

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4647 OF 2009

ANJANI SINGH &amp; ORS. ... APPELLANTS

VS.

SALAUDDIN &amp; ORS. ... RESPONDENTS

## J U D G M E N T

V. Gopala Gowda, J.

This civil appeal is directed against the judgment and award dated 29th November, 2006 passed by the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh in FAO No.236 of 2001, wherein the High Court allowed the said appeal and enhanced the compensation by 1,20,600/- and awarded interest at the rate of 6% per annum. The same is questioned by the appellants-claimants, on the ground that just and reasonable C.A. No.4647 of 2009

2

compensation was not awarded keeping in view the future prospects of income and further, correct multiplier method was not applied taking into consideration the age of the deceased at the time of death. Lastly, compensation under the conventional heads towards loss of love and affection towards the widow, children and parents of the deceased was also not awarded. Hence, this appeal was filed by the appellants seeking further enhancement of compensation.

2. The facts in brief are stated hereunder:

On 17.09.1997 Sergeant Dalbir Singh, husband of appellant No. 1, father of appellant nos. 2 to 4 and son of appellant no. 5 died in a road accident. The

accident took place at 10.15 p.m. on National Highway  
No. 28 between Air Force Station, Gorakhpur and  
Nandanagar Police Station, when the deceased was  
going on his bicycle and was hit by truck No. UP-41A/  
1901 coming from Gorakhpur side. The said truck was  
driven by Respondent No.1, owned by Respondent No.2  
C.A. No.4647 of 2009 3

and insured by Respondent No.3, United India  
Insurance Company.

On 24.11.1997, the appellant/claimants filed the  
Claim Petition No.217 of 1997 before the Motor  
Accident Claims Tribunal, Faridabad (in short "the  
Tribunal") and claimed for 15,00,000/- as  
compensation for loss to estate of the deceased. The  
Tribunal held that, the deceased Sergeant Dalbir  
Singh died because of the accident which took place  
due to rash and negligent driving of respondent No.1  
and awarded the appellants 2,49,600/- as  
compensation. The Tribunal determined the dependency  
of appellants as 31,000/- per annum and applied the  
multiplier of 8 since the deceased suffered death at  
the age of 35 and the age of superannuation in the  
Air Force is 45-50 years.

3. Aggrieved by the judgment and order passed by the  
Tribunal, the appellants-claimants filed First Appeal  
No. 234 of 2011 before the High Court of Punjab and  
C.A. No.4647 of 2009 4

Haryana at Chandigarh on 12.7.2000. The High Court  
allowed the appeal and held that assessment of  
monthly income by the Tribunal as 4030/- is correct  
based on the examination of the salary certificate.  
The finding of the Tribunal leading to deduction of  
1/3rd amount towards personal expenses was held to be

erroneous. Hence, this finding was set aside and only 1/4th of the compensation was deducted towards personal expenses. The total dependency amount came up to 3,62,700/- by applying a multiplier of 10 and 2,500/- was awarded towards funeral expenses and 5,000 towards loss of consortium for the widow of the deceased. In total, a compensation of 3,70,200/- was awarded. Thus, the compensation was enhanced by 1,20,600/-, which carried an interest of 6% per annum from the date of filing of the claim till the date of payment.

4. This Court, vide judgment dated 23rd July, 2009, granted leave, and referred the issue to a larger bench. This was in view of the divergence of opinion C.A. No.4647 of 2009 5

across judgments of this Court, and this aspect of the matter having not been considered in the earlier decisions, particularly in the absence of any clarification from Parliament despite recommendations made by this Court in U.P. State Road Transport Corporation & Ors. v. Trilok Chandra & Ors.1, it was further directed to the Registry to place the matter before the Hon'ble Chief Justice of India for an appropriate order to constitute a larger Bench to answer the points referred to it. Pursuant to the said order, the matter was placed before a larger Bench which answered the points of reference in favour of the appellants, in the decision reported in Reshma Kumari & Ors. v. Madan Mohan & Anr.2 The points answered read as under:

"40. In what we have discussed above, we sum up our conclusions as follows:

(i) In the applications for compensation made under Section 166 of the 1988 Act in death cases where the age of the deceased is 15 years and above, the Claims Tribunals shall select the multiplier as indicated in Column (4) of the table

1

(1996) 4 SCC 362

2

(2013) 9 SCC 65

C.A. No.4647 of 2009

6

prepared in Sarla Verma read with para 42 of that judgment.

(ii) In cases where the age of the deceased is upto 15 years, irrespective of the Section 166 or Section 163A under which the claim for compensation has been made, multiplier of 15 and the assessment as indicated in the Second Schedule subject to correction as pointed out in Column (6) of the table in Sarla Verma should be followed.

(iii) As a result of the above, while considering the claim applications made under Section 166 in death cases where the age of the deceased is above 15 years, there is no necessity for the Claims Tribunals to seek guidance or for placing reliance on the Second Schedule in the 1988 Act.

(iv) The Claims Tribunals shall follow the steps and guidelines stated in para 19 of Sarla Verma for determination of compensation in cases of death.

(v) While making addition to income for future prospects, the Tribunals shall follow paragraph 24 of the judgment in Sarla Verma.

(vi) Insofar as deduction for personal and living expenses is concerned, it is directed that the Tribunals shall ordinarily follow the standards prescribed in paragraphs 30, 31 and 32 of the judgment in Sarla Verma subject to the observations made by us in para 38 above.

(vii) The above propositions mutatis mutandis shall apply to all pending matters where above aspects are under consideration."

In view of the above decision of the larger Bench of

this Court, the appellants were held entitled to  
C.A. No.4647 of 2009 7

future prospects of income considered at the time of

determination of compensation both by the Tribunal

and High Court.

The monthly salary of the deceased

was taken as 4030/- by the Tribunal. The High Court,

in view of the answer to the points raised by this

Court and keeping in view the age of the deceased

which was 35 years, has taken 50% of the monthly

salary to arrive at the multiplicand.

Therefore,

towards future prospects at the rate of 50% with  
monthly income of 4030/- it would come to 2015/-,  
making the total monthly income to 6045/-. Out of  
6045/-, one fourth i.e. 1511/- shall be deducted  
towards personal expenses of the deceased, as per the  
decision of this Court in Sarla Verma & Ors. v. Delhi  
Transport Corporation & Anr.<sup>3</sup> case, as the deceased  
has five dependents, thus the resultant figure would  
be 4534/- per month which after multiplying by 12  
would come to 54,408/- as annual income. The  
multiplier would be 16 as per the above case which  
would come to 8,70,528/- under the head of loss of  
3  
(2009) 6 SCC 121  
C.A. No.4647 of 2009 8

dependency. We further award towards funeral  
expenses, a sum of 25,000/-, towards loss of love  
and affection of the children and the parents, a sum  
of 1,00,000/- and further, a sum of  
1,00,000/- towards loss of consortium by the widow  
of the deceased, as per the legal principle laid down  
by this Court in the three judge bench decision in  
Rajesh & Ors. v. Rajbir Singh & Ors.<sup>4</sup> We also award  
a sum of 25,000/- for the cost of litigation as per  
the principle laid down by this Court in Balram  
Prasad v. Kunal Saha & Ors.<sup>5</sup> Therefore, the amount  
would come to 11,20,528/-. Further, the Tribunal has  
passed the award in the year 2000 and the appellants  
have received 3,25,298/- on 22.7.2000 and 1,80,221/-  
on 9.3.2007. In total they have received 5,05,519/-.  
Now, they are entitled to the remaining amount, i.e.  
6,15,009/-. This amount shall bear interest at the  
rate of 9% per annum following the decision of this  
Court in Municipal Corporation of Delhi, Delhi v.

Uphaar Tragedy Victims Association & Ors.6 from the  
date of application till the date of payment. Out of

this amount, 50% shall be deposited  
in any

nationalized bank of Appellants' choice  
and the

remaining amount to be paid to them through demand  
draft within six weeks from the date of receipt of a

copy of this judgment. The appeal is accordingly  
ordinarily

allowed. There shall be no order as to costs.

.....J.

.....  
[GYAN SUDHA MISRA]

.....J.

.....  
[V. GOPALA GOWDA]

New Delhi,  
April 25, 2014

ITEM NO.1E  
FOR JUDGMENT

COURT NO.13

SECTION IV

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS  
CIVIL APPEAL NO(s). 4647 OF 2009

ANJANI SINGH & ORS.

Appellant (s)

VERSUS

SALAUDDIN & ORS.

Respondent(s)

Date: 25/04/2014  
today.

This Appeal was called on for judgment

For Appellant(s)

Mr. Ashok K. Mahajan, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. Debasis Misra, Adv.

Hon'ble Mr. Justice V. Gopala Gowda  
pronounced the judgment of the Bench comprising  
Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Gyan Sudha Misra and His  
Lordship.

Civil Appeal is allowed in terms of signed  
reportable judgment with no order as to costs.

(Pardeep Kumar)

AR-cum-PS

(Renu Diwan)

Court Master

[SIGNED REPORTABLE JUDGMENT IS PLACED ON THE FILE]