



HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
TUESDAY ,THE TWENTY SEVENTH DAY OF SEPTEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY TWO

PRSENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE B V L N CHAKRAVARTHI

MOTOR ACCIDENT CIVIL MISCELLANEOUS APPEAL NO: 114 OF 2021

Between:

1. The Oriental Insurance Company Limited, Rep. by its Branch Manager.
Extension Office,
Machilipatnam.

...PETITIONER(S)

AND:

1. Pamarthi Gangadhara Rao S/o. Saibabu, aged about 27 years. R/o.
Tarakaturu Village,
Guduru Mandal, Krishna District
2. Rayi Bulli Babu, S/o. Nancharaiah,
Aged about 32 years,
Driver of Innova car
bearing No. AP-16-CN-2525,
R/o. Mallavolu, Krishna District.
3. Jammisetti Sarala Devi, W/o. Ramoji Rao,
Aged about 38 years,
Owner of Innova Car
bearing No. AP-16-CN-2525.
R/o. D No.. 4-103111. Rajupet,
Machilipatnam. Krishna District-521001
(Respondent N.2 is not a necessary party)

...RESPONDENTS

Counsel for the Petitioner(s): A JAYANTHI

Counsel for the Respondents: K VENKATESH

The Court made the following: ORDER



HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

M.A.C.M.A.No.114 OF 2021

Between:

The Oriental Insurance Company Limited,
Rep. By its Branch Manager, Extension Office,
Machilipatnam.Appellant/R-3

Versus

1. Pamarthi Gangadhara Rao,
S/o.Saibabu, Aged 27 years,
R/o. Tarakaturu Village,
Guduru Mandal,
Krishna District.
2. Rayi Bulli Babu, S/o.Nancharaiah,
Aged 32 years, Driver of Innova Car
Bearing No.AP 16 CN 2525,
R/o.Mallavolu Village,
Krishna District.
3. Jammisetti Sarala Devi,
W/o. Ramoji Rao, Aged 38 years,
Owner of Innova Car
Bearing No.AP 16 CN 2525,
R/o.D.No.4-1031/1, Rajupet,
Machilipatnam,
Krishna District.Respondents

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED : 27.09.2022



SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE B.V.L.N.CHAKRAVARTHI

1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers
may be allowed to see the Judgment? Yes/No
2. Whether the copy of Judgment may be
marked to Law Reporters/Journals? Yes/No
3. Whether His Lordship wish to see the
fair copy of the Judgment? Yes/No

B.V.L.N.CHAKRAVARTHI, J



*** HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE B.V.L.N.CHAKRAVARTHI**

+ M.A.C.M.A.No.114 OF 2021

% 27.09.2022

Between:

The Oriental Insurance Company Limited,
Rep. By its Branch Manager, Extension Office,
Machilipatnam.Appellant/R-3

Versus

1. Pamarthi Gangadhara Rao,
S/o.Saibabu, Aged 27 years,
R/o. Tarakaturu Village,
Guduru Mandal,
Krishna District.
2. Rayi Bulli Babu, S/o.Nancharaiah,
Aged 32 years, Driver of Innova Car
Bearing No.AP 16 CN 2525,
R/o.Mallavolu Village,
Krishna District.
3. Jammisetti Sarala Devi,
W/o. Ramoji Rao, Aged 38 years,
Owner of Innova Car
Bearing No.AP 16 CN 2525,
R/o.D.No.4-1031/1, Rajupet,
Machilipatnam,
Krishna District.Respondents

! Counsel for the Appellant : Smt.A.Jayanthi

**^ Counsel for the
Respondent No.1** : Sri K.Venkatesh

^ Counsel for the Respondents No.2 & 3 : ---



< Gist:

> Head Note:

? Cases referred:

- 1. (2015) 7 SCC 2154**
- 2. (2011) 14 SC 481**
- 3. 2019 ACJ 1806**
- 4. 2020 ACJ 25**
- 5. 2011 ACJ 1**
- 6. 2009 ACJ 1298**
- 7. 2016 ACJ 1142**
- 8. (2013) 15 SCC 45**
- 9. (2014) 1 Supreme Court Cases 244**

This Court made the following:



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE B.V.L.N.CHAKRAVARTHI

M.A.C.M.A.No.114 OF 2021

JUDGMENT:

This appeal is preferred by the 3rd respondent/Oriental Insurance Company, challenging the award dated 23.04.2020 passed in M.V.O.P.No.194/2016 on the file of Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal-cum-I Addl. District Judge, Machilipatnam, wherein the Tribunal while partly allowing the petition, awarded compensation of Rs.20,32,800/- with interest @ 9% P.A. from the date of petition, till the date of realisation to the petitioner, for the injuries sustained by the petitioner.

2. For the sake of convenience, the parties are arrayed as parties in the lower Court.

3. As seen from the record, originally the petitioner filed an application U/s.166 of Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (for brevity "the Act") claiming compensation of Rs.30,00,000/- on account of the injuries and disability sustained by the petitioner in a road accident occurred on 02.12.2015 while the petitioner was going on motor cycle bearing No.AP 16 CN 8646 to attend his duty and at about 09.45 a.m. when he



reached Chitti Guduru village cross road on Machilipatnam-Vijayawada High Way, at that time, the 1st respondent being the driver of Innova car bearing No.AP16 CN 2525 came in his opposite direction in a rash and negligent manner and dashed the motor cycle of the petitioner, as a result of which, the right leg of the petitioner was cut off and the petitioner received other multiple injuries over his body.

4. The facts show that 02.12.2015 while the petitioner was going on motor cycle bearing No.AP 16 CN 8646 to attend his duty and at about 09.45 a.m. when he reached Chitti Guduru village cross road on Machilipatnam-Vijayawada High Way, at that time, the 1st respondent being the driver of Innova car bearing No.AP16 CN 2525 came in his opposite direction in a rash and negligent manner and dashed the motor cycle of the petitioner. On account of the said accident, the petitioner was shifted to Government General Hospital, Machilipatnam in 108 ambulance, where he was given first aid. On receipt of hospital intimation, the Out Post Police recorded the statement of the petitioner and the same was registered as FIR in Cr.No.118/2015 of Gudur P.S. for the offence punishable U/s.338 of Indian Penal Code. Subsequently, the petitioner was referred to Time Hospital, Vijayawada, for expert treatment, where a team of doctors treated the petitioner and amputated his right leg. He took treatment for a period



of 10 days and spent Rs.3,00,000/- towards medical expenses. After discharged from the said hospital, the petitioner took treatment as out-patient. Subsequently, the petitioner again took treatment as in-patient in the same hospital for a period of one week. The petitioner spent a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- towards travelling expenses and Rs.1,00,000/- towards extra nourishment. In view of the injuries sustained by the petitioner, he is unable to walk, unable to attend nature calls and depending on his family members. He appointed an attendant to render assistance to him and has been paying Rs.9,000/- per month. The motor cycle of the petitioner was badly damaged. The petitioner suffered mentally, physically and psychologically. He has completed M.C.A. and has bright future. He was unmarried and due to amputation of his right leg, he is unable to attend his job and he lost marriage opportunities.

5. Before the Tribunal, the 1st respondent/driver of the Innova car filed counter, denying the petition averments and contended that the bills filed by the petitioner are all fabricated and obtained for the purpose of false claim. The 2nd respondent i.e., owner of the said Innova car remained exparte.

6. The 3rd respondent/Insurance Company, who is the Appellant in the petition, filed counter resisting while traversing the material



averments with regard to proof of age, avocation, monthly earnings of the petitioner, manner of accident, rash and negligence on the part of the driver of the Innova car, nature of injuries, medical expenditure, alleged permanent disability and liability to pay compensation and contended that the driver of the crime vehicle was not having valid and effective driving license at the time of accident, thereby the 2nd respondent violated the terms and conditions of the insurance policy. The petitioner did not file any documentary proof regarding medical bills and other expenses. The petition is bad for non-joinder of owner and insurer of motor cycle bearing No.AP16 CN 8646. There was no contractual liability to pay interest between the insured and insurer.

7. On the strength of the pleadings of both parties, the Tribunal framed the following issues:

1. Whether the petitioner sustained injuries due to rash and negligent driving of R-1 Innova Car bearing No.AP 16 CN 2525?
2. Whether accident occurred due to contributory negligence of the petitioner?
3. Whether the petitioner is entitled to compensation? If so, to what amount and from which of the respondents?
4. To what relief?



8. To substantiate his claim, the petitioner examined P.Ws-1 to 6 and got marked Exs.A-1 to A-14 and Exs.X-1 to X-3. No oral or documentary evidence adduced by the respondents No.1 and 3.

9. The Tribunal, taking into consideration the evidence of P.Ws-1 to 6, coupled with Exs.A-1 to A-14 and Exs.X-1 to X-3, held that the accident took place due to rash and negligent driving of the driver of the Innova car, and further, taking into consideration of the evidence of P.Ws-1 to 6 corroborated by Exs.A-1 to A-14 and Exs.X-1 to X-3, awarded a compensation of Rs.20,32,800/- with interest @ 9% P.A. from the date of petition, till the date of realisation.

10. The contention of the 3rd respondent/Insurance Company is that the driver of the crime vehicle was not having valid and effective driving license at the time of accident, thereby the 2nd respondent violated the terms and conditions of the insurance policy.

11. The Tribunal considered the evidence on record, and based on the contentions of both parties, held that the accident occurred due to the rash and negligent driving of the 1st respondent/driver of Innova car and that the petitioner sustained injuries due to the said accident.

12. The contention of the Appellant/Insurance Company is that the Tribunal erred in awarding compensation of Rs.20,32,800/- as



compensation and that it is excessive and on higher side. The Appellant also contended that the Tribunal erred in granting 60% disability towards amputation of leg and the Tribunal ought not to have taken the income of the injured as Rs.12,000/- per month without any cogent evidence, and the Tribunal erred in granting Rs.1,00,000/- towards injuries and granting Rs.1,00,000/- towards pain and suffering and the Tribunal erred in granting interest @ 9% P.A., which is excessive and contrary to the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Sarla Verma's case**, where under interest was granted at 6% P.A. only, and that the Tribunal failed to appreciate that the driver of the vehicle was not having valid license at the time of accident and the Tribunal ought to have dismissed the claim against the Insurance Company.

13. The learned counsel for Appellant/Insurance Company contended that, the Tribunal did not appreciate the evidence on record properly, and fixed the disability at 60%, which is excessive and on higher side and further, the Tribunal granted interest at 9% P.A. without any valid reasons, and would have granted interest at 6% P.A. only, considering the present rate of interest as per Reserve Bank of India circulars and guidelines.



14. The learned counsel for claimant vehemently opposed the contention of the Appellant/Insurance Company and submitted that the Tribunal has considered all the facts and came to a right conclusion and awarded interest at 9% P.A. as per judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Jakir Hussein Vs. Sabir**¹, which referred another judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Municipal Corporation of Delhi Vs. Association of Victims of Uphaar Tragedy**².

15. The case of the respondent/claimant is that he was aged 27 years at the time of accident and working as System Administrator in Chief Planning Office, District Collectorate at Machilipatnam and drawing an amount of Rs.19,000/- per month towards salary and on 02.12.2015 at about 09.15 a.m. he was going to attend duty and when he reached Chitti Guduru village cross road on Machilipatnam-Vijayawada National High Way, the 1st respondent/driver, who was coming in opposite direction, driving an Innova car bearing No.AP 16 CN 2525, drove the car in a rash or negligent manner and dashed the motor cycle of the claimant and as a result, the right leg of the claimant was cut off and he also sustained multiple injuries over his

¹ (2015) 7 SCC 2154

² (2011) 14 SC 481



body and immediately he was shifted to Government Hospital, Machilipatnam, and he was given first aid and later shifted to Time Hospital, Vijayawada and there his right leg was amputated to save his life and the claimant spent nearly Rs.3,00,000/- towards medical expenses and he was hospitalised for 10 days and subsequently also he has taken treatment as in-patient for another week and later he was also going to the hospital from his native place to Vijayawada in a car and incurred Rs.1,00,000/- towards travelling expenses, Rs.1,00,000/- towards extra nourishment and due to amputation of leg, he is unable to walk and suffering from physical disability and depending on the mercy of his family members even to attend nature calls and he got appointed an attendant to attend him by paying Rs.9,000/- per month to the attendant and the claimant studied M.C.A. course and he is having bright future and he is an unmarried person and due to amputation of right leg, he is unable to get good job and lost marriage opportunities and he made a claim for Rs.30,00,000/-.

16. The owner of the crime vehicle remained exparte and did not contest the case before the Tribunal. In the Appeal also, the owner remained exparte inspite of notice served on him.



17. The driver of the crime vehicle contended that, the averments of the petition made by the claimant are not true and correct, and he shall prove the expenditure incurred by him for the treatment. The Appellant/Insurance Company contended that, the driver of the crime vehicle was not having any valid and effective driving license, and therefore, the driver and owner of the crime vehicle violated the terms of the policy, and sought protection U/s.147 and 149 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1989 and that the claim of the petitioner is not based on any recognized norms, and the compensation claimed is excessive, exorbitant and the petition is bad for non-joinder of necessary parties i.e., owner, and Insurance Company of the motor cycle on the ground that the petitioner's negligence also contributed for the accident, and there was no contractual liability to pay interest between the insurer and the insured.

18. The Tribunal considered the evidence of the claimant, who was examined as P.W-1 regarding the manner in which the accident was occurred, and held that the evidence of the claimant was corroborated by other circumstances show that the crime vehicle was coming in opposite direction, dashed the motor cycle of the claimant, and that the driver drove the vehicle in a rash or negligent manner, and without blowing horn, dashed the motor cycle of the petitioner and further held



that the contention of the Insurance Company that the claimant contributed to the extent is not supported by any evidence, and the Insurance Company did not choose to adduce any evidence to prove the said contention and further, the driver was not examined to speak about the said fact and as such, the contention of the Insurance Company is not supported by any evidence. In that view of the matter, I do not find any illegality or irregularity in the findings of the Tribunal regarding rash or negligent driving of the 1st respondent/driver.

19. The Tribunal held that the age of the claimant was 27 years at the time of accident and the Tribunal considered Ex.A-14 disability certificate issued by District Medical Board to fix the age of the petitioner as 27 years as on the date of accident. The Tribunal considered the evidence produced by the claimant regarding his income and Ex.A-12 salary certificate issued by the Proprietor of NDR Marketing Associates and P.W-3, who is the Proprietor of NDR Marketing Associates and certified the veracity of Ex.A-12 salary certificate.

20. The Tribunal considered the educational qualification of the claimant as M.C.A. and held that he is a skilled Post Graduate in Computer Applications and relying on the judgments of the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the case of **Managing Director, Tamil Nadu**



State Transport Corporation Limited Vs. P.Jagatannatan and another³ and **B.Balamurugan Vs. M.Dhandapani and another⁴**, and also the prevailing rates in the State of Andhra Pradesh during the year 2015, and fixed the notional income of the claimant as Rs.12,000/- per month and arrived the annual income at Rs.1,44,000/- per annum.

21. The Tribunal also considered the fact that amputation of right leg was a permanent disability, and also considered Ex.A-2 wound certificate issued by the medical authorities and the evidence of P.W-5 doctor, who treated the claimant, and found that the claimant sustained a fracture injury, which is a grievous injury and awarded a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- to the petitioner for amputation of right leg above knee level.

22. The Tribunal also considered Ex.A-14 disability certificate issued by the Medical Board. The contention of the Insurance Company is that the disability sustained by the petitioner is only 20%, but not 88% as ordered by the Medical Board. The Tribunal considered about the functional disability of the petitioner on account of physical disability

³ 2019 ACJ 1806

⁴ 2020 ACJ 25



and assessed the sum at 60% functional disability. The Tribunal considered the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Raj Kumar Vs. Ajay Kumar and another**⁵ relied by the claimant regarding loss of future earnings of the injured persons with preference to permanent disability and applied multiplier 17, as per judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Sarla Verma and others Vs. Delhi Road Transport Corporation and another**⁶ and calculated the loss of future earnings at Rs.1,44,000 x 17 x 60/100 = Rs.14,68,800/-.

23. The Tribunal considered Ex.A-5 and Ex.A-6 discharge summary along with Ex.X-3 case sheet maintained by Time Hospitals, Vijayawada, where the claimant was admitted as in-patient for his treatment and also considered the evidence of P.W-5, the doctor who treated the claimant in the said hospital and awarded a sum of Rs.36,000/- towards loss of income during the treatment period i.e., Rs.12,000 x 3 = Rs.36,000/-.

24. The Tribunal considered the medical bills produced by the claimant towards the expenses incurred by him for the treatment, which are covered under Ex.A-7, Ex.A-8 and Ex.A-9 final bill and also

⁵ 2011 ACJ 1

⁶ 2009 ACJ 1298



considered the evidence of P.W-5, who certified about issuing of Exs.A-7 to A-9 bills by their hospital, and awarded a sum of Rs.1,03,000/-, out of Rs.3,00,000/- claimed by the claimant.

25. The Tribunal awarded a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- towards pain and suffering, in view of amputation of right leg of the claimant and awarded a sum of Rs.10,000/- towards transport charges. The Tribunal awarded Rs.15,000/- towards extra nourishment since the claimant underwent treatment for long time.

26. The Tribunal after considering the evidence of the claimant and P.W-4, awarded a sum of Rs.2,00,000/- against the claim of Rs.4,65,000/- for the expenditure incurred for artificial limb, and Tribunal relied on the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Zahir Khan Vs. Arun Mandal**⁷ on this aspect. The Tribunal did not award any amount towards attendant charges on the ground that the claimant did not prove his claim for the attendant charges.

27. Therefore, the Tribunal after considering the oral evidence as well as documentary evidence produced by the claimant in support his claim as discussed above, awarded compensation as follows:

⁷ 2016 ACJ 1142



<u>Heads</u>	<u>Compensation in Rs.</u>
Injuries	1,00,000-00
Loss of future income on account of the disability	14,68,800-00
Loss of income during convalescent period	36,000-00
Medical expenses	1,03,000-00
Pain and suffering	1,00,000-00
Transportation charges	10,000-00
Extra nourishment	15,000-00
Artificial Limb	2,00,000-00
Total =	20,32,800-00

28. The Tribunal considered the contention of the Insurance Company that the driver of the crime vehicle was not having license and held that the Insurance Company except taking a plea, did not adduce any evidence on this aspect, and therefore, the contention of the Insurance Company cannot be accepted.

29. The Tribunal found that the policy was in force at the time of accident and therefore, the Insurance Company is liable to indemnify the owner of the crime vehicle as per terms of the policy, as there are no violations of the policy terms and conditions. In that view of the



matter, I do not find any reason to interfere with the finding of the Tribunal on the above aspect.

30. The learned counsel for Appellant/Insurance Company vehemently argued that the Tribunal awarded interest @ 9% P.A., which is excessive and exorbitant, and it was not based on any sound reasons and that the interest may be reduced to 6% P.A.

31. The learned counsel for Appellant/Insurance Company relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Sri Benson George Vs. Reliance General Insurance Company Limited and another in Civil Appeal No.1540 of 2022**, and the order of Hon'ble High Court of Madhya Pradesh in the case of **Oriental Insurance Company Limited, Indore Vs. Deepti and others in Misc.Appeal No.1487 of 2021**.

32. The learned counsel for claimant submitted arguments that the Tribunal has considered the relevant circumstances for awarding interest at 9% P.A. and relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Jakir Hussein Vs. Sabir**, and therefore, there are no grounds to interfere with the findings of the Tribunal in awarding interest at 9% P.A.



33. Section 171 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1989 deals with award of interest, where any claim is allowed. In the said provision, no rate of interest has been fixed and duty is bestowed upon the Tribunal to fix the rate of interest according to the well settled principles. It must be exercised judicially on the basis of the facts and circumstances of a particular case.

34. In the case on hand, the claim was made for Rs.30,00,000/-. The Insurance Company has taken several pleas and contested the matter. The claim application was made in the year 2016. It was disposed of in the year 2020 i.e., almost after 4 years. An amount of Rs.20,32,800/- was only awarded against the claim of Rs.30,00,000/-. The Tribunal awarded interest at 9% P.A. from the date of petition, till the date of deposit. The Tribunal in its award has followed the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Jakir Hussein Vs. Sabir**, wherein it is held as follows:

“As regards the rate of interest to be awarded on the compensation awarded in this appeal, we are of the view that the Tribunal and High Court have erred in granting interest at only 07% p.a. and 08% p.a. respectively on the total compensation amount instead of 09% p.a. by applying the decision of this Court in Municipal Corporation of Delhi Vs. Association of Victims of



Uphaar Tragedy. Accordingly, we award the interest @ 09% p.a. on the compensation determined in the present appeal.”

35. The Appellant relied on the judgment in the case of **Sri Benson George Vs. Reiance General Insurance Company Limited and another**, wherein the Hon’ble Apex Court held at para 8.2 as follows:

“Now so far as the impugned judgment and order passed by the High Court reducing the amount of interest from 9% to 6% per annum is concerned, in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, the same is not required to be interfered with by this Court in exercise of powers under Article 136 of the Constitution of India”.

Hence, this judgment will not help to the case of the Appellant, in the case on hand.

36. The Appellant also relied upon the judgment in the case of **Puttamma and others Vs. K.L.Narayana Reddy and another**⁸, wherein the Hon’ble Apex Court held as follows:

“section 171 of M.V.Act empowers the Tribunal to direct that ‘in addition to the amount of compensation simple interest shall also be paid at such rate and from such date not earlier than the date of making the claim as may be specified in this behalf’ and that earlier 12% was found to be the reasonable rate of simple interest.

⁸ (2013) 15 SCC 45



With a change in economy and the policy of Reserve Bank of India, the interest rate has been lowered. The nationalised banks are now granting interest at the rate of 9% on fixed deposits for one year. We, therefore, direct that the compensation amount fixed hereinbefore shall bear interest at the rate of 9% per annum from the date of the claim made by the appellants”.

37. In view of the above principles laid down by the Hon’ble Apex Court, it is clear that the rate of interest must be just and reasonable depending on the facts and circumstances of the case, and should be decided after taking into consideration relevant factors like inflation, change in economy, policy being adopted by Reserve Bank of India from time to time, how long the case is pending, loss of employment of life, etc.,”.

38. In the present case, the injured was a young person, aged about 27 years and he is a Post Graduate in Computer Applications and the Tribunal awarded compensation of Rs.20,32,800/- with interest at 9% P.A. The application was filed in the year 2016. The Hon’ble Apex Court in the case of **Jakir Hussein Vs. Sabir** awarded interest at 9% P.A. by applying law laid down by the Hon’ble Apex Court in the case of **Municipal Corporation of Delhi Vs. Association of Victims of Uphaar Tragedy**. The Hon’ble Apex Court in the case of **Kishan**



Gopal and another Vs. Lala and others⁹, also awarded interest at 9% P.A. for the reason that the Insurance Company has been opposing the claim without settling their legitimate claim for about 21 years, and that if the Insurance Company had award and paid just and reasonable compensation to the Appellant, the same could have been either invested or kept in fixed deposit, then the amount could have 5 times more, than what is awarded today in this appeal and therefore, awarding 9% P.A. interest on the compensation award in favour of the Appellant is legally justified.

39. In the case on hand, as the claim petition was filed in the year 2016, and Insurance Company has been contesting the claim from 2016 till today without settling the legitimate claim.

40. In that view of the matter, I do not find any valid reasons or grounds to interfere with the interest granted by the Tribunal at 9% P.A. from the date of claim petition, till the date of deposit of compensation amount by the Appellant/Insurance Company.

41. In the light of above discussion, I do not find any merits in the appeal and the appeal is liable to be dismissed.

⁹ (2014) 1 Supreme Court Cases 244



42. In the result, the Appeal is dismissed, by confirming the award dated 23.04.2020 passed in M.V.O.P.No.194/2016 on the file of Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal-cum-I Addl. District Judge, Machilipatnam. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, miscellaneous applications pending, if any, shall stand closed.

27.09.2022

psk

B.V.L.N.CHAKRAVARTHI, J



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE B.V.L.N.CHAKRAVARTHI

M.A.C.M.A.No.114 OF 2021

Note: Mark L.R.Copy.

psk

27th September, 2022

psk