

(2009) 04 DEL CK 0293
In the Delhi High Court
Case No : FAO No. 418 of 1998

Dr. Vikram Seth and Another

APPELLANT

Vs

Delhi Transport Corporation and Another

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 20-04-2009

Acts Referred:

Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 — Section 171

Citation : (2009) 04 DEL CK 0293

Hon'ble Judges : Kailash Gambhir, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : O.P. Goyal, for the Appellant; H.S. Dhir, for the Respondent

Judgement

Kailash Gambhir, J.—The present appeal arises out of the award dated 6/8/1998 of the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal whereby the Tribunal awarded a sum of Rs. 5,09,000/- along with interest @ 14% per annum to the claimants.

2. The brief conspectus of the facts is as follows: On 16/9/1992 Mrs. Achala Seth was driving a Maruti van bearing registration No. DEP 8395 while going, with her son, from Civil Lines towards her residence at Lucknow Road, Timarpur. Suddenly a DTC bus bearing registration No. DEP 8395 being driven in a rash and negligent manner came from the opposite direction hit the said van. As a result Mrs. Achala suffered fatal injuries and later on died.

3. A claim petition was filed on 15/3/1993 and an award was passed on 6/8/1998. Aggrieved with the said award enhancement is claimed by way of the present appeal.

4. Sh. O.P. Goyal counsel for the appellants contended that the tribunal has erred in not considering future prospects while computing compensation as it failed to appreciate that the deceased would have earned much more in near future as she was of 38 yrs of age only and would have lived for another 25-35 yrs had she not met with the accident. The counsel submitted that the tribunal has erroneously applied the multiplier of 12 while computing compensation when

according to the facts and circumstances of the case multiplier of 17 should have been applied. It was also alleged by the counsel that the tribunal did not consider the fact that due to high rates of inflation the deceased would have earned much more in near future and the tribunal also failed in appreciating the fact that even the minimum wages are revised twice in an year and hence, the deceased would have earned much more in her life span. The counsel also raised the contention that the rate of interest allowed by the tribunal is on the lower side and the tribunal should have allowed simple interest @ 18% per annum in place of only 14% per annum. The counsel contended that the tribunal has erred in not awarding adequate compensation towards loss of love & affection, funeral expenses, loss of estate, loss of consortium, mental pain and sufferings and the loss of services, which were being rendered by the deceased to the appellants.

5. Nobody appeared for the respondents.

6. I have heard learned Counsel for the appellants and perused the record.

7. As regards the future prospects I am of the view that there is no sufficient material on record to award future prospects. It is no more *res integra* that mere bald assertions regarding the future prospects of the deceased are of no help to the claimants in the absence of any reliable evidence being brought on record. But the tribunal after considering that the deceased was a qualified doctor took into consideration the future prospects of the deceased. Therefore, the tribunal committed no error in granting future prospects in the facts and circumstances of the case.

8. As regards the contention of the counsel for the appellant that the tribunal has erred in applying the multiplier of 12 in the facts and circumstances of the case, I feel that the tribunal has committed no error. This case pertains to the year 1992 and at that time II schedule to the Motor Vehicles Act was not brought on the statute book. The said schedule came on the statute book in the year 1994 and prior to 1994 the law of the land was as laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in 1994 SCC (Cri) 335, G.M., Kerala SRTC v. Susamma Thomas. In the said judgment it was observed by the Court that maximum multiplier of 16 could be applied by the Courts, which after coming in to force of the II schedule has risen to 18. The age of the deceased at the time of the accident was 38 years and she is survived by her husband and two sons. In the facts of the present case, I am of the view that after looking at the age of the claimants and the deceased and after taking a balanced view considering the multiplier applicable as per the II Schedule to the MV Act, the multiplier of 12 has been rightly applied by the tribunal.

9. As regards the issue of interest that the rate of interest of 14% p.a. awarded by the tribunal is on the lower side and the same should be enhanced to 18% p.a., I feel that the rate of interest awarded by the tribunal is just and fair and requires no interference. No rate of interest is fixed u/s 171 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988. The Interest is compensation for forbearance or detention of money

and that interest is awarded to a party only for being kept out of the money, which ought to have been paid to him. Time and again the Hon''ble Supreme Court has held that the rate of interest to be awarded should be just and fair depending upon the facts and circumstances of the case and taking in to consideration relevant factors including inflation, policy being adopted by Reserve Bank of India from time to time and other economic factors. In the facts and circumstances of the case, I do not find any infirmity in the award regarding award of interest @ 14% pa by the tribunal and the same is not interfered with.

10. On the contention regarding that the tribunal has erred in not granting adequate compensation towards loss of love & affection, funeral expenses and loss of estate, whereas, no compensation has been granted towards loss of consortium and the loss of services, which were being rendered by the deceased to the appellants. In this regard compensation towards loss of love and affection is awarded at Rs. 20,000/-; compensation towards funeral expenses is enhanced to Rs. 10,000/- and compensation towards loss of estate is awarded at Rs. 15,000/-. Further, Rs. 50,000/- is awarded towards loss of consortium.

11. As far as the contention pertaining to the awarding of amount towards mental pain and sufferings caused to the appellants due to the sudden demise of the deceased and the loss of services, which were being rendered by the deceased to the appellants is concerned, I do not feel inclined to award any amount as compensation towards the same as the same are not conventional heads of damages.

12. On the basis of the discussion, the total loss of dependency comes to Rs. 4,77,000 as assessed by the tribunal. After considering Rs. 95,000/-, which is granted towards non-pecuniary damages, the total compensation comes out as Rs. 5,72,000/-.

13. In view of the above discussion, the total compensation is enhanced to Rs. 5,72,000/- from Rs. 5,09,000/- with interest on the differential amount @ 7.5% per annum from the date of filing of the petition till realisation and the same should be paid to the appellants by the respondent insurance company in the same proportion as awarded by the tribunal.

14. With the above direction, the present appeal is disposed of.