
(2016) 09 SHI CK 0095
In the High Court Of Himachal Pradesh
Case No : FAO No. 239 of 2011

Oriental Insurance Company Ltd	Vs	APPELLANT
Gurdeep Singh		RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 23-09-2016

Acts Referred:

Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 — Section 147, Section 149, Section 170

Citation : (2017) AAC 134

Hon'ble Judges : Mr. J. Mansoor Ahmad Mir, CJ.

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Mr. Raman Sethi, Advocate, for the Respondent No. 1; Mr. Ajay Chandel, Advocate, for the Appellant; Already Exparte, for the Respondent No. 2

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Mansoor Ahmad Mir, C.J (Oral) - Subject matter of this appeal is the award dated 30th March, 2011, made by the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal-II, Solan, District Solan, H.P. (hereinafter referred to as "the Tribunal") in M.A.C. Petition No. 10-NL/2 of 2008, titled as Gurdeep Singh alias Bhag Singh v. M/s Shree Rama Steel Ltd., whereby compensation to the tune of Rs. 1,20,000/- with interest at the rate of 9% per annum from the date of filing of the claim petition, was granted in favour of the claimant and the insurer came to be saddled with liability (for short, "the impugned award").

2. The claimant and owner-insured have not questioned the impugned award, on any count. Thus, it has attained finality, so far it relates to them.

3. The appellant-insurer has questioned the impugned award on the ground of adequacy of compensation.

4. The question is - whether the appeal is maintainable? The answer is in the negative for the following reasons:

5. In terms of the mandate of Sections 147 and 149 of the Motor Vehicles Act,

1988 (for short "MV Act") read with the terms and conditions contained in the insurance policy, the insurer has limited grounds available, but, it can contest the claim petition on other grounds provided permission in terms of Section 170 of the MV Act has been obtained.

6. This question arose before the Apex Court in the case titled as United India Insurance co. Ltd. v. Shila Datta & Ors., reported in 2011 AIR SCW 6541, and the matter was referred to the larger Bench.

7. The question again arose before the Apex Court in the case titled as Josphine James v. United India Insurance Co. Ltd. & Anr., reported in 2013 AIR SCW 6633. It is apt to reproduce paras 8, 17 and 18 of the judgment herein:

"8. Aggrieved by the impugned judgment and award passed by the High Court in MAC Appeal no. 433/2005 and the review petition, the present appeal is filed by the appellant urging certain grounds and assailing the impugned judgment in allowing the appeal of the Insurance Company without following the law laid down by this Court in Nicolletta Rohtagi's case and instead, placing reliance upon the Bhushan Sachdeva's case. Nicolletta Rohtagi's case was exhaustively discussed by a three judge bench in the case of United India Insurance Company v. Shila Datta, 2011 10 SCC 509. Though the Court has expressed its reservations against the correctness of the legal position in Nicolletta Rohtagi decision on various aspects, the same has been referred to higher bench and has not been overruled as yet. Hence, the ratio of Nicolletta Rohtagi's case will be still applicable in the present case. The appellant claimed that interference by the High Court with the quantum of compensation awarded by the Tribunal in favour of appellant and considerably reducing the same by modifying the judgment of the Tribunal is vitiated in law. Therefore, the impugned judgments and awards are liable to be set aside.

9. to 16.

17. The said order was reviewed by the High Court at the instance of the appellant in view of the aforesaid decision on the question of maintainability of the appeal of the Insurance Company. The High Court, in the review petition, has further reduced the compensation to Rs. 4,20,000/- from Rs. 6,75,000/- which was earlier awarded by it. This approach is contrary to the facts and law laid down by this Court. The High Court, in reducing the quantum of compensation under the heading of loss of dependency of the appellant, was required to follow the decision rendered by three judge Bench of this Court in Nicolletta Rohtagi case (2002) 7 SCC 456 : AIR 2002 SC 3350 : 2002 AIR SCW 3899, and earlier decisions wherein this Court after interpreting Section 170 (b) of the M. V. Act, has rightly held that in the absence of permission obtained by the Insurance Company from the Tribunal to avail the defence of the insured, it is not permitted to contest the case on merits. The aforesaid legal principle is applicable to the fact situation in view of the three judge bench decision referred to though the correctness of the aforesaid decision is referred to larger bench. This important

aspect of the matter has been overlooked by the High Court while passing the impugned judgment and the said approach is contrary to law laid down by this Court.

18. In view of the aforesaid reasons, the Insurance Company is not entitled to file appeal questioning the quantum of compensation awarded in favour of the appellant for the reasons stated supra. In the absence of the same, the Insurance Company had only limited defence to contest in the proceedings as provided under Section 149 (2) of the M.V. Act. Therefore, the impugned judgment passed by the High Court on 13.1.2012 reducing the compensation to Rs. 4,20,000/- under the heading of loss of dependency by deducting 50% from the monthly income of the deceased of Rs. 5,000/- and applying 14 multiplier, is factually and legally incorrect. The High Court has erroneously arrived at this amount by applying the principle of law laid down in *Sarla Verma v. Delhi Transport Corporation*, 2009 6 SCC 121 instead of applying the principle laid down in *Baby Radhika Gupta's* case regarding the multiplier applied to the fact situation and also contrary to the law applicable regarding the maintainability of appeal of the Insurance Company on the question of quantum of compensation in the absence of permission to be obtained by it from the Tribunal under Section 170 (b) of the M.V. Act. In view of the aforesaid reason, the High Court should not have allowed the appeal of the Insurance Company as it has got limited defence as provided under section 149(2) of the M.V. Act. Therefore, the impugned judgment and award is vitiated in law and hence, is liable to be set aside by allowing the appeal of the appellant."

8. Thus, the insurer can question the adequacy of compensation only if it has sought permission under Section 170 of the MV Act.

9. In the present case, it has to be seen whether the insurer has sought any such permission?

10. I have gone through the record, which does disclose that neither any such application was filed by the insurer nor such permission was granted.

11. Having said so, the only ground of attack projected and urged is not available to the insurer. However, I have gone through the record. The claimant has become the victim of the motor vehicular accident, was admitted in the Civil Hospital, Nalagarh, was referred to PGI, Chandigarh and has placed on record OPD slips Ext. PW-3/B to PW-3/D. The amount of compensation appears to be too meager. But, unfortunately, the claimant has not questioned the same, is reluctantly upheld.

12. Viewed thus, the impugned award is upheld and the appeal is dismissed.

13. The Registry is directed to release the awarded amount in favour of the claimant-injured, strictly as per the terms and conditions contained in the impugned award through payee's account cheque or by depositing the same in his bank account.

14. Send down the record after placing copy of the judgment on Tribunal's file.