



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

**230**

**FAO-2510-2017 (O&M)  
Date of decision: 21.08.2025**

**THE NEW INDIA ASSURANCE COMPANY LTD**

**....appellant**

**Versus**

**SIKANDAR & ORS**

**...Respondent**

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

Present : Mr. Pradeep Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Maneet Kaushik, Advocate for

Mr. Ashit Malik, Advocate for respondents No.1 and 2.

Mr. Mohit Giri, Advocate for respondents No.3 and 4.

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

1. Insurance Company is aggrieved by impugned award dated 12.01.2017, passed by Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Kaithal (hereinafter referred as Tribunal) vide which claimants (sons of deceased-Kiran) had sought compensation of Rs.50,00,000/- and were awarded Rs.16,45,000/- along with interest @ 7.5 per cent from the date of filing the petition till realization.

2. The learned Tribunal, after considering the evidence on record, concluded that the deceased was a housewife and applied notional income of Rs. 9,000/-, applied multiplier of 15, as the deceased was 38 years old, and Rs. 25,000/- were awarded towards funeral expenses and determine total compensation to be Rs.16,45,000/-. However, no deductions towards personal expenses were made while calculating dependency nor any future prospects were awarded.

3. Since deceased was housewife therefore notional income determined



- 2-

on the basis of minimum wages payable to unskilled labour and award of multiplier of 15 as deceased was 38 cannot be faulted. Similarly non-award of loss of estate is off set by award of Rs.25,000/- towards funeral expenses. However, in view of the fact that the petitioner was also entitled to a 40 percent addition for future prospects, which was not granted by the learned Tribunal, this Court does not find any substantial change in the overall compensation awarded by the learned Tribunal, by not deducting any personal expenses of deceased. On determination of compensation applying judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of "Sarla Verma & Ors Vs. Delhi Transport Corporation and Anr. [(2009) 6 SCC 121], and National Insurance Company Ltd. vs. Pranay Sethi & Ors. [(2017) 16 SCC 680]" the compensation would be approximately similar (rather little higher specially when consortium is not awarded) to that awarded by the Tribunal.

4. In view of these facts, no interference with the impugned order is warranted.
5. Present appeal is hereby dismissed.

21.08.2025  
amandeep

(PARMOD GOYAL)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No  
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No