

**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 (FAC), Tirupattur.**

Thursday, the 30th day of April 2026

M.C.O.P. No.155/2023

CNR.NO.TNTU04-000344-2023

1. Parsotam @ Purusothaman, (64 years),
S/o. Hari,
No.432, Sai Baba Colony,
Pachal Village & Post,
Tirupattur Taluk & District.

..... Petitioner

/vs/

1. Rayathbasha,
S/o.Vazirbasha,
No.5/26, Kalathumedu,
Kurumberi Village & Post,
Tirupattur Taluk & District.

2. The Divisional Manager,
Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd.,
No.94, III Floor,
Jawaharlal Nehru Road,
Opp. to Hotel Ambica Empire & Above SBI,
Vadapalani,
Chennai.

..... Respondents

The petition filed on 11.08.2020 and came up for final hearing in the presence of **Thiru.S.Veeramani, B.A.,B.L.**, learned counsel for the petitioner.

The 1st respondent is set exparte and **Thiru.D.P.Chandran, B.Sc., B.L.**, learned counsel for the 2nd respondent after hearing both side arguments, perusing case records and having stood for consideration till this day, this tribunal passed the following:-

ORDER

This petition was filed by the Petitioner against the respondent under section 166 of the Motor Vehicles Act claiming compensation of Rs.7,00,000/- as compensation against the respondent together with interest and cost from the date of accident.

1. The averments of the petition in brief :-

On 13.06.2023 at about 10.30 am the petitioner was riding his Yamaha facino two wheeler bearing Reg. No. TN 83 P 7914 on the extreme left side of the Vaniyambadi to Tirupattur road, while While he was waiting near Muneeswaran Temple to cross the road, at at that time the Pulsar bearing Reg. No. TN 83 MC 2724 ca from the Vaniyambadi side driven by its driver in a very rash speed and negligent manner and without following the traffic rules dashed against the petitioner. Due to the impact the petitioner was sustained Anterior Dislocation of (R) hip. Fracture Accatablum (R), Type II Subtrochanteric fracture of (R) hip, Fracture of C2 Cervical Vertibra and Fracture Bilateral Transverse process of L4 vertebra and sustained grievous injuries all over the body. After the accident the petitioner was taken to the Govt. Hospital, Tirupattur, then he was admitted in Arun Hospital, Krishnagiri and the petitioner also take treatment as outpatient in private hospitals. A case

U/s.279 & 337 is also registered by Jolarpettai Police in Cr.No.207/2023. Since the accident took place due to the rash and negligent driving of the Pulsar driver, the 1st Respondent is the owner of the Pulsar two wheeler bearing Reg. No. TN 83 MC 2724 and 2nd Respondent is the insurer of the Pulsar two wheeler are jointly and severally liable to pay compensation to the petitioner for the injuries sustained by him in the above said accident.

2. The notice served to the 1st respondent and appeared before this court and hence set exparte on 29.09.2023. The petition U/Sec 170 of MV Act in order to putforth defence on behalf of the 1st respondent and allowed in IA No.2/2025 dated 14.10.2026.

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

The Respondent denies the allegations as stated in the petition that the accident was due to the rash and negligent driving of the rider of the Bajaj Pulsar motorcycle bearing registration No: TN 83 MC 2724 dashed against the petitioner while he was waiting cross the road on the left side of the road in a Yamaha Fascino motorcycle bearing registration No: TN 83 P 7914 and due to impact the petitioner sustained injuries. However the petitioner is to strict proof of the manner in which the accident happened and of the said allegation. This Respondent submits that the rider of the Bajaj Pulsar motorcycle TN 83 MC 2724 was driving with all care and caution in a normal speed, following the traffic rules. But it was the petitioner was coming from the Palnakuppam road intended to turn to the right side of the road towards Vaniyambadi in a rash and negligent manner without following the traffic rules suddenly entered the main

road without noticing the oncoming vehicle and himself invited the accident. Further the petitioner was not wearing helmet at the time of the accident. Therefore the accident occurred only due to the rash and negligent riding of the rider/petitioner of the two wheeler. In any event the rider/petitioner of the two wheeler TN 83 P 7914 had been guilty of contributory negligence. This respondent submits that the 1st Respondent cum rider of the Bajaj Pulsar motorcycle TN 83 MC 2724 did not have any valid driving license to drive the vehicle at the time of the accident. It was mentioned in the M.V.I Report. Therefore the 1st Respondent cum rider had been violating the terms and conditions of the policy. Hence this respondent is not liable to pay any compensation to the petitioner.

4. On the side of the petitioners, the petitioner examined as PW1 and Ex.P1 to Ex.P13 were marked. On the side of respondent, Official from Regional Transport office namely Maruthachalam examined as RW1, and Ex.R1 and R2 were marked.

5. Points for consideration:-

1) Whether the accident occurred due to the rash and negligence of 1st respondent who is the owner cum driver of the the Bajaj Pulsar motorcycle bearing registration No: TN 83 MC 2724 ?

2) Whether the Petitioner is entitled to get the compensation from the respondent? If so what is the quantum? from whom?

6. POINT NO 1 :-

(1) The petitioner's case is that, the accident happened on 13.06.2023 at about 10.30 am in Vaniyambadi to Tirupattur Road. It is gathered from documents that, the petitioner was riding his YAMAHA FACINO two wheeler bearing Reg. No. TN 83 P 7914 and the 1st respondent who is the owner cum driver of the Bajaj Pulsar motorcycle bearing Reg. No: TN 83 MC 2724 at the time of accident. The 1st respondent remained exparte. The Contesting 2nd respondent not disputed the date, time and Place of the accident. The factum of accident also admitted. The manner of accident alone denied. Hence the tribunal inclined to appreciate the oral as well as document evidence put forth in order to decide the point of Negligence.

(2) The petitioner filed proof affidavit in consonance with the claim petition and examined as PW1. He categorically deposed that, he was proceeding in his Yamaha motor cycle slowly cautiously in the Palnanguppan Koot Road towards Vaniyambadi, at that time, the 1st respondent drove the Bajaj Pulsar Vehicle in a rash and negligent manner who came from Vaniyambadi towards Tirupathur, dashed against the petitioner and caused the accident. Though Pw1 elaborately cross examined the manner of accident not shattered on the side of respondent. The medical records and the damages contained in MV Inspection report (Ex.P 6 & P8) corroborates the case of the petitioner.

(3) It is extracted from medical records, the petitioner immediately taken taken in to Tirupathur G.H. and after taking first aid referred for higher

treatment and then admitted in Arun hospital, Krishnagiri. The time, date and other particulars contained in the Accident register (Ex.P.3) also tallied with the case of the petitioner that he sustained injuries due to that accident. There is no rebuttal evidence put forth in order to rebut the manner of accident. The criminal case registered U/s.279 & 337 registered by Jolarpettai Police in Cr.No.207/2023 against the driver of the Pulsar marked as EX.P1. The said evidence of Pw1 which corroborated by contemporary documents and hence the tribunal wholly relies on the evidence of PW1. Hence the tribunal holds that the accident occurred as per the manner stated in the petition.

(4) It is settled law that the standard of proof required in motor accident claims is that of preponderance of probabilities and not proof beyond reasonable doubt. The petitioner proved his case with preponderance of probability. Hence, the tribunal holds that the accident only occurred due to the rash & negligent driving of the 1st respondent who is the owner cum driver of the Bajaj Pulsor bearing Registration No. TN 83 MC 2724 and termed as offending vehicle. Hence, point No.1 is answered accordingly.

7. POINT NO.2 :

(A) The petitioner deposed that, he had sustained grievous injuries especially in his right side head, right side forehead due to the accident as could be seen in the medical records marked as Ex.P. 2,3,4 & 12. The scan report marked as Ex.P11. The discharge summary of Arun hospital, Krishnagiri for taking treatment as an inpatient from 13.06.2023 – 20.06.2023 marked as EX.P2. The accident occurred due to the rash and negligence of the driver of the Bajaj

Pulsar as decided in point No. 1. Hence the petitioner is entitled compensation from the respondents. This point No. 2 is answered accordingly.

(B) The petitioner claimed Rs.7,00,000/- 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: The petitioner also referred to Medical board and doctors of the medical board had assessed the disability of the petitioner and given Ex.C1, the disability certificate. It shows the percentage of disability is **10%**. Though the petitioner sustained injury it is failed to prove that the same affects his day - day activities and routine work. Upon considering the factors that the disability is not functional this tribunal inclined to apply “**Percentage method**”. Being the accident took place in contemporary period, it is pertinent to read the judgment in

Future General India Insurance Company Limited Vs Manivannan and 2 others, 2024(1) TN MAC 598

The division bench of hon'ble madras high court granted Rs.7,000 per percentage for an accident occurred in the year 2017, towards disability certified by the qualified Doctor or Medical Board."

Relying the dictum laid down in the above judgment, the accident occurred in the year 2022 an enhanced sum of Rs.8,000/- per percentage of disability is herewith applied. **Considering the disability in this case fixed as 10%, it can be calculated at the rate of Rs.8,000/- = Rs.80,000/- is awarded towards Disability.**

(ii) MEDICAL EXPENSES: The petitioner claimed Rs.1,50,000/- towards medical expenses. The Accident occurred on 13.06.2023 at 10.30 a.m. The petitioner taken in to Tirupathur Govt Hospital immediate to the accident on the same day at 11.00 a.m. as contained in Accident Register (Ex.P3). The entries contained in accident register are Left side hip tenderness and immobility & Right knee tendering. The said treatment is taken in Govt. hospital on free of cost and hence no medical bills expected to be produced. The wound certificate reveals that the injuries sustained by the petitioner is of GRIEVOUS IN NATURE.

Then the petitioner admitted in Arun hospital, Krishnagiri on the date of accident itself i.e.13.06.2023 at 12.58 p.m. The discharge summary Ex.P.2 reveals that he had taken treated as inpatient from 13.06.2023 – 20.06.2023. He also undergone surgery on 13.06.2023 Anterior dislocation of right hip, Fracture of right Acetabulum, Type II subtrochant Eric fracture of right hip, fracture of C2 cervical vertebra, fracture bilateral transverse process of L4 vertebra. He also subjected to the procedure CLOSED REDUCTION OF RIGHT HIP, PFN A II FIXATION FOR LEFT SUBTROCHANTERIC FRACTURE. He also advised to take medication and advised to attend review on 25.06.2023. A set of medical bills (52 nos.) produced and marked as Ex.P.13.

(A) INPATIENT BILLS :

(a) The Bill No.1, 2 dated 13.06.2023 relates to purchase of injection for an amount of Rs.513/- + Rs.475/-. Bill No.2 pertains to payment of Rs.1727/- to the pharmacy for purchase of surgical material, gloves, catheter, venflon etc.

The bill No.4, 5, 6, 7 dated. 14.06.2023 relates to purchase of injection and medicine for an amount of Rs.180/- + Rs.485/- + Rs.949/- + Rs.680/- The bill No. 8, 9 dated.15.06.2023 also purchase of dyna silver cervical collar, venflon etc for an amount Rs.480/- + Rs.793/- . The bill No. 10 dated.16.06.2023 related to payment of Rs.461/- towards pharmacy. The bill No. 11, 12 dated.17.06.2023 also purchase of medicine for an amount of Rs.499/- + Rs.860/- . The bill No. 13 dated.18.06.2023 also payment made to pharmacy an amount of Rs.615/-. The bill No. 14, 15, 16, 17 dated.19.06.2023 contains payment of Rs.39/- + Rs.315/- + Rs.39/- + Rs.831/- towards pharmacy. The bill No. 18 dated.20.06.2023 contains payment of Rs.115/-. The bill No. 19 relates to purchase of things from pharmacy for an amount of Rs.2336/-.

(b) The bill No. 37 dated.15.06.2023 contains receipt for an amount of Rs.8000/- paid towards CT scan taken for hip and spine. The bill No. 41 dated.13.06.2023 relates to payment of Rs.800/- for taken Xray in spine and pelvis. The bill No. 42 dated.13.06.2023 relates to payment of Rs.200/- to Lab test, Electro light and pre operative blood test. The bill No. 43 dated.20.06.2023 relates to taken ECG contains payment of Rs.300/-. *Hence the tribunal inclined to award an amount of Rs.21,692/- towards medical expenses for taking treatment as **inpatient** in Krishnagiri Arun hospital.*

(B) OUT PATIENT PHARMACY BILLS :

The bill No. 20, 21, 22 dated.28.06.2023 contains payment of Rs.583/- + Rs.592/- + Rs.578/- towards pharmacy. The bill No. 23 dated.04.07.2023 relates to payment of Rs.612/- towards purchase of syringe and tablets. The bill No. 25

dated. 11.07.2023 pertains to payment of Rs.627/- towards pharmacy. The bill No. 26, 27, 28 dated.25.07.2023 payment towards pharmacy an amount of Rs.319/- + Rs.250/-+Rs.364/- respectively. The bill No. 29, 30 dated.26.07.2023, 01.08.2023 contains payment of Rs.390/- + Rs.390/- towards pharmacy. The bill No. 31, 32, 33 dated.11.08.2023 also payment towards pharmacy an amount of Rs.198/- + Rs.617/- + Rs.140/-. The bill No. 34, 35, 36 dated.29.08.2023, 12.09.2023, 07.10.2023 also contains payment of Rs.373/- + Rs.455/- + Rs.169/- for purchase of medicine etc. The bill No. 38, 39, 40 dated.24.06.2023 contains the payment to Appollo pharmacy an amount of Rs.60/- + Rs.14/- + Rs.210/-. *Hence the tribunal inclined to award an amount of Rs.6,941/- towards medical expenses for taking treatment as **outpatient** paid towards Pharmacy .*

(C) OUT PATIENT CONSULTATION & TREATMENT :

The bill No. 44, 46, 48, 50 dated.28.06.2023, 11.07.2023, 25.07.2023, 29.08.2023 relates to consultation charges of of Rs.500/- + Rs.300/- + Rs.200/- + Rs.200/-.

(a) The bill No. 45 dated.11.07.2023 relates to payment of Rs.900/- for taken Xray in Hip and thigh.

(b) The bill No. 47 dated.25.07.2023 relates to payment of Rs.400/-for taken Xray in Lef AP.

(c)The bill No. 49 dated.11.08.2023 relates to payment of Rs.1000/- for taken Xray in knee and thigh.

(d)The bill No. 51 dated.29.08.2023 relates to payment of Rs.700/- for taken Xray in hip and thigh.

(e)The bill No. 52 dated.07.10.2023 relates to payment of Rs.800/- for taken Xray in pelvis.

*Hence the tribunal inclined to award an amount of Rs.5,000/- towards medical expenses for taking treatment as **outpatient** in Krishnagiri Arun hospital.*

As discussed in detail, the petitioner entitled an amount of Rs. 33,633/- (A + B + C = Rs.21692/- + Rs.6941/- + Rs. 5000/- = Rs. 33,633/-)towards medical expenses for taking treatment as in patient as well as out patient

(iii) LOSS OF INCOME: The Petitioner side has stated that he is doing the business of manufacturing incise and earned Rs.25,000/- p.m. But there is no document produced in order to prove the income of petitioner. The wound certificate reveals that she sustained Grievous injury. Though the petitioner proved that she sustained 10 % Permanent partial disability and failed to prove that the same affected her normal day to day routine. Being Functional disability not proved and hence the tribunal holds that 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 as well as out patient for the head injury especially taken treatment for HIP & SPINE, the petitioner ought to have absented from regular course of employment at least 2 months. Hence considering the period of accident he could have earned atleast Rs.500/- perday the notional income fixed as Rs.15,000/- per month in tribunal inclined to award compensation of Rs.15,000/- x 2 = Rs. 30,000/- 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: It is apparent on the face of medical records that, the petitioner sustained injuries: Anterior dislocation of right hip, Fracture of right Acetabulum, Type II subtrochanteric fracture of right hip, fracture of C2 cervical vertebra, fracture bilateral transverse process of L4 vertebra. Apart from treatment taken treatment in Tirupathur GH & the petitioner constrained to approach higher medical institution due to severe injury in HIP & SPINE . He also taken treatment in emergency in Arun Hospital, Krishnagiri. He took continuous treatment as inpatient as well as Out patient as could revealed from Medical records marked as Ex.P.13. For that the petitioner would have suffered a lot due to pain. Upon considering the said treatment, pain & Sufferings undergone by the petitioner, nature of Injury, age, number of surgery undergone by the petitioner, and disability of 10 % **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 was 65 at the time of accident and **hence the tribunal inclined to award Rs.15,000/- 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 the period from 13.06.2023 – 20.06.2023 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 he ought not to have hospitalized. Hence the considering the period of treatment & the head injury the court is inclined to award **Rs.15,000/-** towards attender Charges.

(d)Transport expenses: Though the petitioner claimed Rs.25,000/- compensation for transportation charges. There is no trip sheet produced in order to prove the expenses incurred towards transportation. It reveals from the records the petitioner taken treatment in Tirupathur GH & Arun Hospital Krishnagiri. The distance between his residence and Krishnagiri nearly about 49 k.m. (for up and down $49 * 2 = 98$). Then he had also taken treatment as out patient in the Arun hospital & Consulting the doctor on the following dates: 28.03.2024 and 30.05.2024. Upon considering the distance, nature of injury sustained, post operating consultation the tribunal inclined to award **Rs.15,000/-** towards transportation expenses as per the evidence produced herewith .

(e) Loss of Amenities: It is clear from record that the petitioner was 64 years old at the time accident. Considering the nature of injuring and permanent disability of 10%, which he has to endure through out life, and hence tribunal inclined to award **Rs. 30,000/-** for loss of Amenities and happiness.

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

1	Towards disability	Rs.80,000/-
2	Towards Medical Expenses	Rs.33,633/-
3	Towards loss of future expenses	NIL
4	Loss of income during the period of injury	Rs. 30,000/-
5	Towards Pain & Suffering	Rs. 60,000/-
6	Extra Nourishment	Rs. 15,000/-
7	Attender Charges	Rs. 15,000/-
8	Transportation expenses	Rs.15,000/-
9	Loss of Amenities	Rs. 30,000/-
	Total	Rs.2,78,633

The 1st respondent is the owner of the offending vehicle/ Bajaj Pulsor bearing Registration No. TN 83 MC 2724 as could be seen from a copy of Registration Certificate (Ex.P7). Being the owner cum driver of the said vehicle, the 1st respondent is liable to pay the compensation for the negligence on his part as decided in Point No. 1. The copy of insurance policy(Ex.P6) reveals that the policy was valid from the midnight of 17.05.2023 to the midnight of 16.05.2024 (for OD & PA coverage) and also the said policy valid from the midnight of 17.05.2023 to the midnight of 16.05.2028 (for TP coverage). The accident occurred on 31.03.2022. The Insurance was in force at the time of accident. The respondent side put forth the violation of policy that the 1st respondent did not possessed Valid DL at the time of accident.

The 2nd respondent side examined the RTO, Tirupathur who appeared on summons as RW1. It is established through RW1 that the driver of the offending vehicle / Bajaj pulsar / 1st respondent had no valid driving license at the time of accident. There is no rebuttal on the side of 1st respondent who are remained exparte and hence adverse inference drawn against them that they have permitted driver who have not possessed driving license to drove their vehicle at the time of accident. The said act is nothing but violation of policy of insurance. Hence the tribunal holds that the driver of the offending vehicle not hold valid driving license at the time of accident.

At this juncture, it is pertinent to rely upon a judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in *(2004) 3 SCC 297 National Insurance Company Ltd., - Vs- Swaran Singh*. As per the dictum laid down in the said Judgment, the 2nd respondent insurance company cannot disown its liability. Based on the above said judgment, this tribunal direct the 2nd respondent insurance company to pay the award amount to the petitioner and thereafter they are entitled to recover the same from the 1st respondent by taking recourse as per section 174 of MV Act. Hence, it is concluded that the 2nd respondent shall pay the compensation to the petitioner. This point is answered accordingly.

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

(a) The Petitioner is awarded Rs.2,78,633/- (**Rupees Two Lakhs Seventy eight Thousand Six Hundred and Thirty Three 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 and thereafter taken recourse against the 1st respondent as Per PAY and RECOVERY METHOD.

(c) The petitioner is permitted to withdraw the deposit amount on condition that to pay the remaining Court Fee of **Rs.1,784/-** 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 given below.

(d) Advocate fee fixed as **Rs.8,572/-** shall be paid by NEFT/RTGS mode.

(e) The 2nd respondent is directed to pay a sum of **Rs.10,940/-** being the cost of the petitioner tabulated there in.

8. 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.7,00,000/-
Amount of compensation awarded by this tribunal is	:	Rs.2,78,633/-
Court fee payable for the said amount is	:	Rs.2,159/-
Court fee already paid is	:	Rs.375/-
Balance court fee to be paid is	:	Rs.1,784/-

Cost List for the Petitioner

Particulars	Petitioner side	Respondent's side
Court fees	Rs.2,159.00	
Vakalath Nama Stamp	Rs. 50.00	
Process fee	Rs. 9.00	
Advocate fee	Rs. 8,572/-	----
Stamp of documents	Rs. 50.00	
Typing charges	Rs. 100.00	
Total	Rs.10,940.00	

Dictated to 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 District.

Petitioner Side Witness:-

PW1 Parsotam @ Purusothaman

Respondents side witness:-

RW1 Srinivasan

Petitioner side Exhibits:

- Ex.P1 Copy of the FIR
- Ex.P 2 Copy of Discharge Summary
- Ex.P 3 Copy of Accident Register
- Ex.P 4 Copy of Wound Certificate
- Ex.P 5 Copy of the DL of the petitioner
- Ex.P 6 Copy of Insurance Policy of the two-wheeler Pulsar bearing Reg.No.TN 83 MC 2724
- Ex.P 7 Copy of RC of the two-wheeler Pulsar
- Ex.P 8 Copy of insurance policy of Yamaha two-wheeler bearing Reg.No. TN 83 P 7914
- Ex.P 9 Copy of Aadhaar Card of the petitioner
- Ex.P 10 Copy of Bank Passbook of the petitioner
- Ex.P 11 Original Scan Report of the petitioner
- Ex.P 12 Original Medical bills of Rs.1,15,000/-
- Ex.P 13 Original Medical bills of Rs.35,456/-

Court side Exhibits :

- Ex.C1 Medical Board report of the petitioner regarding disability.

Respondents side Exhibits:

Ex.R1 Copy of Authorization Letter

Ex.R2 copy of the online search related to DL of the 1st respondent

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