



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

Sr. No.256

FAO-2431-2022 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 12.08.2025

UNITED INDIA INSURANCE CO. LTD.

...Appellant

Versus

SALEMA KHATUN AND OTHERS

....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARMOD GOYAL**

Present:- Mr. Ram Avtar, Advocate  
for the appellant-Insurance Company.

Mr. S.K. Yadav, Advocate  
for respondents No.1 and 2.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PARMOD GOYAL, J. (Oral)**

In the present case, Insurance Company has challenged award of Rs. 8 lacs on the ground that same is excessive as petitioner was only 1-1/2 years old child. Learned Tribunal has granted total compensation of Rs.8 lacs i.e. Rs. 7,50,000/- for loss of dependency and Rs. 50,000/- for funeral expenses, transportation, last rites and other expenses.

It is the case of appellant that deceased was only 1-1/2 years old child and her notional income has been taken as Rs.50,000/- per annum which is on the higher side.

Claimant-petitioner has opposed the plea of appellant. On consideration, I find that though the learned Tribunal has taken notional income of deceased-child to be little excessive to the extent of Rs.50,000/- per annum, however, learned Tribunal has compensated said error by taking multiplier of 15 instead of 18. Therefore, considering the notional income and multiplier applied by learned Tribunal and overall compensation, I do



not intend to interfere in the award passed by learned Tribunal as loss of life can never be calculated in absolute money terms.

Learned counsel for the appellant has argued that notional income is not more than Rs.30,000/-. But even on consideration of the said argument, I find that the difference is not more than Rs.60,000/- in totality. This is taken care by non grant of compensation for consortium, loss of estate and application of multiplier as 15 instead of 18. Little excessive compensation needs to be ignored by the Courts especially keeping in view the fact that Motor Vehicles Act is a beneficial legislation and the Courts need to be liberal in granting compensation.

In these circumstances, no ground for interference is made out.

Hence, the appeal is hereby dismissed.

**12.08.2025**

Anu

**(PARMOD GOYAL)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether reportable : Yes/No