

**BEFORE THE MOTOR ACCIDENT CLAIMS TRIBUNAL,
SPECIAL SUBORDINATE JUDGE, TIRUPATTUR.**

**Present: Tmt.J.Nagalakshmi @ Vijayarani,B.A.,B.L.,
Motor Accident claims Tribunal Authority,
Special Subordinate Judge, Tirupattur.**

Thursday, the 30th day of April 2026

M.C.O.P. No.1/2022

CNR.NO.TNTU04-000001-2022

(Old MCOP No.287/2021 on the file III ADJ, Tirupathur)

1. Arun,(19 years),
S/o. Subramani,
No.1/3 Chinnakallupalli Village,
Kalanthira Post,
Vaniyambadi Taluk,
Tirupathur District.

..... Petitioner

VS

1. M.Velu,
S/o.Munisamy,
No.82, Raja Street,
Kodaiyanchi Post, Ambalur Via,
Vaniyambadi Taluk,
Tirupathur District.

2. The Divisional Manager,
The United India Insurance Company Limited,
No.36, Katpadi Road,
Gandhi Nagar,
Vellore.

..... Respondents

The petition originally filed on 16.12.2021 before III ADJ, Tirupathur and taken as MCOP 287/2021 and as per the proceeding in Dis. No.7733/2015, dated 14.09.2015 of Principal District and Sessions Judge, Vellore transferred to this court and reassigned as MCOP 1/2022 on 04.01.2022 and came up for final hearing in the presence of **Thiru.A.Venkatesan,B.A.,B.L.**, learned counsel for the petitioner. The 1st respondent set exparte and **Thiru.D.P.Chandran, B.Sc.,B.L.**, learned counsel for 2nd respondent and heard both side arguments, perusing case records and having stood for consideration till this day, this tribunal passed the following:-

ORDER

This petition is filed by the Petitioner against the respondents under section 166 of the Motor Vehicles Act claiming claiming Rs.5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakhs Only) as compensation against the respondents together with interest and costs from the date of the accident.

1. The averments of the petition in brief :-

On 27.10.2021 at about 04.45 P.M. the 1st respondent driver one Subbaiya drove the Bharath Pens Lorry bearing Reg.No.TN 83 C 0664 in a very rash and negligent manner towards Tirupathur to Vaniyambadi Main Road near Chinnaveppampattu Jain College opposite to SPN NH Road, the above said vehicle dashed against the petitioner while he was proceedings by his Pulsar RS200 TN 34 X 6001 extreme left side of the road. Due to the above said accident the petitioner sustained grievous injuries and all over the body and

fracture on his right knee & ankle bone. Immediately after the accident the petitioner was taken to Vaniyambadi Govt. Hospital for medical treatment and on the same day he was referred to Vaniyambadi David Hospital for further medical treatment and surgery was conducted in the same hospital and fixed steel rod in the surgery region. Now the petitioner is not able to work, walk and becomes permanently disabled. The petitioner has lost his earning and earning capacity. The petitioner has spent more than Rs.70,000/- towards medical expenses. A case U/S 279, 337 and 338 IPC was registered by the Vaniyambadi Taluk police station in Cr. No. 592/2021 and the same is pending for investigation. Since the accident took place by the fault of the 1st respondent driver. The 1st respondent is the owner and the 2nd respondent is the insurer of the above said Bharath Pens Lorry bearing Reg.No. TN 83 C 0664. So, both the respondents are jointly and severally liable to pay the compensation to the petitioner along with interest and costs.

2. The notice served to the 1st respondent and appeared before this court and hence set exparte on 10.03.2022.

3. The Counter of the 2nd respondent has follows:

This respondent does not admit any of the allegations in the petition, save those that are specifically admitted herein This Respondent denies the allegations that the accident was due to the rash and negligent driving of the driver of Bharat Benz Lorry bearing Reg.No. TN 83 C 0664 and dashed against the petitioner who was proceeding in his Pulsar AS 200 Motorcycle bearing Reg.No.TN 34 X 6001 and due to the impact the petitioner sustained grievous and fracture injuries and injuries all over the body. However the petitioner is

put to strict proof of the manner of the accident. And also denies the age, occupation and earning of the petitioner. In fact, the driver of TN 83 C 0664 was driving with all care and caution in a normal speed, following the traffic rules. But it was the petitioner who was proceeding in a motorcycle in a rash and negligent manner on the wrong side of the road without following the traffic rules and voluntarily dashed against the above said lorry and invited the accident. Hence the rider of the Two Wheeler had been guilty of contributory negligence and this respondent is not liable to pay compensation.

The F.I.R reveals that the petitioner is the owner of the Pulsar Yellow Color motorcycle bearing Reg.No. TN 34 X 6001, but it is not true that he was the owner of the motorcycle at the time of the accident. The above motorcycle was a stolen vehicle and HUDCO Police Station, Krishnagiri District registered a theft case in Cr.No.1130/2020 U/s. 379 IPC. The alleged accident occurred on 27.10.2021 but the said motorcycle was stolen on 24.07.2020 before the accident. Therefore the petitioner was riding the said motorcycle without any valid records and dashed against the above said lorry and invited the accident. This is not a case of Borrower of the vehicle but it is a stolen vehicle at the time of the accident therefore this petition is not maintainable and is liable to be dismissed.

Without prejudice to the above said contentions the petitioner / rider of the motorcycle had no valid Driving License and not wearing Helmet at the time of the accident. Further the above said two wheeler had no coverage of Insurance policy and No R.C. and other valid documents accident occurred only due to the rash and negligent and in-experience riding of the rider / petitioner. The true owner of the two wheeler had no knowledge about the accident.

Therefore the claim against this Respondent is not Bonafide and liable to be dismissed. The petitioner is to putto strict proof of the nature of injuries, the disability alleged, the period of medical treatment, future medical expense. expenses incurred, monthly income and alleged loss of earning power and of income and the petitioner is now alright and attending his normal works. The amount claimed by the petitioner is too high. This respondent is filing an application U/s. 170 of M.V. Act taking over all the defenses available to the insured since he is not cooperating with this respondent in contesting the claim and in all probability he is colluding with the petitioner. The petition is liable to be dismissed with costs.

4. EXAMINATION OF WITNESS : The petitioner filed proof affidavit in consonance with the claim petition and examined as Pw1, the documents Ex.P.1 to P8 were marked. The 1st respondent remained exparte. The 2nd respondent side examined the police officer of Hudco Police station as RW1, Ex.R1 to R5, the police officer of Vaniyambadi Taluk Police station examined as RW2, Ex.R6 is marked, the officer of Insurance company examined as RW3, Ex.R7 is marked and the evidence of both sides closed.

5. Points for consideration:-

1) Whether the accident occurred due to the rash and negligent driving of the driver of Bharat Benz Lorry bearing Reg.No. TN 83 C 0664 belongs to the 1st respondent ?

2) Whether the petitioner is dis entitled to compensation on the ground that he was riding a stolen vehicle?

3) Whether the petitioner is entitled to compensation? If so, what is the quantum?

4) Who is liable to pay the compensation?

6. POINT NO 1: -

(a) It is the case of the petitioner that, the accident happened on 27.10.2021 at about 04.45 P.M. near Chinnaveppampattu Jain College opposite to SPN NH Road, situated in between Tirupathur to Vaniyambadi Main Road. The fact that the vehicle Bharath Pens Lorry bearing Reg.No.TN 83 C 0664 belongs to the 1st respondent and driven by its driver namely the Subbaiya at the time of accident not at all disputed. The petitioner drove the Pulsar RS200 TN 34 X 6001 extreme left side of the road at the time of accident also not denied. The factum of accident, date, time, place of accident also not disputed.

(b) The 1st respondent remained exparte. The manner of accident also not disputed. The entire defense of the contesting 2nd respondent revolves round the violation of traffic rules that the petitioner is not the owner of vehicle as stated in the FIR and the said vehicle is the stolen vehicle and the petitioner is not borrowed the vehicle from the owner and hence not liable for compensation. In the case under 166 of MV act the negligence assumes much important and hence the tribunal inclined to decide the main issue of Negligence and then the core issue of entitlement in the separate head later.

(c) In order to prove the negligence, the petitioner filed proof affidavit in consonance with the claim petition examined as PW1. He categorically deposed that, he was proceeding towards his house Chinnakallupalli from

Veppampattu situated in Vaniyambadi, in the motor Cycle TN 34 X 6001 drove the vehicle slowly, cautiously, in the extreme left side of the road, at that time, nearing Jain college opposite, the Bharat Benz Lorry bearing regn.No. TN 83 C 0664 came from opposite direction, driven by its driver, in a rash and negligent manner without any indication, suddenly turned the vehicle, and due to that impact he lost his control and dashed with the lorry and sustained fracture in his right leg and thus the accident had caused.

(d) It is clear from the evidence of Pw1 that the accident caused due to the rash and negligence of the driver of the 1st respondent. Though Pw1 elaborately cross examined the manner of accident not Shattered. The medical records reveals that the petitioner immediate to the accident admitted in Vaniyambadi GH tallid with the evidence of PW1. It is significant to note that, a criminal case in in Cr. No. 592/2021 U/S 279, 337 and 338 IPC was registered by the Vaniyambadi Taluk police station registered against the driver of the 1st respondent namely Subbiah marked as Ex.P1. The Motor Vehicle report of Bharath Pens Lorry belongs to the 1st respondent marked as Ex.P8 also strengthen the case of the petitioner that the accident happened as per the date, time, place stated in the petition.

(e) The 2nd respondent side not examined any independent eye witness in order to disprove the version of the petitioner with regard to the manner of accident. The Sub inspector of Police, of Vaniyambadi Taluk police station who appeared on summons examined as RW2. He admitted during cross that the complaint obtained the petitioner at the time of taken treatment in Vaniyambadi GH. Though the said witness deposed based on documentary evidence available on record, the involvement of both vehicles in the accident

clearly established. There is no adverse remarks expressed in this regard. The only thing that the petitioner vehicle not sent for Mv Inspection is the duty of the Investigation officer and hence non sending of Vehicle no way affects the claim of the petitioner arising under MV Act. Hence the tribunal holds that the accident occurred as per the manner stated in the petition.

As discussed in detail, the oral testimony of Pw1 and the documentary evidence of contemporary period established the case of the petitioner. The manner of accident, as narrated, appears natural and probable. When the version of the injured claimant is cogent and consistent, and hence the tribunal relies upon the evidence of PW1. The defense taken by the respondents remains a mere denial without substantive backing. Though the Investigation officer Examined as RW3, there is no convincing material placed before this Tribunal to probalilise any alternate manner of occurrence. The investigation report (Ex.R7) is considered only self supporting document. The said report also support the case of the petitioner that the accident is genuine.

Therefore, the tribunal holds that The petitioner proved his case as per the theory of preponderance of probability. It is concluded that accident occurred only due to the negligence of the driver of the Bharath Pens Lorry bearing Reg.No.TN 83 C 0664 belonging to the 1st respondent and termed as offending vehicle. The point No.1 is answered accordingly.

7. POINT NO.2 :

(1) The principal contention raised on behalf of the 2nd respondent is that the petitioner was riding a stolen vehicle at the time of accident and, therefore,

he is not entitled to claim compensation. From the materials placed before this tribunal, it is evident that the vehicle ridden by the petitioner had been reported stolen and that a criminal case had been registered in respect of the said theft. It is also seen from the evidence of RW1 that the complaint had been lodged on missing of vehicle reported on 30.07.2020, well prior to the date of accident, nearly one year three months earlier. The accident occurred only on 27.10.2021.

(2) However, a significant aspect that requires consideration is whether the petitioner can be connected to the alleged theft. The documents produced by RW1 pertains to rough sketch, Mahazar and Final report indicates that as UN There is no material to indicate that the petitioner was implicated as an accused in the theft case or that he had any role in the commission of the said offence. There is also no evidence to establish that the petitioner had knowledge that the vehicle was stolen. If the registered owner of the vehicle examined the said discrepancies would be clarified. In the absence of that, the petitioner happened to ride a vehicle which had earlier been reported as missing cannot lead to an automatic conclusion that he is disentitled from claiming compensation.

(3) It is penitent to note the provision U/Sec 166 of MV Act that, (1) *An application for compensation **arising out of an accident** of the nature specified in sub-section (1) of section 165 may be made*

(a) by the person who has sustained the injury; or (b) by the owner of the property; or (c) where death has resulted from the accident, by all or any of the legal representatives of the deceased; or (d) by any agent duly authorised by the person injured or all or

any of the legal representatives of the deceased, as the case may be:

Provided that where all the legal representatives of the deceased have not joined in any such application for compensation, the application shall be made on behalf of or for the benefit of all the legal representatives of the deceased and the legal representatives who have not so joined, shall be impleaded as respondents to the application.

[Provided further that where a person accepts compensation under section 164 in accordance with the procedure provided under section 149, his claims petition before the Claims Tribunal shall lapse.](2) Every application under sub-section (1) shall be made, at the option of the claimant, either to the Claims Tribunal having jurisdiction over the area in which the accident occurred or to the Claims Tribunal within the local limits of whose jurisdiction the claimant resides or carries on business or within the local limits of whose jurisdiction the defendant resides, and shall be in such form and contain such particulars as may be prescribed:

(4) Therefore, it is necessary to examine whether the alleged illegality has any nexus with the occurrence of the accident. The scope of inquiry in a claim petition of this nature is primarily to ascertain whether the accident arose out of the use of a motor vehicle and whether it was caused by negligence. An illegality can defeat a claim only when it has a direct and proximate connection with the accident. Whereas the present case in concern, there is no material to show that the alleged missing of vehicle or the use of the vehicle by the petitioner contributed in any manner to the occurrence of the accident.

(5) It is important to note that, the petitioner not sustained injury due to Self fall nor he claimed the damages of the vehicle / negligence on his own cause. He claims compensation for the injuries caused to him arising out of accident due to the negligence of the offending vehicle alone. The accident has already been found to have been caused solely due to the negligence of the 1st respondent as decided in Point No1. There is no adverse facts expressed that there is nexus between the cause of accident and the alleged missing of vehicle. Therefore, the circumstance relating to the missing of Pulsar RS200 TN 34 X 6001 remains a collateral factor and not a causative one.

(6) The principle of *'Ex turpi causa non oritur actio'* is attracted only when the claim arises directly out of such wrongful act. If the vehicle involved in theft caused injury to third party, the said principle will be applicable. The present case, the cause of action arises out of the negligent driving of the offending vehicle and not out of the alleged theft/missing. It is well enough to see the contract of Insurance between 1st and 2nd respondent rather than the nature of possession of vehicle hold by the petitioner. Hence, this Tribunal is of the considered view that the contention raised by the 2nd respondent is untenable and does not disentitle the petitioner from claiming compensation. The Point No.2 is answered accordingly.

8. POINT NO.3:

The petitioner deposed that she had sustained two fractures in left leg and also sustained injuries in all over the body due to the accident and hence gone to Vaniyambadi GH, after taking first aid, referred to higher hospital and then admitted in David hospital, Vaniyambadi and thereby undergone surgery

on 28.10.2021 and the same tallied with the medical records. The case records such as wound certificate issued by the Vaniyambadi G.H. marked as Ex.P.2. The discharge summary of David hospital shows treatment taken as inpatient from 27.10.2021 to 01.11.2021 marked as Ex.P.7. The medical Bills for an amount of Rs.58,170/- marked as Ex.P.6. The wound certificate reveals that the injury is “GRIEVOUS IN NATURE “. The accident occurred due to the rash and negligence of the driver of the Lorry as decided in point No.1. Hence the tribunal inclined to award compensation to the petitioner.

The petitioner claimed Rs.5,00,000/- under various heads as compensation stating that the accident caused Permanent disability and hence it appropriate to discuss the same head by head:

(i) DISABILITY: In the petition Rs.1,00,000/- claimed for permanent disability. Though the petitioner side stated that he sustained permanent disability, the petitioner side failed to take steps to refer him to medical board for assessment of disability. The nature of disablement not been proved and hence the tribunal not inclined to award compensation towards disability.

(ii) MEDICAL EXPENSES :

a) The petitioner claimed Rs.70,000/- towards medical expenses. On thorough perusal of case records the petitioner initially taken treatment in Vaniyambadi GH. It reveals that the petitioner referred to GVMCH for further management. Being the treatment taken on free of cost and hence no medical bills expected to be produced. The discharge summary (Ex.P7) reveals that the petitioner had taken further treatment in David hospital, Vaniyambadi and

treated as in patient from 27.10.2021 to 01.11.2021. It also reveals he undergone surgery for RIGHT LEG BOTH BONE FRACTURE on 28.10.2021 and the IMIL Nail were implanted and advised to take complete bed rest, regular dressing done and also instructed to take medication and also to attend review after 3 days. The wound certificate reveals the injury is of Grievous in Nature.

b) In order to prove private treatment, a set of Medical Bills (5 Nos) marked as Ex.P6. Bill No. 5 is the Inpatient medical Bill for taken treatment as in patient containing an amount of Rs.52,300/- paid towards Anesthetist, C Arm Charges, dressing charges, duty doctor fees, Implant & Instrumentation charges, Lab, Medicine Charges, OT Assistant, OT Charges, Room rent(ward), Surgeon -1. Bill No.2 relates to payment of Rs.1000/- towards X ray & Doctor fees. Bill No.3 reveals that he consulted the doctor on 27.10.2021, 08.12.2021, taken X ray and purchased tablets shows payment of Rs.1708/-. Bill No.4 relates to payment to pharmacy for purchase of medicine an amount of Rs. 910/-. It is apparent that Bill No.1-4 relates to out patient medical bills not form part of Bill No.5 relates to inpatient. **Hence, the petitioner entitled an amount of Rs.55,918/- towards medical expenses for taking treatment as in patient as well as out patient.**

(iii) LOSS OF INCOME: The petitioner claimed Rs.1,00,000/- for loss of income and Rs.1,00,000/- towards loss of earning power. It is stated that, the petitioner was worked in private company and earned Rs.10,000/-per month. But there is no records produced to show the employment or earning. The petitioner side not proved the Permanent partial disability sustained and hence there is no loss of earning capacity arises as stated in the petition. At the same

time the petitioner treated in patient as well as out patient for the fracture caused in the said accident. Upon considering the period of treatment as inpatient in DAVID Hospital the petitioner ought to have absented from regular course of employment at least 1 months. Hence the notional income fixed as Rs.7,000/- per month in tribunal inclined to award compensation of Rs.7,000/- towards loss of income during the period of layoff.

(iv) With regard to the other claims made by the petitioner, no documents were filed. Considering the said fact,

(a) For pain and sufferings: The petitioner taken treatment in two hospitals for viz., Vaniyambadi G.H., David hospital, treated as inpatient from 27.10.2021 to 01.11.2021. The petitioner also undergone surgery on both fracture on his right leg subjected the procedure of CRIF WITH IMIL NAILING on 28.10.2021 as could revealed from discharge summary marked as Ex.P.7. The petitioner also taken as outpatient 27.10.2021, 08.12.2021 Upon considering the pain & Sufferings undergone by the petitioner, nature of Injury, age, number of surgery undergone by the petitioner, tests & reports and disability *the tribunal inclined to award Rs.60,000/- as compensation under this head.*

(b)Towards extra nourishment: that would have been taken for speedy recovery, and upon considering the age of the petitioner 19 yrs at the time of accident and *hence the tribunal inclined to award Rs.10,000/- under this head.*

(c) Towards attender charges: Though the petitioner was hospitalized, there is

no material produced that he was assisted by an attender. The period of treatment clarified that the petitioner treated as inpatient for three times as discussed in point No.2 . The petitioner would have been support of the family members for the said period. Though the same offered due to love and affection, if the accident would not happened she ought not to have hospitalized. Hence the considering the period of treatment the court is inclined to award **Rs. 10,000/-** towards attender Charges .

(d)Transport expenses: Though the petitioner claimed Rs.10,000/- compensation for transportation charges. There is no trip sheet produced in order to prove the expenses incurred towards transportation. It is apparent on the face of the record that the petitioner treated as in patient as well as out patient. He also consulted the doctor on 27.10.2021, 08.12.2021 as could revealed from Ex.P6. The petitioner is the resident of vaniyambadi. Though he had taken treatment in Vaniyambadi hospital he incurred some expenses towards transportation i.e at the time of discharge from hospital and two times doctor visit (for up and down). Upon considering the distance, nature of injury sustained, post operating consultation the tribunal inclined to award **Rs.5,000/-** towards transportation expenses as per the evidence produced herewith.

(e) Loss of Amenities: It is clear from record that the petitioner was 19 years old at the time accident. Considering the nature of injury, which he has to endure through out life, and hence tribunal inclined to award **Rs. 10,000/-** for loss of Amenities and happiness.

(8) **Finally**, this tribunal award the following amount towards the claim of the petitioner under the given heads.

1	Towards Disability	NIL
2	Towards Medical Expenses	Rs.55,918/-
3	Towards Loss of Income	Rs.7,000/-
4	Towards Future Expenses	NIL
5	Towards Pain & Suffering	Rs. 60,000/-
6	Towards loss of Amenities	Rs. 10,000/-
7	Towards Transport Expenses	Rs. 5,000/-
8	Towards Extra nourishment	Rs. 10,000/-
9	Attender charges	Rs. 10,000/-
	Total	Rs.1,57,918/-

9. POINT NO.4 :

The 1st respondent is the owner of the Bharat Benz Lorry bearing Reg.No.TN 83 C 0664 at the time of accident as could be revealed from registration certificate marked as Ex.P4. The accident was caused due to the negligence of the driver of the 1st respondent as decided in point No.1. The said vehicle insured with the 2nd respondent company as could be seen from Ex.P.3. The period of validity of policy is between midnight of 31.12.2020 to midnight of 30.12.2021. The petitioner is third party to the 1st respondent vehicle. The accident happened on 27.10.2021. The policy was in force at the time of accident. The MV report(Ex.P8) contains the driver of the 1st respondent hold Valid DL TN 69Z 19920000577, along with badge 2391/1992. There is no violation of policy expressed on the side of 2nd respondent. The defense raised

regarding the petitioner riding a stolen vehicle has already been considered and rejected as discussed in Point No.2. The said contention does not fall within the statutory defenses available to the insurer to avoid liability. In the absence of any valid statutory defence, the insurer is bound to indemnify the insured and satisfy the award passed in favour of the petitioner. Hence the tribunal ordered to pay compensation to the petitioner for the injuries sustained in the accident. The point No.4 is answered accordingly.

In the result, the petition is partly allowed as follows:-

(a) The Petitioner is awarded **Rs.1,57,918/- (Rupees One lakh Fifty Seven Thousand Nine Hundred and Eighteen Only)** together with interest at 7.5% per annum from the date of petition till the date of deposit (Excluding the period for the dismissal for default if any).

(b) The 2nd respondent is directed to deposit the award amount within **one month** from the date of order by NEFT / RTGS mode directly into the account standing in the name of Special Subordinate Judge(MACT), Tirupattur at State Bank of India, Tirupattur Main Branch, Current Account No. **42888609189** under intimation to this Tribunal by way of sending pay advice slip.

(c) The petitioner is permitted to withdraw the deposit amount on condition that to pay the remaining Court Fee of **Rs.579/-** within 15 days from the date of receipt of copy of order. If not paid within the stipulated time, the petitioner not entitled to claim interest for the aforesaid period. The disbursement of the amount shall be made by direct transfer to credit of his account by NEFT/RTGS mode.

(d) Advocate fee fixed as **Rs.6,158** /- shall be paid by NEFT/RTGS mode.

(e) The 2nd respondent is directed to pay a sum of **Rs. 7,299/-** being the cost of petitioner tabulated there in.

10. Following the Judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of the Madras in M/s Cholamandal MS General Insurance Co.Ltd. /Vs/ Ayyanar and others reported in 2020(4) CTC 272, no decree is prepared. All the parties are entitled to free copies of award as per section 168(2) of Motor Vehicles Act.

Other necessary Particulars

Date of petition	:	Respondent's side
Date of Award	:	30.04.2026
Amount of compensation claimed is	:	Rs.5,00,000/-
Amount of compensation awarded by this tribunal is	:	Rs.1,57,918/-
Court fee payable for the said amount is	:	Rs. 952/-
Court fee already paid is	:	Rs.373/-
Balance court fee to be paid is	:	Rs.579/-

Cost List for the Petitioner

Particulars	Petitioner side	Respondent's side
Court fees	Rs. 952.00	
Vakalath Nama Stamp	Rs. 50.00	
Process fee	Rs. 14.00	
Advocate fee	Rs. 6,158.00	----

Stamp of documents	Rs. 25.00	
Typing charges	Rs. 100.00	
Total	Rs. 7,299.00	

Dictated to Steno Typist and directly typed by him in my laptop, corrected, pronounced by me in the open Tribunal on **30th day of April 2026.**

Special Subordinate Judge (FAC),
Motor Accident Claims Tribunal,
Tirupattur, Tirupattur District.

Petitioner Side Witness:-

PW1 Arun

Respondent side witness:-

RW1 Jayaprakash

RW2 Bathpanaban

RW3 Seenivasan

Petitioner side Exhibits:

Ex.P 1 Copy of FIR

Ex.P 2 Copy of Wound Certificate

Ex.P 3 Copy of Insurance Policy of the Bharath Pens Lorry bearing Reg.No.TN 83 C 0664

Ex.P 4 Copy of RC of the Lorry

Ex.P 5 Copy of Aadhaar Card of the petitioner

Ex.P 6 Original Medical Bills of Rs.58,170/-

Ex.P 7 Copy of Discharge Summary

Ex.P 8 Copy of MVI Report of the Lorry

Court side Exhibits :

NIL

Respondent side Exhibits:

Ex. R1 Copy of Authorisation Letter

Ex. R2 Copy of FIR in Cr.No.1130/2020 HUDCO Police Station Hosur,
Krishnagiri U/s. 379 IPC

Ex. R3 Copy of Observation Maghazar

Ex. R4 Copy of Rough Sketch

Ex. R5 Copy of Final Report filed in Cr.No.1130/2020 HUDCO Police
Station

Ex. R6 Copy of FIR

Ex. R7 Copy of Investigation Report

Special Subordinate Judge (FAC),
Motor Accident Claims Tribunal,
Tirupattur, Tirupattur District.