

**IN THE COURT OF SH. AVTAR SINGH,
MOTOR ACCIDENT CLAIMS TRIBUNAL,
PATIALA. (UID No. PB0086)**

MACP/88/2023
CNR No.PBPT01-003637-2023
Filing No. MACP/31/2023
Date of Institution: 28.03.2023
Date of Decision: 17.01.2026

1. Jeet Singh, aged about 51 years son of Balvir Singh, resident of village Shermajra, Tehsil and District Patiala.
2. Charanjit Kaur, aged about 47 years wife of Jeet Singh, resident of village Shermajra, Tehsil and District Patiala.
3. Kuldeep Singh, aged about 22 years son of Jeet Singh, resident of village Shermajra, Tehsil and District Patiala.

.....Claimants

VERSUS

1. Dnyaneshwar Suresh Pawar son of Suresh Pawar, at Redwa, Post Kajaleshwar tq barshitakli, Redawa, Akola, Maharashtra.
(Driver of Mahindra Company Bolero Pickup bearing registration no. MH-14TC-0535)
2. Mahindra and Mahindra Ltd., Plot no. A1/14, Phase IV, MIDC Chakan, Industrial Area, Nighoje village Tal Khed Pune, Maharashtra-410501.
(Owner of Mahindra Company Bolero Pickup bearing registration no. MH-14TC-0535 and disclosed the name of owner by respondent no. 1)
3. HDFC ERGO General Insurance Company Ltd., Leela Business Park, 6th Floor Floor, Andheri, Kurla RD, Mumbai, 400059.
(Insurer of Mahindra Company Bolero Pickup bearing registration no. MH-14TC-0535)

.....Respondents

Claim Petition under Section 166 of the Motor Vehicles Act.

Present: Sh. Bhuvesh Tiwari, Advocate for claimants.
Sh. Amit Gupta, Advocate for respondent no.3.
Respondents no.1 and 2 exparte.

AWARD

The present claim petition has been preferred by the claimants being legal heirs of Harpreet Singh @ Honey son of Jeet Singh, who died in a motor vehicular accident occurred on 08.11.2022 in the area of Police Station Karanja, District Wardha.

It has been averred that on the fateful day of 08.11.2022 deceased Harpreet Singh @ Honey along with Gurdeep Singh son of Mahinder Singh, resident of Sanour, Tehsil and District Patiala was standing near harvesting Combine bearing registration no. HR-09C-5966. Other workers were also present there. Then a Mahindra Bolero Pickup bearing registration no. MH-14TC-0535 (hereinafter called as offending vehicle) being driven by its driver-respondent no.1 rashly, negligently and at a very high speed, hit Harpreet Singh @ Honey deceased, as a result of which, he suffered multiple injuries. The deceased was taken to village hospital from where he was referred to Government Medical College and Hospital, Nagpur, where the deceased was declared dead. The abovesaid accident took place on 08.11.2022 at about 12.30/1.00 am at National Highway no.6, Rajni Shetshivajar-Amarawati Road (Maharashtra) i.e. 3 Kilometers away from Amarawati to Nagpur Highway Road no.6. The accident took place due to rash and negligent driving of offending vehicle by respondent no.1. The matter was reported to the police and an FIR no.420 dated 08.11.2022, under Sections 279, 304-A & 338 IPC and

Section 184 of Motor Vehicles Act was registered at Police Station Karanja, District Wardha.

It has been further averred that the deceased was aged about 23 years at the time of his death. He was working as a foreman on harvesting combine with Nasib Singh son of Sucha Singh, resident of village Shermajra and was earning Rs.2,00,000/- during summer and winter seasons. Besides that, he was also doing the work of dairy farming in partnership with his uncle namely Jasvir Singh son of Balbir Singh and was earning Rs.30,000/- per month. The claimants no.1 and 2 are the parents while claimant no.3 is the brother of the deceased and they were dependent upon the deceased. Thus, a prayer for grant of compensation to the tune of Rs.85,00,000/- along with costs and interest has been made.

2. Notice of the claim petition was issued to the respondents. Respondent no.3 appeared through counsel. However, respondents no.1 and 2 did not appear despite service and as such, they were proceeded against exparte.

3. Respondent no.3-insurance company filed written statement raising preliminary objections that the claimants have no locus standi to file the claim petition; that the claim petition is time barred; that the claim petition is not maintainable; that the driver of offending vehicle was not holding a valid and effective driving licence at the time of accident and that the offending vehicle was being plied without valid registration certificate, fitness certificate and tax receipts etc. On merits, while denying all the averments of the claim petition, a prayer for dismissal of claim petition has been made.

4. From the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed on 03.05.2024:-

1. Whether Harpreet Singh alias Honey son of Jeet Singh died in the motor vehicular accident which took place on account of rash and negligent driving of vehicle no. MH-14TC-0535 by respondent no.1? OPP
2. Whether the claimants are entitled to compensation, if so to what extent and from whom? OPP
3. Whether respondent no.1 was not holding a legal and valid driving licence at the time of the accident? If so, its effect? OPR-3
4. Whether the offending vehicle was being plied without valid registration certificate, fitness and tax receipts etc.? OPR-3
5. Whether petition is beyond limitation? OPR-3
6. Whether petition is not maintainable? OPR-3
7. Relief.

5. In order to prove their case, claimant no.1 Jeet Singh himself stepped into the witness box as CW1 and also examined Gurdeep Singh as CW2, Naseeb Singh as CW3 and Jasvir Singh as CW4. Thereafter, learned counsel for the claimants tendered into evidence copy of translation of FIR as Ex.C5, copy of Senior Secondary Examination certificate of deceased as Ex.C6, copy of aadhar card of deceased as Ex.C7, copy of computer course certificate of deceased as Ex.C8, copy of matriculation certificate of deceased as Ex.C9 and closed the evidence on their behalf.

6. On the other hand, respondent no.3-insurance company did not lead any evidence and evidence of respondent no.3 was closed by order.

7. I have heard the counsel for the parties and have also carefully gone through the record. My issue-wise findings are as under :-

ISSUE NO.1

8. The onus to prove this issue was upon the claimants. In order to prove this issue, claimant no.1 Jeet Singh himself stepped into the witness box as CW1 and tendered his affidavit Ex.CW1/A wherein, he deposed as per the averments contained in the claim petition. He also tendered death certificate of deceased as Ex.C1 and copy of postmortem report as Ex.C2.

9. CW2 Gurdeep Singh is an eye witness of the accident. He tendered his affidavit Ex.CW2/A, wherein, he deposed that 08.11.2022 he along with Harpreet Singh @ Honey deceased was standing near harvesting Combine bearing registration no. HR-09C-5966. Other workers were also present there. Then offending vehicle being driven by its driver-respondent no.1 rashly, negligently and at a very high speed, hit Harpreet Singh @ Honey deceased, as a result of which, he suffered multiple injuries. The deceased was taken to village hospital from where he was referred to Government Medical College and Hospital, Nagpur, where the deceased was declared dead. He further deposed that the abovesaid accident took place on 08.11.2022 at about 12.30/1.00 am at National Highway no.6, Rajni Shetshivajar-Amarawati Road (Maharashtra) i.e. 3 Kilometers away from Amarawati to Nagpur Highway Road no.6. The accident took place due to rash and negligent driving of offending vehicle by respondent no.1. The matter was reported to the police and an FIR no.420 dated 08.11.2022, under Sections 279, 304-A & 338 IPC and Section 184 of Motor Vehicles Act was registered at Police Station

Karanja, District Wardha. He also tendered copy of FIR as Ex.C3 and copy of his aadhar card as Ex.C4.

10. Learned counsel for the claimants argued that Harpreet Singh @ Honey lost his precious life in the accident, which took place on 08.11.2022 while respondent no.1 was driving the offending vehicle rashly and negligently. In this regard, FIR no. 420 dated 08.11.2022, under Sections 279, 304-A & 338 IPC and Section 184 of Motor Vehicles Act was registered at Police Station Karanja. Postmortem report of deceased Harpreet Singh @ Honey Ex.C2 depicts that he died in a road side accident. Learned counsel for the claimants further argued that CW2 Gurdeep Singh is an eye witness of the accident which took place on 08.11.2022. He was cross-examined at length but nothing came out of his cross-examination. Learned counsel for the claimants further argued that The respondents no.1 and 2 did not appear to contest the claim petition. There is no evidence on record to rebut the claim of the claimants. The learned counsel for claimants supplied the authority of the Hon'ble Supreme Court titled **Anita Sharma & Ors. Versus The New India Assurance Co. Ltd. & another, Civil Appeal nos. 4010-4011 of 2020 (arising out of Special Leave Petition © Nos. 32011-32012 of 2018)**, wherein, it was held that strict principles of evidence and standards of proof like in a criminal trial are inapplicable in MACT claim cases. The standard of proof in such like matters is one of preponderance of probabilities, rather than beyond reasonable doubt. One needs to be mindful that the approach and role of Courts while examining evidence in accident claim cases ought not to be to find fault with non-examination of

some best eye-witnesses, as may happen in criminal trial; but, instead should be only to analyze the material placed on record by the parties to ascertain whether the claimant's version is more likely than not true.

It was prayed that issue no. 1 should be decided in favour of claimants and against the respondents.

11. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondent no.3- insurance company argued that no accident as alleged by the claimants ever took place and a false FIR has been got registered against respondent no. 1. It was prayed that issue no.1 should be decided against the claimants and in favour of respondent no.3.

12. From the submissions of learned counsel for the parties and from the perusal of the file, the case of the claimants was that Harpreet Singh @ Honey lost his precious life due to the accident which took place on 08.11.2022 when respondent no.1 Dnyaneshwar Suresh Pawar was driving the offending vehicle rashly and negligently. CW2 Gurdeep Singh is the author of the FIR Ex.C3. He was cross-examined at length but nothing came out of his cross-examination. Perusal of copy of FIR Ex.C3 (Ex.C5) reveals that FIR was registered against respondent no.1 by name and the registration number of the offending vehicle is specifically mentioned therein. Respondents no.1 and 2 did not appear to contest the claim petition and as such, the version of the claimants regarding manner of accident has remained unrebutted and an adverse inference is liable to be drawn against them that the accident was actually caused by respondent no.1. In this regard, reliance is placed upon the authority titled as **Vimla Devi and others vs. National Insurance Company Limited and others,**

2018(4) Law Herald, (SC) 3137, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that "*driver and owner of the offending vehicle both remained exparte since inception. They neither contested the claim petition nor entered into witness box to rebut the allegations. An adverse inference against both could be drawn.*" So, the statement of CW2 Gurdeep Singh, author of the FIR is trustworthy and cannot be discarded, in the light of verdict rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in a case titled **Anita Sharma & others (supra)**. Perusal of postmortem report of the deceased Ex.C2 reveals that he died due to road accidental injuries.

13. In view of above discussion, it is held that the accident took place due to rash and negligent driving of offending vehicle by respondent no.1 in which deceased Harpreet Singh @ Honey died. Consequently, issue no.1 is decided in favour of the claimants and against the respondents.

ISSUES NO.2 & 3

14. Both these issues are interconnected and as such, the same are being taken up together to avoid repetition of discussion. The onus to prove issue no.2 was upon the claimants, while onus to prove issue no.3 was upon respondent no.3.

Learned counsel for the claimants argued that the deceased was 23 years old at the time of accident. He was working as a foreman on harvesting combine with CW3 Nasib Singh and was earning Rs.2,00,000/- during four months in harvesting season in summer and winter. Besides that, he was doing the work of dairy farming in partnership with his uncle CW4 Jasvir Singh and was earning Rs.30,000/- per month. The claimants

no.1 and 2 are the parents and claimant no.3 is the brother of deceased Harpreet Singh @ Honey. So, they are entitled to get the compensation. It was prayed that issue no.2 should be decided in favour of the claimants and against the respondents.

15. On the other hand, learned counsel for respondent no.3 argued that no documentary evidence is brought on the file to prove the avocation and income of the deceased. He further argued that claimants were not dependent upon the deceased. CW1 Jeet Singh clearly stated in his cross-examination that claimant no.3 Kuldeep Singh is doing the work of labour. He submitted that the claimants are not entitled to get compensation in this case. He further argued that the respondent no.1, driver of the offending vehicle was not holding a valid and effective driving licence at the time of alleged accident and as such, respondent no.1 is not liable to pay any compensation to the claimants. It was prayed that issues no.2 and 3 should be decided against the claimants and in favour of the respondents.

16. From the submissions of learned counsel for the parties and from the perusal of the file, the case of the claimants is that the deceased was unmarried at the time of his death. The claimants no.1 and 2 are the parents while claimant no.3 is the brother of deceased. Claimant Jeet Singh while appearing in the witness box as CW1 has clearly stated in his cross-examination that Kuldeep Singh is doing the work of labour. Therefore, in the opinion of this Tribunal, it cannot be said that claimant no.3 was dependent upon his deceased brother. In the authority titled as **Gurmail Singh vs. Pepsu Road Transport Corporation, Patiala, 2003 ACJ**

225, the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court while relying upon pronouncement of Hon'ble Apex Court in case titled as *Gujarat State Road Transport Corporation, Ahmedabad vs. Ramanbhai Prabhatbhai and another, 1987 ACJ 561*, has held that "where the parents of the deceased are not alive, his brothers and sisters, being his legal representatives, can come forward and claim compensation on account of his death in a motor vehicle accident."

17. In the present claim petition, claimants no.1 and 2 are the parents of the deceased and as such, in view of the law laid down in the abovesaid authority (supra), claimant no.3, who is the brother of the deceased, is not entitled to get any any compensation. Therefore, it is held that in the present claim petition, only claimants no.1 and 2 are entitled to receive compensation on account of death of their son Harpreet Singh @ Honey in the accident in question.

18. Next question before this Tribunal is that what was the age of the deceased at the time of accident. In the claim petition, age of Harpreet Singh @ Honey has been mentioned as 23 years. Same age has been mentioned in the copy of his postmortem examination Ex. C2. As per copy of aadhar card of deceased Ex.C7, his date of birth is 13.03.1999. The accident took place on 08.11.2022. By this reckoning, the age of the deceased can be taken between 23-24 years at the time of accident.

19. The next question for determination before this Tribunal is what was the income of the deceased? To prove this fact, the claimants have examined Naseeb Singh as CW3, who tendered his affidavit Ex.CW3/A wherein, he deposed that deceased Harpreet Singh @ Honey

was working as a foreman on harvesting combine with him and was earning Rs.2,00,000/- during four months in summer and winter seasons. During his cross-examination, this witness stated that he does not maintain any account with regard to my earning or expenditure and that he cannot produce any documentary proof with regard to aocation or income of the deceased. The claimants also examined Jasvir Singh as CW4, who tendered his affidavit Ex.CW4/A wherein, he deposed that deceased Harpreet Singh @ Honey was his nephew. He was doing the business of dairy farming with him and was earning Rs.30,000/- per month. During his cross-examination, this witness stated that he cannot produce any documentary proof with regard to the earning of deceased from dairy farming. Therefore, no reliance can be placed on the testimony of CW3 Naseeb Singh and CW4 Jasvir Singh. As such, the income of the deceased should be considered as unskilled worker. As per notification issued by the office of Labour Commissioner, Punjab, bearing No. ST/10279 dated 11.10.2022, the minimum wages fixed for an un-skilled labourer w.e.f. 01.09.2022 are Rs.9,907.68 paise per month. Taking Rs.9,900/-as the monthly income, the annual income of deceased Harpreet Singh @ Honey comes to Rs.1,18,800/-. As per the claim petition, the deceased was unmarried. So, relying upon the law laid down in **Sarla Verma and others vs. Delhi Transport Corporation and another, (2009) 6 Supreme Court Cases 121**, the deduction should be 50% of the established income. After making the deduction of 50%, the income of the deceased comes to Rs.59,400/- per year and multiplier of 18 will be applicable as deceased was about 23-24 years of age at the time of his accidental death.

20. Further, in the light of judgment of **National Insurance Company Limited vs. Pranay Sethi & Ors, 2017(4) RCR (Civil) 1009**, the learned counsel for claimants also pressed for future prospects, therefore, keeping in view the age of deceased being 23-24 years and considering him as a self-employed, claimants no.1 and 2 are also entitled to future prospects @ 40%. By this reckoning, the income of the deceased should be considered as Rs.59,400/- + 23,760/- i.e. total Rs.83,160/- per year. Multiplying this amount of Rs.83,160/- x 18, the total compensation amount would come to the tune of Rs.14,96,880/-.

21. Learned counsel for claimants also prayed for consortium to the claimants. In this regard, reliance can be placed upon the law laid down by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in a case titled **Surjo Devi and others vs. Vinod Kumar and others, IOIN-FAO-1338-2013 (O&M) decided on 12.12.2022**, wherein, it has been held that in **Magma General Insurance Company Ltd. vs. Nanu Ram @ Chuhru Ram and others, 2018 (18) SCC 130** and **United India Insurance Company Ltd., vs. Satinder Kaur alias Satvinder Kaur and others, 2020 SCC Online 410**, it has been laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that consortium is not limited to 'spousal consortium' and it also includes 'parental consortium' and 'filial and spousal consortium'. This view was further endorsed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in a case titled '**The New India Assurance Company Limited vs. Smt. Somwati and others, Civil Appeal No. 3093 of 2020, decided on 07.09.2020**'. In the judgment '**Surjo Devi and others vs. Vinod Kumar and others**' (supra), the Hon'ble High Court has granted loss of consortium to the tune of Rs. 44,000/- each to all the six dependents

(totaling Rs.2,64,000/-). The claimants have further been granted Rs.16,500/- as funeral expenses and Rs.16,500/- on account of loss of estate. While concluding the judgment titled ‘**National Insurance Company Limited versus Pranay Sethi and Ors. decided on 31.10.2017**, it has been ordered that the aforesaid amounts should be enhanced at the rate of 10% in every three years. As on today, the aforesaid judgment had been pronounced more than 07 years ago and as such, 10% more amount is to be added in the sum of Rs. 44,000/-, Rs. 16,500/- and Rs. 16,500/- respectively. By this reckoning, in addition to amount of Rs.14,96,880/-, on account of loss of dependency, claimants no.1 and 2 shall also be entitled to the following amount:-

Sr. No.	Under head	Amount
1.	Loss of dependency	14,96,880/-
2.	Loss of consortium (48,400 x 2)	Rs. 96,800/-
3.	Funeral expenses	Rs. 18,150/-
4.	Loss of Estate	Rs. 18,150/-
	Total	Rs.16,29,980/-(rounded off to Rs.16,30,000/-)

22. So far as entitlement of awarded amount to the legal heirs of deceased is concerned, there are 02 legal heirs of deceased i.e. the parents. As such, claimants no.1 and 2 shall be entitled to receive compensation to the extent of 50% each.

23. Now question arises as to who will be responsible to pay compensation amount to the legal heirs of deceased. Learned counsel for respondent no.3-insurance company has argued that at the time of accident, respondent no.1, driver of the offending vehicle, was not holding a valid

and effective driving licence and as such, respondent no.3-the insurance company is not liable to pay the amount of compensation to the claimants.

24. I have considered the submission of the learned counsel for the respondent no.3-insurance company. As already noted, the offending vehicle bearing registration no. MH-14TC-0535 was being driven by respondent no. 1 Dnyaneshwar Suresh Pawar and the same is owned by respondent no. 2 Mahindra and Mahindra Limited. Perusal of the record reveals that notice of the claim petition was given to respondents no.1 and 2, but they failed to appear to contest the present claim petition despite service and ultimately they were proceeded against exparte. Although the onus to prove that respondent no.1 was not having a valid driving licence at the time of accident was upon respondent no.3-insurance company, but the said onus would only shift on the insurance-company, if owner or driver of offending vehicle pleads and proves that driver of offending vehicle was having a valid driving licence at the relevant time. In the present claim petition, respondents no.1 and 2 have not come present to contest the claim petition despite service. Thus, the respondent no.-3insurance company is held entitled to take a defence that driver of the offending vehicle was not having a valid driving licence at the time of accident. This Tribunal is supported by the authority titled as **Girdhar Kanwar vs. New India Assurance Company Ltd and others, 2014 A.C.J 448**, wherein it has been held as under:-

“Owner despite service of notice failed to produce the driving licence of his driver therefore, a presumption can be drawn against the owner and driver that driver was not holding a valid licence at the time of accident- Owner and driver failed to appear in witness box to lead

any evidence-Whether insurance company is liable-
Held: no; but insurance company directed to pay compensation and then recover the same from the owner and driver of offending vehicle”.

Similarly, in another authority titled as **Pappu and Ors vs. Vinod Kumar Lamba and Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Civil) 42**, the Hon’ble Supreme Court has held that:

“Insurance company is entitled to take defence that offending vehicle was driven by unauthorised person not having valid driving licence. Onus shift on insurance company only after owner of offending vehicle proves that driver of offending vehicle was authorised by him to drive vehicle and was having valid driving licence at relevant time. Merely producing valid insurance certificate in respect of offending truck not enough to make insurance company liable to discharge liability arising from rash and negligent driving by driver of vehicle. The insurance company was directed to pay the amount of compensation at first instance, with liberty to recover same from owner of offending vehicle in accordance with law.”

Both these authorities are fully applicable to the facts of the present case as in the present case also the respondents no.1 and 2 have not furnished the copy of the driving licence of respondent no.1. So, in view of the law laid down in the above said authorities, a presumption is raised that respondent no.1, driver of the offending vehicle, was not having a valid driving licence at the time of accident and as such insurance company is not liable to pay compensation to the claimants no.1 and 2. However, as held in the above said authorities, insurance company is directed to pay the compensation to the claimants no. 1 and 2 at the first instance and then recover the same from owner of the offending vehicle.

25. The claimants have also sought interest at the rate of 24% per annum, but, the same has been opposed by the respondents on the ground that no interest can be granted. However, in view of the settled law by Hon'ble Apex Court in **Rajesh and others vs. Rajvir and others, 2013(3) CCC 15(SC)**, this Tribunal is of considered view that claimants no.1 and 2 are entitled for interest @ 7.5 percent per annum from the date of filing of petition till payment is made. As such, claimants no.1 and 2 are also entitled to interest @ 7.5% on the awarded amount i.e. Rs.16,30,000/- from the date of filing of petition till the payment is made.

26. In view of the above discussion, issue no.2 is partly decided in favour of the claimants and against the respondents, whereas issue no.3 is decided in favour of respondent no.3-insurance company.

ISSUE NO. 4

27. Onus to prove this issue was upon respondent no.3, but no evidence has been led to discharge the said onus. However, it has come on the file that the offending vehicle was insured with respondent no.3-insurance company vide insurance policy, copy of which is available on record, meaning thereby that the offending vehicle was having a valid registration certificate. Thus, it is held that the offending vehicle was being plied with valid documents. Accordingly, this issue is decided against respondent no.3 and in favour of the claimants.

ISSUE NO. 5

28. The onus to prove this issue was upon respondent no.3. However, neither any evidence has been adduced to prove this issues nor

the same was pressed during the course of arguments. Accordingly, this issue is decided against respondent no.3 and in favour of the claimants.

ISSUE NO.6

29. The onus to prove this issue was upon the respondent no.3, but respondent no.3 has failed to prove as to how the claim petition is not maintainable. However, as it has been held while deciding issue no.1 that deceased Harpreet Singh @ Honey died in a motor vehicular accident, which took place due to rash and negligent driving of the offending vehicle by respondent no.1, therefore the present claim petition filed under Section 166 of the Motor Vehicles Act is held to be maintainable. Accordingly, this issue is decided against respondent no.3 and in favour of the claimants.

RELIEF

30. In view of my discussion on the foregoing issues, the claim petition is partly allowed with costs and compensation amounting to Rs.16,30,000/- is hereby awarded in favour of claimants no.1 and 2 along with interest at the rate of 7.5% per annum from the date of filing of claim petition till realization. Claimants no.1 and 2 shall be entitled to receive the compensation to the extent of 50% each. In view of decision in **Civil Revision No.7407 of 2010 by our Hon'ble High Court dated 03.06.2011 in case "Jyoti Burmi vs. Anusandeeep Burmi"**, now it is desirable that the share of claimants no.1 and 2 be deposited in their bank accounts directly on supplying requisite documents by them, so that cumbersome procedure of deposit and withdrawal from the Court could be avoided by both the parties to save their own time as well as precious time of the Court. Respondent no.3-insurance company is directed to pay the amount of

compensation to claimants no.1 and 2 at the first instance, with a right to recover the same from owner of offending vehicle, as per law.

Memo of costs be prepared accordingly. File be consigned to record room after due compilation.

Pronounced.

17.01.2026

Jagjit Singh, Stenographer Gr.I

(Avtar Singh)

Motor Accident Claims Tribunal,
Patiala. (UID no.PB0086)