



IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

2025 INSC 165

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 2204 OF 2025  
(Arising out of SLP(C)No.5541/2023)

**HARE KRUSHNA MAHANTA** ... APPELLANT(S)

**VERSUS**

**HIMADARI SAHU & ANR.** ... RESPONDENT(S)

**ORDER**

Time taken for disposal of the claim petition by MACT 3 years	Time taken for disposal of the appeal by the High Court 3 years	Time taken for disposal of the appeal in this Court 2 years 2 months
--	--	---

Leave granted.

2. This appeal is directed against the Judgment and Order dated 4<sup>th</sup> April, 2022 in MACA No.954 of 2019 passed by the High Court of Orissa at Cuttack, which in turn was preferred against the Judgment and Order dated 13<sup>th</sup> December, 2019 passed in MAC No.77 of 2016 by the 2<sup>nd</sup> Additional District Judge-cum-3<sup>rd</sup> Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Cuttack.

3. The brief facts giving rise to this appeal are that on 6<sup>th</sup> December, 2016, the Claimant-Appellant, aged 51 years, working as a Primary School Teacher at Kadodihi, was returning from the school on his motorcycle bearing No.OR-14-V-6869 with his colleague, namely, Sabita Mahanta, riding on the extremely left side of the road. The offending vehicle bearing No.OR-19-M-4347, coming from the opposite direction of the road, driving rashly and negligently, dashed into the Claimant-Appellant from the

front, thus injuring him seriously. He was taken to Lahunipada CHC for treatment and was, then, shifted to Kaling Hospital Pvt. Ltd., Chandrasekharpur, Bhubaneswar, where he was treated from 7<sup>th</sup> December, 2013 to 22<sup>th</sup> December, 2013. Subsequently, he also got treatment at ISPAT General Hospital, Rourkela. During treatment, the Claimant-Appellant underwent surgery, and a nail was inserted in his right leg.

4. In connection with this incident, FIR No.100/2013 was registered under Sections 279, 337, 338 of the Indian Penal Code by the husband of the other injured person, Sabita Mahanta, at IIC, Lahunipada Police Station.

5. The Claimant-Appellant filed an application for compensation under the Motor Vehicle Act, 1988, seeking compensation to the tune of Rs. 15,00,000/-, submitting therein that he was working as a Primary School Teacher earning Rs.19,000/- per month at the time of the accident and also has spent Rs.10,00,000/- towards medical treatment, also suffered pain and loss of income.

6. The Tribunal, by its Order, proceeded *ex-parte* against Respondent No.1 and held Respondent No.2, the Insurance company, liable to pay an amount of Rs.6,17,515/- along with interest @ 7%. The Tribunal considered permanent disability suffered by the Appellant as 10% and took his income to be Rs. 16,340/- per month on the basis of his salary certificate.

7. Being aggrieved with the amount of compensation awarded, the Claimant-Appellant filed an appeal before the High Court for enhancement on the ground that

the Tribunal had incorrectly appreciated the nature of the injury and further claimed permanent disability to the extent of 40%.

8. The High Court, vide the impugned order, enhanced the amount awarded to the Claimant-Appellant with an additional consolidated sum of Rs.60,000/.

9. We have heard the learned counsel for the parties. It is borne from the record that the Claimant-Appellant had agreed on the additional consolidated sum granted by the High Court. It is imperative for this Court, however, to reiterate that despite such consent, the objective when granting compensation under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, is to ensure just and fair compensation is paid to the aggrieved party. This came to be reiterated by this Court recently in *Meena Devi v. Nunu Chand Mahto*<sup>1</sup>, wherein it was observed:

“17. The Tribunal/Court ought to award "just" compensation which is reasonable in the facts relying upon the evidence produced on record. Therefore, less valuation, if any, made in the claim petition would not be impediment to award just compensation exceeding the claimed amount.”

10. As a result of the discussion above, the compensation payable to the Claimant-Appellant in accordance with law is as follows:

#### FINAL COMPENSATION

Compensation Heads	Amount Awarded	In Accordance with:
Monthly Income ( <i>Salary Certificate</i> )	Rs.16,340/-	<b>National Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Pranay Sethi</b> (2017) 16 SCC 680 <i>Para 42 &amp; 59</i>
Yearly Income	16,340 X 12 = Rs.1,96,080/-	
Future Prospects (30%) age 51 years	1,96,080 + 58,824 = Rs.2,54,904/-	
Multiplier (11)	2,54,904 x 11 = Rs.28,03,944/-	
Permanent Disability	Rs.11,21,578/-	

<sup>1</sup> (2023) 1 SCC 204

(40%)		
Medical Expenses	Rs.3,08,827/-	<b>Kajal v. Jagdish Chand</b> (2020) 4 SCC 413 <i>Para 19 and 25</i>
Attendant Charges	16,340 x 11 = Rs.1,79,740/-	
Special Diet & Transportation	Rs.40,000/-	<b>Sidram v. Divisional Manager, United India Insurance Ltd.</b> (2023) 3 SCC 439 <i>Para 89</i>
Pain and Suffering	Rs.1,00,000/-	<b>K.S. Muralidhar v. R. Subbulakshmi and Anr.</b> 2024 SCC Online SC 3385 <i>Para 13 and 14</i>
Loss of Income during treatment For 2 months	16,340 X 2 = Rs.32,680/-	<b>Raj Kumar v. Ajay Kumar</b> (2011) 1 SCC 343 <i>Para 6</i>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>Rs.17,82,825/-</b>

Thus, the difference in compensation is as under:

<b>MACT</b>	<b>High Court</b>	<b>This Court</b>
Rs. 6,17,515	Rs. 6,77,515	Rs.17,82,825/-

11. The Civil Appeal is allowed in the aforesaid terms. The impugned award dated 13<sup>th</sup> December, 2019 passed in MAC No.77 of 2016 by the 2<sup>nd</sup> Additional District Judge-cum-3<sup>rd</sup> Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Cuttack as modified in terms of the impugned order, stands further modified to the above extent. Interest is to be paid as awarded by the Tribunal.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

.....J.  
(SANJAY KAROL)

.....J.  
(PRASHANT KUMAR MISHRA)

**New Delhi;**  
**February 7, 2025.**