MHST010017902019

Presented on : 03.06.2019
Registered on : 14.06.2019
Decided on : 10.07.2026
Duration : Y-7, M-1, D-07

IN THE MOTOR ACCIDENT CLAIMS TRIBUNAL SATARA, AT SATARA.
(Presided over by N.M.Jamadar, Member, MACT)

M.A.C.P. No.146/2019
Exh.No.

1. Subhash Ganpati Gadekar,
Age : 58 years, Occup.: Nil,

2. Urmila Subhash Gadekar,
Age : 50 years, Occup.: Household,
Both R/o. : 195, Yadogopal Peth, Satara. **....Claimants**

V e r s u s

1. Pankaj Shrirang Mainkar,
Age : 32 years, Occup.: S.T.Driver,
R/o. : Dighanchi, Tal. Atpadi,
District Sangli.

2. Controller,
Maharashtra State Road Transport
Corporation, Division Satara. **....Respondents.**

Petition under Section 166 of Motor Vehicles Act.

Appearance:
Shri. S.N.Kenjale : Learned advocate for Claimants.
Shri. S.D.Jagatap : Learned Advocate for Respondents.

J U D G M E N T
(Delivered on 10 July, 2026)

The instant claim petition has been filed U/sec. 166 of Motor Vehicles Act (for short "M.V. Act"), for grant of compensation regarding death of Gaurav Subhash Gadekar, who died in a vehicular accident involving S.T.Bus bearing registration No. MH-14/BT-2490 (hereinafter referred to as “offending vehicle”).

Brief facts of the case are as follows;

2. That on 01.11.2018, deceased Gaurav Gadekar was proceeding towards Vita, District Sangli from Karad along with Akshay Rajaram Shalgaonkar in a Maruti Ritz car bearing registration No.MH-11/BH-3327. He was driving his car slowly and by left side of the road. At about 7:30 p.m., when he reached at village Rajmachi, the offending vehicle being driven by respondent no.1, came in excessive speed to the wrong side and gave dash to the Maruti car. Respondent no.1 was driving the offending vehicle rashly and negligently. Due to the accident, Gaurav Gadekar died on the spot while Akshay Shalgaonkar suffered injuries. When shifted to hospital, Gaurav Gadekar was declared dead. With regard to the accident, C.R.No.878/2018 came to be registered with Karad City Police Station against respondent no.1.

3. Allegedly, at the time of accident, age of deceased was 27 years. Claimants being parents of deceased, were dependent on him At the time of accident, deceased Gaurav was earning Rs.50,000/- per month from his business of builder and developer and Rs.45,000/- per month from his vocation of teacher in Krazy Creation Institute. Thus, his monthly income was Rs.95,000/-. With these contentions, claimants have prayed to hold both respondents jointly and severally liable to pay compensation claiming the compensation amount of Rs.1,98,00,000/- with interest at the rate of 18% P.A.

4. Respondent no.2 has filed written statement (Exh.19) and thereby specifically denied all the contentions put forth by claimants. Allegedly, the accident took place on Vita-Karad road near village

Rajmachi, however, respondent no.1 was not driving the offending vehicle in rash and negligent manner. Rather, the offending vehicle was proceeding by left side of the road in normal speed, when Maruti car came from Karad side in excessive speed and gave dash to the offending vehicle. Allegedly, it was head-on collision and therefore, deceased was solely responsible for the accident. It is also contended, that the petition is bad for non-joinder of necessary parties for not adding the owner and insurance company of the Maruti car involved in the accident. With these contentions and denying the liability, respondent no.2 has prayed to dismiss the petition.

5. By filing pursis at Exh.20, respondent no.1 has adopted the written statement filed by respondent no.2.

6. The predecessor of this Tribunal has framed issues at Exh.24. I reproduce the issues along with my findings thereon for the reasons to follow :

	Issues		**Findings**
1.	Whether the claimants prove that due to rash or negligent driving of the vehicle S.T.Bus bearing registration no. MH-14/BT-2490 the accident occurred and as a consequence thereof, Gaurav Subhash Gadekar died ?	:	Yes.
1A	Whether the opponents prove, that there is sole negligence of driver of Maruti car bearing no. MH-11/Bh-3327 i.e. deceased in the accident dated 01.11.2018 ?	:	No.
2.	Whether the claimants are entitled to get compensation? If yes, what should be the quantum ?	:	Yes, as per final order.
3.	Who is liable to pay compensation ?	:	Both respondents.

4.	What Order and award ?	:	Petition is partly allowed.

R E A S O N S

7. To substantiate the claim, claimants have examined Subhash (C.W.1) at Exh.27, Sandip (C.W.2) at Exh.46 and Sudhir (C.W.3) at Exh.67. Claimants have relied upon substantial documentary evidence which will be referred during appreciation of evidence. After the claimants closed evidence vide pursis at Exh.79, respondents have examined respondent no.1 Pankaj (R.W.1) at Exh.80 and Jeevandhar (R.W.2) at Exh.81 before closing evidence vide pursis at Exh.82.

8. I have heard learned learned advocate Shri. S.N.Kenjale for claimants and learned advocate Shri S.D. Jagatap, for respondents.

As to Issue Nos.1 and 1A :-

9. Admittedly, in the present case, there was an accident between Maruti car bearing no. MH-11/Bh-3327 and S.T.Bus bearing No. MH-14/BT-2490 on 01.11.2018 near village Rajmachi. It is also admitted, that respondent no.1 was driving the offending vehicle at the time of accident. On this backdrop, the contentions of the parties can be considered.

10. According to claimants, respondent no.1 drove the offending vehicle in rash and negligent manner and caused the accident in which deceased Gaurav Gadekar died. According to the respondents, deceased Gaurav Gadekar who was driving the Maruti car bearing no. MH-11/BH-3327 was solely responsible for the accident since allegedly, the accident took place due to his sole negligence. Learned Advocate for respondents Shri. S. D. Jagtap, by placing reliance on the case of ***Sitaram Prabhu Tele***

and another Vs. Rajabai Vilas Patil and others, 2002 A.C.J. 85 submitted, that in case if there is head-on collision between two vehicles the Court has to apportion the liability on both the drivers. Thus, relying on the said case, he submitted that there was even contributory negligence on the part of the deceased. Learned Advocate for the claimants Shri. S.N. Kenjale submitted, that for proving negligence on the part of respondent no.1, it is not necessary that the fact shall be proved beyond reasonable doubt. He submitted, that it is settled law that the strict rules of evidence are not applicable in the cases under accident claims. To substantiate his arguments, he relied upon the case of ***Prabhavati Vs. Managing Director, Bangalore Metropolitan Transport Corporation, Laws (SC)-2025-2-114***. It is settled law, that under M. V. Act in the cases for grant of compensation, strict rules of evidence as used in the criminal trials are not applicable and the standard of proof is preponderance of probability. Thus, there can be no dispute as to what is held in the case of ***Prabhavati*** (supra) in that regard. Keeping in mind the legal principles, it shall be seen as to who amongst the deceased and respondent no.1 was negligent causing the accident and whether principle of composite negligence or contributory negligence can be invoked. For these reasons, both the issues are taken together for discussion.

11. Subhash (C.W.1) has deposed as per the contentions in the claim petition. During cross-examination certain questions were asked on the count of happening of accident to him. Admittedly, Akshay Shalgaonkar was with the deceased in the car. A suggestion was put to the witness that at the time of accident Akshay was driving the car. However, it was denied. He also denied that he falsely deposed that the accident took place due to negligence of respondent no.1. Besides these suggestive questions, there is absolutely no cross-examination of Subhash (C.W.1) on

the point of alleged negligence or accident.

12. Respondents have examined Pankaj (R.W.1) who was driver of the offending vehicle. He deposed, that he was driving his offending vehicle by left side of the road but the Maruti car came from wrong side and gave dash to the bus. Claimants put certain suggestions to Pankaj (R.W.1) that the offending vehicle was proceeding on wrong side and the accident was caused by the offending vehicle. Thus, both the parties have denied the alleged negligence respectively on their part. Jeevandhar (R.W. 2) is hearsay witness and not direct witness on the actual accident.

13. In view of the above discussion, it is important to go through police papers on record.

14. It is not disputed, that Gaurav Gadekar died in the accident. The inquest panchnama (Exh.31) shows that Gaurav Gadekar had suffered injuries in the accident. Death certificate (Exh.32) shows that he died by head injury. Same is the case with postmortem report (Exh.33). Thus, one fact is clear that the deceased died in a vehicular accident involving Maruti car and the offending vehicle.

15. On the above backdrop, learned Advocate for the claimants pointed out the description in the panchnama of place of incident (Exh.30) to submit that the accident took place when the offending vehicle came towards wrong side and collided with Maruti car. The same panchnama is relied upon by respondents to submit that that the accident took place close to the middle portion of the road and it shows that the car was being driven negligently and it was about to come in the middle of the road.

16. After having heard both the learned Advocates, I have gone

through the panchnama (Exh.30). Since both the learned Advocates have relied upon the panchnama (Exh.30), it is safe to rely on the said panchnama. As per the panchnama (Exh.30), width of the road was 18 feet and on both sides of the road there were rough side strips having width of 5 feet each. The spot of incident is shown in the map showing that it was at the distance of 8 feet from Western boundary of the road. Thus, it was at the distance of 10 feet from Eastern boundary of the road. Admittedly, the deceased was proceeding from South side to North side while the offending vehicle was proceeding from North side to South side.

17. When the spot of incident was at a distance of 8 feet from the West boundary of the road, it would mean that the car was being driven on correct side of the road and it was not in the middle of the road. If the same spot is considered for the offending vehicle, it clearly indicates that the spot was 1 feet beyond the middle line of the road towards West side. Thus, it is abundantly crystal clear that the offending vehicle was not on the correct side of the road but it had crossed the middle line and gone towards West side of the road. This would indicate that the offending vehicle was not following the rules of traffic and therefore, the driver of the offending vehicle was rash and negligent in driving it.

18. It is important to mention, that admittedly a crime has been registered against respondent no.1 and the charge-sheet has been filed. It is settled law, that when regarding an accident a charge-sheet is filed against driver of the offending vehicle, one can presume during the proceeding under Section 166 of the M. V. Act, that the offending vehicle was driven rashly or negligently. Therefore, the settled law as well as position shown in the police papers which are not disputed by respondents, clearly indicate that Pankaj (R.W.1) is trying to express

incorrect situation of accident. When the panchnama (Exh.30) is not disputed, it is clear that the deceased was driving the car by correct side of the road while the offending vehicle went on wrong side and gave dash to the car. Therefore, in view of the discussion made above, when death of deceased Gaurav Gadekar is not in dispute, it is clearly established that the accident took place due to rash and negligent driving of the offending vehicle by respondent no.1 and there was no question of any negligence on the part of the deceased in driving the car. Thus, neither the case of sole negligence of deceased nor the case of contributory negligence of deceased is established. It was solely because of respondent no.1, the accident happened. In the said accident, the deceased died.

19. Since it is clarified that there was no negligence on the part of deceased in driving his car, there is no question of making the owner and insurance company of Maruti car party in the petition. Thus, the defence that the petition is not maintainable for non-joinder of necessary parties has no merit. There is absolutely no requirement that the owner and insurance company of Maruti car shall be joined as parties in the petition. Thus, the defence has failed and by preponderance of probability on the basis of investigation documents and legal presumptions discussed above, it is clear that death of deceased was caused in the accident caused by respondent no.1. Therefore, I answer issue no.1 in the affirmative and issue no. 1A in the negative and record my findings accordingly.

As to Issue Nos.2 to 4 :

20. Once it is established, that death of deceased was caused due to rash and negligent driving by respondent no.1 of the offending vehicle causing accident, being driver and owner both the respondents shall be jointly and severally liable to pay compensation to claimants. Thus, it is

necessary to see as to what shall be the quantum of compensation to be granted. In that regard, the evidence adduced by claimants shall be taken into consideration.

21. So far as the age of the deceased Gaurav Gaadekar is concerned, according to claimants on the date of death, his age was 27 years. This aspect has been simply denied by respondents. However, from the date of birth mentioned on the PAN Card (Exh.34), it appears that the deceased had born on 24.04.1991. Thus, on the date of accident i.e. on 01.11.2018, his age was 27 years. In this regard for drawing appropriate multiplier, the chart in the case of ***Sarala Verma Vs. Delhi Transport Corporation and another (2009) 6 SCC 121*** shall be taken into consideration. As such for the age group of 26 to 30 years the appropriate multiplier is 17. Hence, subject to the evidence of income of deceased, the multiplier which shall be applied in the case, shall be 17.

22. Admittedly, both the claimants are parents of deceased. The deceased has died unmarried. Thus, he was bachelor at the time of accident, therefore, with regard to dependency and deduction from income of the deceased, the principles in the case of ***National Insurance Company Ltd. Vs. Pranay Sethi & Others (2017) 16 SCC 680*** are material. In the said judgment, in case if the deceased died bachelor leaving only parents, there shall be deduction for personal expenses to the extent of ½ share. Since in the case in hand, the deceased was a bachelor and he died leaving only parents, deduction for personal expenses shall be ½.

23. Coming to the income of deceased, learned Advocate for claimants Shri. S.N.Kenjale submitted, that the deceased had acquired Diploma in Animation Course from Pune University and as such in the

Animation Institute named Krazy Creation Institute at Satara, he was serving and getting salary of Rs.45,000/- per month. According to him, the deceased was also doing the business of builder and developer and his income therefrom was Rs.50,000/- per month. Hence, it is claimed that the income of deceased was Rs.95,000/- per month. To counter this arguments, the learned Advocate for respondents Shri. S. D. Jagatap submitted, that it is not possible to consider that the deceased was simultaneously doing two businesses i.e. of teaching and of builder and developer.

24. Considering respective arguments, the evidence on record has to be taken into consideration.

25. Through Sandip (C.W.2), claimants have brought on record, the evidence of appointment letter (Exh.47) of Gaurav Gadekar with Krazy Creation Technical Institute, confirmation letter (Exh.48), transfer letter (Exh.49) and certificate of Gaurav Gadekar (Exh.50). They have also relied upon the bank statements of the employer at Exh.55 to Exh.59. Even the cash vouchers have been relied upon which are at Exh.60 to Exh.65. Sandip (C.W.2) has admitted that as per the agreement with deceased, he was not permitted to work anywhere else and he was not permitted to do any business. It is also admitted, that there is no document to show that the deceased was paid Rs.45,000/- towards salary or Rs.25,000/- towards salary. Considering these aspects from the evidence of Sandip (C.W.2) what appears is that he has done a Certificate Course in Animation.

26. It cannot be denied, that he was given appointment on the job by Krazy Creation Technical Institute. However, the bank account extracts noted above, do not show clear entries either regarding payment of Rs.20,000/- per month or Rs.25,000/- per month or Rs.45,000/- per

month. There are stray entries of payment of Rs.7,000/- Rs.10,000/- etc. at various different times to the deceased. Therefore, the mere vouchers at Exh.60 to Exh.65 cannot be the deciding factor in absence of clear evidence of payment of Rs.45,000/- to deceased towards salary every month. However, the fact stands proved that the deceased was serving with Krazy Creation Technical Institute.

27. Through Sudhir (C.W.3), claimants have tried to bring on record evidence regarding their contentions that the deceased was also doing construction business. Sudhir (C.W.3) has deposed to have given construction work to the deceased by agreement. The agreement is at Exh.68. The said agreement indicates that there could be a transaction whereby the deceased had accepted to construct a house for Sudhir (C.W.3). However, this is the only agreement produced on record and there is no license or authorization that the deceased was a builder and developer. Although Sudhir (C.W.3) deposed, that he transferred Rs.15,00,000/- in the account of the deceased, the bank account extracts produced at Exh.85 to Exh.92 as well as Exh.93 do not disclose the receipt of Rs.15,00,000/- by deceased from Sudhir (C.W.3). Even the income tax return of deceased filed at Exh.99 to Exh.104 and the bank account extracts at Exh.96 to Exh.98 do not indicate the payment of any specific amount as alleged to the deceased. Therefore, by virtue of the judgment in the case of ***Prabhavati*** (Supra), applying the principle of preponderance of probability, the only inference can be drawn from the evidence of Sandip (C.W.2) and Sudhir (C.W.3) that the deceased was working with Krazy Creation Technical Institute and was also accepting the contracts for construction of houses. However, there is no clear evidence either about his salary from service or about his income from the business.

28. With regard to income of the deceased, learned Advocate for claimants Shri. S.N.Kenjale has relied upon the income tax returns at Exh.35 to Exh.38. According to him, the latest income tax return filed by the deceased before his death shall be taken into consideration for drawing his annual income.

29. Here, it shall be noted that when learned Advocate for claimants is specifically relying upon the income tax returns, it shall be mentioned that income tax returns being an authentic document regarding declaration of income to the Income Tax Department, can be taken into consideration. Income tax return is a statutory document and hence it can be relied upon for computation of annual income of deceased. Therefore, whatever evidence was tried to be brought on record regarding income of deceased from Krazy Creation Technical Institute and from the business of builder and developer, all must reflects in the income tax returns. At least it can be assumed that all income drawn from all relevant sources was disclosed by the deceased while making payment of income tax. Therefore, income tax return shall be considered as the sole document of income in the case in hand.

30. The income tax returns for the assessment year 2015-2016 to assessment year 2018-2019 have been produced on record. On perusal of the computation sheet it shows that there is mention of salary received from Krazy Creation Technical Institute. Thus, all requisite sources have been shown in the computation sheet, however, the question is income tax return of which year shall be considered. In this regard, placing reliance on following judgments, learned Advocate for claimants Shri. S. N. Kenjale submitted, that the highest income shown in the income tax return shall be considered. The judgment relied on are the following.

(1) ***Malarvizhi Vs. United India Insurance Co. Ltd., AUR 2929 Supreme Court 90***,

(2) ***National Insurance Co. Ltd. Vs. Nagma Hujefa Usmani and Ors., 2026: BHC-AS: 24062*** and

(3) ***Santita Arya Vs. Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd., AIR Online 2020 SC 592***.

(4) Smt. Anjali and others Vs. Lokendra Rathod and others, 2020 LiveLaw (SC) 1012.

31. I have carefully gone through the said judgments. In the case of ***Malarvizhi*** (supra), it was observed that since income tax return is a statutory document to determine annual income of deceased, it can be relied upon. In the said case, when the Hon'ble High Court had relied upon the income tax return showing highest income, the Hon'ble Apex Court did not find fault in it. In the case of ***National Insurance Company*** (supra), the last income tax return prior to death of deceased was taken into consideration. In the case of ***Smt.Sangita*** (supra), the last income tax return of deceased even filed after his death was taken into consideration. In the case of ***Smt.Anjali*** (supra), document of income tax return has been held to be reliable for computation of annual income. Thus, if the authorities referred above are taken into consideration, either the income tax return showing highest income or the last income tax return before the death of deceased would be relevant for drawing his annual income.

32. Learned Advocate Shri. S.N.Kenjale also submitted that once the income tax return is believed no deductions of tax from amount drawn as compensation shall not be considered. To substantiate his submissions, he relied upon the following three cases.

(1) Vimal Kanwar & Ors Vs. Kishore Dan & Ors., AIR 2013 Supreme Court 3830,

(2) National Insurance Co. Ltd. Vs. Indira Srivastava & Ors., AIR 2008 Supreme Court 845, and

(3) Manorama Sinha and another Vs. Divisional Manager, Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd. & Ors., 2025 INSC 1237.

33. I have carefully gone through the judgments referred above. The question in those cases was, whether the income tax is liable to be deducted for determination of compensation under M.V.Act. In the case of ***Vimal Kanwar*** (supra) it was held that no deduction from compensation amount towards income tax shall be done. In the case of ***Indira Srivastava*** (supra), it was the issue under consideration whether the facilities being provided to the family stand as benefit. Similarly, the issue of deduction of income tax from the compensation amount was under consideration. In the case of ***Manorama*** (supra), similar issue was under consideration. The crux of the inference is, to not to charge income tax on the compensation amount.

34. After having considered the legal discussion with reference to the case laws produced on record it is safe to rely upon the income tax return for the assessment year 2018-2019 which was showing that the deceased had income and it was even the last income tax return of the deceased. It also shows, his income from all relevant sources, such as business income as well as salary income. As per the income tax return at Exh.38, the annual income of the deceased was Rs.3,59,509/-. Hence, this can be considered to be yearly income of deceased for the purpose of deciding quantum of compensation.

35. The claimants being parents are dependents of the deceased and hence the yearly income of Rs.3,59,509/- has to be divided by 2 for drawing the figure of personal expenses of deceased. The same comes to

Rs.1,79,755/- (Rs.3,59,509/- (÷) 2). Thus, after deducting the said amount from his income, the amount of loss of dependency would be drawn. It is Rs.1,79,755/- (Rs.3,59,509 (–) Rs.1,79,755/-). It is the amount of loss of dependency. As per the judgment in the case of ***Pranay Sethi*** (supra), loss of future prospect shall be considered as the deceased had shown his employment in the income tax returns. He can be considered to be a salaried employee. His age was below 40 years. Therefore, he is entitled to 50% of amount towards loss of future prospects. It comes to Rs.89,878/- (Rs.1,79,755/- (÷) 2). For drawing the multiplicand, the amount of loss of dependency and the amount of future prospects shall be calculated. It comes to Rs.2,69,633/- (Rs.1,79,755/- (+) Rs.89,878/-).

36. The multiplicand of Rs.2,69,633/- shall be multiplied by the multiplier, which is 17. The total comes to Rs.45,83,761/- (Rs.2,69,633 (x) 17). As per the judgment in the case of ***Pranay Sethi*** (supra), the conventional heads shall be granted with 10% of increase after every three years. As such, the amount of funeral expenses shall be Rs.18,000/-, the amount of loss of estate shall be Rs.18,000/- and amount of consortium shall be Rs.48,000/-. Although, by relying on the judgment in the case of ***Sriram General Insurance Co. Ltd. Vs. Bhagatsingh Rawat and others in Criminal Appeal Nos. 2410-2412/2023***, learned Advocate for respondents submitted to not to grant the amount of loss of consortium to both parents, it is settled subsequently that parental consortium can be granted. Thus, for both the claimants, the total amount of consortium shall be Rs.96,000/- (Rs.48,000 (x) 2). As such, total amount of compensation would come to Rs.47,15,741/-.

37. Learned Advocate Shri. S.N.Kenjale prayed for grant of 9% of

interest on the amount of compensation. For that purpose, he relied upon the judgments in the case of ***Smt.Anjali*** (supra), ***Prabhavati*** (supra), ***Malarvizhi*** (supra) and ***Vimal*** (supra). After having gone through the judgments in the said cases, I am of the considered view that there shall be no harm to grant interest at the rate of 9% P.A. and it shall be charged from the date of filing of the claim petition till realization of compensation amount. Therefore, in view of the discussion made above, I answer issue no.2 in the affirmative as per final order, issue no.3, as both respondents jointly and severally and record my findings accordingly. The claim petition, therefore, deserves to be partly allowed with proportionate costs. Since the claimants have only paid Rs.5,000/- towards Court fees, they shall be directed to pay deficit Court fees within 15 days. If they fail to pay the same, it can be recovered. Hence, in the result and in answer to issue no.4, I pass following order.

O r d e r

1. The petition is partly allowed with proportionate costs

2. The claimant nos. 1 and 2 are entitled to compensation amount of Rs.47,15,741/- (Rupees Forty-seven Lakhs Fifteen Thousand Seven Hundred Forty-one Only).

3. The respondents No.1 and 2 are directed to jointly and severally pay an amount of Rs.47,15,741/- (Rupees Forty-seven Lakhs Fifteen Thousand Seven Hundred Forty-one Only) inclusive of N.F.L. amount, to claimants along with interest @ 9% p.a. to be charged from the date of filing of the petition till realization of the entire amount.

4. The respondents are directed to deposit the compensation amount of Rs.47,15,741/- (Rupees Forty-seven Lakhs Fifteen Thousand Seven Hundred Forty-one Only) along with the interest as above, by R.T.G.S. or N.E.F.T. in the Bank account of the claimant nos.1 and 2 in equal proportion (half each) and intimate compliance thereof to

this Tribunal as early as possible. For that purpose the claimants are directed to produce the bank details with a certificate of Banker giving details of their respective Bank accounts including IFSC code or a copy of cancelled cheque each of their bank account. These details shall also be given to respondents. This compliance shall be done within 15 days from the date of judgment. If the claimants have no Bank account, then they shall immediately open the Bank account and make compliance accordingly within two weeks.

5. The claimants are directed to pay deficit Court fees within 15 days. If they fail to pay the same, it can be recovered.

Draw award accordingly.

(Dictated and pronounced in open court).

Digitally signed by NASIRHUSEN MOHIDDIN JAMADAR
Date: 2026.07.10 17:34:49 +0530

Place : Satara. (N. M. Jamadar)
Dated : 10.07.2026 Member, M.A.C.T, Satara.

CERTIFICATE

I affirm that the contents of this PDF file Judgment are same word for word as per original Judgment.

Name of the Steno	:	Jitendra R. Bartakke
Name of the Court	:	Shri. N. M. Jamadar Member, MACT, Satara.
Date	:	10.07.2026
Judgment signed by Presiding Officer on	:	10.07.2026
Judgment uploaded on	:	10.07.2026