3,44,773/- towards medical expense. Considering the nature of injuries and the period of treatment, I am inclined to allow ₹1,000/- under the head damage to clothing and articles, ₹24,600/- under the head by-stander's expenses and ₹28,700/- under the head extra nourishment.

11. The petitioners claimed ₹3,00,000/- under the head pain and suffering, ₹2,00,000/- under the head compensation for shock and anxiety and ₹3,00,000/- under the head compensation for loss of expectation of life. By virtue of Section 2 of *the Kerala Torts (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1977*, the cause of action on account of the personal claim would survive to the legal heirs. In ***Ali (Late) v.***

Sumesh (2010 (3) KLT 70), the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala held that Section 2 of the above Act is incorporated to undo the restriction introduced by S. 306 of the Indian Succession Act. Further, in the decision reported in **Anuradha Varma v. State of Kerala (1993 KHC 419)**, The Hon'ble High Court of Kerala held that *legal representatives are entitled to initiate action for such damages or to proceed with the claim already made by the injured and that they are entitled to claim compensation under the head 'pain and suffering' of the deceased apart from other amounts payable to the injured as his legal heirs. In **Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd. and Ors. vs. Vijayamma and Ors. (23.12.2021 - KERHC) : MANU/ KE/ 3398/2021** the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala held that, "in *Satinder Kaur*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that in death cases, compensation can be awarded under the heads loss of estate, loss of consortium and funeral expenses alone. It was held that no amount is to be awarded under the head of pain, suffering or hardship caused to the legal heirs of the deceased. However, there is no detailed enquiry in the judgment as to whether the pain and sufferings of the deceased from the time of the accident till the time of his death is to be compensated as an addition to his estate. Since the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Satinder Kaur* (supra) did not specifically state that no amount should be paid for pain and suffering of the deceased, I am of the opinion that going by the decisions referred above, there is justification for the claim made by the claimants". As per the legal principles settled in **Jyni and others Vs. Raphel P.T and others reported in 2016 (2) KHC 870**, the **Hon'ble High Court of Kerala** held that "in cases of instantaneous death as well as cases where the deceased was unconscious between the time of accident and the time of his death, some notional amount is payable under the head pain and suffering. A slightly higher amount can be awarded under this head, if the death is not instantaneous. Therefore, a conventional amount in the range of ₹5,000/- to ₹15,000/- could be awarded under the head pain and suffering in such*

cases". Considering all these aspects, I am inclined to award ₹15,000/- towards compensation for pain and suffering.

12. The petitioners claimed ₹50,00,000/- under the head compensation for loss of dependency. According to the petitioners, the deceased was a head load worker and coolie and was earning ₹50,000/- per month and Ext.A15 certificate issued by the workers union is produced to show that the deceased was a headload worker. But the petitioners have not produced any document to show that the deceased was a worker under any particular sector to claim the minimum wages applicable to that particular sector, as notional income. However considering the fact that accident took place in the year 2021 and going by the law laid down in *Ramachandrappa vs. Manager, Royal Sundaram Alliance Insurance Company Ltd. (2011) 13 SCC 236*], and in *Soman v. Jinesh James and Others 2020 (4) KHC 623*, the notional monthly income of the deceased is fixed at ₹13,000/-.

13. Ext.A16, copy of driving licence would show that the date of birth of the deceased is 15/04/1978. The date of accident is 11/07/2021. Mr. Assain died on 05/09/2021. Hence relying on Ext.A16, the age of the deceased is taken as 43 years at the time of death. For the age group between 40 to 50, 25% enhancement is to be added to the monthly income for future prospects as per the dictum in ***National Insurance Company Limited Vs. Pranay Sethi and others reported in AIR 2017 SC 5157***. Accordingly the annual income of the deceased is arrived at as ₹1,95,000/- ie. $[(13,000 + 25\% \text{ of } 13,000) \times 12]$.

14. According to the petitioners, the deceased was the sole earning member of the petitioner's family. According to the petitioners, they were depending on the income of the deceased. Ext.A13 the family membership certificate would show that petitioner No.1 is the wife, petitioner No.2 to 4 are the children and petitioner No.5 is the mother of the deceased Mr. Assain. The petitioners can primarily be

treated as dependents.. In **United India Insurance Company Limited v. Shalumol and others (2021 (5) KHC 28)**, wherein the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala held that *'even if dependency is a relevant criterion to claim compensation for loss of dependency, it does not mean financial dependency is 'the ark of covenant'. Dependency includes gratuitous service dependency, physical dependency, emotional dependency, psychological dependency, and so on and so forth which can never be equated in terms of money. In Vasu and Ors. vs. United India Insurance Company Limited (MANU/KE/2354/2021.)*. The Hon'ble High Court of Kerala held that *the dependency need not necessarily a mere financial dependency. It can also be an emotional dependency, dependency of personal care and attention, love etc. While considering an application under section 166 for death of a person, the attempt of the court is to make good the loss suffered by them on all grounds on account of the death of the victim, to the extent possible in terms of monetary compensation. In that view of the matter, all the appellants have to be treated as dependents for the purpose of computing the compensation for loss of dependency.* In this case the dependents are five in numbers and hence 1/4th of the income has to be deducted towards his personal/living expenses. Thus the income which the deceased would have spent for his dependents annually would be ₹1,46,250/-.

15. For the age group between 41 and 45, the applicable multiplier is '14' as per the dictum in **Sarla Verma and Others Vs Delhi Transport Corporation and another reported in AIR 2009 SC 3104**. Thus the compensation for loss of dependency is arrived at as ₹20,47,500/- ie. (annual income x multiplier).

16. The petitioners claimed an amount of ₹1,00,000/- towards funeral expense, ₹1,00,000/- towards loss of estate and ₹10,00,000/- towards compensation for loss of consortium. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **National Insurance Co. Ltd. Vs. Pranay**

Sethi and others has set out various amounts to be awarded as compensation under the conventional heads viz., loss to estate, loss of consortium and funeral expense in case of death. In **Magma General Insurance Company limited Vs. Nanu Ram and others reported in 2018 ACJ 2782**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that "*in legal parlance consortium is a compendious term which encompasses spousal consortium, parental consortium and filial consortium. It is further held that the amount of compensation to be awarded as consortium will be governed by the principles of awarding compensation under the loss of consortium as laid down in Pranay Sethi case.*" The Apex Court in *Pranay Sethi* while fixing reasonable figures on conventional heads namely loss of estate, loss of consortium and funeral expenses had also directed that the figures fixed should be enhanced at the rate of 10% in every three years. The judgment in *Pranay Sethi* having been rendered by the Apex Court in the year 2017 and the current year being 2026, the compensation payable to the claimants under the conventional heads would be as follows: ₹18,150/- towards loss of estate and ₹18,150/- towards funeral expenses and ₹2,42,000/- towards consortium to the petitioner Nos.1 to 5.

17. The petitioners claimed ₹10,00,000/- towards compensation under the head love and affection. In **United India Insurance Company Ltd Vs Satinder Kaur alias Satvinder Kaur and others(AIR 2020 SC 3076)** the Hon'ble Apex Court approved the interpretation given to the expression consortium to include spousal consortium, parental consortium as well as filial consortium. It is further laid down that loss of love and affection is comprehended in loss of consortium and hence there is no justification to award compensation towards loss of love and affection as a separate head.

18. The compensation claimed by the petitioners and the compensation payable to the petitioners under different heads are summarized in the table below.

Sl. No.	Head of claim	Amount claimed	Amount awarded	Basis
Part. I				
a	Transport to hospital and back to home	1,00,000	15,000	
b	Damages to clothing and other articles	10,000	1,000	
c	By - stander's expenses	24,600	
d	Extra Nourishment	28,700	
e	Compensation for the treatment and medical expenses	20,00,000	3,44,773	Ext.A14 series
f	Funeral expenses	1,00,000	18,150	
Part. II				
g	Compensation for pain and suffering	3,00,000	15,000	
h	Loss of estate	1,00,000	18,150	
i	Compensation for loss of consortium	10,00,000	2,42,000	Pranay Sethi's case Magma General insurance case
j	Compensation for loss of love and affection	10,00,000	Nil	
k	Compensation for the loss of dependency	50,00,000	20,47,500	
l	Compensation for shock and anxiety	2,00,000	Nil	

m	Compensation for loss of expectation of life	3,00,000	Nil	
	Total	₹1,01,10,000/- claim is limited to ₹75,00,000/-	₹27,54,873/- rounded of to ₹27,54,900/-	

19. Therefore I find it just and reasonable to award ₹27,54,900/- as compensation. Issue No.2 is answered in favour of the petitioners in respect of the compensation awarded as referred to above.

20. **Issue No.3:-** According to the petitioners, all the respondents are jointly and severally liable to pay the compensation. Ext.A4 copy of AMVI report would show that the respondent No.1 is the registered owner of the LMV goods carriage No. KL-13-Y-6888. The respondent No.3 entered appearance and filed written statement admitting that the LMV goods carriage No. KL-13-Y-6888 was insured during the period of accident. Ext.B1 the copy of policy would show that respondent No.1 is the insured at the time of accident. But respondent No.3 contended that the vehicle had no valid fitness certificate at the relevant time of accident. The burden is on the insurer to prove the violation of the policy conditions. Respondent No.3 filed an application in IA 2/2023 to direct the respondent No.1 to produce fitness certificate of the vehicle and this Tribunal directed the respondent No.1 to produce the fitness certificate of the vehicle, but he did not comply with the direction to produce the fitness certificate of the vehicle. So, the contention of the respondent No.3 that the vehicle had no fitness certificate at the time of accident stands un-controverted. So, there is merit in the contention raised by respondent No.3 regarding the violation of policy conditions. It is already found that the accident took place due to the rash and negligent driving of respondent No.2. Hence respondent Nos.1 and 2 being the owner and driver of the LMV goods carriage No. KL-13-Y-6888 are jointly and severally liable to pay compensation to the

petitioners. The respondent No.3 being the insurer is liable to indemnify the insured and pay compensation to the petitioners and the respondent No.3/insurer can recover the amount awarded from the respondent No.1/owner after discharging liability to the claim petitioners. The issue No.3 is answered accordingly.

21. **Issue No.4** :- In view of the findings on issue Nos.1 to 3, I hold that petitioners are entitled to get the compensation of ₹27,54,900/- with interest at the rate of 7.5% per annum from the date of filing of the petition ie. 15/11/2021 till the realization with proportionate cost and that the respondent No.3 being the insurer shall pay the amount within thirty days from the date of this award. The petitioner No.1 is entitled to get 65%, petitioner Nos.2 to 4 are entitled to get 10% each and additional petitioner Nos.6 to 10, being the legal heirs of the deceased petitioner No.5 together are entitled to get 5% in equal proportion of the compensation amount. Petitioner No.3 became major and the majority was recorded as per order in I.A.5/2025. Issue No. 4 is answered accordingly.

In the result, the petition is allowed in part as follows :

1. Respondent No.3 shall pay an amount of ₹27,54,900/- (Rupees twenty seven lakh fifty four thousand and nine hundred only) with interest @ 7.5% per annum from the date of filing of petition i.e 15/11/2021 till realization with proportionate cost. The petitioner No.1 is entitled to get 65%, petitioner Nos.2 to 4 are entitled to get 10% each and additional petitioner Nos.6 to 10, being the legal heirs of the deceased petitioner No.5 together are entitled to get 5% in equal proportion of the compensation amount.
2. Respondent No.3 shall produce a cheque for 74,368/- (Rupees seventy four thousand three hundred and sixty eight only) being the court fee payable by the petitioners in favour of Motor

Accidents Claims Tribunal, Irinjalakuda.

3. On making such deposit of the award amount, the office of this Tribunal shall take steps to credit the amount due to the petitioner Nos.1 to 3 and 6 to 10 in the bank account of the petitioner Nos.1 to 3 and 6 to 10, the details of which is specifically mentioned below through NEFT or RTGS or any other electronic mode.

Sl. No.	Name	Bank Account Number	Name of Bank and Branch	IFS Code
1	Maphitha M.J	53250003156405	ESAF Small Finance Bank, Irinjalakuda	ESMF0001122
2	Anshahad C.A	5655120000213	Canara Bank, Vellikulangara	CNRB0005655
3	Asna C.A	5655120000093	Canara Bank, Vellikulangara	CNRB0005655
4	C.K. Salam	5655101001086	Canara Bank, Vellikulangara	CNRB0005655
5	Suhara	110244980368	Canara Bank, Vellikulangara	CNRB0005655
6	Naseema C.K	006403600010552	Dhanlaxmi Bank, Varandarappilly	DLXB0000064
7	Sudheer C.K	5655101001491	Canara Bank, Vellikulangara	CNRB0005655
8	Hussain	5655108000049	Canara Bank, Vellikulangara	CNRB0005655

4. Respondent No.3 is directed to deposit the amount with interest and proportionate cost due to the minor petitioner No.4 as fixed deposit in a nationalized bank payable to the minor on attaining majority and the fixed deposit shall have a lien marked on the face of receipt and the amount shall be credited in the bank account of petitioner No.4, the details of which is specifically mentioned below through NEFT or RTGS or any other electronic mode only on the petitioner No.4 attained majority or

on the orders of the Tribunal.

1	Mohammed Hashim C.A	110079782463	Canara Bank, Vellikulangara	CNRB000 5655
---	---------------------	--------------	-----------------------------	--------------

5. After depositing the amount as aforesaid, the respondent No.3/insurer can recover the amount awarded from the respondent No.1/owner.
6. Upon deposit being made as above, the respondent No.3 shall submit to this Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal, a copy of the bank payment advice and a memo in the prescribed format. A copy of the payment advice along with the memo shall be served on the contesting parties and their respective counsels in compliance with the Circular No.1/2025 dated 19/09/2025 of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala.
7. The respondent No.3 shall provide Form -16 A under the Income Tax Act 1961 to the petitioner Nos.1 to 4 and 6 to 10.
8. The office shall make necessary entries in the registers of the Tribunal evidencing the payment of the amount to the petitioner Nos.1 to 4 and 6 to 10.

(Dictated to the Confidential Assistant, transcribed and typed by her, corrected and pronounced by me in open court, this 31st day of March, 2026).

Sd/-

**Vinod Kumar N.
Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal,
Irinjalakuda.**

<u>APPENDIX</u>			
<u>PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:-</u>			
A1	:	12/07/2021	Copy of FIR No.0381/21, P.S.Vellikulangara
A2	:	14/10/2021	Copy of Final Report
A3	:	13/07/2021	Copy of Scene Mahazar

A4	:	26/07/2021	Copy of AMVI Report
A5	:	26/07/2021	Copy of AMVI Report
A6	:	12/08/2021	Copy of Discharge Certificate
A7	:	12/08/2021	Discharge Summary
A8	:	30/08/2021	Discharge Summary
A9	:	11/07/2021	MRI Report
A10	:	12/08/2021	Correction Report from Jubilee Mission Hospital
A11	:	05/09/2021	Copy of Postmortem Certificate
A12	:	25/09/2021	Copy of Death Certificate
A13	:	29/09/2021	Family Membership Certificate
A14	:	---	Medical Bills
A15	:	01/09/2021	Certificate from General Workers Union INTUC(I)
A16	:	--	Copy of Driving Licence
A17	:	07/12/2020	Copy of Birth Certificate
A18	:	07/12/2020	Copy of Birth Certificate
A19series	:	--	Copy of Aadhaar Card
A19(a)	:	--	Copy of Aadhaar Card
A19(b)	:	--	Copy of Aadhaar Card
A19(c)	:	--	Copy of Aadhaar Card
A19(d)	:	--	Copy of Aadhaar Card
A19(e)	:	--	Copy of Aadhaar Card
A19(f)	:	--	Copy of Aadhaar Card
A19(g)	:	--	Copy of Aadhaar Card
A19(h)	:	--	Copy of Aadhaar Card
A19(i)	:	--	Copy of Aadhaar Card
A20series	:	--	Copy of Pan Card
A20(a)	:	--	Copy of Pan Card
A20(b)	:	--	Copy of Pan Card
A20(c)	:	--	Copy of Pan Card
A20(d)	:	--	Copy of Pan Card
A21series	:	--	Copy of Bank Passbook
A21(a)	:	--	Copy of Bank Passbook
A21(b)	:	--	Copy of Bank Passbook

A21(c)	:	--	Copy of Bank Passbook
A21(d)	:	--	Copy of Bank Passbook
A21(e)	:	--	Copy of Bank Passbook
A21(f)	:	--	Copy of Bank Passbook
A21(g)	:	--	Copy of Bank Passbook
A21(h)	:	--	Copy of Bank Passbook
A22	:	18/06/2025	Copy of Death Certificate
A23	:	18/06/2025	Family Membership Certificate
A24	:	--	Copy of SSLC Certificate
A25	:	--	Copy of Aadhaar Card
<u>RESPONDENTS EXHIBITS:</u>	:		
B1	:	--	Copy of Policy
<u>COURT'S EXHIBITS :</u>	:	Nil	
<u>PETITIONER'S WITNESS:</u>	:	Nil	
<u>RESPONDENTS WITNESS:</u>	:	Nil	

COSTS:

Court Fee	:	26,922.00
Vakalath	:	25.00
Stamp for Document	:	50.00
Process Batta	:	50.00
Writing fee for plaint copies	:	50.00
Writing fee for process	:	50.00
Expenses for certified copies	:	50.00
Senior Adv.Fee	:	1,40,145.00
Junior Adv.Fee	:	70,073.00
Stamp for petitions	:	50.00
Writing fee for petitions	:	50.00

Total	:	2,37,515.00 (Allowed)
		=====

Id/-

Vinod Kumar N.
Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal,
Irinjalakuda.
 By Order

/True copy/

Sheristadar