

**BEFORE THE MOTOR ACCIDENTS CLAIMS TRIBUNAL, ATTUR,  
(SALEM DISTRICT)**

Present: **Thiru S.Ganesan, B.Sc.,M.A.B.L.,**  
MOTOR ACCIDENTS CLAIMS TRIBUNAL  
(SUBORDINATE JUDGE)

**Monday this the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of March 2026**

**M.A.C.O.P. No.67/2019  
(CNR No.TNSA 12000-918-2019)**

1.	Name and address of the Claimant(s)	<p>1. Annamayeli, aged about 45 years, wife of Late. Chinnasamy, Door No.132B, East Harijan Street, Pethanaickenpalayam village and Post, Pethanaickenpalayam Taluk, Salem District.</p> <p>2. Manimuthu, aged about 37 years, son of Chinnasamy, Door No.132B, East Harijan Street, Pethanaickenpalayam village and Post, Pethanaickenpalayam Taluk, Salem District.</p> <p>3. Anbukkarasi, aged about 23 years, wife of Kalleriyan, D/o. Chinnasamy, Door No.1/45, Adi Dravidar Street, Chockanathapuram village and Post, Attur Taluk, Salem District.</p>
2.	Name and Address of the Respondent(s)	<p>1. Elayaraja, aged about 35 years, son of Chinnasamy, Harisana plot No.13/50, Gate No.06, Abdulhameed road, Near Madadevi Mandir, Malat West, Malvani, Mumbai City, Maharashtra State.</p> <p>2. Ramraj, aged about 54 years, son of Sambasivam, No.F 310, Martin Multi proset, S.B.Pattiroad, Chinnavedampatti pot, Coimbatore District 641 035</p> <p>3. National Insurance Company Limited, Maruthi Vartical Divisional Office -10, 803 Tower C.Konnactus</p>

		Bhavbhulli Marg, Near Minto Bridge, Opp New Delhi Railway Station, Ajmeri Gate, New Delhi 110 002.
3.	Date of filing of the claim petition	17.06.2019
4.	Date of Award	23.03.2026
5.	Amount of Award	<b>Rs.6,24,000/- (Rupees Six Lakhs and twenty four thousand only)</b>  <b>1<sup>st</sup> Petitioner is entitled for a sum of Rs.2,49,600/-</b> <b>2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioners and the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent are also entitled for a sum of Rs.1,24,800/- each (Rs.3,74,400/-)</b>
6.	Costs allowed	Rs.18,286.50
7.	Total Court Fee	Rs.5,612.50/-
8.	Court fee paid	Rs.375/-
9.	Balance of Court fee to be paid	Rs.5,237.50/-
10.	Note	As per the direction of the Hon'ble High Court, Madras in Tr.CMP.Nos.264 to 281 of 2020 M/s.Cholamandalam M/S General Insurance Company Limited -vs-Ayyanar.S. and Others Dated 11.05.2020 no separate decretal Order will be drafted

This petition came before me on 23.03.2026 for final hearing in the presence of Thiru.R.P.Marimuthu, the Learned counsel for the Petitioners, and Thiru.G.E.Veerakumar, Learned Counsel for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent,

Tmt.B.Radha Rukmani, Learned Counsel for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Respondent. R1 called absent set exparte and upon hearing both sides arguments and on perusal of entire material records placed before me, this Tribunal passed the following

### ORDER

Facts relating to the claim:

- |                        |   |                                |
|------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 1.Claim for            | : | Death                          |
| 2.Name of the deceased | : | Chinnasamy, son of Gundukannan |
| 3.Age of the deceased  | : | 55 years                       |
| 4.Occupation           | : | Verrilai Kodikal work          |
| 5.Income pleaded       | : | Rs.30,000/- per month          |
| 6.Date of accident     | : | 16.01.2018                     |
| 7.Compensation claimed | : | Rs.30,00,000/-                 |

1. **The laconic of facts stated in the petition is as follows:-**

2. On 16.01.2018 at about 08.30 A.M. the deceased Chinnasamy along with one Govindan had gone to see a betel view garden near Sanyasi Madam in Thalavaipatti from Pethanaickenpalayam at about 08.30 A.M. While returning Govindan was driving the two wheeler TVS XL bearing registration No.TN77-H-0160, the deceased Chinnasamy was sitting on the back of the vehicle. As they were traveling from east to west on the Salem - Chennai bye pass road near the Attur Thalavaipatti junction, a driver in a Maruti Suzuki Car bearing Registration No.TN38-CK-2507 coming from behind in the same direction (east to west towards Salem) drove the vehicle in a rash and negligent manner and dashed against the TVS XL vehicle and causing the accident. Due to the accident, the Chinnasamy sustained severe

bleeding injuries to the back of his head, severe internal injuries to his left eye and cheek and left shoulder, and abrasions to his left knee and the big toe of his right foot and the rider Govindan sustained injuries. The two wheeler vehicle also sustained damage.

3. Immediately, after the accident the Chinnasamy was taken to the Government Hospital, Attur given first aid and admitted in Salem Mohan Kumaramangalam Medical College Hospital on 16.01.2018 and he was in treatment till 22.01.2018. But, the deceased died on 22.01.2018.

4. The accident was occurred only due to the rash and negligent driving of the driver at the time of the accident. In this regard, Attur Rural Police had registered a case against the owner cum driver of the vehicle i.e., the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent in Crime No.28/2018 under section 279, 337 of IPC. Further, altered report filed under Section 279,337 and 304(A) IPC. The deceased was working as a contractor for verrilai kodikal and and he was earning not less than Rs. 30,000/- per month. Due to this accident, the sudden death of the deceased the life of the petitioners are in "DOL DRUM". The first petitioner is wife, 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner and 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioners are the son and daughter of the deceased Chinnasamy. The 1<sup>st</sup> respondent is the elder son of the deceased. The 1<sup>st</sup> respondent is residing at Bombay. 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent is the owner cum driver of the accident vehicle and insured with the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent.

5. The petitioners are entitled to a sum of Rs.30,00,000/- as compensation towards all other heads from the respondents. The 2 & 3 respondents are jointly and severally liable to pay the compensation amount of Rs.30,00,000/- with cost and interest at the rate of 15% per annum from the date of accident till the date of realization.

6. The abridgment of the counter filed by the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent is as follows:

7. All the averments found in the petition are repudiated, except those specially admitted herein. This respondent denies the allegations regarding the age, occupation, income leveled in column 3, 4,5 and 6 respectively of the claim petition are all false and incorrect one and the petitioner is put to strict proof of the same. The amount claimed on various heads in para 21 of the claim petition are very high, baseless and not in accordance with law. This respondent further submits that accident as alleged by the petitioner's had not taken place. Further the accident had taken place only on the negligence of the deceased by not taking care of the signals and by not following even the basic rules of driving. The deceased is liable for contributory negligent. Therefore, the deceased is solely responsible for the accident and this respondent or her driver did not cause the accident. So this respondent is not liable to pay any compensation to the deceased as claimed by the petitioners in the above petition.

8. The accident occurred and the deceased died during the subsistence of the policy and within the terms and condition of the policy. Hence if at all any compensation to be payable to the petitioner, that can be awarded only against the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent namely the insurer.

9. This respondent is unnecessary party to the proceedings. Hence, the petition is not maintainable as against this respondent.

10. The allegations leveled in para 1 and it of the column 23 are all false and incorrect. The age, education, professional training, occupation and income of the deceased are all denied and the petitioner is put to strict

proof of the same.

11. The allegations leveled in para iii of column 23 are all the false and incorrect one. It is denied that the petitioner is the dependent of the deceased and she would like for another 35 years. There is no merit in the petition and it is liable to be dismissed In-liminie. This respondent reserve his right to file additional counter if it is necessary. Therefore, the petition is liable to be dismissed with costs.

12. **The abridgment of the counter filed by the 3<sup>rd</sup> Respondent is as follows:**

13. The petition is false, frivolous and unsustainable in law and on facts. All the averments made in the petition except those that are specifically admitted hereunder are hereby denied and the petitioner is put to strict proof of the same. All the allegations made in Para 24 of the petition are not true. The second respondent drove the CAR bearing registration number TN-38 CK-2507 very slowly and carefully on his proper side and observing all the traffic rules. 4) It is false to allege that the deceased travelled in a TVS XL motor cycle bearing registration number TN-77-H-0160, as pillion rider.

14. As per the Accident Register of the petitioner given by the Government Hospital, Attur and as per the MVI report of the TVS XL and also by the statement given by Govindaraj, it is clear that the Deceased Chinnasamy, had alone driven the TVS XL motor cycle, on the date of accident. It is false to allege that the rider of the TVS XL motor cycle one, Govindhan, was driving the motor cycle from East to West, observing all the traffic rules. It is again false to allege that, while the rider of the TVS XL was nearing the ThalaivaiPatti Pirivu Road, the second respondent drove the CAR

in rash an negligent manner, came on the backside of the deceased motor cycle and dashed against the TVS XL Motor cycle,

15. In fact, the second respondent was driving the CAR bearing registration number TN 38CK 2507, very slowly and the carefully, on his proper side, observing all the traffic rules, sounding the horns, while so, the rider of the TVS XL, drove the TVS 50 motor cycle, rashly and negligently with high speed, without observing the traffic rules, without observing the on coming vehicles, suddenly and unexpectedly, without giving any signals, turned from the Pirivu Road to the main road, came on the line of motion of the CAR and dashed against the same. Therefore the accident was not due to the rash and negligent driving of the driver of the second respondent. Hence, the accident was solely due to the rash and negligent on the part of the rider of the TVS XL. So the petitioners have come forward with this unlawful and false petition as against this respondent only with an illegal intention to obtain unlawful compensation from this respondent.

16. The deceased had voluntarily, knowingly, willfully and wantonly had driven the TVS XL Motor cycle without valid and effective driving licence and had failed to wear helmet on the date of the accident in violation of the MV ACT. So, this respondent is not liable to pay any compensation to the petitioner, as such; this petition is liable to be dismissed as against the respondent In-limine. The accident occurred on 16.01.2018, but the intimation to the police was given on 18.01.2018, after two days delay. This itself will clearly reveal the after thought mind of the petitioner to change the incident into accident. The petitioners have to prove by acceptable documentary evidence that they are the only legal heirs of the deceased.

17. The Petitioners have to prove by acceptable documentary

evidence the age and income of the deceased as they all are denied by this respondent. The amounts claimed under various heads were not incurred and are excessive and arbitrary and cannot be claimed by the petitioners. The petitioners have to prove every item of the loss alleged by acceptable documentary evidence. As per the Adhar of the deceased Chinnasamy, the age was 63 years, at the time of accident. Hence, prayed to dismiss the petitioner against the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent. The claim against the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent shall be dismissed.

18. **The point for consideration is:**

1. ***On whose negligence, did the accident occur?***
2. ***Which Respondent is liable to pay the compensation to the Petitioners?***
3. ***Whether the Petitioners are entitled to compensation? if so what is the quantum?***

19. **Point No.1:-**

20. In order to shew and evince the case of the Petitioners, the 1<sup>st</sup> Petitioner Tmt.Annamayeli,, was examined herself as PW1 and Tr.Rajendran was examined as PW.2 and the evidence of PW1 and PW.2 are nothing but total replica of the averments made in the petition. Through the PW1, Copy of FIR, Copy of Postmortem certificate, Copy of Death Certificate, Legal Heir certificate, Copy of Rough Sketch, MVI Report the vehicle CAR bearing registration number TN 38CK 2507, Copy of R.C. of the vehicle, Insurance policy of the vehicle and copy of D.L. of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent were marked as Ex.P1 to Ex.P10 through PW.1. During the cross examination of PW.1 Ex.R1 to R4 were marked. Copy of Family card, Adhar card copy of Chinnasamy, Adar card copy of the 1 to 3 petitioners were marked.

21. On the side of Respondents, none of the oral as well as documentary evidence were adduced.

22. The 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner is the Wife and 2 & 3 petitioners are the Son and Daughter of the deceased Chinnasamy. On 16.01.2018 at about 08.30 A.M. the deceased Chinnasamy along with one Govindan had gone to see a betel view garden near Sanyasi Madam in Thalavaipatti from Pethanaickenpalayam at about 08.30 A.M. While returning Govindan was driving the two wheeler TVS XL bearing registration No.TN77-H-0160, the deceased Chinnasamy was sitting on the back of the vehicle. As they were traveling from east to west on the Salem - Chennai bye pass road near the Attur Thalavaipatti junction, a driver in a Maruti Suzuki Car bearing Registration No.TN38-CK-2507 coming from behind in the same direction (east to west towards Salem) drove the vehicle in a rash and negligent manner and dashed against the TVS XL vehicle and causing the accident. Due to the accident, the Chinnasamy sustained severe bleeding injuries to the back of his head, severe internal injuries to his left eye and cheek and left shoulder, and abrasions to his left knee and the big toe of his right foot and the rider Govindan sustained injuries. Subsequently, the deceased Chinnasamy was died due to the injuries caused on the accident.

23. The accident was occurred only due to the rash and negligent driving of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent i.e., owner cum driver of the vehicle Maruti Suzuki Car bearing Registration No.TN38-CK-2507 In this regard, Attur Police had registered a case against the driver of the first respondent in Crime No.25/2018 under section 279, 304 'A' of IPC. The vehicle is insured with the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent.

24. The Ex.P1 is the copy of the F.I.R, it reveals that the owner

cum driver of the vehicle i.e., the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent Maruti Suzuki Car bearing Registration No.TN38-CK-2507 drove the vehicle without observing the road rules and regulation with high speed in a rash and negligent manner, so as to endanger human life and dashed against the TVS XL vehicle deceased Chinnasamy and hit the deceased and he died on the spot.

25. The 3<sup>rd</sup> Respondent counsel argued at the time of accident the deceased Chinnasamy had valid D.L. and failed to wear the helmet and violation of policy and the intimation to the police delayed for two days and the accident is happened due to the own negligence of the deceased only. The deceased Chinnasamy is a pillion rider only. Hence, the arguments of the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent counsel cannot be countenanced.

26. But, no witness was examined on the side of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Respondent to prove the above said facts. Thereby, the FIR and other details clearly indicates that the proximity and cause of the accident is only due to the rash and negligent act of the driving of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent only.

27. Further, the 3<sup>rd</sup> Respondent has not examined any independent witnesses to prove that only due to the negligent act of the deceased among the accident was took place.

28. Further, the 3<sup>rd</sup> Respondent didn't examine the Investigation Officer who investigated the criminal case to prove that the deceased was liable for the accident. Further, this Tribunal is of the view that the proximate cause of the accident is the rash and negligent driving of the vehicle owner cum driver of the vehicle i.e., 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent who drove the Maruti Suzuki Car bearing Registration No.TN38-CK-2507 and he is liable for the accident.

29. Therefore, considering the evidence of PW.1 and documents supported by the petitioners, it would clearly revealed that the accident happened only due to the high speed and rash and negligent manner of the driving of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent's vehicle Maruti Suzuki Car bearing Registration No.TN38-CK-2507. Hence, the owner cum driver of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent vehicle Maruti Suzuki Car bearing Registration No.TN38-CK-2507 is held liable for the accident. Accordingly, the point No.1 is answered.

30. **Point No.2:-**

31. As discussed in point No.1, this Tribunal has held that the driver of the vehicle was responsible for the cause of the accident. Therefore, the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent being the owner cum driver of the offending vehicle Maruti Suzuki Car bearing Registration No.TN38-CK-2507, is liable to pay compensation to the petitioners. Further, the 3<sup>rd</sup> Respondent has not denied that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent vehicle is not insured with the 3<sup>rd</sup> Respondent. Since the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent insured his vehicle with the 3<sup>rd</sup> Respondent and the 3<sup>rd</sup> Respondent Insurance Company is bound to indemnify the compensation payable by the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent. As the insurance of the vehicle is in force from 22.07.2017 to 21.07.2018 under the Ex.P9 Insurance policy of the vehicle. Hence, the 3<sup>rd</sup> Respondent Insurance Company is liable to pay compensation to the petitioners. Accordingly, the point No.2 is answered.

32. **Point No.3 :-**

33. The Petitioners in their petition as well as proof affidavit and in the petition, they have specifically stated that the deceased Chinnasamy was doing Verrilai kodikal work and he was earning Rs.30,000/- per month. There is no documentary evidence has been produced

to shows the income of the deceased Chinnasamy.

34. Hence, an adverse inference had to be drawn against claimants since they had not produced any positive and cogent evidence to establish the income of the deceased and also the loss of income to the claimants/petitioners.

35. The Hon'ble Apex Court in *NATIONAL INSURANCE CO. LTD. v. PRANAY SETHI AND OTHERS* reported in 2017 SCC on line SC 1270 has held that income of the deceased will have to be taken into consideration based on the established income, would apply in all force to the facts on hand.

36. Since, there is no other go, except to rely the notional income is fixed as Rs.10,000/-. Moreover, the petitioner is worked as a verrilai kodikal work. the income of the deceased would be notionally fixed as Rs.10,000/- Since, the accident occurred in the year 2018. The cost of escalation the monthly income is fixed at **Rs.10,000/-** by being guess work for fixing the income. since there is no substantiating materials to show the income of the deceased individual. Hence, the monthly income is fixed at **Rs.10,000/-**.

37. The age of the deceased at the time of accident is 55 years mentioned in the petition as well as the Ex.P2 Post Postmortem certificate of deceased. But in the Aadhar card it is noted as 63 years in Ex.R.2 . Hence, considering the age of the petitioners and the relevant official documents like ration card and Aadhar card the age is 63. Hence, only to raise the claim, it has been mentioned as 55 years. Therefore, this tribunal fixes the age of the deceased is fixed as 63 years. Hence, this Tribunal is inclined to fix the age of

the deceased as 63 years.

38. As per *Sarla Varma and Pranay Sethy* cases, the multiplier would be 7 for the 61-65 years old. As per Pranay Sethy case.

39. The deceased left with petitoenrs 1 to 3 and the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent as legal heirs to succeed the estate of the deceased. Thereby, the 1/4th of income has to be deducted. Zfurther the 1<sup>st</sup> respondents is reisdnf in Bombay thereby is also entitled to one of the share as apportionment in the award.

40. For the above reasons, the just compensation to be payable to petitioner is calculated, calibrated and tabulated as follows:-

**Head of Compensation Awarded**

i)	Income	Rs.10,000/-
iii)	Total Income	Rs.10,000/-
iv)	After deducting 1/4 since the petitioners are the dependents of the deceased	The income deducting ¼ for personal and living expenses is Rs.10,000-Rs.2,500= Rs.7,500/-
v)	Loss of future income	Rs.7,500 x 12 x 7 =Rs.6,30,000/-
vi)	Loss of love and affection Spousal consortium Rs.40,000/-  Filial consortium Rs.40,000 x 2 =Rs.80,000/-  Total	Rs.40,000/-  Rs.80,000/-  Rs.1,20,000/-
vii)	Loss of Funeral expenses	Rs.15,000/-
Viii)	Loss of Estate	Rs.15,000/-

	Total	<b>Rs.7,80,000/-</b>
--	-------	----------------------

41. In this case the deceased, he driven the vehicle without helmet and driving license. Further, the injuries were on the head cranial vault fracture right temporal bone M - 6 Cms and right parietal bone M - 8 Cms. Brain Sum Arachnoid hemorrhage all over the brain surface base of skull. Therefore, for the contributory negligence caused upon the accident by the deceased 20% to be deducted as whole for without having helmet and driving license.

42. Hence, from the total amount **Rs.7,80,000/-** 20% has to be deducted for contributory negligence. i.e 1,56,000/- Hence, the total awarded sum after deduction is **Rs.6,24,000/-**

43. In the awarded sum, the 1<sup>st</sup> Petitioner is entitled to 40%, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioners and 1<sup>st</sup> respondent are entitled to 20% each.

44. In the result, this petition is partly allowed with proportionate costs. The petitioners and 1<sup>st</sup> respondent are entitled to a sum of **Rs.6,24,000/- (Rupees Six Lakhs and twenty four thousand only)**. Out of the compensation amount, the 1<sup>st</sup> Petitioner is entitled for a sum of **Rs.2,49,600/-**. The 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioners and 1<sup>st</sup> respondent are also entitled for a sum of **Rs.1,24,800/-** each (Total **Rs.3,74,400/-**) as compensation with interest at 7.5% per annum from the date of filing i.e., on 17.06.2019 to till the date of payment. The 3<sup>rd</sup> Respondent is liable to pay compensation and it is directed to pay/deposit such compensation in **MACT Bank Current Account Number 42827362039 (IFSC Code No.SBIN0000810)** within 30 days from the date of this order. From the amount, half of the amount is

payable to the petitioners and half of the amount is ordered to be deposited in any Nationalized Bank for a period of 3 years with condition that the 3<sup>rd</sup> Respondent has to send the details of deposited amount to this Court within 48 hours of depositing the compensation amount to the mail of this Court i.e., [slmatu.SC-tn@indiancourts.nic.in](mailto:slmatu.SC-tn@indiancourts.nic.in) Advocate fee is fixed at Rs.11,974/- The 3<sup>rd</sup> Respondent is also directed to pay the cost as tabulated hereunder.

### COST DETAILS

<b>Particulars</b>	<b>Petitioners Rs.</b>
Stamp on Court fee	5612.5
Vakalath	10.00
Documents stamp	35.00
Process fees	255.00
Advocate Fees	11974
Notice charges	200.00
Writing charges	200.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>Rs.18,286.50</b>

1.	Name & Address	:	Subordinate Judge,Attur (MACT) MCOP Tribunal, Attur (Salem District)
2.	Name and address of Bank Account maintained by the Subordinate Judge,Attur MCOP Tribunal, Attur	:	The Branch Manager, State Bank of India, Attur
3.	Account Number of the Subordinate Judge, MCOP		Current Account Number 42827362039

	Tribunal, Attur		
4.	Bank Code No.	:	810
5.	IFS Code		SBIN0000810
6.	MICR Code	:	636002027

The Petitioner has filed separate petition under rule 24(3) of MV claim rules for exemption of court fee and paid court fee of **Rs.375/-** is affixed in the claim petition. The Court fee is fixed at **Rs.5,612.50**. The Deficit Court fee of **Rs.5,237.50** shall be paid by petitioner within a month from the date of this order and only on such payment the petitioner shall be entitled to withdraw the sum deposited pursuant to the award.

Dictated to the Steno-typist typed by her through computer and directly and corrected and pronounced in the open court on this the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of March 2026.

MOTOR ACCIDENTS CLAIMS TRIBUNAL  
(SUBORDINATE JUDGE) ATTUR

**Petitioner side witnesses:-**

PW.1- Tmt.Annamayelie

PW.2- Thiru.Rajendran

**Exhibits on the side of Petitioners:-**

Ex.P1	18.01.2018	True copy of FIR
Ex.P2	22.01.2018	Certified copy of Postmortem certificate of the deceased

Ex.P3	06.03.2018	On line copy of death certificate of Chinnasamy
Ex.P4	03.05.2018	Legal Heir certificate original
Ex.P5	18.01.2018	True copy of Rough Sketch
Ex.P6	20.01.2018	True copy of MVI Report of Maruti Suzuki Car bearing Registration No.TN38-CK-2507,
Ex.P7	05.03.2018	Photo copy of MVI report of TN77-H-0160 vehicle
Ex.P8	09.08.2017	Copy of R.C Maruti Suzuki Car bearing Registration No.TN38-CK-2507,
Ex.P9	22.07.2017	Copy of Insurance policy copy of Maruti Suzuki Car bearing Registration No.TN38-CK-2507,
Ex.P10	-	Driving licence copy of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> respondent

**Witness on the side of Respondents : NIL**

**Exhibits on the side of 3<sup>rd</sup> Respondent:-**

Ex.R1	--	Adhar card copy of Chinnasamy
Ex.R2	--	Photo copy of family card of Chinnasamy
Ex.R3	--	Adhar card copy of the petitioners 1 to 3
Ex.R4	--	Photo copy of postmortem certificate of deceased Chinnasamy

MOTOR ACCIDENTS CLAIMS TRIBUNAL  
(SUBORDINATE JUDGE) ATTUR

**Draft/Fair Order**  
**MCOP.No.67/2019**  
**MACT/Sub-Court,Attur**  
**Dated : 23.03.2026**