

MHTH230008052019 	Presented on : 18/04/2019
	Registered on: 18/04/2019
	Decided on : 31/07/2026
	Duration : 07Ys. 03Ms. 13Ds.

IN THE COURT OF MEMBER, MACT & DISTRICT JUDGE-2, VASAI,
DIST. THANE.

(Presided over by Smt. C. P. Jain)

M.A.C.P NO.30/2019
CNR NO.MHTH230008052019
Exh. No.

Mr. Dattatrey @ Dattatray Shanwar @ Shinvar Jadhav

Age: 45 Years, Occu: Nil,
R/at House No. 257 Arnala Vasai Road,
Katkari Pada, Nirmal, Vasai West,
Virar West, Nallasopara (West),
Dist.Palghar,Applicant.

v.

- Mr. Hazra Begam Mohd. Anwar Rain,**
Age : Adult, Occu: Not known,
At Harsh Apartment, Flat No. 303,
3rd Floor, Near Jain Mandir, Sopara Gaon,
Nallasopara (West), Dist.Palghar,
(Owner of the vehicle No.M14 ptH-48-BG-1634)
- Reliance Gen. Insurance Co. Ltd.,**
Having its office at Kalpataru Prime,
1st floor, Unit No. D-3, Road No. 16,
Wagle Industrial Estate, Thane (W).
(Insurer of Vehicle No.MH-48-BG-1634)Opponents.

**Application U/s. 166 of the
Motor Vehicles Act.**

....1/-

APPEARANCE

Mrs. Rina Kundu,
Opponent No.1
Mr. P.T. Sonar,

- Ld. Advocate for the applicant.
- Without W.S.
- Ld. Adv. for the Opponent No.2

JUDGMENT

(Delivered on 31/07/2026)

This application is filed under section 166 of The Motor Vehicles Act 1988 (Hereinafter referred as “**the act**” in short) for compensation of Rs.1,00,000/- for injuries sustained by applicant in motor accident occurred on 11.03.2019.

2] **The application in brief is as under:-**

On 11.03.2019 at about 11.00 am, Sanjay Girdhola was driving motorcycle No. MH-04-ER-6704 and he was pillion rider on said motorcycle. They started journey from State Bank, Vasai West towards their home. When they reached near Sun City Police Chowki, Vasai West, a scooty No. MH-48-BG-1634 came in high and excessive speed and in rash and negligent manner, dashed the motorcycle No. MH-04-ER-6704 of Sanjay Girdhola. Due to violent dash, applicant and his friend fell down from motorcycle. Applicant and his friend sustained serious injuries.

3] After the accident passerby took the applicant at Golden Park Hospital, Vasai. He was admitted there from 11.03.2019 to 20.03.2019. Doctor treated the applicant and operated the injured leg. After discharge, applicant is taking outdoor treatment from the

same hospital. Applicant is unable to move for his serious injuries. So he needs full-time attendant. Applicant is still under treatment, therefore, his disability has not assessed yet. He is 100% disable to do any work. Applicant had done welding course from Agnel Technical College. Prior to accident, he was doing welding business. His income was more than Rs.35,000/- per month. After the accident, he has lost his income as he is still under treatment and doctor advised for rest.

4] Therefore, applicant claim total compensation of Rs.1,00,000/- from both opponents. The offending vehicle is owned by opponent no.1 and same is insured with opponent no.2. Therefore, both are jointly and severally liable to pay compensation.

5] Opponent No.1 failed to appear inspite of service. Therefore, matter proceeded ex-parte against him.

6] Opponent no.2 filed its written statement at Exh.12 and contested the claim petition. It has denied all the averments in claim except those which are specifically admitted by him. According to opponent No.2, the driver of the offending vehicle was not rash and negligent at the time of accident and that accident has occurred due to sole negligence of applicant. On alleged date of accident i.e 11.03.2019, the Honda Activa bearing No. MH-48-BG-1634 was proceeding from Vasai Road towards

Vasai. The rider of aforesaid vehicle had observed all traffic rules and he was riding motorcycle in moderate speed. At relevant time of accident, the motorcycle bearing MH-04-ER-6704 was coming from opposite side and the applicant was riding this motorcycle in rash and negligent manner with high and excessive speed along with pillion rider. Due to high speed, the applicant lost control over his vehicle and went on wrong side of the road and dashed against the Activa bearing No. MH-48-BG-1634. Therefore, the said accident occurred due to sole negligence of the motorcycle bearing MH-04-ER-6704 of applicant. Opponent further denies that the applicant was 45 years old, was doing welding business, and was earning more than Rs.35,000/- p.m. Opponent denies nature of the injuries sustained by applicant, period of treatment and expenses incurred towards the said treatment. Opponent further denies that the applicant is prevented from resuming to normal work, that accident has affected career and future earning capacity of the applicant. Opponent denies that applicant sustained Permanent Partial Disability. Further, according to opponent, claim is bad for mandatory compliance under section 134(c) of the Act. Opponent No.1 failed to furnish the particulars of policy, date, time and place of accident, particulars of injured and the name of the driver and particulars of the driving license. Further the claim of applicant is also bad for mandatory compliance under section 158(6) of the Act. The concerned police station after registration of offence failed to forward all the relevant documents regarding the accident. Therefore, this opponent is not liable to pay any compensation to

applicant. Claim is further bad for non-joinder of the necessary party, as driver of the offending vehicle is not impleaded as party in this claim. Opponent further contend that the driver of Activa bearing No. MH-48-BG-1634 was not holding valid and effective driving license at the time of the accident. There is breach of the terms and conditions of the policy. Opponent is therefore not liable to pay any compensation to applicant. The application filed by the applicant is false, frivolous, misconceived, vexatious, and not maintainable and therefore prayed for dismissal with costs.

7] Heard submissions of both the Ld. Advocates. Considering averments in petition, contentions in written-statement, documents filed on record, following issues framed by my predecessor-in-office at Exhibit 18 arise for my consideration with its findings and for reasons to follow-

<u>Sr. No.</u>	<u>Issues</u>	<u>Findings.</u>
1.	Does petitioner prove that accident took place on 11.03.2019 near Sun-City Police Chowky, Vasai (W) at 11.30 am due to rash and negligent driving of driver of Scooty bearing No. MH-48-BG-1634 ?	In the affirmative.
2.	Does he further prove that in the said accident, petitioner sustained fracture injuries to his right femur and lower end of tibia and 100% permanent disability ?	In the affirmative.
3	Does the Respondent No. 2 Insurance	In the negative.

Company prove that, accident took place due to sole negligence of the drive of the motorcycle No. MH-04-ER-6704 ?

4. Does it further prove that, the Respondent No.1 committed breach of the terms and conditions of Insurance Policy ? In the negative.
5. Whether petition is bad for non-joinder of necessary parties i.e. owner and insurer of motorcycle bearing No. MH-04-ER-6704 ? In the negative.
6. Whether petitioner is entitled to claim compensation along with interest @ 18% per annum ? If yes, from whom and what is the quantum ? In the affirmative.
7. What Order, Award and Costs ? As per final order

REASONS

8] Applicant in order to substantiate the averments in the application, has filed affidavit of evidence of himself as AW-1 at Exh.19, filed affidavit of evidence of Dr. Shraddha Hemdatta Palekar as AW-2 at Exh.33, and affidavit of evidence of Dr. Samir Ankush Lokare as AW-3 at Exh.36 and closed their oral evidence vide evidence close purshis at Exh.38.

9] The claim is proceeding ex-parte against opponent No.1. Therefore, there is no evidence of opponent No.1.

10] The opponent No. 2 Insurance Company in order to set out their defence has examined Ramesh Kashinath Pote as DW1 at Exh. 46 and filed evidence affidavit of Umesh D. Patil as DW2 at Exh.50 and closed their oral evidence vide evidence close purshis at Exh. 57.

11] Applicant in support of their oral evidence has relied upon number of documents such as Copy of disability certificate at Exh.37, copy of FIR at Exh. 23, copy of spot panchanama at Exh. 24, copy of registration certificate of Scooty bearing No. MH-48-BG-1634 at Exh.26, copy of Insurance Policy at Exh.27, copy of School Leaving Certificate of applicant at Exh.80, Certified copy of statement of applicant at Exh.58, copy of Adhar Card of applicant at 81, copy of welding certificate of Angel Technical College at Exh. 79 and Exh. 82, copy of PAN Card of Applicant at Exh. 83. Copy of discharge summary of Golden Park Hospital at Exh.59 to 61, The copies of Golden Park hospital treatment papers, Vijayee Blood Bank papers, receipts, Golden Park Radiography reports, Golden Park Hospital Bills, receipts and chemist bills at Exh.62 to 77 respectively and copy of Adhar Card of applicant at Exh.78.

12] Opponent No.2 Insurance Company in support of their oral evidence has relied upon documents such as policy in respect of Scooty bearing No. MH-48-BG-1634 at Exh.53, office copy of notice dated 29.04.2019 at Exh.54.

AS TO ISSUES NO. 1 and 3 :-

13] As both the Issues are inter-related, they are discussed together.

14] Ld Advocate for applicant argued in lines of pleadings in petition and relied upon observations in following cases-

i. Mehboob Fatullal Shaikh Vs. Mr. Shakil Kadir Varekar @ Warekar, The Hon'ble High Court of Bombay in First Appeal No. 889 of 2016 D/O 17.03.2022,

“The Tribunal constituted under the said Act is not bound by strict rules of evidence. Therefore, the said bills and vouchers ought to have been taken into consideration by the Tribunal in absence of the specific case made out that the documents were fabricated.”

ii. Erudhaya Priya Vs. State Express Transport Corporation Ltd., the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal Nos. 2811-2812 of 2020 D/O 27/07/2020.

“In Jagdish Vs. Mohan & Others, and Sandeep Khanuja Vs. Atul Dande & Another, We extract below the principle set out in the Jagdish Case (supra) in para 8’

“In assessing the compensation payable the settled principles need to be borne in mind. A victim who suffers a permanent or temporary disability occasioned by an accident is entitled to the award of compensation. The award of compensation must cover among others, the following aspects:

- (i) Pain, suffering and trauma resulting from the accident;
- (ii) Loss of income including future income;
- (iii) The inability of the victim to lead a normal life together with its amenities;
- (iv) Medical expenses including those that the victim may be required to undertake in future; and
- (v) Loss of expectation of life.

15] Ld Advocate for opponent argued in lines of pleadings in reply and relied upon observations in following cases-

i. **Sannala Bhaskar Reddy Vs. M. Sreenivasulu and Anrs, 2010 ACJ 1122 Andhra Pradesh High Court,**

“Disability certificate issued by a doctor who did not treat the injured has no evidentiary value.”

ii. **Raj Kumar Vs. Ajay Kumar And Another, 2011 ACJ 1**

16] A.W.1 Dattatraya has testified in lines of pleadings in application. According to his testimony, on 11.03.2019 at about 11.00 am, his friend Sanjay Girdhole was driving motor cycle No. MH-04-ER-6704. He was pillion rider on the aforesaid motor cycle. They started their journey from State Bank, Vasai West towards their home. When they reached near Suncity Police Chowky, Vasai West, the offending vehicle scooty No. MH-48-BG-1634 came in high, excessive speed, in rash and negligent manner and dashed their motorcycle No. MH-04-ER-6704. Due to violent dash, he and his friend fall down from motorcycle and sustained serious injuries.

17] The aforesaid testimony of A.W.1 Dattatraya is lending corroboration from the recitals in copy of FIR (Exh.23), copy of statement at Exh.58, and copy of spot panchanama at Exh. 24.

18] The aforesaid oral and documentary evidence is not rebutted on record by oral or documentary evidence from opponents. In cross-examination, A.W.1 Dattatraya admitted that at the time of accident, he was pillion rider on motorcycle bearing MH-04-ER-6704. He also admitted that at that time, he and Sanjay

were talking with each other and that he cannot tell as to how scooter No. MH-48-BG-1634 came across their motorcycle.

19] The aforesaid statements even if taken as it is, they cannot help to prove that it was Sanjay who was in high speed, rash or negligent at relevant time of accident. Only because they were speaking with each other does not mean that they were negligent. The aforesaid oral and documentary evidence which is unrebutted on record speak in favour of applicant. There is no evidence on record that applicant was in any manner negligent and was responsible for accident. It has come on record that, at the relevant time of accident, it is driver of the offending vehicle scooter No. MH-48-BG-1634 was in high, excessive speed, and came in rash and negligent manner and dashed the motorcycle No. MH-04-ER-6704 of applicant. All the aforesaid oral and documentary evidence prove the factum of accident taken place on 11.03.2019, and the fact that the driver of the offending vehicle scooter No. MH-48-BG-1634 was in high-speed and was rash and negligent at relevant time of accident. As the aforesaid oral and documentary evidence is unrebutted, there is no reason to disbelieve this evidence. Accordingly, I answer Issue No. 1 in affirmative and Issue No. 3 in negative.

As to Issue No.2.

20] A.W.1 Dattatraya has testified that he sustained fracture injuries to his right femur and lower end of tibia in the aforesaid

accident. After the accident, passerby took him to Golden Park Hospital, Vasai. He was admitted there from 11.03.2019 to 20.03.2019.

21] In support of his testimony, applicant has filed evidence affidavit of AW-2 Dr.Palekar. AW-2 Dr.Palekar is residential medical officer serving in Golden Park hospital since 13/06/2022. She has corroborated the evidence of AW-1 Sanjay on facts that applicant was admitted in Golden Park Hospital since 11/03/2019 to 20/03/2019 and had taken treatment.

22] The evidence affidavit of AW-1 Dattatraya is further corroborated by the evidence of AW-3 Dr. Lokare who is orthopaedic surgeon since last more than 8 years and running lotus multispecialist clinic at Mulund in Mumbai. AW-3 Dr.Lokare had examined AW-1 Dattatraya on 14/11/2021 for assessing disability suffered by him. He has stated in detail the injuries sustained by applicant on 11/03/2019 i.e a) Right Femur comminuted fracture, b) Right neck of femur fracture, c) Fracture of right lower end of Tibia and d) Multiple abrasions over hand, applicant undergoing various operations, and the complaints which applicant is facing even after operation. On examining the applicant, he has assessed the permanent partial disability to extent of 58 percent. The disability Certificate Exh.37 is corroborating the evidence of AW-3 Dr.Lokare. The aforesaid evidence is also not impeached and there is nothing on record to doubt it. Therefore, Issue No. 2 is answered in affirmative.

As to Issue No.4

23] D.W.2 Umesh Patil has testified that driver of the offending vehicle did not have valid and effective driving licence on the date of accident. The copy of charge-sheet is proved on record from the evidence of D.W.1 Pote and it is at Exh.49. Offenses levelled against the driver of the offending vehicle scooty No. MH-48-BG-1634 includes section 3/81 of the M.V. Act. Therefore, the driver of the offending vehicle scooty No. MH-48-BG-1634 did not have valid driving license at the relevant time of accident.

24] The registration certificate of the vehicle shows that the vehicle is registered in the name of owner i.e. opponent No.1. Though it is contention of the Insurance Company that driver of the vehicle did not have driving license, there is no document to prove this fact. Opponent has filed the copy of charge-sheet at Exh.49 to prove this fact. According to opponent, driver of the scooty No. MH-48-BG-1634 did not have driving license and therefore, he is charge-sheeted for offence punishable under section 3/181 of the Motor Vehicles Act. But it is important to note that, the aforesaid sections are levelled against the driver of the offending motorcycle, but said charge is not proved in aforesaid case nor it can be said that same is proved in present case. Only offences levelled against the driver in the charge-sheet cannot said to be proving the said charge. The best evidence is copy of the driving license of the driver of scooty No. MH-48-BG-1634. However, except bare words of D.W.1 Pote and D.W.2 Patil, there is no other documentary evidence

on record. The copy of driving license of the driver of offending vehicle is not tendered on record to prove the fact that driver of the vehicle did not have the valid driving license on the relevant day of accident. In absence of cogent documentary evidence on record, mere bare words of D.W.1 Pote and D.W.2 Patil, cannot be said to be sufficient to prove this fact. Without said documentary evidence, the testimony of D.W.1 Pote and D.W.2 Patil on this fact cannot be believed. Therefore, it cannot be said that there is breach of terms and conditions of insurance policy. Accordingly, I answer Issue No. 4 in the negative.

As to Issue No.5.

25] It is also defence of opponent that petitioner has not arrayed the owner and driver of the offending vehicle, therefore, claim is bad for non-joinder of necessary parties. It is pertinent to note that, D.W.1 Patil in his affidavit of evidence, did not whisper on aforesaid fact. Therefore, it can be clearly said that though defence is raised, said fact is not seriously disputed by the opponent. The observations in the case of **New India Assurance Co. Ltd. Vs. Sitaram Devidayal Jaiswal 2012 ACJ 2647** squarely applies. It is observed as follows:

“10. Thus, the law is that the claimant while filing a claim application is under no obligation to ensure that all necessary and proper parties are impleaded as opponents to the claim petition. Considering the nature of the proceedings, the responsibility is of the Tribunal to ensure that the notices are issued to all the necessary parties. This power can be exercised by the Tribunal at any stage of the proceedings.

11. It is a matter of common knowledge that while defending a claim petition, diverse defences are raised in the written statements by the

owners and especially the Insurers. However, in many cases, we find that all the defences pleaded are not pressed into service at the time of final hearing. Whenever a contention is pressed into service by any of the opponents to the claim petition or the persons to whom the notice of the claim petition is issued under Rule 260 that the driver of a vehicle is a necessary party, the Tribunal is under an obligation to examine the said contention and if found correct, issue a notice to the driver. It is obvious that if such contention is not pressed by the party to whom the notice is served, the said party cannot be allowed to raise the said contention for the first time in the appeal. A claimant cannot be allowed to suffer as he is under no obligation to implead any party as the opponent to the claim petition.”

26] In the light of aforesaid observations and aforesaid discussion, this Issue No. 5 is answered in the negative.

As to Issue No.6.

27] AW-2 Dr.Palekar testified that she is residential medical officer in Golden Park Hospital at Vasai. Applicant was admitted in their hospital on 11.03.2019 to 20.03.2019, again on 08.04.2019 and thereafter on 23.09.2019 to 09.10.2019. Accordingly, their hospital had issued discharge summary at Exh. 59 to Exh.61. Hospital Bills of Rs.1,00,350/-, Rs.15,000/-, Rs.8000/-, Rs. 1800/- and advance payment receipt of Rs.5,000/- was issued to applicant. Applicant was taking outdoor treatment from the same hospital in follow-up treatment. Applicant had taken regular dressing, physiotherapy and x-ray. She also stated that applicant had visited 14 times in their hospital till 13.01.2020 and bills of Rs. 5650/- was issued to applicant which applicant has paid. The aforesaid testimony is corroborated by documents Exh.59 to Exh.61

(discharge summary), and Exh.62 to 77 (Chemist bills, Golden Park hospital bills, receipts, papers, pathology reports, bills, dressing charges, follow up treatment charges etc.)

28] Though in cross examination she stated that she has no personal knowledge about the treatment, admission of applicant in the hospital and about various hospital bills, discharge summary etc. same shall not be fatal to applicant. AW-2 Dr. Palekar is deposing on basis of documentary evidence maintained and issued by Golden Park hospital. There is nothing on record that the Chemist bills, Golden Park hospital bills, receipts, papers, pathology reports, bills, dressing charges, follow up treatment charges etc. and all other aforesaid medical papers, Chemist bills are false, fabricated, and bogus. There is nothing on record that the aforesaid documents are not issued by the hospital. Therefore, it cannot be said that the evidence of AW-2 Dr. Palekar is impeached on record. The observations in cited case of **Shri Mehboob Fatullal Shaikh** is therefore helpful to applicant. Therefore, there is no reason to disbelieve evidence of AW-2 Dr. Palekar. It can be safely said that the evidence of AW-2 Dr. Palekar is corroborating the evidence of AW-1 Dattatraya on the factum of expenditure incurred by the applicant. Therefore, the evidence of AW-1 Dattatraya on the factum of expenditure incurred by him to tune of Rs. 2,07,610/- is worth acceptable.

29] AW-3 Dr. Lokare has assessed the disability to extent of

58%. In cross-examination, AW-3 Dr. Lokare admitted that the disability Certificate is pertaining to affected body part.

30] It is now settled legal position as is observed in the cited case of **Rajkumar** that at the time of deciding the claim about the injuries and permanent disability, the Tribunal is required to assess the extent of disability and its impact on the person making claim. Ascertainment of the effect of the permanent disability on the actual earning capacity involves three steps as under: (i) The Tribunal has to first ascertain what activities the claimant could carry on inspite of permanent disability and what he could not do as a result of the permanent disability (this is also relevant for awarding compensation under the head of loss of amenities of life). (ii) The second step is to ascertain his avocation, profession and nature of work before the accident, as also his age. (iii) The third step is to find out whether : (a) the claimant is totally disabled from earning any kind of livelihood, or (b) whether inspite of the permanent disability, the claimant could still effectively carry on the activities and functions, which he earlier carried on, or (c) whether he was prevented or restricted from discharging his previous activities and functions, but could carry on some other or lesser scale of activities and functions so that he continues to earn or can continue to earn his livelihood.

31] If the aforesaid legal position, evidence of AW- 1 to AW-3 and the disability certificate Exh-37 is taken into account, it is

clear that the applicant is unable to carry out his normal activities which he could earlier carry out. He was welder by profession. The certificate of Angel Technical College is at Exh. 79 and Exh. 82. He cannot earn as he could earn earlier to accident. It cannot be concluded that inspite of the permanent partial disability, the applicant could still effectively carry on the activities and functions, which he earlier carried on. Though he is not totally disabled, considering the difficulties faced by applicant after operation as is stated by AW-3 Dr. Lokare in his evidence affidavit, the earning capacity of applicant can be said to be reduced by 40%.

32] Age of applicant, as claimed by him, is 45 years. Same is not disputed. Hence, his age is considered as 45 years.

33] According to applicant, he was welder and earning more than Rs.30,000/- per month. But he has not filed any oral or documentary evidence on record to show this income. As per the standard of minimum wages, his age and as there is welding certificate at Exh. 79 and Exh.82, his notional income can roughly be considered as Rs. 15,000/- per month.

34] As applicant was 45 years of age at the time of accident, multiplier of '13' will have to be applied in view of the observations of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of **National Insurance Vs Pranay Sethi** decided on 31/10/2017. In above referred case, Hon'ble Supreme Court has also granted future prospects. Here, applicant is self-employed person, in between 40 to 50 years of age. Hence, 25% of amount will have to be added as future prospects.

35] Applicant was hospitalized for several days. He has proved hospital bills and all other medical expenditure of Rs. 2,07,610/-. He has suffered permanent partial-disability of 40% & suffered pain and suffering. Therefore, he is entitled to amount of Rs. 25000/- for pain and suffering.

36] Thus, applicant is entitled to receive compensation in light of observations in cited case of **Erudhaya Priya**, which can be computed as under :

Sr. No	Heads	Calculations (Rs.)
i	Monthly income	15,000/-
ii	25% of the income is added as future prospect.	15,000/- (+) 3750/- 18750/-p.m. 2,25,000/-p.a.
iii	Compensation after multiplier of '13' is applied	2,25,000/- (x) 13 29,25,000/-
iv	40% of Rs. 25,20,000/- (as permanent disability is 40%)	11,70,000/-
v	Towards pain and suffering	25,000/-
vi	Hospital Bills and other medical expenses	2,07,610/-.
	Total (iv to vi)	Rs. 14,02,610/-

37] Opponent No.1 is owner and Opponent 2 is insurance company with whom the offending vehicle is insured as discussed above. The Cover note/ policy shows that accident is covered by policy. Having arrived at aforesaid findings, Opponents are liable to pay compensation to applicant. Accordingly, Issue No.6 is answered in affirmative.

As to Issue No.7

38] Having arrived at aforesaid findings, the petition of applicant deserves to be allowed. In result, I proceed to answer issue No.7 by following order:-

ORDER

- 1) The petition is allowed with costs against respondent Nos. 1 & 2. The claimant is entitled to receive compensation of Rs.14,02,610/- (Rupees Fourteen Lakhs, Two Thousand, Six Hundred and Ten Only) inclusive of NFL amount of Rs.25,000/-.
- 2) The respondent Nos. 1 & 2 shall jointly and severally pay an amount of Rs.14,02,610/- (Rupees Fourteen Lakhs, Two Thousand, Six Hundred and Ten Only) with interest at the rate of 7% per annum from the date of filing of this petition till realization of entire amount towards compensation to the claimant.
- 3) Applicant is directed to furnish following details on separate sheet along with photocopy of first page of his Bank Passbook containing his photograph and PAN Card, (if any) :-
 - (i) Full name of the claimant with current address ;
 - (ii) Name of the Bank & Branch
 - (iii) Bank IFSC Code
 - (iv) Bank Account Number of claimant.

- 4) Applicant is directed to personally remain present at the time of furnishing the above said information for personal verification.
- 5) Respondents are directed to deposit the amount, as directed to them, in the following account of this Tribunal.

Name of Account:

Member, Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Vasai.

Bank Name : **State Bank of India,**

Branch : **Bassein Branch, Vasai (West),**

Type of Account : **Saving Account**

Account No. : **43933875350,**

IFSC Code : **SBIN0000326**

- 6) Claimant has paid court fees on Rs. 1,00,000/-. He is directed to deposit court fees on remaining additional amount /-.
- 7) Award be drawn up accordingly.

Vasai.

Date : 31/07/2026

(C. P. Jain)

District Judge-2 &
Member,

Motor Accident Claim Tribunal, Vasai.