Karnataka High Court

```
M/S The New India Assurance Co Ltd vs Prakash S/O Avvappa Sanni on 27 October, 2009 Author: A.S.Pachhapure
```

1 IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA CIRCUIT BENCH AT GULBARGA DATED THIS THE 27*" DAY OF OCTOBER, 2009 **BEFORE** THE HONBLE MRJUSTICE A.S.PACHHAE' JR E"V;~ " MISC. FIRST APPEAL NO. 5002/zooaiaamrcfl -A cgw MFA cR0B.No.1032,/.2008 , A **BETVVEEN** M/s. The New India AssuralleeV.CO.I;td...,' P.Kali:{18a1 Raga Rfiafl.' Banga10re -- "27 "*-- = By duiy COnSi ifil; fed Mtfariaey.AppelIant. [Sri.Veereeh.B.'PafiI; for Appellant). S/0.AVVappa Sarmi, Ag'ed"a b'evut 23 years. « 'R,/';:.._Jy'11y Galli, Bijapur. 2] Rev-ahna Siddappa Mallappa " Tdnashyal, .,_ Major in age, Residing at Honnalli, Bijapur.Resp0nder1ts. {Sri.Um.esh.V.Mamadapur, Advocate for C / R. 1]. {Sri.BapugOuda Siddappa, Advocate for R. 1). 2 This MFA filed U/sec. 30 (1) of Workrnens Compensation Act against the order dated: 30.3.2004 passed in WCA/SR/l04/2003, on the file of the Labour

Compensation Act against the order dated: 30.3.2004 passed in WCA/SR/l04/2003, on the file of the Labour Officer and Commissioner for Workmen's Compensation, Sub-Division 1, Bijapur, awarding compensation of Rs.2, 15, 137/-- and directil'1g"»o the appellant herein to pay the same). -.

court delivered the following: _ __ .

The appellant -- insurer has $eh:a\sim i_lei1g\%ecl$

compensation awarded to theifirst res'p.orrd.ent'lvherein for $\mbox{\bf V}$

the by..llVV1V9i'im in a Motor Vehicle

Accident in thevpeOAfurse..pof«his employment.

v'.l'h-e.__f_a_ets relevant for the purpose of this

' pappealv areas under:

A it referring to the parties as per the rank

beforethe Commissioner for Workmen's Compensation

Cf for"-the purpose of convenience.

D4

The appellant herein is the second respondent and the insurer of the vehicle bearing Reg.No.i{A*28/H>---.i 927 owned by the second respondent herein the first respondent before the Conlmission_er;-..V. dfirst!' respondent herein filed a was the cleaner on the yehicle"referrediv.tuoabove; tandfl while cleaning the lorry on the Vehicle was parked by the of _ near the cotton market at Hubli, 2;... the opposite direction there'by'v*ne sustained fracture of his leg He was admitted in the

I-Iospitai aridAt?flser--eafter he took treatment with the

Dopctors; "'-----fie sustained disability and averred

he_;'vifas.::getting salary of Rs.3,00o/+ PM and daily

3. In pursuance of the notice issued, the first respondent admitting the employment of the petitioner as the cleaner on the Vehicle alleged that the wasjiaying

Rs.2,500/-- per month as salary in addition to};

day as bata. He also contended

respondent insurer is liable Whereas, the second res,po'ndell\Eh:v,,,¢ile¢1 objections denying the relationship of and employee between first respondent

and alsol'th.e.p:salarj;r;--liability andthe disability. On these grounds.' it of the application.

basisisof these pleadings, the learned

Cornrnissiloner frained that issues and it is thereafter,

examined as AW--l and the Doctor

vlfas as AW--2 and in the evidence, the

.,docu.me"nts A-1 to A»? were got marked." The first

l'l~ resp'londent did not lead any oral evidence but the

" "second respondent got marked the Insurance Policy HR-

a/."_.,

2(1)] with consent. The learned Cornn3iss.ierie_r'~V.for Workmen's Compensation, on material on record assessed the.wa ges;of at Rs.2,000/ \sim per month and at 70% adopted the releizeint factors granted the compen.sationt---of"::Rs;--.1.,8;f,076./and the interest of at 18%.

```
Aggrieved by .ihe
                    the insurer
has :t i>n.V. appeal. The first
respondent: 3:; = tthed" ' "erhss~obj eetions seeking
enhan"e enlent ' .
  It heard the Eeaned Counsel for the
   also the first respondent {cross--oi;>jeotor].
'' 6.'. point that arise for my consideration is: "
"Whether the compensation awarded to the
first respondent herein is on the higher side and
whether it requires any modification?
ML
70% and therefore, he submits that the compensation
has to be enhanced.
9. I have carefully scrutinized the material placed
on record in the context of the submissions madeyby the
learned counsel. There is no dispute
employment of the applicant on the vehi~cle4 j ..
and the applicant having su=stained 'iinju'1*ies""in
accident in the coursefof hisl.v einployrii,ent, Thesis'
applicant has produced injuiyilcei-i.ificate and
it reveals h e«ha<:ld"sustained a cut laceraiied wound
over theright "thefX«ray reveals fracture of both
thegbcries oi7th'e'1riglht:leg and ankle level. The Doctor
  that the injury sustained is grievous in
 as could be seen from the disability
 certificate produced at Ex.A--4 issued by AW-2, the
 Doctor on examination of the applicant: states that the
Mix
```

10

ORDER

The appeal is allowed in part and Objection is dismissed. In modifi»eatior:? j and award passed by the leetrnedt "Workmerfs Compensation,._Vti:.e res};ond_er1-t herein' (the applicant) is the heo piansation of Rs. 1,60,351/- with : dejests.raitisr1 12. 1. 2.2002 1:111 its deposit. ioefore this Court shail 133: 'iT:bI''if:.' Commissioner for 'fo1''p%aymeni' and the excess amoiiiit "refunded to the iuggurance COmPan\$f.<__"V . ., directed to send the records to the ,1e'e§rned«'V'fCorfx1i1issioner for Workmen's Compensation fort'hw'itAh§' "

Sd/-	
JUDGE sWk*	«,,