

**BEFORE THE MOTOR ACCIDENT CLAIMS TRIBUNAL PONNERI,  
THIRUVALLUR DISTRICT.**

**(IN THE COURT OF THE ADDITIONAL SUBORDINATE JUDGE  
PONNERI, THIRUVALLUR DISTRICT**

**Present : Tmt.P.Ezhilarasi, B.Com., LLM.**

**Motor Accident Claims Tribunal Judge/ Additional Sub Judge**

**Monday, 02<sup>nd</sup> day of March-2026**

**MCOP.No.166 of 2022**

**CNR.No.TNTR0F000572022**

Challagundla Dhanalakshmi

..... Petitioner

**// Vs //**

1. Kowsar
2. Oriental Insurance Company Limited,  
IIIrd Party Claims HUB,  
Oriental House, No.216, 115,  
Prakasam Salai,  
Chennai – 600 008.

..... Respondents

This petition came up before this tribunal for final hearing on 27.02.2026 in the presence of M/s S.Suresh Kumar, S.Balaji, R.Kanchana and M.Archana, learned counsels for the petitioner and Mr.S.Damodaran, learned counsel for the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent, and the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent remained exparte and upon perusing the records and on hearing both sides and having stood over for consideration till this day, this court passes the following:

**ORDER**

This petition has been filed under section 166 of Motor Vehicles Act 1988 r/w Rule 3 of Tamil Nadu Motor Vehicles Claims Tribunal Rules 1989, claiming

compensation of Rs.11,00,000/- (Rupees Eleven Lakhs only) towards the injury sustained by the petitioner in a road accident held on 22.05.2022 along with interest from the date of filing of the petition till the date of realization with costs.

## **2. BRIEF AVERMENTS OF THE PETITION:**

The petitioner has contended that she was aged about 64 years and she is a self employee and was earning Rs.20,000/- per month at the time of accident and she states that on 22.05.2022 at about 1.00 a.m., when the petitioner along with other persons were travelling by a car bearing Regn.No.AP-39-GZ-3609, as a passenger on Sri Kalahasti to Tirupathi Road and was nearing Mallavaram Village, the Ashok Leyland Lorry bearing Regn.No.AP-03-X-7117, which came in the opposite direction was driven by its driver in a rash and negligent manner and hit the car and caused accident, as a result the petitioner sustained grievous injuries and she further stated that the said accident occurred due to rash and negligence of the driver of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent who drove the Ashok Leyland Lorry bearing Regn.No.AP-03-X-7117. The 1<sup>st</sup> respondent being the owner of the vehicle and the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent being the insurer of the above said vehicle, both are jointly and severally liable to pay compensation to the petitioner.

3. Summons could not be duly served on the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent. Steps for substituted service was taken. Paper publication was filed and effected to the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent and he failed to appear before this Tribunal either in person or through pleader, hence he was called absent and set exparte on 15.06.2023.

**4. BRIEF AVERMENTS OF THE COUNTER FILED BY THE 2<sup>nd</sup> RESPONDENT :**

4.1. This respondent denied all the allegations made in the petition and stated that there is delay in lodging the complaint and registration of F.I.R. There was no policy at the time of accident. This respondent denies that the accident occurred due to rash and negligent driving of the Ashok Lelyand Lorry bearing Regn.No.AP-03-X-7117. This respondent further submits that the alleged accident is not reported by the first respondent to this respondent and documents pertaining to the vehicle policy and driving license of the driver have not been produced for verification and return. The driving license particulars not mentioned in the petition. The petitioner is put to strict proof that the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent driver had valid driving license at the time of accident. The petition is not maintainable either in law or on facts and it is devoid of merits and and the petitioner's claim of compensation is very much exorbitant and this respondent is not liable to pay compensation to the petitioner. Hence this petition is to be dismissed with costs.

**5. POINTS FOR CONSIDERATION :**

(1) Who has attributed to the accident which had taken place on 22.05.2022 and whether the said accident took place due to the rash and negligent driving of the driver of the Ashok Leyland Lorry bearing Regn.No.AP-03-X-7117?

(2) Whether the respondents are liable to pay compensation to the petitioner?

(3) Whether the petitioner is entitled to the compensation, if so, what is the quantum of compensation he is entitled to?

6. On behalf of the petitioner, the petitioner's husband Mr.Challagundla Subramaniam was examined as PW.1, Ex.P1 to Ex.P14 were marked. On the side of 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent, neither oral evidence adduced nor documentary evidence produced. The 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent filed an application U/s 170 of Motor Vehicles Act and the same was allowed in I.A.No.1 of 2026 on 04.02.2026. The Disability Certificate issued by the Regional Medical Board, Government Kilpauk Medical College Hospital, Chennai is marked as ExC1.

7. Heard the arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned counsel for the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent and this tribunal perused the entire case records carefully.

8. **POINT NO : 1**

***"Who has attributed to the accident which had taken place on 22.05.2022 and whether the said accident took place due to the rash and negligent driving of the driver of Ashok Leyland Lorry bearing Regn.No.AP-03-X-7117?"***

**NEGLIGENCE**

8.1. In order to prove the case of the petitioner herein, her husband was examined as PW.1 and Ex.P1 to Ex.P14 were marked on the side of the petitioner. On perusal of the entire case records it can be seen that the petitioner has approached this

tribunal seeking compensation of Rs.11,00,000/-, towards the injuries sustained by her in the accident dated on 22.05.2022 at about 1.00 a.m., when the petitioner along with other persons were travelling by a car bearing Regn.No.AP-39-GZ-3609, as a passenger on Sri Kalahasti to Tirupathi Road and was nearing Mallavaram Village, the Ashok Leyland Lorry bearing Regn.No.AP-03-X-7117, which came in the opposite direction was driven by its driver in a rash and negligent manner and hit the car and caused accident, as a result the petitioner sustained brain injury and fracture of facial bone and right maxillary sinus and Nasal bone, 5<sup>th</sup> Toe laceration in right foot and grievous injuries all over the body, she took treated as inpatient treatment at Apollo Hospital, Chennai, from 22.05.2022 to 02.06.2022 thereafter she was shifted for further treatment at Apollo Hospital, Nellore, and taken inpatient treatment from 02.06.2022 to 23.06.2022 and 10.10.2022 to 12.10.2022, thereafter she took inpatient treatment at Anjeneyam Kerala Ayurveda Vaidya Salai, Nellore, from, 12.07.2023 to 27.07.2023, subsequently she took treated as inpatient treatment at Kottakkal Ariya Vaidyasala, Mallapuram District, Kerala, from 20.03.2024 to 11.04.2024. The petitioner has further contended that the said accident occurred due to rash and negligence driving of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent driver who drove the Ashok Leyland Lorry bearing Regn.No.AP-03-X-7117. The 1<sup>st</sup> respondent being the owner of the vehicle and the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent being the insurer of the above said vehicle, both are jointly and severally liable to pay compensation to the petitioner.

**8.2.** The court is of the view that, there is no doubt that to succeed in the claim

petition in view of the Sec.166 of Motor Vehicle Act 1988 it is for the claimant to prove that the vehicle which caused the accident was being driven in a rash and negligent manner by its driver. Moreover in action founded on the principle of fault liability, proof of rash or negligent driving is sin qua non and the standard of proof is not to be applied stringently in criminal cases and that of proof beyond reasonable doubt in a claim on tort liability evidence is tested on preponderance of probabilities.

**8.3.** To support the case of the petitioner, the petitioner's husband was examined as PW.1, Ex.P1 to Ex.P14 were marked. On perusal of Ex.P1 which is the Attested copy of FIR it can be seen that a complaint was lodged and FIR was registered on 22.05.2022 in Crime No.118/2022 against the driver of the Ashok Leyland Lorry bearing Regn.No.AP-03-X-7117, under section 279 and 337 of IPC. On perusal of Ex.P2 which is the Copy of Registration certificate, it is evident that the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent is the owner of the above said lorry. On perusal of Ex.P3 which is the Copy of Insurance Policy, it is evident that the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent's vehicle is insured with the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent's insurance company. On perusal of Ex.P4 Copy of driving licence of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent driver it is evident that the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent's lorry driver had valid driving licence at the time of the said accident. On perusal of Ex.P5 which is the copy of the Discharge summary, it is evident that the petitioner had taken treatment as inpatient at Apollo Hospital, Chennai, from 22.05.2022 to 02.06.2022. Surgery was done to the petitioner on 25.05.2022. On perusal of Ex.P6 it can be seen that it is the copy of Aadhar card of the petitioner. On perusal of Ex.P7 which is the

Copy of Motor Vehicle Inspection Report, it is evident that the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent driver Mr.Althaf Hussain had driven the vehicle in question and he had valid driving licence at the time of accident. On perusal of Ex.P8 which is the copy of charge sheet, it is evident that the said accident has taken place because of the rash and negligent driving of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent vehicle driver Mr.Althaf Hussain. On perusal of Ex.P9 which is the copy of the Discharge summary, it is evident that the petitioner had taken treatment as inpatient at Apolla Hospital, Nellore from 02.06.2022 to 23.06.2022. On perusal of Ex.P10 which is the Discharge summary, it is evident that the petitioner had taken treatment as inpatient at Apollo Hospital, Chennai, from 10.10.2022 to 12.10.2022. On perusal of Ex.P11 which is the copy of the Discharge summary, it is evident, that the petitioner has taken treatment as inpatient at Anjeneyam Kerala Ayurveda Vaidya Salai, Nellore, from, 12.07.2023 to 27.07.2023. On perusal of Ex.P12 which is the Discharge summary, it is evident, the petitioner has taken treatment as inpatient at Arya Vaidyasala, Kottakkal, Mallapuram District, Kerala, from 20.03.2024 to 11.04.2024. On perusal of Ex.P13 which is the Medical Bills, it is evident the petitioner had sustained injuries in the above said accident and she had spent a sum of Rs.19,87,321.71/- for her medical expenses. On perusal of Ex.P14 which is the Transporation receipts, it is evident the petitioner had spent a sum of Rs.60,000/- for her Transporation charges ,

Further on perusal of Ex.C1 Medical Board Disability Certificate issued by Regional Medical Board, Chennai, it is evident that the petitioner has sustained 67% disability and the petitioner/PW.1 has reiterated and reaffirmed all the averments

made in the petition and though she was cross examined on the respondent's side the manner of accident was not shattered by the respondent in the cross examination. The evidence of PW.1 and the documents ExP.1/FIR and ExP8/charge sheet clearly establishes that the offending vehicle namely Ashok Leyland Lorry bearing Regn.No.AP-03-X-7117 has caused the said accident.

**8.4.** The learned counsel for the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent argued that the accident had occurred due to careless and negligent act of the petitioner vehicle driver. Hence, this respondent is not liable to pay compensation to the petitioner. In order to prove the same, the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent neither adduced oral evidence nor produced documentary evidence and there are no instances to believe that the said accident occurred due to the rash and negligent of the driving of the petitioner vehicle. Mere allegation in counter without proof could not be accepted. No doubt that the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent is fit person to say that the accident has not been taken place as alleged by the petitioner. But he remained exparte. Therefore, adverse inference has been drawn against the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent that due to rash and negligence driving of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent driver the said accident had taken place.

**8.5.** Further no other eye witness was examined in support of the respondent case to prove that the said accident took place due to rash and negligence of the petitioner vehicle driver. In addition to this, the respondent has not taken any steps to quash the FIR registered against him. At this juncture, it is worth to refer the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Sunitha and others Vs. Rajasthan State Transport***

*Corporation and another, 2019 AIR SCC 994*, wherein, it was held that if the FIR and charge sheet are not challenged before the Court of law and are not shown to be indeficient and are corroborated by other evidence, they can be considered to form an opinion that the accident occurred due to the negligence of accused-driver in the criminal case concerned, irrespective of the out-come of such criminal case. In this case on hand the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent has not challenged the Ex.P1/ FIR and Ex.P8 Copy of charge sheet, though it was registered against him. Hence the tribunal could not come to the conclusion that the accident has taken place because of the negligent act of the the peititioner vehicle driver. If the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent driver had driven the lorry with due care, diligent and caution, he could have avoided the accident. Hence, the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent counsel's argument in this aspect could not be accepted, and hence rejected. Even in ExP.1/Copy of FIR and Exp8/ Copy of charge sheet it is clearly stated that the accident took place due to rash and negligent driving of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent driver and there is no proof filed by the respondent to prove that the accident took place due to negligent act of the petitioner vehicle driver. Hence, considering the evidence of PW.1 and petitioner side exhibits, this Tribunal comes to the conclusion that the said accident had taken place due to the rash and negligent driving of the 1st respondent driver. This point is answered accordingly.

**9. POINT NO : 2**

***“Whether the respondents are liable to pay compensation to the petitioner?”***

**LIABILITY**

The Court is of the view that on perusal of copy of Registration Certificate of the Ashok Leyland Lorry bearing Regn.No.AP-03-X-7117, which is marked as Ex.P2 it is evident that the said lorry stands in the name of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent and on further perusal of copy of Insurance Policy which is marked as Ex.P3 it is evident that the said lorry is insured with the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent Insurance company and there is also a valid insurance for the period from 07.01.2022 to 06.01.2023 and the date of accident is 22.05.2022 and the period of insurance covers the date of accident and the said policy is in force at the time of accident. The court is of further opinion that on perusal of Ex.P4 Copy of driving licence of the 1st respondent driver had valid driving licence at the time of accident. Hence, the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent's vehicle had valid policy and the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent driver had valid driving licence, hence the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent is liable to pay the compensation to the injured petitioner/claimant. This point is answered accordingly.

**10. POINT NO : 3**

***“Whether the petitioner is entitled to the compensation, if so, what is the quantum of compensation he is entitled to?”***

As per the petition, the age of the petitioner is mentioned as 64 years and on perusal of Ex.P6 Aadhar card copy of the petitioner her date of birth is mentioned as 05.08.1960 and according to it the age of the petitioner is 62 years at the time of accident. No rebuttal evidence has been adduced on the 2nd respondent side to contradict the same. Therefore, this court is inclined to determine the age of petitioner

as 62 years at the time of accident.

According to the petitioner she was a self employee and earning a sum of Rs.20,000/- per month at the time of accident but however she has no documents produced regarding her occupation and income. Considering the age and avocation of the petitioner and the year of accident, this tribunal is inclined to fix the income of the petitioner at Rs.10,000/- per month.

The petitioner has appeared before the Regional Medical Board, Chennai, and on perusal of the Disability certificate/Ex.C1 issued by the Medical Board it is evident that the petitioner has been assessed with 67% disability. The 2nd respondent has not produced any evidence to contradict the same. Therefore, this court is inclined to fix the percentage of disablement of the petitioner as 67%.

## **10.2 QUANTUM**

For the reason stated in point no:1 this tribunal has come to the conclusion that due to the rash and negligent driving of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent driver only the accident has happened therefore, the petitioner's claim of compensation is acceptable. As the petitioner claims compensation under various heads this Tribunal for its convenience has proceeded to decide each head separately as under:

### **(i) LOSS OF INCOME DUE TO PERMANENT DISABILITY:**

The petitioner has sustained injury in the accident and Ex.P5, Ex.P9 to Ex.P12 which are the copy of Discharge summaries, it is evident the petitioner sustained severe traumatic brain injury and Facial bone fracture, thereafter she took

treated as inpatient at Anjeneyam Kerala Ayurveda Vaidya Salai, Nellore, subsequently she took treated as inpatient treatment at Kottakkal Ariya Vaidyasala, Mallapuram District, Kerala. Surgery was done to the petitioner. Due to the said accident, it is noted in ExC1 Medical board certificate as “ ***Post Traumatic squealee causing (Neuro Bladder, Dental disability) ”***”.

It is clear that the petitioner is entitled for just and reasonable compensation for her brain injury. As per the catena of decisions of the Apex Court the possession of one’s own body is the first and most valuable all human rights and while awarding compensation for bodily injuries this primary element is to be kept in mind. Though it is impossible to equate money with human suffering, agony and personal deprivation, the Tribunal should make an honest and serious attempt to award damages so far as money can compensate the loss. Ex.P5, Ex.P9 to Ex.P12 Discharge summaries, Ex.C1 Certificate of Disability, it is evident that the petitioner has sustained brain injury and fracture of facial bone due to the accident. Certainly, it would restrict his day to day activities. In this connection, her earning power is reduced and it is functional disability. Therefore, the court is of the view that the multiplier method will be right for computing the quantum of compensation. The monthly income is fixed at Rs.10,000/- per month. Taking into consideration the nature of job of the petitioner this court is of the view that the petitioner is not entitled for future prospects, hence his monthly income is arrived at Rs.10,000/-per month.

As per medical records and disability assessment certificate Ex.C1, which

would show the petitioner has sustained injuries on her head and right foot and the percentage of the disability arrived by the medical board is 67%. Applying the multiplier of 7 for the total loss of future income would be Rs.10,000 x 67 % x 12 x 7 =Rs. 5,62,800/-. As such, the petitioner is liable for 1/3rd deduction towards personal and living expenses. Therefore, from a sum of Rs.5,62,800/- (Rupees Five lakhs Sixty two thousand and Eight hundred only) 1/3 of it which is Rs.1,87,600/- (Rupees One lakh Eighty seven thousand and six hundred only) is deducted and **Rs.3,75,200/-** (Rupees Three lakhs Seventy five thousand and Two hundred only) (Rs.5,62,800 – Rs.1,87,600 ) is awarded as a disability compensation for loss of earning capacity of the petitioner.

(ii) **MEDICAL EXPENSES:** The petitioner has stated that she has taken treatment as inpatient treatment at Apollo Hospital, Chennai, from 22.05.2022 to 02.06.2022 then shifted for further treatment at Apollo Hospital, Nellore, from 02.06.2022 to 23.06.2022 and 10.10.2022 to 12.10.2022 at Apollo Hospital, Chennai, thereafter she took inpatient treatment at Anjeneyam Kerala Ayurveda Vaidya Salai, Nellore, from, 12.07.2023 to 27.07.2023, subsequently she took treated as inpatient treatment at Kottakkal Ariya Vaidyasala, Mallapuram District, Kerala, from 20.03.2024 to 11.04.2024 and the petitioner has produced Ex.P13 medical bills for a sum of Rs.19,87,321.71 for her medical expenses. Hence the petitioner is entitled for **Rs.19,87,321/-** under this head.

**(iii) ATTENDER CHARGES:** The petitioner has filed Ex.P5 Copy of Discharge summary according to which the petitioner had taken treatment as inpatient at Apollo Hospital, Chennai, from 22.05.2022 to 02.06.2022 (12 days) and Ex.P9 Copy of Discharge summary, the petitioner shifted for further treatment at Apollo Hospital, Nellore, from 02.06.2022 to 23.06.2022 (21 days) and Ex.P10 Copy of Discharge summary, again the petitioner has taken inpatient treatment at the same from 10.10.2022 to 12.10.2022 (3 days) and Ex.P11 Copy of Discharge summary, the petitioner taken inpatient treatment at Anjeneyam Kerala Ayurveda Vaidya Salai, Nellore, from, 12.07.2023 to 27.07.2023 (16 days) and Ex.P12 Discharge summary, it is evident the petitioner she took treated as inpatient treatment at Kottakkal Ariya Vaidyasala, Mallapuram District, Kerala, from 20.03.2024 to 11.04.2024 (23 days). Therefore, totally the petitioner was taken treatment for 75 days. Hence, she is entitled 75 days attender charges at the rate of Rs.500/- per day (500x75)= **Rs.37,500/-**.

**(iv) TRANSPORT CHARGES:** Considering the medical treatment taken by the petitioner, she would have incurred transporation expenses and the petitioner has produced Ex.P14 Transporation receipts it is evident the petitioner had spent a sum of Rs.60,000/- for her Transporation charges. Hence the petitioner is entitled for **Rs.60,000/-**-under this head.

**(v) EXTRA NOURISHMENT & DAMAGE TO CLOTHING & ARTICLES:** Considering the nature of accident and the injuries suffered by the

petitioner and the period of treatment it will be just and necessary to provide a sum of **Rs.10,000/-** towards extra nourishment and **Rs.1,000/-** towards damages to clothing and articles.

(vi) **LOSS OF AMENTIES:** The petitioner definitely would not act as before the accident due to the injuries suffered by her at the time of accident. Hence considering these facts, it would be just and proper to grant a sum of **Rs. 1,00,000 /-** towards loss of amenities.

(vii) **PAIN AND SUFFERING :** Considering the nature of injury suffered, disability and treatment taken by the petitioner for the injuries, hence, it is just and proper to award **Rs.1,00,000 /-** towards pain and sufferings.

It is no doubt that the petitioner has claimed only Rs.11,00,000/- towards compensation. It is well settled law that under section 168 of the Motor Vehicle Act, 1988, there is no restriction that compensation could be awarded only up to the amount claimed by the injured petitioner. In an appropriate claim cases, where, from the evidence brought on record, the claim Tribunal considered that the injured petitioner is entitled to get more compensation than claimed. In other words, the only embargo is, it should be just compensation i.e., it should be neither arbitrary fanciful nor unjustifiable from the evidence on record. Therefore, under the Motor Vehicle Act, 1988, there is no restriction that the Tribunal cannot award compensation amount exceeding the claim amount. This view has been clearly adumbrated by the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Nagappa Vs Gurudayal Singh reported in 2003 (2) SCC 274*.

Hence, the injured petitioner/claimant is entitled compensation more than claimed amount.

Therefore the compensation is assessed as follows :

**CALCULATION:**

1.	Loss of income due to permanent disability	Rs. 3,75,200.00
2.	Medical Bills	Rs. 19,87,321.00
3.	Attender charges	Rs. 37,500.00
4.	Transport charges	Rs. 60,000.00
5.	Extra Nourishment & Damage to cloth and articles	Rs. 11,000.00
6.	Loss of amenities	Rs. 1,00,000.00
7.	Pain and suffering	Rs. 1,00,000.00
		-----
	Total	Rs. 26,71,021.00
		-----

In the light of the above discussions and assessment, the petitioner claimant is entitled to a just compensation of Rs.26,71,021/- (Rupees Twenty six lakhs Seventy one thousand and Twenty one only). This point no.3 is answered accordingly.

In view of the findings given in points the petitioner is entitled for compensation a sum of Rs.26,71,021/- together with interest at 7.5% from the date of presentation of petition till the date of realisation, together with cost. The interest for the period of dismissed for default stands excluded.

**11. RESULT:-**

In the result, this petition is allowed with costs as follows:-

1. That the petitioner is entitled to get a sum of to Rs.26,71,021/- from the respondents as compensation along with subsequent interest at the rate of 7.5% p.a from the date of this petition to till its realization.

2. That the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent is hereby directed to deposit the award amount of Rs.26,71,021/- (Rupees Twenty six lakhs Seventy one thousand and Twenty one only) (*including interim award passed if any*) with interest at 7.5% per annum from the date of filing the petition i.e 04.07.2022 till the date of realization and with costs, within two months from the date of passing order.

3. The above said award amount is directed to be deposited by the second respondent in the court MACT account through the URL Link/QR Code



<https://www.onlinesbi.sbi/sbicollect/icollecthome.htm?saralID=912678056>

hosted in the Thiruvallur District Court website

<https://tiruvalur.dcourts.gov.in/mact-award-deposits/> within two months from

the date of order under due intimation to this tribunal Email ID: [trlpon.sc-](mailto:trlpon.sc-tn@indiancourts.nic.in)

[tn@indiancourts.nic.in](mailto:tn@indiancourts.nic.in) with MCOP numbers.

4. After deposit, the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent is hereby directed to send bank deposit copies and inform to this tribunal and the petitioner or her counsel.

5. That the petitioner is permitted to withdraw their entire award amount along with interest and award amount will be directly transferred into petitioner's Account mentioned in the bank details column through NEFT or RTGS on filing necessary and appropriate application.

6. There is no default period in the case, hence, no deduction from the interest.

7. The petitioner has paid Rs.372.50 for the claim of a sum of Rs.11,00,000/- as court fees and the petitioner is directed to deposit the deficit court fee for the award amount of Rs.26,71,021/- (Rupees Twenty six lakhs Seventy one thousand and Twenty one only) within 15 days and the petitioner is hereby directed to pay the advocate fee as fixed by rules.

Directly typed me in my laptop, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this 02<sup>nd</sup> day March-2026.

**MACT Judge/ Additional Sub Judge,  
Ponneri.**

**PETITIONER'S SIDE WITNESSES:-**

PW.1 - Mrs.Challagundla Subramaniam

**PETITIONER'S SIDE EXHIBITS:-**

<b>S.No</b>	<b>Exhibits</b>	<b>Description of documents</b>
1.	Ex.P1.	Copy of First Information Report
2.	Ex.P2.	Copy of Registration certificate of the 1 <sup>st</sup> respondent vehicle

3.	Ex.P3.	Copy of Insurance policy of the 1 <sup>st</sup> respondent vehicle
4.	Ex.P4.	Copy of driving licence of the 1 <sup>st</sup> respondent driver
5.	Ex.P5.	Copy of Discharge summary
6.	Ex.P6.	Aadhar card copy of the petitioner
7.	Ex.P7.	Copy of Motor Vehicle Inspection Report of the 1 <sup>st</sup> respondent vehicle
8.	Ex.P8.	Copy of charge sheet
9.	Ex.P9.	Discharge summary
10.	Ex.P10.	Discharge summary
11.	Ex.P11.	Copy of Discharge summary
12.	Ex.P12.	Discharge summary
13.	Ex.P13.	Medical Bills
14.	Ex.P14.	Transportation Receipts

**RESPONDENT SIDE WITNESS AND EXHIBITS :- NIL**

**COURT SIDE EXHIBITS:-**

Ex.C1 - Disability Certificate issued by Regional Medical Board, Kilpauk Medical College and Hospital, Chennai.

**MACT Judge/ Additional Sub Judge,  
Ponneri.**