Received on :04.01.2019
Registered on :04.01.2019
Decided on : 06.08.2026
Duration : 07Y.07M.02Dys
CNR No. MHPU140000482019

BEFORE MOTOR ACCIDENT CLAIMS TRIBUNAL
AT BARAMATI, DISTRICT PUNE
(Presided over by V. C. Barde)

Motor Accident Claim Petition No.6/2019 **Exh.64**

1] **Jayashri Suresh Boravane**
Age: 42 years, Occupation : Household,

2] **Pragati Suresh Boravane**
Age: 21 years, Occupation : Education,

3] **Sarthak Suresh Boravane**
Age: 19 years, Occupation : Education,

4] **Mayuri Mahendra Darekar**
Age: 23 years, Occupation : Household,
All R/o. Patethan, Tq.Daund, Dist. Pune

} **Claimants**

V E R S U S

1] **Someshwar Shashikant Natu**
Age- 45 years, Occupation: Agri.,
R/o. Pimpalgaon, Tq. Daund, Dist. Pune

2] **Divisional Manager**
United India Insurance Co. Ltd.,
Satav Udyog Bhavan, Bhigwan Square,
Baramati, Tq. Baramati, Dist. Pune.

3] **Dattoba Trimbak Natu**
Age- 55 years, Occupation: Agri.,
R/o. Pimpalgaon, Tq. Daund, Dist. Pune

} **Respondents**

PETITION UNDER SECTION 166 OF THE MOTOR VEHICLES ACT, 1988.

CLAIM : Rs. 1,00,000/-

Appearance :-

Adv. M. M. Divekar	:	Advocate for claimants
Adv. S. H. Jagtap	:	Advocate for respondent nos.1 & 3
Adv. H. B. Taware	:	Advocate for respondent no.2

J U D G M E N T

(Delivered on 06th of August, 2026)

Claimant nos. 1 to 4 being wife, daughters and son of deceased-Suresh Parshuram Boravane, have filed this claim petition under Section 166 of The Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 claiming compensation of Rs. 1,00,000/- on account of his accidental death.

Facts of the case, in brief, are as under:

2. Claimants contended that on 12.11.2018, deceased-Suresh was proceeding to village Rahu from village Patethan for field work on his Activa scooter No. MH12-G-2196, riding it on left side of road in a slow speed, paying attention to the traffic rules. When said scooter came within the limits of village Pilanewadi, one tractor No. MH42-Y-7233 alongwith two trolleys bearing Nos. MH42-Z-3068 and MH42-Z-3067, approached from backside in a rash, negligent manner with a high speed, and while driver-Shivaji Baban Natu of said tractor was overtaking the scooter of deceased front left side of second

trolley No. MH42-Z-3067, heavily dashed to the scooter of deceased, resulting into his death. The said tractor driver was responsible for the accident. As deceased sustained grievous injuries to head, he was taken to Yavat Rural Hospital for treatment, where doctor declared him dead. F.I.R. was lodged at Yavat Police Station against the driver of said tractor-Shivaji Baban Natus, owned by respondent no.3.

3. Deceased-Suresh was able bodied earning member of family of claimants, aged 47 years at the time of accident, and was not suffering from any disease. He was having agricultural field and taking crops like sugarcane, wheat, onion etc. He was providing sugarcane crop to Shrinath Mhaskoba Sugar Factory, Patethan. He was earning Rs.12,000/- to Rs.15,000/- per month from agricultural products. He was also carrying business of milk by providing to Samarth Rambaba Milk Distribution Center, Patethan, and earning Rs.18,000/- to Rs.20,000/- per month from said milk business, and spending all the amount on the welfare and maintenance of the claimants. Claimants were dependent on deceased. Claimants have been deprived of the income, love and affection of the deceased. Claimants have expended Rs.7,000/- towards ambulance charges and Rs.30,000/- towards funeral. On all the counts, claimants have claimed compensation of Rs.1,00,000/- with interest @ 12% per *annum*.

4. Respondent No.1, being registered owner of trolleys bearing Nos. MH42-Z-3068 and MH42-Z-3067, and respondent no.3 being registered owner of tractor bearing no. MH42-Y-7233,

have filed their joint written statement at Exh.14, denying the facts as to accident occurred due to negligence of tractor driver and death of deceased as a result thereof. They alleged negligence of deceased by riding motorcycle in a rash and negligent manner, and giving dash to tractor. They denied the earnings of deceased. They stated that they got insured offending tractor and trolleys with respondent no.2-insurance company. They submitted to dismiss the petition.

5. Respondent no.2 being insurer, has filed written statement at Exh. 17, denying the claim made by claimants. It is alleged that deceased being rider of two wheeler, was responsible for alleged accident, who was riding in a rash and negligence manner. Respondent denied the income and compensation claimed by claimants. There is breach of policy. Respondent-insurance company is not liable to pay compensation. Respondent submitted to dismiss the petition.

6. Ld. Predecessor framed Issues at Exh. 18, on which, findings are recorded alongwith reasons therefor, as under:

Sr.	Issues	Findings
1)	Whether the claimants proved that due to rash or negligent driving of Tractor bearing registration No.MH42-Y-7233, accident occurred on 12.11.2018, within the premises of Pilane Vasti, Patethan-Rahu Road, Tq. Daund, Dist. Pune and as a consequence thereof, Suresh Parshuram Boravane died?	Yes.

2)	Are the claimants entitled to get compensation? If yes, upto what extent and from whom?	Partly Yes, as per order below.
3)	What Order?	As per final order.

R E A S O N S

AS TO ISSUE NO. 1:-

7. Heard Ld. Advocate for claimants and Ld. Advocate for respondents so appearing. Perused the record.

8. Evidence on affidavit led by claimant No.1-Jayashri Suresh Boravane being wife of deceased as C.W.1, is on the lines of her case in the main petition regarding the accident, death of her deceased husband, and the amount of compensation claimed**.**

9. Claimants have filed documentary evidence viz.,- Complaint (Exh.26), Supplementary Statement of complainant (Exh.27), F.I.R. (Exh.28), Spot Panchanama (Exh.29), Inquest Panchnama (Exh.30), Death Certificate of deceased (Exh.31), *Post Mortem* Report (Exh.32), copy of R.C. (Exh.33) of offending tractor No. MH42-Y-7233 owned by respondent no.3, Insurance Policy (Exh.34) of offending Trolley No. MH42-Z-3067 and its R.C. (Exh.35), belonging to respondent no.1, copy of Policy (Exh.36) of offending Trolley No. MH42-Z-3068 and its R.C. (Exh.37), 7/12 Extract (Exh.38) of land field Gat No.225 of village Patethan, its Mutation Extract (Exh.39), 8-A Extract

(Exh.40), and driving licence (Exh.63) of the tractor driver. Claimants examined Umesh Dilip Borawake (C.W.2) and relied on Certificate (Exh.52) of particulars of sugarcane bill in the name of deceased, and further, bills (Exhs. 55 and 56) for the years 2016-17 to 2017-18, issued by Shrinath Mhaskoba Sugar Factory Ltd. Claimants further examined Prashant Dilip Hambir (C.W.3) and relied on the documents viz; Shop Act Licence (Exh.57) of Rambaba Dudh Dairy & Farm, with its Intimation Receipt (Exh.58) and Certificate (Exh.59) on behalf of Sahyadri Agro & Dairy Ltd., in respect of providing milk to the dairy by deceased.

10. Insofar as the death of deceased Suresh due to alleged rash and negligent driving of the offending tractor in question, evidence of C.W.1-Jayashri is on the basis of police papers. Report (Exh.26) was lodged by one Kisan Vitthal Ghadage, being villager from the place of deceased, that due to rash and negligent driving by driver of offending tractor, a dash by rear trolley was given to the two wheeler ridden by deceased on the spot, resulting into his death. The Spot Panchanama (Exh.29) proves the spot of incident being Patethan-Rahu tar road, 16 feet in width, within the limits of village Patethan, having 3 feet rough side strips on both sides of road. The two wheeler ridden by deceased was standing in damaged condition. In the Death Certificate (Exh.31) issued by Rural Hospital, Yavat, cause of death of deceased-Suresh is mentioned as head injury. In informant's supplementary statement (Exh.27), it is mentioned

that offence was registered against the driver of offending tractor, under Sections 279, 337, 338, 304(2) of the Indian Penal Code, as well as Section 184, 134/177 of the Motor Vehicles Act.

11. C.W.1-Jayashri was cross-examined at length by Ld. advocate for respondent no.2-Insurer, in which, she testified that on the day of accident, she was at home and did not know as to who was responsible for the accident. She further testified that the road where accident occurred was rough having pits where tar stones were lying. She denied the suggestions that deceased was overtaking the offending tractor and due to rough road, deceased himself fell down and sustained injuries. Further suggestions regarding not getting income from agricultural land and milk business by deceased; falsely claiming excessive compensation amount of Rs.20,00,000/-; and that the incident occurred due to negligence of deceased, have been denied by her. Respondent nos.1 and 3 failed to cross-examine C.W.1.

12. The above discussed evidence of claimant No. 1-Jayashri in view of the filing of report, FIR, spot panchanama, *Post Mortem* report, inquest and other documents coupled with her oral evidence, discloses that the accident was reported by informant to have occurred due to the rash and negligent driving of the tractor in question, whereby the deceased was dashed while overtaking by the tractor, resulting into the dash of its second trolley to deceased. The deceased suffered grievous injury resulting into fatal accident, whereby he was declared dead when taken to the Government Hospital. The claimants have to

prove the occurrence of accident by producing the evidence which may be assessed on the basis of probabilities. In the case at hand, it is pertinent to note here that offence was registered against driver of tractor only, who was possessing valid driving licence at the time of incident. The plea of insurance company therefore is without any substance. The oral and documentary evidence brought on record by claimants proves the accidental death of deceased due to rash and negligent driving of tractor driver. Accordingly, Issue No.1 is answered in the affirmative.

AS TO ISSUE NO.2:-

13. With respect to the claim for compensation of Rs. 20,00,000/-, C.W.1-Jayashri deposed that at the time of accident, deceased was aged 47 years. He was having agricultural field and was taking crops like sugarcane, wheat, onion etc. He was providing sugarcane crop to Shrinath Mhaskoba Sugar Factory, Patethan, and earning Rs.12,000/- to Rs.15,000/- per month from agricultural produce. He was also carrying business of milk and earning Rs.18,000/- to Rs.20,000/- per month from said milk business. She relied on the 7/12 Extract (Exh.38), Mutation Extract (Exh.39) and 8-A Extract (Exh.40) of land field Gat No.225 of village Patethan. Perusal of the same shows that deceased-Suresh Parshuram Boravane was shown as cultivator of land admeasuring 1H. 20Rs. of village Patethan, cultivating crops of sugarcane and wheat from the year 2007-2008 to 2015-2016. Mutation Extract shows that names of claimants were recorded as legal heirs of deceased.

14. Claimants have adduced the evidence of C.W.2-Umesh Dilip Borawake, who deposed that he is working in Shrinath Mhaskoba Sugar Factor in Accounts Department. Since the year 2015 to 2018, deceased was supplying sugarcane crop to said factory. He has produced sugarcane bills (Exhs. 55 and 56) of Rs.3,21,843/- and Rs. 79,104/- respectively for the years 2016-2017 and 2017-2018, issued by Shrinath Mhaskoba Sugar Factory Ltd. in the name of deceased, amount of which was credited by Credit Co-Operative Society of Factory in the bank account of deceased. During testified version in cross-examination by respondent no.2-Insurance company, he stated that he has not produced any document to show that deceased was member of sugar factory. Document (Exh.52) is the Certificate and not bill. Sugarcane bills (Exhs.55 and 56) do not reflect the gat number of agricultural land of deceased. He has not produced the weighing bills of sugarcane which was supplied by deceased during the period from 2016-2017 and 2017-2018. He could not state whether name of claimants were recorded as members of factory after death of deceased. He denied the suggestion that after the year 2017-2018, claimants have supplied sugarcane crops to factory. Suggestion of issuing bills of excessive amount at Exhs.55 and 56, is denied by C.W.2.

15. Prashant Dilip Hambir (C.W.3) has deposed that he was running milk collection and freezing centre, in the name of Samarth Rambaba from the year 2014 to 2019, operated by Sahyadri Agro and Dairy Ltd., and now he is running milk

business by name Rambaba Dudh Dairy And Farm, at Patethan village. Deceased-Suresh was daily supplying 8 to 10 liters of cow milk to the dairy, and he was paying Rs.25/- per liter as price of milk. After his death, claimants have not supplied any milk to the dairy. He has produced Shop Act Licence of the firm at Exh.57, with intimation receipt (Exh.58). He has filed Certificate (Exh.59) that deceased was supplying milk to Sahyadri Agro and Dairy. During cross-examination by Ld. Advocate for respondent no.2-Insurance company, C.W.3 testified that deceased had supplied milk to their dairy during the period from the year 2014 to 2019, on daily basis. He used to keep one copy of weighing of milk issued to deceased, which he has not produced on record. He has denied that claimants are supplying 8 to 10 liter milk to his dairy, and he has issued false certificate.

16. Perusal of testimony of C.Ws.1 to 3 shows that the deceased was an agriculturist and doing the milk business. According to C.W.1, her husband was earning Rs.10,000/- to Rs.15,000/- p.m. from field and Rs.8,000/- to Rs.10,000/- p.m. from milk business, and that total income of deceased was Rs.20,000/- p.m. Regarding the agricultural income, 7/12 extract (Exh.38) is produced of 01H.20 Rs. of land, Gat No.225/2 of Mauje Patethan, pertaining to the crops of sugarcane and wheat. C.W.2 from sugar factory was examined regarding the last sugarcane supplied by the deceased to the sugar factory in the year 2017-2018 i.e. before the accident, to the tune of Rs.1,39,925/-, from which, an amount of Rs.60,821/- was

deducted and an amount of Rs. 79,104/- was paid to him. In the cross-examination, he stated that in the bills at Exhs.55 and 56, Gat number of the field of Suresh is not mentioned, and the weight of sugarcane supplied is also not given. Regarding the milk, C.W.3 for Sahyadri Agro and Dairy Ltd., Baramati, has filed Certificate at Exh.59, without mentioning for any accounts or bills of milk supplied by the deceased, who also testified in cross-examination that no such bills with receipts have been filed. Thus, regarding the exact income from the milk, the evidence so produced is ambiguous.

17. In the case of ***Nirmala Bai & Ors. Vs. Manusingh and Ors. [Civil Appeal No. 248 of 2026, decided on 13.01.2026],*** Hon'ble Apex Court observed as follows:

> *"7.1. Insofar as the assessment of income of the deceased is concerned, it was claimed that he was cultivating land. He was also involved in animal husbandry and milk vending. Even if the land which may be owned by the family is still subsisting the contribution of the male member of the family needs to be assessed. There is vast difference between the quality of contribution by a family member as compared to an employee. His working hours are not fixed. Any person who has an opportunity certainly tries to do as much work as he can do to support his family and also see that they live in comfort. Farming is not a regular vocation. The farmers remain engaged in doing animal husbandry and milk vending as well side by side, which also generates extra income for them. Considering the aforesaid facts, in our opinion, the income of the deceased can be increased from ₹5,000/- per month, as taken by the High Court, to ₹8,000/- per month."*

18. In the said case, the deceased died in the year 2014,

for which, the monthly income of the deceased was considered at Rs.8,000/- p.m. being an agriculturist, doing milk business. In the instant case, keeping in view the evidence of C.Ws.1 to 3 duly testified by way of cross-examination as discussed above, the monthly income of deceased shall be considered as in the year 2018 when deceased died, at Rs.12,000/- p.m., being an agriculturist and doing milk business, and the compensation has to be calculated accordingly. C.W.-1 deposed that deceased was spending all the amount on the welfare and maintenance of the claimants. In *Post Mortem* Report (Exh.32), deceased is mentioned to be aged 48 years old. Therefore, at the time of accident, deceased was 48 years of age.

19. Following citations have to be taken into consideration for the purpose of calculation and grant of compensation as per the law laid down therein by the Hon'ble Apex Court:

i] ***National Insurance Company Limited Vs. Pranay Sethi [Special Leave Petition (Civil) No.25590 of 2014, decided on 31.10.2017]***, wherein, Hon'ble Apex Court observed as under:

> *"In view of the aforesaid analysis, we proceed to record our conclusions:-"*
> *"While determining the income, an addition of 50% of actual salary to the income of the deceased towards future prospects, where the deceased had a permanent job and was below the age of 40 years, should be made. The addition should be 30%, if the age of the deceased was between 40 to 50 years. In case the deceased was between the age of 50 to 60 years, the addition should be 15%. Actual salary should be read as actual salary*

less tax.”
“In case the deceased was self-employed or on a fixed salary, an addition of 40% of the established income should be the warrant where the deceased was below the age of 40 years. An addition of 25% where the deceased was between the age of 40 to 50 and 10% where the deceased was between the age of 50 to 60 years should be regarded as the necessary method of computation. The established income means the income minus the tax component.”
“For determination of the multiplicand, the deduction for personal and living expenses, the tribunals and the courts shall be guided by the paragraphs 30 to 32 of ***Sarla Verma*** *which we have reproduced hereinbefore.”*
“The selection of multiplier shall be as indicated in the Table in ***Sarla Verma*** *read with paragraph 42 of that judgment.”*
“The age of the deceased should be the basis for applying the multiplier.”
“Reasonable figures on conventional heads, namely, loss of estate, loss of consortium and funeral expenses should be Rs.15,000/-, Rs.40,000/- and Rs.15,000/- respectively. The aforesaid amounts should be enhanced at the rate of 10% in every three years.”

ii] ***United India Insurance Company Limited Vs. Satinder Kaur @ Satwinder Kaur and Others [2020 (3) T.A.C. 6 (S.C.]***, in which, Hon'ble Apex Court held as under:

“In Pranay Sethi (supra), the Constitution Bench held that in death cases, compensation would be awarded only under three conventional heads viz. loss of estate, loss of consortium and funeral expenses.”
“The Court held that the conventional and traditional heads, cannot be determined on percentage basis, because that would not be an acceptable criterion. Unlike determination of income, the said heads have to be quantified, which has to be based on a reasonable foundation. It was observed that factors such as price

index, fall in bank interest, escalation of rates, are aspects which have to be taken into consideration. The Court held that reasonable figures on conventional head, namely, loss of estate, loss of consortium and funeral expenses should be Rs.15,000/-, Rs. 40,000/- and Rs.15,000/- respectively.The Court was of the view that the amounts to be awarded under these conventional heads should be enhanced by 10% every three years, which will bring consistency in respect of these heads."

iii] ***Harpreet Kaur Vs. Mohinder Yadav [AIR 2023 S.C.111]***, wherein, Hon'ble Supreme Court observed as follows:

"21. A Constitution Bench of this Court in Pranay Sethi [National Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Pranay Sethi, (2017) 16 SCC 680: (2018) 3 SCC 5 (2017) 16 SCC 680 6 (2018) 18 SCC 130 (Civ) 248 : (2018) 2 SCC (Cri) 205] dealt with the various heads under which compensation is to be awarded in a death case. One of these heads is loss of consortium. In legal parlance, "consortium" is a compendious term which encompasses "spousal consortium", "parental consortium", and "filial consortium". The right to consortium would include the company, care, help, comfort, guidance, solace and affection of the deceased, which is a loss to his family. With respect to a spouse, it would include sexual relations with the deceased spouse : [Rajesh v. Rajbir Singh, (2013) 9 SCC 54]."

iv] ***Asha Devi & Ors. Vs. Assistant Director, State Insurance & Provident Fund Department & Ors. [2021 ACJ 2679]***, in which, Hon'ble Apex Court held that:

"6. Learned counsel for the Insurance Company vehemently argued that the Tractor could not carry any passenger, therefore, the Insurance Company cannot be made liable to pay compensation. The said argument is not tenable as the insurance policy itself has a clause that one passenger is permissible to be carried on the

> *Tractor. This passenger is in addition to driver as driver cannot be called passenger. Still further the Municipal Council has produced evidence of payment of the additional premium to insure four passengers.*

v] ***Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd. Vs. Sangita Dattatraya Jamdade & Ors. [2006 ACJ 971].***

20. Thus, the monthly income of the deceased is considered at Rs.12,000/- per month as above. Deceased was proved to be 48 years of age at the time of his death. Therefore, the multiplier of 13 is to be applied. As per the case of ***Pranay Sethi (supra)***, as the age of deceased was above 40 years, on the head of future prospects, 25% amount shall be added being self-employed. For personal expenses of deceased**,** 1/4th amount therefrom shall be deducted, as dependents on the deceased at the time of death were claimant Nos.1 to 4 being wife and three children.

21. As per the case of ***Pranay Sethi (supra)***, on the heads of loss of estate and funeral expenses, compensation of Rs.15,000/- on each head with 10% increment is considered from the year 2019 at total Rs.36,000/. Further, as per case of ***Pranay Sethi (supra)***, regarding loss of parental consortium, claimant Nos.1 to 4 being wife, daughters and son, it may be granted at **Rs.40,000/- each with increase at 10% at total Rs.1,92,000/-**.

22. Claimants are entitled to receive compensation on account of the death of Suresh Parshuram Boravane, as

mentioned in tabular form, as under:-

Sr. No.	Heads	Calculations [Rs.]
i]	Notional Income per year -: (Rs.12,000/- x 12)	1,44,000/-
ii]	Add amount of future prospects at 25%	36,000/-
iii]	Sub total [i + ii]	1,80,000/-
iv]	1/4th deduction towards personal expenses	45,000/-
v]	Net income for calculation. [iii - iv]	1,35,000/-
vi]	v] X 13 multiplier.	17,55,000/-
vii]	Add Loss of estate + Funeral expenses	36,000/-
viii]	Add amount of Consortium for claimant Nos. 1 to 4	1,92,000/-
ix]	**GRAND TOTAL** [vi + vii + viii]	**19,83,000/-**

23. Thus, the total sum to be awarded to the claimant nos. 1 to 4 as compensation as above is Rs.19,83,000/-, to which, claimant nos. 1 to 4 are entitled.

24. In the case of ***New India Assurance Co. Ltd. Vs. Ganesh Nalkande and Ors. [First Appeal No.631 of 2007, decided on 11.01.2019]***, Hon'ble Bombay High Court observed as under:

> *"5. I have heard the learned Counsel for the parties and I have perused the records of the case. It is not in dispute that the appellant was the insurer of Tractor No. MH 30E-7971 and the Trailer having No. MH 30J-335. As per the policy at Exhibit-78 it has been found that the trolley involved in the accident was duly insured by the appellant. The said trolley was found to be in motion alongwith the Tractor which was not insured by the appellant. However,*

the trolley being duly insured, it has been rightly found by the Claims Tribunal that being in motion, it was a motor vehicle and hence the Insurance Company could not be exonerated from its liability. This conclusion of the Claims Tribunal is supported by the decision in Lakshmana Murthy vs. Rajesh (Minor) by Guardian 1999 (1) ACC 311. I do not find any reason to take a different view from one taken by the Claims Tribunal. The appellant has been rightly held responsible for satisfying the claim."

25. In the instant case, Respondent No. 1 is the registered owner of trolley bearing no. MH42-Z-3067, which is insured with respondent No.2-Insurance Company, as per the policy (Exh.34), and respondent no.3 is registered owner of tractor bearing no. MH42-Y-7233. Driving licence of the tractor driver is at Exh.63, during which period, the accident occurred. In view of the above observations in the case of ***New India Assurance Vs. Ganesh (supra)***, all the respondents are jointly and severally liable to pay compensation to the claimants.

26. In view of above discussion, Issue No. 2 is answered in the partly affirmative for Rs.19,83,000/- against respondents, and following order is passed:

O R D E R

1. Claim-petition is hereby partly allowed against respondent nos.1 to 3.
2. Respondents shall jointly and severally pay compensation of Rs.19,83,000/- to claimant Nos.1 to 4 in the shares enumerated below, alongwith interest thereon @ 7.5 % per *annum*, from the date of filing claim-petition, subject to deduction of the amount of compensation awarded for No Fault Liability under Section 140 of the M.V. Act, if any:

a) Claimant No. 1 – Rs.4,98,000/-
b) Claimant No. 2 – Rs.4,95,000 /-
c) Claimant No. 3 – Rs.4,95,000/-
d) Claimant No. 4 – Rs.4,95,000/-

3. Out of amount of the shares of the claimants, an amount of Rs.1,50,000/-**each**, be invested in the Fixed Deposit Scheme in their names in any of the nationalized bank for the period of three years.

4. Claimant nos. 1 to 4 shall pay first the deficit Court fees as per rules, if not earlier paid on petition, in order to be entitled to claim the compensation so awarded.

5. An Award be prepared accordingly.

VIJAY CHANDRASHEKAR BARDE Digitally signed by VIJAY CHANDRASHEKAR BARDE Date: 2026.08.06 15:12:25 +0530

(V. C. Barde)
Date :- 06.08.2026 Member,
M.A.C.T. Baramati.

CERTIFICATE

I affirm that the contents of this P.D.F. file Judgment are same word to word as per original Judgment.

Name of Stenographer	:	Stenographer (G-1)
Court Name	:	Member, MACT Baramati, Dist. Pune.
Date of Judgment	:	06.08.2026
Judgment signed by Presiding Officer	:	06.08.2026
Judgment uploaded on	:	06.08.2026