



\$~60

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **MAC.APP. 203/2026**

SMT GEETA GOYAL

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. S.N. Parashar and Mr. Ritik Singh,
Advts.

versus

SH SONU PAL & ORS.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Pankaj Seth and Ms. Shruti Jain,
Advts. for R-3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

ORDER

% **23.03.2026**

CM APPL.18126/2026 (Exemption)

1. Exemption allowed subject to just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of, accordingly.

CM APPL.18125/2026 (Condonation of delay)

1. This application has been filed seeking condonation of delay of 07 days in filing the present appeal.
2. For the reasons, as stated in the said application, the same is allowed.
3. Delay is condoned.
4. Application stands disposed of, accordingly.

CM APPL.18127/2026 (Condonation of delay)

1. This application has been filed seeking condonation of delay of 50 days in re-filing the present appeal.
2. For the reasons, as stated in the said application, the same is allowed.
3. Delay is condoned.



4. Application stands disposed of, accordingly.

MAC.APP. 203/2026

1. This appeal has been filed seeking enhancement of compensation awarded by Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, West, Tis Hazari Courts (*'MACT/Tribunal'*) in MACT No.495/2021 by award dated 15th October 2025 for Rs. 75,30,256/- along with interest @ 9% per annum.

2. This compensation was awarded in relation to an accident which occurred on 10th June 2021 at about 12:30 p.m. when appellant, along with her husband, was travelling on a scooter and was hit by a *Tata 709*.

3. *Mr. S.N. Parashar*, counsel for appellant, seeks enhancement principally on three grounds:

- (i) That the permanent disability was certified at 80% in respect of both her lower limbs and the left upper limb, and the appellant had also suffered serious injuries to the rest of her body; despite this, the functional disability was taken as 50% by the MACT;
- (ii) That no compensation was awarded towards future attendant charges, despite clear evidence that appellant requires continuous assistance and was paying Rs.21,000/- per month for the attendant; and
- (iii) That compensation under non-pecuniary heads was highly inadequate, considering the extreme disability which had been caused.

4. Accordingly, issue notice.

5. *Ms. Shruti Jain*, counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondent no.3.

6. At this stage, there is no requirement for notice to respondent nos.1 &

2.



7. Copy of the appeal paperbook be supplied by *Mr. S.N. Parashar*, counsel for appellant, to Ms. Shruti Jain, counsel for respondent no.3.
8. Trial Court Record be also requisitioned and placed on record. Digital copy of the same be supplied to the counsels for the parties, if so requested.
9. Counsels for parties will file their respective note of arguments not exceeding *three pages*, synopsisizing their contentions along with *list of citations*, which they wish to rely upon, cross-referencing *PDF pages* of the Court File. The same will be exchanged *inter se* counsels *at least three days* prior to the next date of hearing.
10. List on 27th August 2026.
11. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

ANISH DAYAL, J

MARCH 23, 2026/MK/bp