Karnataka High Court

P Prakash S/O Perumal vs Papaiah on 9 June, 2008

Author: Anand Byrareddy

uuau ur nnxmnlnlxn HIE.-i:-1 COOK?" O'F..KARNATAKA H£GH COURT OF KARNATAKA HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA HIGH COURT 36 'mg 3193 cmm 1}? xammaam AT " m;r~E§ '2':-:53 mg saw 953' 9? C I' BEFOR2§ mg zmzrsnz mt. waasmfbzrsy O gamma: '3 vmwsic j' C mmamarz'21'¢ 1 x;n3'aa§;a'mg.--caz.OH¥;"1s*rtaz,iegx,: §5 §%, mmmai□ban E!s1i'G.□,Git□}Dm'?i'I¥IGT._'._ A ~ ; '.-._ "

I 3}' 9' 4jlB§K£'hIGR ., _ " .V \$"n□Ek§□§'T.I_EA H9313, ' , DISTHCT.

2 mt am &gs:.cHa u 3 .. smasmnmsumxcn cc.

"V "xHo.9;:,I1I.scoRanAD ..BB.EG.£s1.£¥□560 042. .. R%Bnm'x's .1, 313120 mum FGK m:

```
mama} far Z'rIf:.;'2; I''
2.3 The in a goods

wmcés of the which
§f:3Imla amt had undergono
p-er?rJd. Tm medical
```

cvpined that an am-aum: of the % % there was dhability m the whale awn: mi' 18%, tha appellant was before thus V V' □aima Tribunal sneaking amzpenmtsiun. I '§"§*§b1ms.I has awarded a tow; sum of Ra.66,00(}I-, E Glaimsing as» wo□\$rman Gfthe mum. In this matter, the e t if any, mm:

mtitémd to the saw wt:-uid hs:ve..#;g swna? am that 11% izmurefs with ma gramisc in vsa:I,I[h%w§uIa my-,IG% Hm-am of AM-.1ich':ecu3d he scape 5501:

mde: it therefara Tribunal was z:] by □a<:ture to the neck of □btzigs.' disability to the whole bod§' x'5£=:*"T{Gh'.§ tm Tribunai was tntally Eiey. who was not mm □x-at irzatanae and the aasasaxmnt : d□abélity was apparently am □as I faijd g Igazad. The Tribunal has rightly rejacted tha yurpaaes ::sfc::I@utat:i::I::: of any cJsJm' tcawards _ :%:a::mp%mr§afian undaer the head □mzre has of earning The 'Ii'%una.1 has awarded subsmn:tn1' 3 amouma mmw an varicus hm □a and that it does

not UUKI Ur mmmnm HIGH coma _oI=-..;<AnNArAxA HIGH COURT or KARNATAKA HIGH COURT or KARNATAKA HIGH COURT or !(ARNA'!'Ai(A HIGH COURT % wax-mm any mt by Ms court in that a?su§::pur£§ng matmial to esnhaw the same.

5. 0% that: wntsanmm. in 153:: 3 m.1&,,amg~ mwards pm F Eaww a ☐aa, in the op§11ion same requires 'Lo be sum of RS.5,t'.§1%?☐-.. Irjg--s»§ are wanxserrasazi; the appellant warm baa of 335,000;-.

in an {ax §'"uf:L:i'z-e aan arag '3 mmnea, nmted the. medical in to the ¢:pge§1Fa;;;, _cant1at; be said that the appellant .\sz";\serV_' in the extant -.::If 13% to the . poimed nut W the: Tribunal, 111 the face that the fracture au dered m the \$11.13 which is mat a w the beakrm beam. the Em'vm" been assessed at 18% does mt immlc-3 O F' mn macae as to the am-wracy nsf the same' Hnweym, in JURT OF KARNATAKA HIGH COURT OFKARNATAKA HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA I"liGI'l COURT OF KARNATAKA HIGI'l COURT OF KARNATAKA HIGH COURT 7% éhe abaem at 3135* matsrial by paractzitiznner, even E 56% of the F1»1-fwaw af ompumuzan cf mg: Aoga cf x mpadqr, the app-eliant A.i:,a summntia} aum. Henge, A patmamage af disab ☐ty as whola may an ☐if «on that n1u1t':pher mtim \(\subseteq \), if towanis mm w\(\subseteq \) u1d be entitled me a Tbrnl, 'm my mg be entitled to as af □xture :_f' Er1. s::':%. i5&'»:*-f.:a.:¢=:. zt11§ t::5x'z□antiun of the mutual □at □w ac liability that mum arise under 4:.he'BV3%?:=§3&'k:raté§'_a':;f3om.p:9matian Act, and theréare, the mum is he be reatrkzted. ta tlrm mm-. is 'wiaéch the irmwzar wnuki have tn work out _ f_ 33¢ ethm rmpommm since the Tribunal has ~\\$.\\$e1.\\$.~1 tlxattmyerejoimlymnd many liable to pay the auuau OF KARNATAKA HIGH COURTAADEKARNATAKA HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA HIGH COURY OF KARNATAKA HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA HIGH COURT mama at' mzgma on, The said finding rexmdna s undmur ded gimme the imurcr is net. in □. tha 9&1 h ma % ea Ra._.a1,s-ao;- with of tha \$500 \$9: §<...<zxS_ ...O Enou :9... 5.<.p<z._§ ".o .5500 \$0.: S_.<~<2.__5. Lo 5500 \$3.... <:(_¢Zx<L....5_.._xDDJa=.. 5.<.<z:5. .5 :53"