

**BEFORE THE MOTOR ACCIDENT CLAIMS TRIBUNAL, VELLORE,  
VELLORE DISTRICT.  
(I ADDITIONAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS COURT, VELLORE.)**

**PRESENT: Tmt. G. Santhi,**

Motor Accident Claims Tribunal Judge/  
I Additional District and Sessions Judge,  
Vellore.

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

**M.C.O.P. No.478/2018**

**(CNR No.TNVL01-001205-2018)**

(a) Name and address of the claimant / Petitioner (s)	1. T. Kalpana, aged 44 years, W/o. Late R.Krishnan
	2. K. Daranika, aged 19 years, D/o. Late R.Krishnan
	3. Minor. Thirumurthi, aged 15 years, S/o. Late R.Krishnan
	4. P.S.Rajendiran, aged 75 years, S/o. Late. Sadasivam
	5. R. Santhakumari (died) aged 71 years, W/o. P.S.Rajendiran. Petitioners 1 to 4 are residing at No.9, 1 <sup>st</sup> Cross Street, 'A' Sector, V.G.Rao Nagar, Dharapadavedu, Katpadi Taluk, Vellore District.
	6. Kirubakaran, aged      years, S/o. P.S. Rajendiran, residing at No.9, 1 <sup>st</sup> Cross Street, 'A' Sector, V.G.Rao Nagar, Dharapadavedu, Katpadi Taluk, Vellore District.
	7. Geetha, aged      years, W/o. A.D.Ramanan, D/o. P.S. Rajendran, residing at No.49, Pondicherry Road, Kottur, Chennai 600 085. (Petitioners 6 and 7 are amended as per order in I.A.No.2/2022 on 09.11.2022)

(b) Name and address of the respondent (s)	: 1. Shaik Ameer Basha, Son of Kalesha, Door No.4-3-4 Pedda Masid Street, Naidupettah Village and Mandal, Nellore, Andhra Pradesh – 524 126. 2. Cholamandalam MS General Insurance Company Limited, Rep. by its Authorized Signatory, Dare House, Second Floor, No.2 NSC Bose Road, Chennai – 600 001.																								
(c) Date of presentation Date of Taken on File	: 25.06.2018 : 05.07.2018																								
(d) Date of award	:																								
(e) Amount of award	: <b>Rs.37,13,580/- (Rupees Thirty Seven lakhs Thirteen thousand Five hundred and Eighty only)</b> as compensation. Out of the award amount, the 1st petitioner is entitled to Rs.14,85,432/-, the petitioners 2 and 3 are entitled to Rs.7,42,716/- each, the 4th petitioner is entitled to 3,71,358/- , and the petitioners 6 and 7 (legal representatives of the deceased 5th petitioner) are entitled to Rs,3,71,358/- jointly.																								
(f) Costs, if any	: <table style="margin-left: 40px;"> <tr> <td>Stamp on petition</td> <td>-</td> <td>Rs.</td> <td>20.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Stamp on Vakalath</td> <td>-</td> <td>Rs.</td> <td>10.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Court fee</td> <td>-</td> <td>Rs.</td> <td>36,508.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Advocate fee</td> <td>-</td> <td>Rs.</td> <td>56,636.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>=====</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">Total</td> <td>=</td> <td>Rs.</td> <td>93,174.00</td> </tr> </table>	Stamp on petition	-	Rs.	20.00	Stamp on Vakalath	-	Rs.	10.00	Court fee	-	Rs.	36,508.00	Advocate fee	-	Rs.	56,636.00				=====	Total	=	Rs.	93,174.00
Stamp on petition	-	Rs.	20.00																						
Stamp on Vakalath	-	Rs.	10.00																						
Court fee	-	Rs.	36,508.00																						
Advocate fee	-	Rs.	56,636.00																						
			=====																						
Total	=	Rs.	93,174.00																						
(g) Balance Court fee	Rs.36,488/-																								

1. T. Kalpana, aged 44 years, W/o. Late R.Krishnan
2. K. Daranika, aged 19 years, D/o. Late R.Krishnan
3. Minor. Thirumurthi, aged 15 years, S/o. Late R.Krishnan
4. P.S.Rajendiran, aged 75 years, S/o. Late. Sadasivam
5. R. Santhakumari (died) aged 71 years, W/o. P.S.Rajendiran.
6. Kirubakaran, aged years, S/o. P.S. Rajendiran,
7. Geetha, aged years, W/o. A.D.Ramanan, D/o. P.S. Rajendran,  
(Petitioners 6 and 7 are amended as per order in I.A.No.2/2022 on  
09.11.2022)

... Petitioners

/Vs/

1. Shaik Ameer Basha, Son of Kalesha,
2. Cholamandalam MS General Insurance Company Limited,  
Rep. by its Authorized Signatory,

... Respondents

This petition is came up before me for final hearing on 23.02.2026 in the presence of Thiru.K.N.Sathyamoorthy, Counsel appearing for the petitioners and Thiru. J.Kathiravan Counsel appearing for the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent and Thiru. S.John, Counsel appearing for the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent and the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent called absent set exparte, upon hearing the arguments both sides and upon perusing the entire records of the case, having stood over for consideration till this date, this Tribunal pronounces the following:-

### **ORDER**

This petition has been filed under Section 166 of the Motor Vehicles Act by the dependents of the deceased Krishnan who died in a accident seeking for compensation of Rs.60,00,000/-.

**2. The averments made in the petition are briefly as follows:-**

The petitioners are the wife, children, and parents of the deceased R. Krishnan, an Ex-Serviceman who was earning a total monthly income of Rs.24,058/- through pension and private employment and was the sole breadwinner of the family.

On 27.06.2017 at about 4:45 PM, while the deceased was riding his motorcycle bearing Registration No. **TN-23-BJ-9963** from Vellore towards Tirupathi, a Goods Carriage vehicle (Ashok Leyland Dost) bearing Registration No. **AP-26-TD-7382**, driven in a rash and negligent manner, dashed against him head-on collision. Due to the impact, the deceased sustained multiple injuries and died on the spot. Initially, a criminal case was registered against the deceased based on a complaint allegedly given by his brother-in-law, who was not an eyewitness and had signed blank papers under distress. The petitioners contend that the complaint was manipulated and that the accident occurred solely due to the negligence of the driver of the Goods Vehicle. The said vehicle belonged to the 1st respondent and was insured with the 2nd respondent; hence both respondents are jointly and severally liable to pay compensation. During the pendency of the case, the 5th petitioner died and her legal representatives were impleaded. The petitioners have filed this claim seeking Rs.60,00,000/- as compensation along with interest and costs.

**3. The averments made in the counter filed by the First respondent are briefly as follows:-.**

This Petition is not maintainable under law and on facts. This respondent denied all the allegations made in the petition except those that are specifically admitted and the respondent stated that he is the registered owner of the offending vehicle, Goods Carriage LMV (Ashok Leyland Dost) bearing Registration No. **AP-26-TD-7382**. The driver of this respondent possessed a valid and effective driving licence on the date of the accident. The accident occurred solely due to the rash and negligent riding of the deceased, who, while proceeding from Chittoor towards Tirupathi on a TVS Star City motorcycle, attempted to overtake a vehicle ahead without noticing the oncoming Goods Carriage LMV bearing Registration No. **AP-26-TD-7382**, resulting in a collision. Due to the impact, the deceased sustained fatal injuries and died on the spot. The driver of this respondent's vehicle also sustained injuries and was admitted to SVRRGG Hospital, Tirupathi for treatment. Hence, there was no negligence on the part of the driver of this respondent. On the complaint, the Sub-Inspector of Police, Chandragiri Police Station registered a case in **Cr.No.145/2017** under Sections **279, 337 and 304(A) IPC** against the deceased. After investigation, the Deputy Sub-Divisional Police Officer, Tirupathi (West) vide proceedings in **C.No.109/Refer-SDPO-TPT(W)/2017 dated 12.07.2017**, referred the case as abated due to the death of the accused (deceased herein).

Since no case was registered against the driver of this respondent and the accident occurred solely due to the negligence of the deceased, this respondent is not liable to pay any compensation. The claim petition is therefore false and filed only for wrongful gain. Further, this respondent submits that the offending vehicle bearing Registration No. **AP-26-TD-7382** was duly insured with the 2nd respondent Insurance Company under a valid policy bearing No. **3392/200009301/000/00**, valid from **01.12.2016 to 30.12.2017**, covering the date of accident. In the event of any compensation being awarded by this Hon'ble Tribunal, the 2nd respondent Insurance Company is liable to indemnify this respondent. Hence, the liability, if any, shall be borne by the 2nd respondent and this respondent is not personally liable to pay any compensation.

**4. The averments made in the counter filed by the Second respondent are briefly as follows:-.**

The 2nd respondent Insurance Company denies all the allegations in the claim petition and puts the petitioners to strict proof of the same. It is contended that the insurer is not liable to pay any compensation either legally, factually or contractually. The age, occupation, income, relationship and dependency of the deceased are all denied for want of proof, and the manner of accident, cause of injuries and death are also not admitted.

According to the 2nd respondent, the accident occurred solely due to the rash and negligent riding of the deceased while riding the two-wheeler bearing Registration No. TN-23-BJ-9963, and not due to any fault on the part of the driver of the lorry bearing Registration No. AP-26-TD-7382. The police have registered a case in Cr.No.145/2017 against the deceased, which was subsequently closed as abated due to his death, thereby establishing that the deceased himself was responsible for the accident. Alternatively, it is contended that the deceased contributed to the accident and therefore any compensation, if awarded, is liable to be reduced on account of contributory negligence.

The 2nd respondent further submits that the driver of the 1st respondent's vehicle did not possess a valid and effective driving licence at the time of the accident, which amounts to violation of policy conditions, and hence the insurer is not liable to indemnify the owner. The alleged income of Rs.24,059/- is denied as exaggerated and unsupported by evidence, and there is no proof of loss of dependency. The compensation claimed is excessive, arbitrary and not supported by documents, and the rate of interest claimed is also on the higher side. Hence, the claim petition is liable to be dismissed as against this respondent.

**5. The point for consideration in this petition are as follows:-**

- (1) Whether this accident was occurred due to the rash and negligent riding of the deceased while riding the two-wheeler bearing Registration No. TN-23-BJ-9963 or due to rash and negligent driving of the driver of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent's vehicle Lorry bearing Reg No. AP-26-TD-7382?
- (2) Who is liable to pay the compensation?
- (3) Whether the petitioner is entitled to compensation? and if so, what is the quantum?

6. On the side of the petitioners, four witnesses have been examined as PW1 to PW4 and 45 documents have been marked as Ex.P1 to P45. On the side of Respondent, no witness was examined and no documents were marked.

**7. Point No.1:**

(i) It is the case of the petitioners that on 27.06.2017 at about 4:45 PM, while the deceased was riding his motorcycle bearing Registration No. TN-23-BJ-9963 from Vellore towards Tirupathi, a Goods Carriage vehicle (Ashok Leyland Dost) bearing Registration No. AP-26-TD-7382, driven in a rash and negligent manner, dashed against him head-on, resulting in his death on the spot.

(ii) To prove the case, on a careful consideration of the pleadings and evidence, it is seen that PW1 is not an eyewitness and PW2 is a hearsay witness. However, PW4 has clearly deposed that he witnessed the accident

and that the driver of the lorry bearing Registration No. AP-26-TD-7382 drove the vehicle in a rash and negligent manner and caused the accident.

(iii) Though Ex.P2 – FIR was registered against the deceased, it is well settled that FIR is not a substantive piece of evidence and cannot be the sole basis to fix negligence. The petitioners have contended that the FIR was wrongly registered, and the respondents have not produced any convincing evidence to prove negligence on the part of the deceased.

(iv) Further, the respondents have not examined the driver of the offending vehicle, who is the best person to speak about the manner of accident. Hence, an adverse inference is drawn against the respondents. The evidence of PW4 remains unshaken and supports the case of the petitioners.

(v) In the absence of any material to prove contributory negligence, this Tribunal holds that the accident occurred solely due to the rash and negligent driving of the driver of the 1st respondent's vehicle bearing Registration No. AP-26-TD-7382. Thus, this point is answered accordingly.

#### **8. Point No.(2)**

(i) In Point No.(1), this Tribunal has already found that the accident occurred mainly due to the rash and negligent driving of the driver of the Goods Carriage vehicle bearing Registration No. **AP-26-TD-7382**.

(ii) The petitioners have stated that the 1st respondent is the owner of

the said vehicle and that the vehicle was insured with the 2nd respondent under Policy No.3392/200009301/000/00, valid from 01.12.2016 to 30.12.2017, which covers the date of accident. The 2nd respondent has not effectively denied the existence of the policy. Ex.P31 – Insurance Policy also supports the case of the petitioners that the vehicle was duly insured on the date of accident.

(iii) On perusal of the records, this Tribunal finds that the respondents have not produced any sufficient oral or documentary evidence to prove breach of policy conditions. Though the 2nd respondent raised a defence regarding absence of valid driving licence, no convincing evidence has been placed before this Tribunal to substantiate the same.

(iv) Hence, this Tribunal comes to the conclusion that the 2nd respondent, being the insurer of the offending vehicle bearing Registration No. **AP-26-TD-7382**, is liable to pay the compensation to the petitioners and indemnify the 1st respondent. Accordingly, this point is answered.

### **9. Point No.(3)**

(i) The 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner has been examined as PW1. In the Postmortem Certificate was marked as Ex.P3 through P.W.1, it has been stated that the deceased died due to "shock and Haemorrhage, as a result of multiple injuries". From the above document, the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner has proved that the

deceased died due to the accident. In the petition, it has been stated that the petitioners 1 to 5 are the legal heirs to the deceased and 6 and 7 are the dependents of the deceased. In the Legal Heir certificate, which is marked as Ex.P.5. Therefore, this Tribunal comes to the conclusion that the petitioners 1 to 3 are entitled to the compensation.

**10. Age of the deceased :**

(ii) As per the judgment in *Smt. Sarla Verma & Ors. Vs. Delhi Transport Corporation & Anr.* The age of the deceased is decided as 49 years as per Postmortem Certificate, Ex.P3.

**11. Monthly & Annual Income of the deceased:**

(iii) In the petition, it is stated that at the time of the accident, the deceased was receiving pension as an Ex-Serviceman and was also working as a Cleaning Supervisor in Ambal Agencies. As per Ex.P13, the deceased was receiving a monthly pension of Rs.13,771/-. Further, as per the evidence of PW3 and Ex.P12, the deceased was earning a salary of Rs.10,287/- per month. Therefore, this Tribunal is inclined to fix the total monthly income of the deceased at **Rs.24,058/-** (Rs.13,771/- + Rs.10,287/-).

**12. Future Prospects:**

(iv) As per **The National Insurance Company Limited Vs. Pranay Sethi and Others, Special Leave petition (Civil) No. 25590 of 2014**

**order dated 31.10.2017**, while determining the income, an addition of 40% of actual salary to the income of the deceased towards Future prospects, where the deceased was self employed and was below the age of 40 years should be made. The addition should be 25%, if the age of deceased was between 40 - 50 years. In case the deceased was between the age of 50 - 60 years, the addition should be 10%.

In this case, the age of the deceased Krishnan is 49 years and 25% future prospectus would be added, it will come to a sum of **Rs.24,058 x 25% = Rs.6,015/-**. Thus, the monthly income of the deceased would be Rs.24,058 + Rs.6,015/- = **Rs.30,073/-**.

### **13. Number of Dependents:**

(v) The petitioners 1 to 5 are the dependents of the deceased. During the pendency of the case, the 5th petitioner (mother of the deceased) died and her legal representatives were impleaded as petitioners 6 and 7. Therefore, the number of the dependents is 4. **the deduction would be 1/4 .**

### **14. Deduction for personal expenses:**

(vi) As per judgment in *Smt. Sarla Verma & Ors. Vs. Delhi Transport Corporation & Anr. (2009) 4 MLJ (SC) 997*, 1/4 has to be deducted as the personal and living expenses of the deceased. As per the dictum laid down in the 2009(2) TN MAC 1(SC) **Smt.Sarla Varma & others Vs. Delhi Transport Corporation & others**, this court deducted ¼ of salary towards

personal and living expenses of the deceased. After such deduction the monthly income of the deceased fixed as Rs.30,073/- - Rs.7,518/- = Rs.22,555/-.

**15. Multiplier and total Loss of dependency:**

(vii) Considering the age of the deceased is 49 years and as per the dictum laid down in 2009(2) TN MAC 1(SC) **Smt.Sarla Varma & others Vs. Delhi Transport Corporation & others**, cited supra, the multiplier 13 is adopted for calculation of compensation. Therefore, the compensation calculated to Rs.22,555/- x 12 x 13 = Rs.35,18,580/- and therefore the petitioners are entitled for **Rs.35,18,580/-** as compensation towards Loss of income.

**16. Loss of Consortium :**

(viii) As per *the Judgment of Hon'ble Apex court passed in SLP (civil) 25590/2014 Dated 31.10.17 between National Ins. Co. Ltd., ..Vs.. Pranay Sethi and others*, the 1<sup>st</sup> Petitioner is entitled to **Rs.40,000/-** under the head of loss of consortium.

**17. Loss of Love and Affection:**

(ix) Next, we have to determine the compensation for the loss of love and affection. Hence this Tribunal decides that the Petitioners 2 to 4 have lost their father and son and they are entitled for the loss of love and affection of the deceased. Hence this Tribunal decides that the petitioners 2 to 4 are

entitled for **Rs.40,000/-** each under the head of loss of love and affection.

**18. Loss of Estate:**

(x) Following *the Judgment of Hon'ble Apex court passed in SLP (civil) 25590/2014 Dated 31.10.17 between National Ins. Co. Ltd., ..Vs.. Pranay Sethi and others*, the Petitioners are entitled to **Rs.15,000/-** under the head of "Loss of Estate".

**19. Transportation:**

(xi) Under the head "Transportation to hospital", upon considering the place of occurrence and the hospital where the postmortem was done and the place of residence of the petitioner, this Tribunal comes to the conclusion that the petitioners are entitled to a sum of **Rs.5,000/-** towards the head "Transport to hospital".

**20. Funeral Expenses:**

(xii) Following *the Judgment of Hon'ble Apex court passed in SLP (civil) 25590/2014 Dated 31.10.17 between National Ins. Co. Ltd., ..Vs.. Pranay Sethi and others*, the Petitioners are entitled to **Rs.15,000/-** under the head of "**Funeral expenses**".

(xiii) **CALCULATION:**

1. Total loss of dependency	:	Rs. 35,18,580/-
2. Loss of Consortium	:	Rs. 40,000/-

3. Loss of Love and Affection	:	Rs. 1,20,000/-
3. Loss of Estate	:	Rs. 15,000/-
4. Transport charges	:	Rs. 5,000/-
5. Funeral Expenses	:	<u>Rs. 15,000/-</u>
<b>Total Compensation is fixed at</b>	:	<b><u>Rs. 37,13,580/-</u></b>

From the above-said discussions, this Tribunal comes to the conclusion that a total sum of Rs.37,13,580/- would be just and fair compensation to the petitioners 1 to 4, 6 and 7. Out of the award amount, the 1st petitioner is entitled to Rs.14,85,432/-, the petitioners 2 and 3 are entitled to Rs.7,42,716/- each, the 4th petitioner is entitled to 3,71,358/- , and the petitioners 6 and 7 (legal representatives of the deceased 5th petitioner) are entitled to Rs,3,71,358/- jointly. Therefore, Point No.3 is answered.

In the result, this petition is partly allowed with costs and the petitioners are entitled for **Rs.37,13,580/- (Rupees Thirty Seven lakhs Thirteen thousand Five hundred and Eighty only)** as compensation. Out of the award amount, the 1st petitioner is entitled to Rs.14,85,432/-, the petitioners 2 and 3 are entitled to Rs.7,42,716/- each, the 4th petitioner is entitled to 3,71,358/- , and the petitioners 6 and 7 (legal representatives of the deceased 5th petitioner) are entitled to Rs,3,71,358/- jointly. The 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent is directed to pay and deposit the award amount into this Court within one month from the date of this order with interest at 7.5% per annum

from the date of filing of this petition till the date of deposit, excluding the period of default if any. The 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent is directed to deposit the said award amount through **NEFT or RTGS** mode in the account of **FIRST ADDITIONAL DISTRICT COURT, MACT, Vellore in Account No.42830452508 (IFSC Code SBIN0008688) of SBI, Sathuvachari Branch, Vellore, under intimation to this court and claimants.** The compensation amount has to be deposited in the above Nationalized bank till the minor 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioner attains majority and the Guardian/1st petitioner/mother is entitled to receive the interest once in six months exclusively for the welfare of the 3<sup>rd</sup> minor Petitioner. The award amount allotted to the petitioners are ordered to be transferred to their bank account by RTGS/e-transfer subsequently. The petitioners had paid **Rs.20/-** as court fee. The petitioners have been exempted from paying court fee at the time of filing and they are directed to deposit the deficit Court Fee of **Rs.36,488/- (Rs. 36,508/- (-) Rs.20/- = Rs.36,488/-)** for the above claim amount into this Court within 15 days, from the date of this order, failing which, the petitioners are not entitled for interest for the default period. Advocate fee is fixed at **Rs.56,636/-** as per Rules. There is no need to prepare or draft the decree for this Award and further all the parties are entitled to get free copies of the award as per the Section 168(2) of the Act and Rules 20(6) of the Rules, as per order passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in M/s

Cholamandalam MS General Insurance Co., Ltd., Vs. Ayyanar and others –  
Judgment dated 11.05.2020 in Tr.CMP Nos.264 to 281 of 2020.

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

**Motor Accident Claims Tribunal Judge/  
I Additional District and Sessions Judge,  
Vellore.**

**Petitioner's side Witness :**

P.W.1 : Tmt.Kalpana  
P.W.2 : Thiru. Jayaprakash  
P.W.3 : Thiru.Madhavan  
P.W.4 : Thiru.Parveenkumar

**Petitioner's side Exhibits:**

Ex.P1	27.06.2017	Xerox copy of the Complaint
Ex.P2	27.06.2017	Xerox copy of the F.I.R
Ex.P3	28.06.2017	Xerox copy of the Postmortem certificate the deceased R.Krishnan
Ex.P4	03.07.2017	Xerox copy of the Death certificate of the deceased R.Krishnan
Ex.P5	18.07.2017	True copy of the Legal Heirship Certificate of the deceased R.Krishnan
Ex.P6	---	Xerox copy of the Driving Licence of R.Krishnan
Ex.P7	---	Xerox copy of the Adhaar Card of the 1 <sup>st</sup> petitioner
Ex.P8	---	Xerox copy of the Adhaar Card of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> petitioner
Ex.P9	---	Xerox copy of the Adhaar Card of the 3 <sup>rd</sup> petitioner
Ex.P10	---	Xerox copy of the Adhaar Card of the 4 <sup>th</sup> petitioner

Ex.P11	---	Xerox copy of the Adhaar Card of the 5 <sup>th</sup> petitioner
Ex.P12	18.07.2017	Salary certificate of the deceased R.Krishnan
Ex.P13	---	Xerox copy of the pension certificate of R.Krishnan for this month of June 2017
Ex.P14	---	Xerox copy of the RC Book of motor cycle TN-23-BJ-9963
Ex.P15	07.02.2018	Office copy of the Legal Notice
Ex.P16	---	Postal Acknowledgment card
Ex.P17	---	Postal Acknowledgment card
Ex.P18	---	Postal Acknowledgment card
Ex.P19	---	Returned Postal Cover
Ex.20	---	Photo copy of the bank pass book for account number 231810100023901 of the 1 <sup>st</sup> petitioner in Andra Bank (Katpadi Branch)
Ex.21	---	Photo copy of the bank pass book for account number 615614708 in Indian Bank (VIT Branch) for the 2 <sup>nd</sup> petitioner
Ex.22	---	Photo copy of the bank pass book for account number 6564789011 of the 3 <sup>rd</sup> petitioner in Indian Bank (VIT Branch).
Ex.23	---	Photo copy of the bank pass book for account number 168301000009340 of the 4 <sup>th</sup> petitioner in Indian Overseas Bank (Auxilium College Branch).
Ex.24	---	Photo copy of the bank pass book for account number 168301000019085 of the 5 <sup>th</sup> petitioner in Indian Overseas Bank (Auxilium College Branch).
Ex.25	---	Photo copy of the Pan Card of the 1 <sup>st</sup> petitioner
Ex.26	---	Photo copy of the Pan Card of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> petitioner
Ex.27	---	Photo copy of the Pan Card of the 4 <sup>th</sup> petitioner
Ex.28	---	Pan Card of the 5 <sup>th</sup> petitioner
Ex.29	---	True copy of the D.L of the Driver of 1 <sup>st</sup> respondent K.Nagaraju
Ex.30	---	True copy of the R.C Book for the Vehicle bearing Regn.No.AP-26-TD-7382

Ex.31	---	True copy of the Insurance Policy of Vehicle Reg.No.AP-26-TD-7382
Ex.32	---	True copy of the M.V.I Report for Vehicle Reg.No.TN-23-BJ-9963
Ex.33	26.12.1985	Xerox copy of Transfer Certificate of deceased R.Krishnan
Ex.34	25.06.1984	Xerox copy of SSLC Mark Sheet of deceased R.Krishnan
Ex.35	---	Xerox copy of Certificate of passing Higher Grade Technical Education (Telephone Operator) of deceased
Ex.36	---	Xerox copy of I.D. Card issued by VIT., Vellore of deceased R.Krishnan
Ex.37	01.06.1989 and 30.11.1989	Xerox copy of Higher Secondary Mark Sheets of T.Jayaprakash
Ex.38	07.07.1986 and 07.01.1987	Xerox copy of SSLC Mark Sheets of T.Jayaprakash
Ex.39	---	Xerox copy of Voorhees College Transfer Certificate of T.Jayaprakash
Ex.40	22.09.2025	Authorization Letter
Ex.41	28.06.2017	Marriage Invitation of R.Sinduja and R.Dinesh Kirushna
Ex.42	---	Xerox copy of the R.C Book of Two wheeler Splendor plus TV-23-AF-9608 D.Parveen Kumar
Ex.43	---	Salary slip of R.Krishnan for the months of April 2017 to June 2017 issued by Ambal Agencies, Vellore
Ex.44	---	Statement of Account of A/C.No.407570967 of VIT Branch (Vellore) of Kalpana for the period from 21.10.2017 to 26.12.2017
Ex.45	---	Statement of Account of A/C.No.993476987 of Indian Bank, Katpadi Branch, of R.Krishnan for the period from 18.04.2017 to 31.01.2018

**Respondent's side Witnesses and Exhibits : Nil**

MACTJ/I ADJ, Vellore.

**FAIR/DRAFT ORDER**  
**(Contested)**

MCOP.No.478 of 2018  
CNR No.TNVL01- 001205-2018  
D.O.D.23.03.2026  
I ADJ Court, Vellore.