



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

(107)

FAO No. 2373 of 2023  
Date of Decision: 11-09-2025

Sunita and others

... Appellants

Versus

Mangat Singh and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIRINDER AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Abhimanyu Singh, Advocate  
for the appellants.

\*\*\*\*\*

**VIRINDER AGGARWAL, J. (ORAL)**

1. The present appeal has been filed by the claimants-appellants seeking enhancement of compensation awarded by the learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Bhiwani, (hereinafter referred as Tribunal), vide award dated 01.02.2023 passed in MACT Case No. 78-RBT of 2022.

2. The facts in brief are that the husband of appellant No.1, namely Suresh Singh, died in a motor vehicle accident on 14.02.2018. The Tribunal assessed the monthly income of the deceased at ₹8,407/- being the minimum wages prevalent in the State of Haryana in year 2018, applied the multiplier of 15 considering the age of the deceased to be 40 years, and deducted one-fourth towards personal expenses as per *Smt. Sarla Verma versus Delhi Transport Corporation (SC) 2009(3) RCR(Civil) 77*. Further, Tribunal added future prospects at 25% in terms of the law laid down in *National Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Pranay Sethi (2017) 16 SCC 680*, Conventional sums



towards consortium and loss of love and affection were also granted in light of *Magma General Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Nanu Ram* (2018) 18 SCC 130. On this basis, the Tribunal awarded compensation of ₹18,08,580/- along with interest at rate of 7% per annum.

3. The sole contention raised before this Court is that the income of the deceased was wrongly restricted to minimum wages, as according to the appellants, he was earning ₹50,000/- per month from cattle trade and agriculture. However, except for oral assertions, no documentary evidence whatsoever has been brought on record to substantiate such claim. In absence of any cogent proof, the Tribunal was justified in relying upon the minimum wages as the safe standard for computing loss of dependency.

4. Having heard the learned counsel for the appellants and on perusal of the award, I find that the Tribunal has applied the correct legal principles. The income has been rightly determined, appropriate multiplier applied, correct future prospects granted, and conventional heads awarded as per binding precedents by *Sarla verma(supra) and Pranay Sethi(supra) and Magma General Insurance(supra)*. Hence, there is no illegality, perversity, or jurisdictional error is pointed out in the impugned award.

5. In such circumstances, no valid ground is made out even for issuance of notice to the respondents. The appeal being devoid of merit is, accordingly, dismissed in limine.

11.09.2025  
Saurav Pathania

(VIRINDER AGGARWAL)  
JUDGE

- (i) Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No  
(ii) Whether reportable : Yes/No