

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Miscellaneous Appeal No.4049/2025

1. Krishna Wife Of Jagdish Yadav, Aged About 48 Years, Resident Of Janaksinghpura, Tehsil Neemrana, District Alwar, Rajasthan.
2. Jagdish Yadav Son Of Shri Lakharam, Aged About 49 Years, Resident Of Janaksinghpura, Tehsil Neemrana, District Alwar, Rajasthan.
3. Rohit Son Of Shri Jagdish Yadav, Aged About 21 Years, Resident Of Janaksinghpura, Tehsil Neemrana, District Alwar, Rajasthan.
4. Mona Bai Daughter Of Shri Jagdish Yadav, Aged About 28 Years, Resident Of Janaksinghpura, Tehsil Neemrana, District Alwar, Rajasthan.

----Appellants

Versus

1. Dataram Son Of Shri Bahadur, Resident Of Khurdi, Tehsil Kotputli, District Jaipur, Rajasthan(Driver/owner-Jeep No. Rj-23-Ua-5594).
2. IFFCO Tokio General Insurance Company Limited, Having Its Regional Office At 101, 1St Floor, Arg Corporate Park, Gopalbadi, Ajmer Road Flyover, Jaipur Rajasthan Through Its Regional Manager (Insurance Company Jeep No. Rj-23-Ua-5594).

----Respondents

For Appellant(s) : Mr. Vinay Mathur

For Respondent(s) : Mr. C.S. Jodha

JUSTICE ANOOP KUMAR DHAND

Order

23/02/2026

1. The instant appeal has been preferred against the impugned judgment and award dated 30.05.2025 passed by the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal No.2, Behror District Alwar (for short "the

Tribunal”) in MAC Case No.361/2023 by which the claim petition submitted by the appellants-claimants (for short “the claimants”) has been partly allowed and the respondents have been directed to pay compensation of Rs.16,36,432/- along-with 7.5% interest from the date of filing of claim petition.

2. Being aggrieved and dissatisfied by the same, the claimants have approached this Court by way of filing the instant appeal.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the claimants submits that the amount so awarded by the Tribunal is inadequate and which needs to be suitably enhanced.

4. The aforesaid submissions made by learned counsel for the claimants have been opposed by counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents and counsel has submitted that after considering each and every aspect of the matter, an adequate amount of compensation has been awarded in favour of the claimants by the Tribunal. Hence, interference of this Court is not warranted and the instant appeal submitted by the claimants is liable to be rejected.

5. Heard and considered the submissions made at the Bar and perused the material available on the record.

6. Perusal of the record indicates that the deceased met with an accident on 09.04.2022 and at the time of the accident, his age was 22 years, hence, multiplier of 18 was applied by the Tribunal in terms of the judgment passed by the Hon’ble Apex Court in the case of **Sarla Verma Vs. Delhi Transport Corporation** reported in **(2009) 6 SCC 121**. Furthermore, looking to the fact that there was no proof of income of the deceased produced on the record of

the Tribunal, hence, he was treated as an agriculturist and his income was determined as an unskilled daily wager and accordingly, an adequate amount of compensation has been granted to the claimants.

7. In the considered opinion of this Court, the claimants have failed to satisfy this Court as to how the award passed by the Tribunal is not justified. Hence, this Court finds no merit and substance in the appeal and the same is hereby rejected.

(ANOOP KUMAR DHAND),J