**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**FAO-1518-2025 (O&M) &
XOBJC-38-2025**

THE ORIENTAL INSURANCE CO. LTD.

......Appellant

vs.

MANJU SINGAL AND ORS.

......Respondents

Reserved on:- 27.04.2026
Pronounced on:- 12.05.2026
Uploaded on:- 15.05.2026

Whether only the operative part of the judgment is pronounced? *NO*
Whether full judgment is pronounced? *YES*

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Punit Jain, Advocate
for the appellant-Insurance Company.

Mr. Nitin Jain, Advocate
for cross-objectors/respondents No.1 to 3.

Mr. Amit Chaudhary, Advocate
for respondent No.4.

****

SUDEEPTI SHARMA J.

FAO-1518-2025

1. The present appeal has been preferred against the award dated 24.10.2024 passed by the learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Hisar (for short, 'the Tribunal') in the claim petition filed under Section 166 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, wherein the appellant-Insurance company was fastened with the liability to pay the compensation of Rs.1,17,05,643/- to the

claimants along with interest @ 7.5 % per annum on the ground of quantum of compensation to be on higher side.

XOBJC-38-2028

2. The present cross-objections have been preferred by cross-objector/claimants against the award dated 24.10.2024 passed by the learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Hisar in the claim petition filed under Section 166 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, for enhancement of compensation, granted to them to the tune of Rs.1,17,05,643/- along with interest @ 7.5 % per annum on account of death of Neha Singal in a Motor Vehicular Accident.

3. As sole issue for determination in the present appeal and cross-objections is confined to quantum of compensation awarded by the learned Tribunal, a detailed narration of the facts of the case is not required to be reproduced here for the sake of brevity.

SUBMISSIONS OF LEARNED COUNSEL FOR THE PARTIES

4. Learned counsel for the appellant-Insurance Company contends that the learned Tribunal has taken income of deceased on higher side. He further contends that income of Rs.56,498/- assessed by the learned Tribunal is wholly without any basis because the employer of deceased was not examined, therefore, in absence of any evidence on record, the learned Tribunal has taken monthly income of deceased on whims and fancies. He furthermore contends that the learned Tribunal has erred in deduction 1/3rd instead of 1/2 towards personal and living expenses as per the settled law, therefore, he prays that the present appeal be allowed and amount of compensation be reduced.

5. Per contra, learned counsel for cross-objectors/claimants contends that compensation awarded by the learned Tribunal is on the lower side hence warrants enhancement. He furthermore contends that learned Tribunal has rightly assessed the monthly income of the deceased after deducting Income Tax as per the settled law. He furthermore contends that compensation under the conventional heads are on lower side and deserves to be enhanced.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the whole record of this case with their able assistance.

SETTLED LAW ON COMPENSATION

7. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Sarla Verma Vs. Delhi Transport Corporation and Another*** **[(2009) 6 Supreme Court Cases 121]**, laid down the law on assessment of compensation and the relevant paras of the same are as under:-

> "***30***. *Though in some cases the deduction to be made towards personal and living expenses is calculated on the basis of units indicated in Trilok Chandra, the general practice is to apply standardised deductions. Having a considered several subsequent decisions of this Court, we are of the view that where the deceased was married, the deduction towards personal and living expenses of the deceased, should be one-third (1/3rd) where the number of dependent family members is 2 to 3, one-fourth (1/4th) where the number of dependent family members is 4 to 6, and one-fifth (1/5th) where the number of dependent family members exceeds six.*
>
> ***31***. *Where the deceased was a bachelor and the claimants are the parents, the deduction follows a different principle.*

In regard to bachelors, normally, 50% is deducted as personal and living expenses, because it is assumed that a bachelor would tend to spend more on himself. Even otherwise, there is also the possibility of his getting married in a short time, in which event the contribution to the parent(s) and siblings is likely to be cut drastically. Further, subject to evidence to the contrary, the father is likely to have his own income and will not be considered as a dependant and the mother alone will be considered as a dependant. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, brothers and sisters will not be considered as dependants, because they will either be independent and earning, or married, or be dependent on the father.

***32**. Thus even if the deceased is survived by parents and siblings, only d the mother would be considered to be a dependant, and 50% would be treated as the personal and living expenses of the bachelor and 50% as the contribution to the family. However, where the family of the bachelor is large and dependent on the income of the deceased, as in a case where he has a widowed mother and large number of younger non-earning sisters or brothers, his personal and living expenses may be restricted to one-third and contribution to the family will be taken as two-third.*

* * * * * *

***42.** We therefore hold that the multiplier to be used should be as mentioned in Column (4) of the table above (prepared by applying Susamma Thomas[3], Trilok Chandra and Charlie), which starts with an operative multiplier of 18 (for the age groups of 15 to 20 and 21 to 25 years), reduced by one unit for every five years, that is M-17 for 26 to 30 years, M-16 for 31 to 35 years, M-15 for 36 to 40 years, M-14 for 41 to 45 years, and M-13 for 46 to 50* *years, then reduced by two units for every five years, that is, M-11 for 51 to 55 years, M-9 for 56 to 60 years, M-7 for 61 to 65 years and M-5 for 66 to 70 years.*

8. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***National Insurance Company Ltd. Vs. Pranay Sethi & Ors.*** **[(2017) 16 SCC 680]** has clarified the law under Sections 166, 163-A and 168 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, on the following aspects:-

(A) Deduction of personal and living expenses to determine multiplicand;

(B) Selection of multiplier depending on age of deceased;

(C) Age of deceased on basis for applying multiplier;

(D) Reasonable figures on conventional heads, namely, loss of estate, loss of consortium and funeral expenses, with escalation;

(E) Future prospects for all categories of persons and for different ages: with permanent job; self-employed or fixed salary.

The relevant portion of the judgment is reproduced as under:-

"***52.*** *As far as the* ***conventional heads*** *are concerned, we find it difficult to agree with the view expressed in Rajesh[2]. It has granted Rs.25,000 towards funeral expenses, Rs 1,00,000 towards loss of consortium and Rs 1,00,000 towards loss of care and guidance for minor children. The head relating to loss of care and minor children does not exist. Though Rajesh refers to Santosh Devi, it does not* *seem to follow the same. The conventional and traditional heads, needless to say, cannot be determined on percentage basis because that would not be an acceptable criterion. Unlike determination of income, the said heads have to be quantified. Any quantification must have a reasonable foundation. There can be no dispute over the fact that price index, fall in bank interest, escalation of rates in many a field have to be noticed. The court cannot remain oblivious to the same. There has been a thumb rule in this aspect. Otherwise, there will be extreme difficulty in determination of the same and unless the thumb rule is applied, there will be immense variation lacking any kind of consistency as a consequence of which, the orders passed by the tribunals and courts are likely to be unguided. Therefore, we think it seemly to fix reasonable sums. It seems to us that reasonable figures on conventional heads, namely, loss of estate, loss of consortium and funeral expenses should be Rs.15,000, Rs.40,000 and Rs.15,000 respectively. The principle of revisiting the said heads is an acceptable principle. But the revisit should not be fact-centric or quantum-centric. We think that it would be condign that the amount that we have quantified should be enhanced on percentage basis in every three years and the enhancement should be at the rate of 10% in a span of three years. We are disposed to* *hold so because that will bring in consistency in respect of those heads.*

* * * * *

59.3. *While determining the income, an addition of 50% of actual salary to the income of the deceased towards future prospects, where the deceased had a permanent job and was below the age of 40 years, should be made. The addition should be 30%, if the age of the deceased was between 40 to 50 years. In case the deceased was between the age of 50 to 60 years, the addition should be 15%. Actual salary should be read as actual salary less tax.*

59.4. *In case the deceased was self-employed (or) on a fixed salary, an addition of 40% of the established income should be the warrant where the deceased was below the age of 40 years. An addition of 25% where the deceased was between the age of 40 to 50 years and 10% where the deceased was between the age of 50 to 60 years should be regarded as the necessary method of computation. The established income means the income minus the tax component.*

59.5. *For determination of the multiplicand, the deduction for personal and living expenses, the tribunals and the courts shall be guided by paras 30 to 32 of Sarla Verma*[4] *which we have reproduced hereinbefore.*

59.6. *The selection of multiplier shall be as indicated in the Table in Sarla Verma[1] read with para 42 of that judgment.*

59.7. *The age of the deceased should be the basis for applying the multiplier.*

59.8. *Reasonable figures on conventional heads, namely, loss of estate, loss of consortium and funeral expenses should be Rs 15,000, Rs 40,000 and Rs 15,000 respectively. The aforesaid amounts should be enhanced at the rate of 10% in every three years."*

9. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Magma General Insurance Company Limited Vs. Nanu Ram alias Chuhru Ram & Others [2018(18) SCC 130]** after considering **Sarla Verma (supra)** and **Pranay Sethi (Supra)** has settled the law regarding consortium. Relevant paras of the same are reproduced as under:-

*"**21**. A Constitution Bench of this Court in Pranay Sethi[2] dealt with the various heads under which compensation is to be awarded in a death case. One of these heads is loss of consortium. In legal parlance, "consortium" is a compendious term which encompasses "spousal consortium", "parental consortium", and "filial consortium". The right to consortium would include the company, care, help, comfort, guidance, solace and affection of the deceased, which is a loss to his family.*

With respect to a spouse, it would include sexual relations with the deceased spouse.

21.1. ***Spousal consortium*** *is generally defined as rights pertaining to the relationship of a husband-wife which allows compensation to the surviving spouse for loss of "company, society, cooperation, affection, and aid of the other in every conjugal relation".*

21.2. ***Parental consortium*** *is granted to the child upon the premature death of a parent, for loss of "parental aid, protection, affection, society, discipline, guidance and training".*

21.3. ***Filial consortium*** *is the right of the parents to compensation in the case of an accidental death of a child. An accident leading to the death of a child causes great shock and agony to the parents and family of the deceased. The greatest agony for a parent is to lose their child during their lifetime. Children are valued for their love, affection, companionship and their role in the family unit.*

22*. Consortium is a special prism reflecting changing norms about the status and worth of actual relationships. Modern jurisdictions world-over have recognised that the value of a child's consortium far exceeds the economic value of the compensation awarded in the case of the death of a child. Most jurisdictions therefore permit*

2026:PHHC:075871

parents to be awarded compensation under loss of consortium on the death of a child. The amount awarded to the parents is a compensation for loss of the love, affection, care and companionship of the deceased child.

***23**. The Motor Vehicles Act is a beneficial legislation aimed at providing relief to the victims or their families, in cases of genuine claims. In case where a parent has lost their minor child, or unmarried son or daughter, the parents are entitled to be awarded loss of consortium under the head of filial consortium. Parental consortium is awarded to children who lose their parents in motor vehicle accidents under the Act. A few High Courts have awarded compensation on this count. However, there was no clarity with respect to the principles on which compensation could be awarded on loss of filial consortium.*

***24**. The amount of compensation to be awarded as consortium will be governed by the principles of awarding compensation under "loss of consortium" as laid down in Pranay Sethi[2]. In the present case, we deem it appropriate to award the father and the sister of the deceased, an amount of Rs 40,000 each for loss of filial consortium.*

10. A perusal of the award reveals that deceased was stated to be 26 years of age at the time of accident, which is duly proved from post-mortem

2026:PHHC:075871

report Ex.P-5. Therefore, the learned Tribunal has rightly assessed her age as 26 years at the time of accident and rightly applied the multiplier of 17.

11. A perusal of the award reveals that the deceased was stated to be working with Webashlar, earning Rs.65,000/- per month. So far as contention of learned counsel for appellant-Insurance Company that income of the deceased is taken on higher side is bereft of merit.

12. A further perusal of the award reveals that the claimants have proved before learned Tribunal beyond any shadow of doubt regarding the employment and monthly income of deceased-Neha Singal. It is also evident from the award that the appellant-Insurance Company had summoned official from Webashlar Company in order to dispute the monthly income of the deceased. However, when said witness came before the learned Tribunal, the learned counsel for the appelant-Insurance Company intentionally did not examined him. Therefore, the sanctity and credibility of the documents as placed on record by claimants/cross-objectors remained unimpeachable. Consequently, the learned Tribunal has rightly placed reliance upon the documents (Ex.P-2, Ex.P-3 to Ex.P-15) and assessed the monthly income of deceased as Rs.56,498/- after deducting the Income Tax. Therefore, no inference is warranted on his count and the income of deceased is assessed as Rs.56,500/- (rounded off).

13. A perusal of the award further reveals that the learned Tribunal has rightly deducted 1/3rd towards personal expenditure after taking into account settled law.

14. A perusal of award further reveals that amount awarded under the head of loss of consortium, loss of estate and funeral expenses is on the lower side. Therefore, the award requires indulgence of this Court.

15. In view of the aforesaid discussion, the compensation is liable to be recalculated as under:

Sr. No.	***Heads***	***Compensation Awarded***
1	Monthly Income	Rs.65,000/-
2	Future Prospects @40%	Rs.26,000/- (40% of 65,000)
3	Deduction towards personal expenditure 1/3	Rs.30,333/- (91,000 X 1/3)
4	Total Income	Rs.60,667/- (91,000 – 30,333)
5	Total yearly income	Rs.60,667 X 12 = Rs.7,28,004/-
6	Income Tax deduction	Rs.6,77,979/- (7,28,004 – 50,025)
7	Multiplier (17)	Rs.1,15,25,643/- (6,77,979 X 17)
8	Annual Dependency	Rs.1,15,25,643/-
9	Loss of estate	Rs.20,000/-
10	Funeral Expenses	Rs.20,000/-
11	Loss of Consortium: Parental: 1 X Rs.53,240/- Spousal: 1 X Rs.53,240 /- Filial: 1 X Rs.53,240/-	Rs.1,59,720/-
12	**Total Compensation**	**Rs.1,17,25,363/-**
13	**Amount Awarded by the Tribunal**	**Rs.1,17,05,643/-**
14	**Enhanced amount**	**Rs.19,720/-** **(Rs. 1,17,25,363 - 1,17,05,643)**

16. So far as the interest part is concerned, as held by Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Dara Singh @ Dhara Banjara Vs. Shyam Singh Varma*** **2019 ACJ 3176** and ***R.Valli and Others VS. Tamil Nadu State Transport***

Corporation (2022) 5 Supreme Court Cases 107, the respondents No.1 to 4-claimants are granted the interest @ 9% per annum on the enhanced amount from the date of filing of claim petition till the date of its realization.

17. The appellant-Insurance Company is directed to deposit the enhanced amount of compensation along with interest with the Tribunal within a period of two months from today. The Tribunal is further directed to disburse the enhanced amount of compensation along with interest in the account of the claimants/respondents No.1 to 4. The claimants/respondents No.1 to 4 are directed to furnish their bank account details to the Tribunal.

18. Consequently, the present appeal, being devoid of merits, stands ***dismissed*** and cross-objections i.e. XOBJC-38-2025 is ***allowed***.

19. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

12.05.2026 **(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)**
Ayub/Sahil **JUDGE**

Whether speaking/non-speaking : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes