

IN THE MOTOR ACCIDENTS CLAIMS TRIBUNAL, WAYANAD, KALPETTA

Present: Sri.A.V.Unnikrishnan, Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal, Kalpetta

Thursday, this the 26th day of March, 2026
05th day of Chaithra, 1948

ORIGINAL PETITION (MV) Nos.01/2025 & 32/2025

OP (MV) 01/2025

Between:

Anish N.R., Aged 46 years, S/o Ramankutty,
Nedumpullikudiyil House, Kaniyaram,
Mananthavady Taluk, Wayanad District,
Pin - 670 645.

}

Petitioner

And:

R1. Shamila A., Aged 26 years, D/o Abdul Nasar A.,
Alan House, Mananthavady Post, Pandikadavu,
Mananthavady Taluk.
(Now at Nova Driving School, Chungam,
Sulthan Bathery Post)

}

Respondents

***(Driver cum Owner of the Scooter
No. KL-72 E-2762)***

R2. The Manager, Cholanmandalam M.S General
Insurance Company Ltd., 2nd Floor,
Acel State No.40/856, Chittoor Road,
Ernakulam Post - 682 011.

}

OP (MV) 32/2025

Between:

Somadas, Aged 64 years, S/o Achuthan,
Arackal Veed, Kaniyaram, Mananthavady Post,
Mananthavady Village, Mananthavady Taluk,
Wayanad District, Pin - 670 645.

}

Petitioner

And:

R1. Shamila A., Aged 26 years, D/o Abdul Nasar A.,
Alan House, Mananthavady Post, Pandikadavu,
Mananthavady Taluk,
(Now at Nova Driving School, Chungam,
Sulthan Bathery Post)

}

Respondents

***(Driver cum Owner of the Scooter
No. KL-72 E-2762)***

R2. The Manager, Cholamandalam M.S General Insurance Company Ltd., 2nd Floor,
Acel State No.40/856, Chittoor Road,
Ernakulam Post -682 011. } Respondents

These OP (MV)s are coming on this the 24th day of February, 2026 for final hearing before me in the presence of Sri.Babu Cyriac & Sri.Vijai Isac, Counsels for petitioners, Smt.Rejimol John, Counsel for respondent No.2 and respondent No.1 remained absent and set exparte in OP(MV)32/2025 and Sri.Varghese A, counsel for respondent No.1 in OP(MV) 01/2025 and having stood over for consideration to this day the Tribunal passed the following.

COMMON AWARD

Both these petitions are filed under Section 166(1)(a) of the Motor Vehicles Act 1988 by the respective petitioners.

2. Vide order in IA.No.04/2025 order dated 13.11.2025 joint trial was allowed. OP(MV) 32/2025 is the leading case.

3. Case of the petitioners in brief is as follows:- On 07.09.2024 at about 7 pm, while the petitioners were riding on the scooter bearing Reg. No.KL-72C-8681 along Koyileri – Mananthavady Public Road as the petitioner in OP(MV) 32/2025 as the rider and petitioner in OP(MV) 1/2025 as the pillion rider, and tried to enter the road leading to Kammana small bridge after giving proper indicator, a scooter bearing Reg.No.KL-72E-2762 ridden by R1 in a rash and negligent manner, coming from Koyileri side, knocked down the scooter on which the petitioners were travelling and thereby the petitioners sustained grievous injuries. R1 was the rider cum owner of the scooter bearing Reg.No.KL-72E-2762, who rode it in a rash and negligent manner and caused the accident. R2 is the insurer.

4. Petitioner in OP(MV) No.01/2025 was a contingent staff at Mananthavady Municipality, aged 46 years, and was earning a monthly income of ₹32,000/- at the time of the accident. Petitioner is claiming a compensation of ₹2 lakh.

5. Petitioner in OP(MV) No.32/2025 was a coolie worker, aged 64 years and was earning a monthly income of ₹20,000/- at the time of the accident. Petitioner is claiming a compensation of ₹10 lakh. Petitioners are claiming compensation jointly and severally from the respondents.

6. On receipt of the summons in OP(MV) 1/2025, R1 and R2 appeared through counsels and filed written statements. In OP(MV) 32/2025, R1 remained absent and set exparte. R2 appeared through counsel and filed written statement.

7. R1 filed written statement in OP(MV) 1/2025 with the following conditions :- It is admitted by R1 that he was the rider cum owner of the scooter bearing Reg.No.KL-72E-2762 involved in the accident. It is contended that the accident occurred not due to his rashness or negligence. It is also contended that the vehicle was insured with R2, hence compensation if any is to be paid by R2.

8. R2 filed written statement in both the OP(MVs) with similar contentions :- R2 admitted that the scooter bearing Reg.No.KL-72E-2762 involved in the accident was validly insured with them at the time of accident. It is contended by R2 that, the accident occurred not due to the rashness and negligence of R1, but due to the negligence of the petitioner in OP(MV) 32/2025 as who rode the scooter bearing Reg.No.KL-72E-2762 in a rash and negligent manner. It is also contended that the petitioner in OP(MV) 32/2025 was charge sheeted by the police for riding

the scooter in a rash and negligent manner causing the accident. Hence, the compensation if any is to be payable by the equal of that scooter. Without prejudice to this contention, it is further stated that the age, nature of injury, period of treatment and expenses as narrated in the petition are not correct and hence denied. The petitioners has to prove these aspects with strict proof. For the reasons stated above prays to dismiss the petitions.

9. The following common issues were framed for consideration in both the OP(MVs).

- 1 Whether the accident was due to negligence of R1?
- 2 Whether the petitioner sustained injuries as alleged?
- 3 Whether the petitioner is entitled to get compensation and if so, who is liable to pay the same?
- 4 If issue Nos.1 to 3 are answered in favour of the petitioner, what is the quantum of compensation entitled by the petitioner?
- 5 Reliefs and costs?

10. On the side of both the petitioners, Exts.A1 to A14 are marked. Ext.C1 is marked in OP(MV) 32/2025. Exts.B1 to B3 are marked on the side of R2.

11. Heard all sides.

12. **Issue No.1 in both the OP(MV)s :-** Case of the petitioner is that while they were riding on the scooter bearing Reg.No.KL-72C-8681 along Koyileri – Mananthavady public road as the petitioner in OP(MV) 32/2025 as the rider and petitioner in OP(MV) 1/2025 as the pillion rider, and tried to enter the road leading to Kammana small bridge after giving proper indicator, a scooter bearing

Reg.No.KL-72E-2762 ridden by R1 in a rash and negligent manner, coming from Koyileri side, knocked down the scooter on which the petitioners were travelling and thereby the petitioners sustained grievous injuries. According to the petitioners the accident was caused due to the negligent riding of the scooter by R1. Ext.A4 is the Final Report submitted by the Sub Inspector of Police, Mananthavady Police Station. Going by Ext.A4 it can be seen that, the investigating officer upon conclusion of his investigation charge sheeted the R1, the rider of the offending vehicle for commission of offences punishable under Sections 281, 125(a) & 125(b) of the BNS. On the other hand, R2 produced Ext.B1 copy of charge sheet. Ext.B1 will go to show that police registered 'A' charge and 'B' charge. 'A' charge is against R1 alleging commission of offences under Sections 281, 125(a) & 125(b) of BNS. Going by Ext.B1, 'B' charge also is registered against the rider of the scooter bearing Reg. No.KL-72C-8681 under Sections 281, 125(a) & 125(b) of BNS. The Investigating Officer after due process of investigation found that R1 being the rider of the scooter bearing Reg.No.KL-72E-2762 and the petitioner in OP(MV) 32/2025 being the rider of the scooter bearing Reg.NO.KL-72C-8681 rode their respective vehicles in a rash and negligent manner and caused the accident. Now, it is settled legal position as held by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in *New India Assurance Co. v. Pazhaniammal and others (2011 (3) KLT 648)* and in *Kolavan and Others V. Salim and Others (2018 (1) KLT 489)* **the Honourable High Court of Kerala**, that, *Unless otherwise proved the finding arrived at by the Investigation Officer, after due process of investigation can be accepted as to find out upon whom the negligence can be attributed.* I find nothing to disbelieve the findings of the investigating officer. Considering the materials available before me, I am of the opinion that both the riders of the scooters bearing

Reg.No.KL-72E-2762 and KL-72C-8681 involved in the accident are equally contributed to the accident. This issue is found accordingly.

13. **Issue No.2 in both the OP(MV)s :-** In the written statement filed by the R2, the accident in which the petitioners sustained injuries stands admitted. R2 in their written statement admitted that, the scooter bearing Reg. No.KL-72E-2762 is validly insured with them.

14. Ext.A6 is the copy of wound certificate issued from Wayanad Government Medical College Hospital, Mananthavady, pertaining to the petitioner in OP(MV) 01/2025. As per Ext.A6, petitioner sustained the injuries such as, lumbar spine tenderness and pain over back.

15. Ext.A5 is the copy of wound certificate issued from Wayanad Government Medical College Hospital, Mananthavady, pertaining to the petitioner in OP(MV) 32/2025. As per Ext.A5, petitioner sustained the injuries such as, pain over upper back, left leg and left knee, abrasion over left knee and fracture D4, D6, D7.

16. The admission of R2 in their written statement and the Exts.A1, A4, A5, A6 will prove that petitioners sustained injuries in an accident as stated in the petitions. This issue is found in favour of the petitioners.

17. **Issue Nos.3 & 4 in OP(MV) 01/2025 :-** According to the petitioner, at the time of the accident, he was a contingent staff at Mananthavady Municipality and was earning a monthly income of ₹32,000/-. Apart from making such averments in the petition, no positive evidence is produced to prove the petitioner's occupation and income. In the absence of any such evidence, I am of the opinion that only a notional income can be considered as the income of the petitioner. The Hon'ble

High Court in Fathima K.T @ Pathummu v the Manager, National Insurance Company Limited, in MACA No.1059/2021 dated 06.03.2025, relying on the decision of the **Honourable Supreme Court in Angad Tiwari and Another v National Insurance Company Ltd. and Another reported in 2024 KHC 8590**, held that, the Tribunals and Courts shall not fix income below the minimum wages. The Honourable High Court fixed a minimum wage of **₹17325/-** relying on G.O(P) No.56/2017/Fin.dated 28.04.2017. I am of the opinion that the minimum wages of the petitioner can be fixed as **₹17,325/-**.

18. Ext.A6 is the copy of wound certificate issued from Wayand Government Medical College Hospital, Mananthavady. Ext.A7 is the discharge summary issued from the same hospital. As per Ext.A7, the petitioner was admitted in that hospital on 07.09.2024 and was discharged on 09.09.2024 (3 days) diagnosed with contusion lower lumbar.

19. Upon considering the nature of the injuries sustained to the petitioner and the period for which he was treated as inpatient, I am of the opinion that the petitioner is entitled to get a sum of **₹20,000/-** as compensation for pain and sufferings.

20. As per Ext.A7 discharge summary, petitioner was treated as an inpatient for a total period of 3 days. I am of the opinion that petitioner is entitled to get bystander expenses at the rate of **₹600/-** per day which will come to **₹1,800/-** (600x3).

21. Towards extra nourishment, petitioner is entitled to get **₹1,800/-** (600x3).

22. Towards damage to clothes ₹3,000/- is awarded.

23. Upon considering the nature of the injuries sustained to the petitioner, the period for which he was treated, I am of the opinion that petitioner might not have worked for one month after the accident and the petitioner is entitled to get an amount of ₹17,325/- towards loss of earnings (17325x1).

24. Towards transportation petitioner is entitled to get a sum of ₹3,000/-.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMS RAISED AND ALLOWED

Sl. No.	Head of claim	Amount claimed in ₹	Amount awarded in ₹	Basis
PART -				
1	Loss of earning (Total)	60,000	17,325	17325x1 month
2	Loss of earning (Partial)	0	0	Nil
3	Medical and miscellaneous expenses	5,000	0	Nil
4	Future treatment	0	0	Nil
5	Bystander expenses	5,000	1,800	600x3 days
6	Transportation expenses	5,000	3,000	Nil
7	Extra nourishment	5,000	1,800	600x3 days
8	Damage to clothing, etc	3,000	3,000	Nil
9	Pain and suffering	1,00,000	20,000	Considering nature of injuries
10	Loss of earning power	25,000	0	Nil
11	Loss of amenities in life	0	0	Nil
12	Compensation for continuing/ permanent disability	1,00,000	0	Nil
13	Physical and mental shock	0	0	Nil
14	Shortened expectation of life	12,000	0	Nil

15	Inconveniences, hardship, discomfort, disappointment, frustration and mental stress in life	0	0	Nil
	Total	₹3,20,000/- claim limited to ₹2 lakh	₹46,925/-	

25. **Issue Nos.3 & 4 in OP(MV) 32/2025:-** According to the petitioner, at the time of the accident, he was a coolie worker and was earning a monthly income of ₹20,000/-. Apart from making such averments in the petition, no positive evidence is produced to prove the petitioner's occupation and income. In the absence of any such evidence, I am of the opinion that only a notional income can be considered as the income of the petitioner. The Hon'ble High Court in Fathima K.T @ Pathummu v the Manager, National Insurance Company Limited, in MACA No.1059/2021 dated 06.03.2025, relying on the decision of the **Honourable Supreme Court in Angad Tiwari and Another v National Insurance Company Ltd. and Another reported in 2024 KHC 8590**, held that, the Tribunals and Courts shall not fix income below the minimum wages. The Honourable High Court fixed a minimum wage of ₹17325/- relying on G.O(P) No.56/2017/Fin.dated 28.04.2017. I am of the opinion that the minimum wages of the petitioner can be fixed as ₹17,325/-.

26. Ext.A5 is the copy of wound certificate issued from Wayand Government Medical College Hospital, Mananthavady. Ext.A8 is the discharge summary issued from the same hospital. As per Ext.A8, the petitioner was admitted in that hospital on 07.09.2024 and was discharged on 10.09.2024 (4 days) diagnosed with fracture D4, D6 & D7 of spine.

27. Ext.C1 is the report of Medical Board issued from District Hospital, Mananthavady, which assessed a permanent disability of 17% with respect to whole body. The Medical Board found that left knee range of movement 0-110°, power grade V, weight bearing plus, squatting partial, pain plus.

28. Upon considering the nature of the injuries sustained to the petitioner and the period for which he was treated as inpatient, and the disability suffered by him, I am of the opinion that the petitioner is entitled to get a sum of **₹70,000/-** as compensation for pain and sufferings.

29. Towards loss of amenities, petitioner is entitled to get a sum of **₹30,000/-**.

30. As per Ext.A8 discharge summary, the petitioner was treated as an inpatient for a total period of 4 days. I am of the opinion that petitioner is entitled to get bystander expenses at the rate of **₹600/-** per day which will come to **₹2,400/-** (600x4).

31. Towards extra nourishment, the petitioner is entitled to get **₹2,400/-** (600x4).

32. Towards damage to clothes **₹3,000/-** is awarded.

33. Upon considering the nature of the injuries sustained to the petitioner, the period for which he was treated, I am of the opinion that petitioner might not have worked for six months after the accident and the petitioner is entitled to get an amount of **₹1,03,950/-** towards loss of earnings (17325x6).

34. Towards transportation, the petitioner is entitled to get a sum of **₹10,000/-**.

35. Ext.C1 is the report of Medical Board issued from District Hospital, Mananthavady, which assessed a permanent disability of 17% with respect to whole body. *In Raj Kumar v Ajay Kumar 2011(1) SCC 343, it is held by the Hon'ble supreme Court that, "the percentage of permanent disability with reference to the whole body of a person, cannot be assumed to be the percentage of loss of earning capacity. To put it differently, the percentage of the loss of earning capacity is not the same as the percentage of permanent disability (except in a few cases, where the Tribunal on the basis of evidence, concludes that percentage of loss of earning capacity is the same as percentage of permanent disability)".* Considering the nature of the injuries and work of the petitioner, I am of the opinion that functional disability of the petitioner is taken as **15%**.

36. Ext.A11 is the copy of PAN card. As per Ext.A11, date of birth of the petitioner is 10.03.1960. The date of accident was on 07.09.2024. Age of the petitioner at the time of accident was 64 years. Since the petitioner is aged above 59, no enhancement is to be added for future prospects. Considering the age of the petitioner, the applicable multiplier is '7' as per the dictum in *Sarla Verma and Others Vs Delhi Transport Corporation and another reported in AIR 2009 SC 3104*. The compensation for continuing and permanent disability will come to **₹2,18,295/-** (17325x12x7x15/100). That amount is allowed.

37. Since the petitioner in OP(MV) 32/2025 was contributed to the accident, I am of the opinion that R1 the owner of the scooter bearing Reg. No.KL-72E-2762 and its insurer is liable to pay only 50% of the total compensation.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMS RAISED AND ALLOWED

Sl. No.	Head of claim	Amount claimed in ₹	Amount awarded in ₹	Basis
PART -				
1	Loss of earning (Total)	2,40,000	1,03,950	17325x6 months
2	Loss of earning (Partial)	60,000	0	Nil
3	Medical and miscellaneous expenses	10,000	0	Nil
4	Future treatment	0	0	0
5	Bystander expenses	10,000	2,400	600x4
6	Transportation expenses	7,000	10,000	Nil
7	Extra nourishment	10,000	2,400	600x4
8	Damage to clothing, etc	3,000	3,000	Nil
9	Pain and suffering	2,00,000	70,000	Considering nature of injuries
10	Loss of earning power	1,30,000	0	Nil
11	Loss of amenities and conveniences , etc	0	30,000	Nil
12	Compensation for continuing/permanent disability	3,00,000	2,18,295	17325x127x15/100
13	Physical and mental shock	0	0	Nil
14	Shortened expectation of life	30,000	0	Nil
15	Inconveniences, hardship, discomfort, disappointment, frustration and mental stress in life	0	0	Nil
	Total	₹10 lakh	₹4,40,045/-. Half of the compensation is ₹2,20,023/-	

38. Now the next question is who shall pay the compensation. While discussing issue No.1, I have already come to a conclusion that the accident was occurred due to the rashness and negligence of both the riders of the scooters bearing Reg.No.KL-72E-2762 and KL-72C-8681 involved in the accident. Admittedly, the

rider of the scooter bearing Reg. No.KL-72C-8681 was the petitioner in OP(MV) 32/2025. Since the petitioner in OP(MV) 32/2025 has contributed to the accident, I am of the opinion that R1 the owner of the scooter bearing Reg.No.KL-72E-2762 and its insurer is liable to pay only 50% of the total compensation. I am of the opinion that R2 shall pay **half of the compensation** to the petitioner in OP(MV) 32/2025.

39. As far as the petitioner in OP(MV) 1/2025 is concerned, he has not contributed to the accident. Rather he is a victim of a composite negligence. He sustained injuries in an accident caused due to the composite negligence of the petitioner in OP(MV) 32/2025 and R1. While deciding point No.1, I have already come to a conclusion that both the riders of the vehicles involved in the accident have equally contributed to the accident. The learned counsel for the R2 contended that if at all for any reason it is found that R2 is liable to pay compensation to the petitioner he is liable to pay only half of the compensation.

40. Liability of the respective owners/ insurance companies in the event of composite negligence was considered by Honorable Supreme Court of India in *KHENYEI vs. New India Assurance Company Limited reported in AIR 2015 SC 2261*. It is held by Honorable Supreme Court that what emergence from the aforesaid discussion is as follows:-

(i) :- In the case composite negligence, plaintiff/claimant is entitled to sue both or anyone of the joint tortfeasors and to recover the entire compensation as liability of joint tortfeasors is joint and several.

(ii) *in the case of composite negligence, apportionment of compensation between two tortfeasors vis-a-vis the plaintiff/claimant is not permissible. He can recover at his option whole damages from any of them.*

(iii) *In case all the joint tortfeasors have been impleaded and evidence is sufficient, it is open to the Court/Tribunal to determine inter se extent of composite negligence of the drivers. However, determination of the extent of negligence between the joint tortfeasors is only for the purpose of their inter se liability so that one may recover the sum from the other after making whole of payment to the plaintiff/claimant to the extent it has satisfied the liability of the other. In case both of them have been impleaded and the apportionment/ extent of their negligence has been determined by the Court/Tribunal. In main case one joint tortfeasor can recover the amount from the other in the execution proceedings.*

(iv) *It would not be appropriate for the court/ tribunal to determine the extent of composite negligence of the drivers of two vehicles in the absence of impleadment of other joint tortfeasors. In such a case, impleaded joint tortfeasor should be left, in case he so desires to sue the other joint tortfeasor in independent proceedings after passing of the decree or award'.*

41. That being the case merely because one of the tortfeasors in a composite negligence case is not made a party, his right to recover the entire compensation from the other tortfeasor cannot be denied. The Hon'ble Supreme Court further held that *"It would not be appropriate for the court/ tribunal to determine the extent of composite negligence of the drivers of two vehicles in the absence of impleadment of other joint tortfeasors. In such a case, impleaded joint tortfeasor should be left, in case he so desires to sue the other joint tortfeasor in*

independent proceedings after passing of the decree or award". I am of the opinion that extent of the contribution of the joint tort feasons as far as this OP 1/2025 is concerned, is left open.

42. As far as OP 1/2025 is concerned, apart from a finding that the accident was occurred due to the composite negligence of the petitioner in OP (MV) 32/2025, the proportion of the contribution is not decided in this OP. As far as OP(MV) 32/2025 is concerned, both the tort feasons are in party array. These issues are found accordingly.

43. **Issue No.5 in OP(MV) 01/2025** :- In view of the above findings, the petitioner is entitled for a sum of **₹46,925/ (Rupees Forty six thousand Nine hundred and Twenty five only)** as compensation. The petitioner is entitled to realise an amount of **₹46,925/-** as compensation from **R2** with interest at the rate of 8% per annum from the date of petition i.e., **03.01.2025** till realisation with proportionate costs. This issue is found in favour of the petitioner.

In the result,

- 1 An award is passed for **₹46,925/ (Rupees Forty six thousand Nine hundred and Twenty five only)** with interest @ 8% per annum from the date of filing of the petition i.e., **03.01.2025** till realisation with proportionate costs.
- 2 R2 is directed to furnish cheques for **₹1,373/-** towards Court Fee and **₹2,000/-** towards Legal Benefit Fund payable by the petitioner, in favour of MACT, Kalpetta.

- 3 R2 shall deposit the award amount with proportionate costs and interest directly to bank account of petitioner **stated in Ext.A14 (A/c No.2879000100065002 IFSC : PUNB0287900)** within one month from the date of award by way of electronic funds transfer, which the petitioner shall be at liberty to withdraw.
- 4 Immediately when the payments as afore stated are made, R2 shall file a statement before the Tribunal, regarding compliance of the order along with a copy of the transaction records certified by the Bank concerned which will be countersigned and issued to the petitioner by the Tribunal.
- 5 Office shall make necessary entries in the registers of the Tribunal, evidencing payment of the amounts to the petitioner.

44. **Issue No.5 in OP(MV) 32/2025** :- In view of the above findings, the petitioner is entitled for a sum of **₹2,20,023/- (Rupees Two lakh Twenty thousand and Twenty three only)** as compensation. The petitioner is entitled to realise an amount of **₹2,20,023/-** as compensation from **R2** with interest at the rate of 8% per annum from the date of petition i.e., **24.01.2025** till realisation with proportionate costs. This issue is found in favour of the petitioner.

In the result,

- 1 An award is passed for **₹2,20,023/- (Rupees Two lakh Twenty thousand and Twenty three only)** with interest @ 8% per annum from the date of filing of the petition i.e., **24.01.2025** till realisation with proportionate costs.

- 2 R2 is directed to furnish cheques for **₹9,373/-** towards Court Fee and **₹10,000/-** towards Legal Benefit Fund payable by the petitioner, in favour of MACT, Kalpetta.
- 3 R2 shall deposit the award amount with proportionate costs and interest directly to bank account of petitioner **stated in Ext.A13 (A/c No.42162010001821 IFSC : CNRB0014216)** within one month from the date of award by way of electronic funds transfer, which the petitioner shall be at liberty to withdraw.
- 4 Immediately when the payments as afore stated are made, R2 shall file a statement before the Tribunal, regarding compliance of the order along with a copy of the transaction records certified by the Bank concerned which will be countersigned and issued to the petitioner by the Tribunal.
- 5 Office shall make necessary entries in the registers of the Tribunal, evidencing payment of the amount to the petitioner.

(Dictated to the Confidential Assistant, transcribed and typed by her, corrected and pronounced by me in open court, this the 26th day of March, 2026).

MOTOR ACCIDENTS CLAIMS TRIBUNAL

APPENDIX

Petitioners' Witnesses :

Nil

Petitioners' Exhibits :

- | | | |
|-----------|------------|--|
| A1- | 08/09/2024 | Copy of First Information Report & FIS |
| A2- | 10/09/2024 | Copy of Scene Mahazar |
| A3-series | 20/09/2024 | Copy of AMVI Reports |
| A4- | 30/09/2024 | Copy of Final Report |

A5-	07/09/2024	Copy of Accident Register cum Wound Certificate of Somadas
A6-	07/09/2024	Copy of Accident Register cum Wound Certificate of Anish
A7-	09/09/2024	Discharge Summary of Anish
A8-	10/09/2024	Discharge Summary of Somadas
A9-	25/10/2011	Copy of Aadhar Card of Somadas
A10-	24/11/2011	Copy of Aadhar Card of Anish N.R
A11-	-	Copy of PAN Card of Somadas
A12-	-	Copy of PAN Card of Anish N.R
A13-	06.02.2024	Copy of Bank Pass Book of Somadas
A14-	13/11/2023	Copy of Bank Pass Book of Anish

Respondent's Witnesses : Nil

Respondent's Exhibits :

B1-	30/09/2024	Copy of Final Report
B2-	-	Copy of Policy
B3-	07/08/2025	Copy of Judgment in ST 121/2025

Court Witnesses & Exhibits : Nil

Court Exhibits :

C1	26/08/2025	Medical Certificate issued by District Medical Board, Mananthavady, Wayanad
----	------------	---

MOTOR ACCIDENTS CLAIMS TRIBUNAL

Typed by : Sadeesh K
Compared by : Kalesh R.
FCS :