



2026:CGHC:30305



CGHC010331052024

2026:CGHC:30305

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****MAC No. 1867 of 2024**

1 - Khushbulata Mannewar S/o Late Balram Maitri Aged About 25 Years Resident Of Village Budhanpur, Police Station Nagarda, Tahsil Baradwar, District Sakti, Chhattisgarh.

... Appellant**versus**

1 - Devdatt Mannewar S/o Ramayan Singh Aged About 35 Years Resident Of Village Ghuichunva, Police Station Nagarda, District Sakti, Chhattisgarh (Owner Of The Offending Tractor)

2 - Ifco Tokyo General Insurance Company Limited Shop No. 205, Second Floor, M.M. Silwar Plaza, Near Mining Office, Mahavir Nagar Ring Road No. 1, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh, (Owner Of The Offending Tractor Trolley)

3 - Ramlal Mannewar S/o Piladau Aged About 52 Years R/o Village Budhanpur, Police Station Nagarda, Tahsil Baradwar, District Sakti, Chhattisgarh.

4 - Shyambai Mannewar W/o Ramlal Mannewar Aged About 52 Years R/o Village Budhanpur, Police Station Nagarda, Tahsil Baradwar, District Sakti, Chhattisgarh.

... Respondent(s)

For Appellant : Mr. Ishwar Chandra, Advocate on behalf of
Mr. Ishwar Jaiswal, Advocate

For Respondent(s) : Ms. Shrishti Attal, Advocate



Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal, J.
Order on Board
(16.07.2026)

1. This appeal has been preferred by the appellant, being aggrieved by the award dated 06.07.2024 passed by the First Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Sakti, District Janjgir-Champa, in Claim Case No. 31/2023, whereby inadequate compensation has been awarded. Hence, the present appeal.
2. Facts of the case: - The claimants, being the dependents of the deceased Balram Maitry, filed a claim petition under Section 164 of the Motor Vehicles Act seeking compensation on account of his death. It was pleaded that on 02.04.2023, while the deceased was driving tractor bearing Registration No. CG-11-AM-0956 for agricultural work, the tractor allegedly overturned due to a mechanical defect, resulting in his death at the spot. The accident was reported to the police, and the claimants sought compensation of ₹12,00,000/-. Upon considering the evidence on record, the learned First Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Sakti, District Janjgir-Champa, by award dated 06.07.2024, awarded a lump-sum compensation of ₹5,00,000/-. Aggrieved by the quantum of compensation awarded, the present appeal has been preferred seeking enhancement thereof.



3. Learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the learned Claims Tribunal has erred in awarding inadequate compensation to the claimants. It was contended that the Tribunal failed to consider the evidence regarding the deceased's occupation as a skilled driver and his monthly income, resulting in an erroneous assessment of compensation. It was further submitted that the Tribunal did not award any amount towards future prospects, loss of consortium, funeral expenses, and loss of estate, and also awarded interest at an inadequate rate. It was, therefore, prayed that the impugned award be suitably modified by enhancing the compensation along with the rate of interest.
4. Learned counsel for the insurance company supported the impugned award and submitted that the learned Claims Tribunal has rightly passed the award after due appreciation of the evidence on record and that the same suffers from no illegality, infirmity, or perversity warranting interference by this Court.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents with utmost care.
6. It is apparent that the claim petition was filed under Section 164 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988. The said provision provides for fixed compensation in case of death arising out of a motor vehicle accident. As per the statutory



scheme, the amount of compensation payable under Section 164 for death is capped at ₹5,00,000/-.

7. In the present case, the learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, after considering the facts and circumstances of the matter, has awarded a lump-sum compensation of ₹5,00,000/- to the claimants, which is the maximum amount prescribed under Section 164 of the Motor Vehicles Act. Since the compensation awarded is in accordance with the statutory limit, no further enhancement can be granted under the said provision. This Court does not find any illegality, infirmity, or jurisdictional error in the impugned award passed by the learned Claims Tribunal warranting interference.
8. The appeal, being devoid of merit, is accordingly dismissed.
- No order as to cost(s)

Sd/-
(Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal)
Judge

Vaishali