



2026:CGHC:2932



2026:CGHC:2932

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MAC No. 322 of 2025

- Panchu Tandi S/o Paras Ram Tandi Aged About 55 Years R/o Village Jamdi, P.S. Basna, District Mahasamund Chhattisgarh (Owner Of The Offending Vehile Tractor No. Cg 06 Gj 8580)

... Appellant

versus

1. Belmoti Sonwani W/o Subaran Sonwani Aged About 62 Years R/o Village Jamdi Post Sirko, P.S. Basna, District Mahasamund Chhattisgarh (Claimant)
2. Tulsiram Sonwani S/o Subaran Sonwani Aged About 45 Years R/o Village Jamdi Post Sirko, P.S. Basna, District Mahasamund Chhattisgarh (Claimant)
3. Bastiram Sonwani S/o Subaran Sonwani Aged About 36 Years R/o Village Jamdi Post Sirko, P.S. Basna, District Mahasamund Chhattisgarh (Claimant)
4. Yogesh Kumar Sao S/o Chhabilal Sao R/o Village Jamdi P.S. Basna, District Mahasamund Chhattisgarh (Driver Of The Offending Vehile Tractor No. Cg 06 Gj 8580)

... Respondent(s)

For Appellant	:	Mr. Virendra Verma, Advocate
For Respondents No. 1 to 3	:	Mr. Vikram Pratap, Advocate
Fro Respondent No. 4	:	Mr. Praveen Dhurandhar, Advocate holding the brief of Mr. Purendra Kichariya, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

19.01.2026

1. The owner of the vehicle has filed this appeal challenging liability part assailing award passed by the learned 1st Additional Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Saraipali, District Mahasamund passed in Claim Case No. 27.04.2024, whereby the learned Tribunal has granted compensation to the tune of Rs. 5,57,000/- with interest at the rate of 9% per annum on account



of death of Subaran Sonwani.

2. The facts in brief are that on 08.04.2022 deceased Subaran Sonwani was going to village Bhalukona on a Tractor bearing registration No. CG 06 GJ 8580 as he was invited by one Panchu Tandi to participate in a family function. The driver of the offending Tractor drove it rashly and negligently, resultantly, it turned turtle, consequently, Subaran Sonwani and three other persons died on the spot. The wife and two major sons filed application under Section 166 of Motor Vehicle Act, wherein they pleaded that at the time of accident age of the deceased was 65 years and earning Rs. 300-400/- per day. They claimed a sum of Rs. 18,73,000/-.
3. As the vehicle was not insured, the driver and owner of the vehicle filed reply to the claim petition and denied its averments.
4. Mr. Virendra Verma, Advocate appearing for the appellant would argue that driver of the offending vehicle had borrowed it from its owner/appellant and due to his negligence, the Tractor turned turtle and four persons lost their lives. He would submit that as the vehicle was within custody of the driver of the offending vehicle, the learned Tribunal should have fastened liability with him. He would pray to set-aside the award.
5. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for respondents would oppose. They would contend that the driver was engaged by owner of the vehicle and the Tractor was provided by the owner himself; therefore, the learned Tribunal rightly fastened liability with the owner and driver of the vehicle. They would submit that the owner failed to examine himself to prove this fact. They would submit that the appeal deserves to be dismissed.
6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.
7. The claimant No. 1 examined herself and deposed that due to rash and



negligent driving of the Tractor, it turned turtle and deceased Subaran Sonwani lost his life. She exhibited final report, FIR, merg-intimation, *Naksha Panchnama*, Postmortem report, Crime detail form, seizure memo and arrest memo.

8. FIR was registered against the driver of the vehicle on 08.04.2022. In the FIR, there is no mention that the Tractor was borrowed by its owner. Joint reply was filed by owner and driver of the vehicle. In reply also, there is no statement that Tractor was borrowed by its driver from its owner. The owner failed to examine any witness to substantiate the fact that the Tractor was borrowed by its driver and he was negligent. No issue was framed in this regard by the learned Tribunal.
9. The learned Tribunal after appreciating oral and documentary evidence passed award. The submission that the vehicle was borrowed by its driver from its owner is being raised first time at appellate stage.
10. Taking into consideration the above-discussed facts, I do not find any good ground to interfere with the award passed by the learned Tribunal. Accordingly, this appeal fails and is hereby **dismissed**, at admission stage itself.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
Judge