

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN: MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS CLAIMS TRIBUNAL
JAGTIAL DISTRICT**

PRESENT: **SMT.C.RATNA PADMAVATHI**
CHAIRMAN, M.A.C.T,
JAGTIAL DISTRICT.

DATED THIS THE 28th DAY OF JANUARY, 2026

M.V.O.P. NO. 33 OF 2024

Between:

Shaik Sajaad, S/o. Sajeed, age 2 ½ years (minor) represented by his father and guardian Shaik Sajeed, S/o. Kaleem, age 26 years, Occ:Business, R/o. H.No.1-1-27, Chilukawada, Jagtial town and district.

--Petitioner (minor)

A N D

1. Md. Riyan @ Md. Rehan Baig, S/o. Mohd. Rasheed Baig, age 20 yrs, Occ:Driver of Car No.TS-09-EP-1235, R/o. H.No.5-5-198/2 Gunj Street, Jagtial town and district.
2. Md. Khaizer, S/o. Chand Pasha, age 50 years, Occ:Owner of Car No.TS-09-EP-1235, R/o. Chilukawada, Jagtial town and district.
3. Chola Ms General Insurance Company Limited Branch: Karimnagar, R/o. Door No.8-6-11, Vijaya Complex Kothirampur, Hyderabad Road beside Andhra bank, Karimnagar-505001.

(Policy No. 3362/02787891/000/00 is valid from 14.11.2023 to 13.11.2024)

--Respondents

Counsel for Petitioner (minor):	Sri. V. Venugopal, Advocate
Respondents No.1:	Exparte
Respondents No.2:	Sri. Md. Saleem, Advocate
Counsel for Respondent No.3 :	Sri. B. Gnana Prakash, Advocate

This petition coming for final hearing before me in the presence of the above counsels on record and after hearing them and the matter having stood over to this day for consideration, this Tribunal has made the following:-

::O R D E R::

1. This is a claim petition filed by the Petitioner (minor) under Sec.166 (1)(a) of Motor Vehicles, Act, 1988 seeking for compensation of Rs. 2,00,000/- (Rupees Two Lakhs only) for the injuries he received in motor vehicle accident that took place on 05.12.2023 at Gandhi Nagar, Jagtial.

2. The brief averments in the petition are as follows:-

That on 05.12.2023 while the Petitioner (minor) along with his parents and his another brother who is also minor were going to a village from Jagtial on a Scooty Bearing No.TS-21-B-2539 and when they reached Gandhi Nagar locality, one **auto Bearing No.AP-01-W-1782** was also passing in front of his Scooty, meanwhile the respondent No.1 being the **driver of Car No.TS-09-EP-1235** came in opposite direction with high speed and drove the said car in rash and negligent manner and dashed the auto and subsequently dashed their scooty due to which he his parents fell down and all of them sustained bleeding and fracture injuries. The Petitioner (minor) was shifted to "Om Sri Sai Multi Specialty Hospital at Jagtial" as in patient. Hence, the present claim was made by the claimant/minor petitioner (aged 2 ½ years) seeking for compensation of Rs.2,00,000/- from Respondents No.1 to 3, who are the driver, Owner and Insurer of the said crime vehicle on the ground that he sustained grievous injuries due to the said accident. Hence, the petition.

3. The **respondent no.1/Driver of the crime vehicle** remained ex-parte.

4. **Respondents No. 2**/owner of the crime vehicle filed counter and contended that there is no negligence on the part of the respondent no.1 and due to the own negligence of the father of Petitioner, he fell down from the vehicle and received injury and got foisted a false case against respondent no.2. He further contended that the respondent No.1 is having valid driving license **and prayed for dismissal of the petition.**

5. Whereas, **Respondent No. 3/Insurer** in their counter denied the material averments in the petition and thereby denied the rashness and negligence on the part of the driver of the offending vehicle. The respondent No. 3 further contended that the driver of offending vehicle is not having valid driving license and the liability of respondent No. 3 does not arise and the amount of compensation claimed by the Petitioner (minor) is excessive and exorbitant and prayed for dismissal of the petition.

The Respondent No.3/Insurance Company also filed a petition under Sec.170(b) of the Motor Vehicles Act, in I.A.No. 821 of 2025 and is permitted to raise all the defences that are available to the owner (insured) of the crime vehicle i.e. Respondent No.2 by orders dated 20.11.2025.

6. **Basing on the respective pleadings of the parties, the following issues were settled for trial :-**

- 1) **Whether Petitioner sustained injuries due to rash and negligent driving of the driver of the vehicle bearing No. TS 09 EP 1235?**
- 2) **Whether the Petitioner is entitled for compensation, if So ? From which of the respondents ?**

3) To what relief ?

7. During the course of trial, on behalf of the Petitioner, **Pws 1 and 2** are examined and **Ex.P1 to Ex.P7** are marked. Whereas, on behalf of the Respondent No.2 no evidence was adduced and his evidence is closed. Whereas on behalf of respondent no.3, Rws 1 and 2 are examined and **Ex.R1 and Ex.X1 and Ex.X2** are marked.

8. Heard both sides.

9. **ISSUE NO.1 :-**

“Whether the Petitioner sustained injuries in the road accident due to the rash and negligent driving of the vehicle bearing No. TS 09 EP 1235 by the First respondent?”

To answer this issue, the father of the minor petitioner, who is also one of the injured in the said accident and an eye witness is examined as PW1. He during the course of his chief-examination reiterated the averments in the petition and thereby deposed in support of his case.

The testimony of PW1 reveals that on 05.12.2023 while he was proceeding on his scooty bearing No. TS 21 B 2539 along with his wife. Sk.Ziban and two minor sons including the minor petitioner from Jagtial to a village and when they reached Gandhinagar locality at Jagtial then one Auto bearing No. AP 01 W 1782 was also passing in front of his scooty, then the **driver of the car bearing No. TS 09 EP 1235**

I.e, respondent no.1 drove the same in a rash and negligent manner with high speed and dashed against the auto and subsequently dashed their scooty, due to which he, his wife and children fell down and sustained bleeding injuries and they were shifted to “Omsri Sai hospital, Jagtial” for treatment.

His testimony further reveals that a case was registered in Cr.No.524/2023 by PS Jagtial town u/s 337 IPC and later altered to Sec.338 IPC.

Thus as per the testimony of PW1, the minor petitioner sustained “injuries” only as a result of the accident that occurred on 05.12.2023 due to the rash and negligent driving of the offending car by its driver i.e., Respondent No. 1.

10. In this regard, PW1 relied upon Ex.P1, Ex.P2, Ex.P4 and Ex.P5 to substantiate his case. Among them, **Ex.P1** is the certified copy of FIR along with complaint, **Ex.P2** is the CC of Charge Sheet and **Ex.P4** CC of CDF. **Ex.P5** CC of Form-54 (Accident Information Report).

On perusal of **Ex.P1 which is C.C.of FIR along with complaint**, the same clearly reveals that the accident occurred only due to the rash and negligent driving of the offending vehicle by its driver i.e., respondent no.1. So also **Ex.P2 which is the certified copy of charge sheet** wherein the investigation done by the police clearly reveals that it occurred only due to the rash and negligent driving of the crime vehicle by its driver and charge sheet was filed against the driver of the crime vehicle i.e., Respondent No.1 for the offences under Section 338 IPC and sec 3 r/w 181 of Motor Vehicles Act. Hence, **Ex.P1 and Ex.P2** lends support to the testimony

of PW1. Whereas **Ex.P4 and Ex.P5** probablizes the very occurrence of accident on 05.12.2023.

11. It is pertinent to note that Respondents No.1, who is the driver of the offending vehicle remained exparte and did not choose to contest the matter.

Respondent No. 1 being the driver of the offending vehicle is the proper and the best person to deny (or) dispute the rashness and negligence on his part in driving the crime vehicle. But, he remained exparte and thereby failed to deny the material fact that the accident occurred due to rashness and negligence on his part in driving the crime vehicle, which is sufficient to resolve this issue.

12. Whereas, respondent No. 2/owner of the crime vehicle, filed counter by denying the claim of Petitioner (minor) and contended that there is no negligence on the part of respondent no.1.

Whereas respondent no.3/insurance company has denied the claim of the Petitioner (minor) and denied their liability.

13. During the course of Trial the respondent no.2 failed to cross examine Pw1. Consequently, the cross examination of Pw1 by Respondent no.2 is **recorded as nil** and thereby the evidence of Pw1 remained uncontroverted and undisputed by respondent no.2 which lends enough support to the claim of the Petitioner (minor) and as stated supra the respondent no.1/driver of the crime vehicle failed to deny the claim of the Petitioner (minor) as remained exparte and in those circumstances the plea raised by respondent no.3 is no longer tenable and acceptable.

Whereas, respondent no.3, during the course of cross-examination of PW1 suggested to PW1 that accident occurred due to the own fault of Pw1 as he tried to over take an auto and dashed against the offending vehicle which is denied by PW1. It is further suggested to Pw1 that there is no negligence on the part of the driver of the offending vehicle which also denied by Pw1. Thus, except formal cross examination of Pw1 nothing material was elicited to discredit the testimony of PW1.

14. When once the driver of the offending vehicle i.e., respondent no.1 remained exparte and failed to deny the rashness and negligence on his part and when once the owner of the offending vehicle i.e., Respondent no.2 failed to deny the evidence of Pw1 by way of cross examination, it is no more open to the insurance company to raise the plea that there is no rashness (or) negligence on the part of the driver of the offending vehicle i.e., respondent no.1 and it will not with stand.

15. Further, the contents in Ex.P2/CC of Charge sheet remained uncontroverted, while cross examining Pw1, which lends enough corroboration to the testimony of PW1. Hence the contents in Ex.P2/CC of charge sheet can be relied upon in proof of the rashness and negligence on the part of respondent no.1 in driving the crime vehicle.

At this juncture this Tribunal relied upon the following rulings which are as follows:

1. **2012 ACJ page 1370 (between New India Assurance Company Ltd., Vs. Pazhaniammal and others)** where in it was held:-

"the charge sheet filed by a police officer after

due investigation can be accepted as evidence of negligence against inductee unless there is rebuttal evidence to disprove the same".

2. Further relied upon the ruling reported in **2020 SCC online Karnataka 1884 (Division bench) Smt. Sheetal Naik @ Sheetal Nayak Vs. Smt. Chandra Prabha** wherein it was held:

"The police records which speaks about the rashness and negligence of the driver of the vehicle involved in the accident cannot to ignored unless controverted by substantial evidence".

In the light of above citations, Ex.P2/CC of charge sheet can be relied upon in proof of rashness and negligence on the part of driver of offending vehicle as the contents therein remained unrebutted.

16. Further, as stated supra, Respondent No. 1/ Driver of the offending vehicle remained exparte and failed to deny the claim of the Petitioner (minor) and thereby failed to deny the rashness and negligence on his part in driving the crime vehicle, which tantamount to an admission on his part of the said material fact. Hence, no further proof is required in this regard **"as admitted facts needs not be proved by virtue of Sec.58 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872"**.

17. Thus, the evidence of Pw1 coupled with the undisputed documentary evidence on record i.e. Ex.P2/CC of charge sheet amply proves that the respondent No.1 is solely responsible for the accident.

On the other hand, on behalf of Respondent no.3, RW1 is examined but his testimony no way helpful to rebutt the evidence of Pw.1 and Ex.P2 on record.

Thus, the oral and documentary evidence on record clearly established that the accident occurred only due to the rash and negligent driving of the offending vehicle by its driver i.e. respondent No.1. Accordingly, this issue is answered in favour of the Petitioner (minor).

18. **ISSUE NO.2 :- Whether the Petitioner is entitled for compensation, if So ?**
From which of the respondents ?

One of the main contention of the Respondent No. 3/Insurance company is that the driver of the crime vehicle i.e., respondent no.1 is not having valid driving license as on the date of accident as such there is breach of the terms and conditions of the policy and its liability does not arise. Therefore, it is for respondent No. 3/Insurance company to prove the same in terms of Sec.149 of Motor Vehicle Act to disown its liability.

In this regard, on behalf of respondent No.3, **RW1** is examined who is the Manager (Legal) in the Insurance company and **Ex.R1** /attested copy of policy is marked through him.

Rw1 categorically deposed that the respondent no.1 was plying the offending vehicle without driving license as on the date of accident in violation of terms and conditions of the policy under **Ex.R1**.

He further deposed that police even charge sheeted the respondent no.1 for the offence **u/s 3 r/w 181 of Motor Vehicles Act** also and relied upon Ex.P2 which is relied by the Petitioner (minor) himself.

19. On perusal of Ex.P2/CC of charge sheet which is relied upon by the Petitioner (minor) reveals that the charge sheet was filed even for the offence **u/s 3 r/w 181 of Motor Vehicles Act** also which is sufficient to prove the plea of the respondent no.3 that the driver of the offending vehicle has no valid driving license as on the date of accident.

20. In order to prove its plea, the respondent no.3 /insurance company also got summoned the authorized person of the RTO Jagtial and examined him as **Rw2**.

Rw2 is the Junior Assistant in RTO office, Jagtial who was authorized by the District Transport officer, Jagtial to give evidence before this Tribunal.

He produced the extract of license search pertaining to the respondent no.1 by name Mohammad Riyan Baig S/o Mohammad Rashid i.e., **Ex.X1** and also produced the letter dated 08.01.2026 issued by the District Transport officer stating that the respondent no.1 has no driving license/**Ex.X2**.

Rw2 clearly deposed that as per Ex.X1, the respondent no.1 has no driving license and the license search under Ex.X1 pertains to entire Jagtial District. He

also clarified that if the driving license is issued anywhere in the State, the same will be reflected in the RTO portal. The said oral testimony of Rw2 and Ex.X1 and Ex.X2 remained unshattered and there is no reason to disbelieve the said evidence. **Thus the testimony of Rws 1 and 2 coupled with Ex.X1 and Ex.X2 clearly establishes that the respondent no.1 has no driving license as on the date of accident.**

Furthermore as stated supra, the crime record relied upon by the Petitioner (minor) i.e. Ex.P2/CC of charge sheet itself establishes that the driver of the offending vehicle has no valid driving license as on the date of accident as the charge-sheet was admittedly filed for the offence u/s 181 of Motor Vehicles Act also. Thus the respondent no.3/insurance company has proved its contention that there is breach or violation of the terms and conditions Ex.R1/policy. Hence the contractual liability of respondent no.3 does not arise.

However, to subserve the ends of justice it is just and proper to direct the Respondent No.3/insurance company to pay the compensation amount to the Petitioner (minor) and then recover the same from the insured/Owner by applying the “**principle of pay and recover**”.

21. At this juncture, this Tribunal is placing reliance on the ruling reported in **2017 ACJ 1362** (Lalsingh Marabi vs. National Insurance Co. Ltd. and others) and further relied on **Civil Appeal No.5123/2019** (Parmender Singh V. New India Insurance Company Ltd.) wherein it was held that :

“when the driver of the offending vehicle has no driving license at the time of accident, the insurance company can be directed to pay the compensation to the claimant and recover the amount from the owner and driver of the offending vehicle.”

22. At this juncture further relied upon the order in **MACMA 105/2024 dated 30.04.2024 of the Hon’ble High Court for the State of Telangana**, wherein the Hon’ble High Court for the State of Telangana by considering ratio laid down in **Parmender singh Vs New India Assurance company limited and others and in Shamanna and another Vs Divisional Manager Oriental Insurance company Limited and others**, directed the insurance company to deposit the compensation amount with interest with a liberty to recover the same from the owner and driver.

This Tribunal further relied upon the latest ruling i.e., **2025 SCC Online SC 2297 (K.Nagendra Vs. New India Assurance Company)** wherein the order of the Hon’ble High Court applying the **Principle of pay and recover** in respect of the accident that occurred on 07.10.2024 is held to be justified.

In this regard, the **learned counsel for the Petitioner (minor)** relied upon the ruling of the Hon’ble Apex Court i.e., 2025 latest **case law 930 SC (Rama bai vs M/s. Amit minerals through in-charge officer/Competent officer and Anr)**

wherein it was held that when the insurer is directed to satisfy the award, it can be recovered by the insurer from the insured/owner of the crime vehicle.

On the other hand, the **learned counsel for Respondent no.3** relied upon the ruling reported in 2013 (3) TAC page no.29 SC which cannot be considered in the light of the latest rulings as referred above.

In the light of above citations, in order to subserve the ends of justice, the respondent no.3 may be directed to deposit the compensation amount and then recover the same from Respondent no.1 and 2 under the **"Principle of pay and recover"**.

23. Now the quantum of compensation payable to the Petitioner (minor) which is just and reasonable is to be assessed and fixed having regard to the nature of injuries and disability if any suffered by the injured.

Just compensation is to be determined on the foundation of fairness, reasonableness and equitably on acceptable legal standards as loss of life and limb can never be compensated in an equal measure, but the provisions under the Motor Vehicles Act are meant to compensate the claimant to a reasonable extent for the loss suffered by him.

24. In the case on hand, the contention of the Petitioner (minor) is that he sustained grievous injuries during the course of accident that occurred on 05.12.2023.

PW1 during the course of his chief-examination deposed about the injuries sustained by his son (minor petitioner) and about the treatment undergone by him in **"Om Sri Sai hospital, Jagtial."**

In this regard, PW1 relied upon **Ex.P2/** CC of Charge Sheet, **Ex.P3/**CC of MLC and **Ex.P5/**Discharge summary.

On perusal of **Ex.P2/** CC of charge sheet (undisputed document), it reveals that the charge sheet was filed for the offence under Section 338 IPC which lends support to the contention of the Petitioner (minor) that he sustained "**Grievous injuries**" in the said accident.

25. To substantiate his case, the Petitioner also examined, **Pw2 who is the concerned doctor of Om Sri Sai hospital, Jagtial** who treated the Petitioner (minor) categorically deposed that the Petitioner (minor)/patient came to his hospital on 05.12.2023 with injuries to right thigh due to road traffic accident occurred on 05.12.2023 and he examined him and found the following injury.

- **Fracture shaft femur on right thigh.**

He further deposed that he did surgery for the above injury and period of his treatment is 05.12.2023 to 12.12.2023. Ex.P5/Discharge summary and Ex.P7/original hospital bill were issued by him.

As per his testimony, the petitioner also requires future medical treatment for implant removal and the approximate cost for implant removal of Rs.30,000/- to Rs.40,000/-.

Thus, as per the testimony of PW.2, the injury sustained by the petitioner is **Grievous in nature.** Ex.P3/Medical certificate and Ex.P5/discharge summary lends

support to the oral evidence of PW.2. So also Ex.P2/CC of Charge sheet further lends enough support to the evidence of PW.2.

The said testimony of PW.2 also remained uncontroverted by respondent No.2 as the cross-examination is **recorded as nil**.

Whereas, the respondent No.3 though cross-examined PW.2 but the fact that the minor petitioner was treated by PW.2 as inpatient is nowhere denied (or) disputed. Hence, there is no reason to discredit the testimony of PW.2 and also to disbelieve Ex.P3 and Ex.P5. Though the respondent No.3 suggested to PW.2 that the petitioner only sustained simple injuries but the same is denied by PW.2 and the said suggestion is quite baseless and devoid of any proof. **Thus, the evidence of PW.2 can be safely relied upon in proof of the injuries sustained by PW.1 and medical treatment undergone by him in that regard.**

Hence, the oral evidence of Pws. 1 and 2 coupled with Ex.P2, Ex.P3 and Ex.P5 clearly establishes that the petitioners sustained "**Grievous injuries**".

26. Further, in view of the evidence of Pws. 1 and 2 coupled with Ex.P2, Ex.P3 and Ex.P5 it is further established that the Petitioner (minor) i.e. son of PW.1 undergone surgery. Hence, naturally there will pain and sufferance to a great extent as grievous injury sustained by PW.1 on his right thigh. Hence, **for pain and sufferance of trauma suffered by PW.1 due to "grievous injuries"** it is just and reasonable to award an amount of Rs.90,000/-.

27. The further contention of PW.1 is that he undergone treatment at **"Om Sri Sai Hospital, Jagtial"** from **05.12.2023 to 12.12.2023** and incurred medical expenses for the same. In this regard, PW.1 categorically deposed that he incurred an amount of Rs.49,500/- towards hospital bill and further Rs.20,000/- as other investigation charges and Rs.10,000/- for purchasing medicines part from Rs.20,000/- towards attendant charges.

28. To substantiate his plea, the petitioner also examined **PW.2** who is the concerned doctor who treated the minor petitioner. He categorically deposed about the period of treatment of minor petitioner (son of Pw1) as inpatient which lends enough corroboration to the evidence of PW.1. Pw2 clearly admitted that Ex.P7/ original hospital bill was issued by him. On perusal of **Ex.P7/Original hospital bill the total amount incurred by the petitioner is Rs.49,500/-** .

During the course of cross examination of Pw2, it is suggested to him that Ex.P7 bill was issued for excess amount and the same is denied by Pw2. Except giving a vague suggestion nothing was elicited through Pw.2 that under what heads the bill was excessively made. Hence, there is no reason to discredit Ex.P7/original hospital bill cum consultation charges and to disbelieve the evidence of PW.2 which is found to be consistent and reliable.

Hence, the evidence of Pws.1 and 2 coupled with Ex.P5/discharge summary and Ex.P7/Original hospital bill clearly establishes that Pw1 incurred an amount of Rs.49,500/- towards his medical treatment in **"Om Sri Sai hospital, Jagtial"**. Hence,

it is just and reasonable to award an amount of Rs.49,500/- to the petitioner towards actual medical expenses incurred for his inpatient treatment.

29. Further in the light of the pleadings and evidence on record, the petitioner herein sustained grievous injury on the right thigh region and undergone surgery for the same and he was advised bed rest for six weeks. Hence naturally his family members has to attend his daily needs of the minor petitioner and to assist him in attending his ordinary pursuits during his bed rest period by devoting more time apart from eking out their livelihood. Therefore, **it is just and proper to award attendant charges at the rate of Rs.4000/- per month. Hence it is just and reasonable to award an amount of Rs.6000/- (i.e. Rs.4000 x 1 month 15 days) towards attendant charges.**

30. Furthermore, as per the testimony of PW.2, Petitioner (minor) undergone surgery i.e. CRIF with NAILS right FEMUR. As per the testimony of PW.2, the patient requires future medical treatment for implant removal which costs around Rs.30,000/- to Rs.40,000/-. However, no document was placed by PW.2 in that regard so as to rely upon the said approximate estimation of costs. However, the facts remain that the implants are to be removed in future. **Therefore, it is just and proper to award an amount of Rs.15,000/- for implant removal.**

31. Further in the light of facts and circumstances of the case **it is just and reasonable to award an amount of Rs.6000/- towards transportation.**

32. Further **It is just and reasonable to award an amount of Rs.6,000/- towards extra-nourishment.**

33. Further **it is just and reasonable to award an amount of Rs.6000/- towards loss of amenities. Accordingly the Petitioner (minor) is entitled for compensation as follows.**

34. The total compensation arrived is shown as follows:-

Sl. No.	Head	Calculation
1.	For pain and sufferance and trauma suffered by Petitioner (minor) due to grievous injuries.	Rs.90,000/-
2.	Medical expenses incurred	Rs.49,500/-
3.	Future medical expenses (implant removal)	Rs.15,000/-
4.	Attendant charges	Rs.6000
5.	Transportation	Rs.6000/-
6.	For extra nourishment	Rs.6,000/-
7.	Loss of amenities	Rs. 6,000/-
	Total compensation	Rs.1,78,500/-

35. **ISSUE NO. 3 :- To what relief?**

As issue Nos. 1 & 2 are decided in favour of the Petitioner (minor), he is entitled for compensation of **Rs.1,78,500/-** which is just and reasonable.

Thus, respondent No.2 is vicariously liable for the acts of respondent no.1 and is liable to pay the said compensation amount. Accordingly, this issue is answered.

36. **In the result,** the petition is partly allowed and Petitioner is awarded compensation of **Rs.1,78,500/-** (Rupees One Lakh Seventy Eight Thousand Five

Hundred only) with proportionate costs and interest at 7.5% per annum from the date of filing of the petition till the date of realization.

The Respondents no.1 and 2 are jointly and severally liable to pay the compensation to the Petitioner and directed to deposit the said compensation amount within one month from the date of this order.

However, to subserve the ends of justice, the Respondent No.3/insurance company is directed to deposit the said compensation amount with accrued interest within one month from the date of this order and recover the same from respondent No.2/Owner/insured in the execution proceedings under the “**principle of Pay and Recover**”.

The compensation amount awarded shall be kept in FDR till the Petitioner attains majority.

However, in the light of facts and circumstances of the case, PW1, who is representing the minor Petitioner can seek the permission of the Court to meet urgent medical necessities, if any of the minor Petitioner from out of the compensation amount that was awarded, if the circumstances warrants so but subject to filing of necessary proof to that effect.

The natural guardian and father of the minor Petitioner is at liberty to withdraw the accrued interest on the FDR of minor Petitioner quarterly and utilize the same for the benefit and welfare of the minor Petitioner.

Advocate's fee is Rs.3,000/-.

Typed to my dictation directly on computer to the Typist, typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in open Court on 28th day of January, 2026.

**CHAIRMAN M.A.C.T,
Jagtial**

APENDIX OF EVIDENCE

Witnesses Examined.

FOR Petitioner (minor):-

PW.1 : Shaik Sajeed

PW.2 : Dr.M.Phaneendra Kumar

FOR RESPONDENTS:-

Rw1: K.Sasi Kiran

Rw.2: M. Mogilaiah

DOCUMENTS MARKED

FOR Petitioner (minor):-

Ex.P.1:	CC of FIR.
Ex.P.2:	CC of Charge sheet.
Ex.P.3:	CC of medico legal certificate
Ex.P.4:	CC of Form 54
Ex.P.5:	Original Discharge Summary issued by Omsri Sai hospital. Dated 12.12.2023
Ex.P.6:	Original essentiality certificate, dt.12.12.2023
Ex.P.7:	Original hospital bill cum consultation charges dated 12.12.2023 issued by Omsri Sai Hospital for the period from 05.12.2023 to 12.12.2023 (for Rs.49,500/-) with relevant enclosures.

FOR RESPONDENT NO.3:-

Ex.R1: Attested copy of Policy

FOR PROPOSED WITNESS (RW.2):-

Ex.X1: is the extract of license search pertaining to respondent No.1

Ex.X2: Letter dt. 08.01.2026 issued by District Transport Officer, Jagtial stating that Mohammad Riyan Baig/Respondent No.1 has no driving license.

**CHAIRMAN M.A.C.T
Jagtial**