Balaji Motors vs Muniyammal on 31 July, 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

RESERVED ON: 08.06.2026

PRONOUNCED ON:31.07.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.MURALI SHANKAR

C.M.A(MD)No.702 of 2025
and
C.M.P.(MD)Nos.17584 and 11220 of 2025

Balaji Motors,
Paramakudi Main Road,
Mudukulathur – 623 704,
represented through its
Branch Manager. : Appellant/3rd Respondent

Vs.

1.Muniyammal
2.Shanmugavalli
3.Muthuvel : Respondents 1 to 3/Petitioners 1 to 3

4.Dinesh Kumar
5.R.Joyal : Respondents 4 & 5/Respondents 1 & 2

PRAYER:- Civil Miscellaneous Appeal filed under Section 173 of the Motor Vehicles Act,1988 against the judgment passed in M.C.O.P.No.79 of 2022, dated 20.03.2025, on the file of the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal (Sub-Court), Mudukulathur.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

For Appellant : Mr.H.Arumugam

For Respondents :Mr.K.K.Samy
for R.1 to R.3

: R.4 and R.5 - exparte

JUDGMENT

This Civil Miscellaneous Appeal is directed against the award made in M.C.O.P.No.79 of 2022, dated 20.03.2025, on the file of the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal / Subordinate Court, Muthukulathur.

2. The appellant/3rd respondent – dealer who was mulcted with liability to pay compensation of Rs.8,62,800/- with interest and costs to the respondents 1 to 3 / claimants for the death of Karuppiah, consequent to an accident occurred on 06.01.2021, challenged the liability mulcted on it and also the quantum of compensation awarded by the Tribunal.

3. For the sake of convenience and brevity, the parties will hereinafter be referred as per their status/ranking in their original petition.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

4. The case of the claimants is that on 06.01.2021 while the deceased Karuppiah was returning to his natice place at about 02.30p.m., in Muthukulathur to Kadaladi main road, on the left side from North to South direction near West Sakkulam Junction road, an unregistered Apache motorcycle bearing Engine Number DE5LL2705953, Chassis Number MD637DESSL2105869 which came in the same direction in a rash and negligent manner dashed against the said Karuppiah and as a result of which, he sustained serious injuries, that the injured was taken to Government Hospital, Muthukulathur and after first aid, he was referred to Government Rajaji Hospital, Madurai and despite treatment, he succumbed to the injuries on 08.01.2021 and that the accident was occurred only due to the rash and negligent driving of the two wheeler rider.

5. It is the further case of the claimant that a criminal case came to be registered in Cr.No.5/2021, under Sections 279 and 304(A) I.P.C., on the file of the Muthukulathur Police Station against the two wheeler rider – second respondent herein. It is the further case of the claimant that the deceased was aged 60 years at the time of accident and that he had 200 https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis sheep and was earning Rs.5,00,000/- per year and through agricultural work, he was earning Rs.2,00,000/- per year.

6. The defence of the third respondent is that the first respondent booked Apache Motorcycle and took the vehicle from the third respondent, that the second claimant gave a written complaint to the Muthukulathur Police and on that basis, F.I.R., came to be registered against the second respondent stating that he drove the Splendor Plus two wheeler bearing Registration No.TN-21-Q-7286 and caused the accident, that the claimants suppressing the above facts, filed the claim petition as if the

accident was caused by an unregistered Apache two wheeler, that the respondens and the claimants are belonging to the same village and with an intention to get compensation, they have colluded together and implicated the unregistered TVS Apache vehicle instead of Splendor Plus two wheeler, which was actually involved in the accident, that there is no privity of contract between the petitioners and the third respondent, that the respondents 1 and 2 being the owners and the riders of the two wheeler are responsible for the accident and that therefore, the claim petition as against the third respondnet is liable to be dismissed. https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

7. During trial, the claimants examined the third and second claimants as P.W.1 and P.W.2 respectively and the occurrence witness Gurusamy as P.W.3 and exhibited 11 documents as Exs.P.1 to P.11 and the witness document came to be exhibited as Ex.X.1. The respondents 1 and 2 had remained exparte. The third respondent, who contested the petition adduced neither oral nor documentary evidence. The learned trial Judge, considering the pleadings and the evidence both oral and documentary and on hearing the arguments of both sides, passed the impugned order dated 20.03.2025 holding that the second respondent rode the new unregistered Apache vehicle in a rash and neglignet manner and caused the the accident and that the third respondent - dealer who allowed the first respondent to ply the vehicle without registration and without insurance, is the deemed owner and as such, he is liable to pay compensaiton and directed the third respondent to pay compensation of Rs.8,62,800/- with interest and costs. Aggrieved by the impugned award, the third respondent dealer has filed the present Civil Miscellaneous Appeal.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

8. The learned Counsel for the appellant would contend that the third claimant initially lodged a written complaint based on which F.I.R., came to be registered agaisnt the second respondent alleging that he drove the Splendor Plus two wheeler bearing Registration No.TN-21- Q-7286 rashly and caused the accident, which leads to the death of the said Karuppiah, but subsequently the claimants and the respondents 1 and 2 belonging to the same Village, colluded together and with an intention to claim compensaiton, falsely implicated the unregistered TVS Apache vehicle, that the jurisdictional police, after registering the F.I.R., alleging that the Splendor Plus two wheeler was involved, subsequently, laid a final report as if the unregistered Apache vehicle was involved in the accident, that neither the first respondent nor the second respondent offered any explanation for initially implicating the Splendor Plus vehicle and that the Tribunal, without considering the above material aspects, has erroneously rendered a finding that the unregistered TVS Apache vehicle ridden by the second respondent had caused the accident.

9. It is pertinent to note that on the basis of the complaint laid by the third claimant, F.I.R., came to be registered in Cr.No.5 of 2021 under https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis Sections 279, 304-A I.P.C., on the file of the Muthukulathur Police Station against the second respondent implicating the involvement of the Splendor Plus two wheeler bearing Registration No.TN-21-Q-7286, but after completing the investigation, Muthukulathur police laid the final report, against the second respondent stating that the second respondnet drove the unregistered Apache two wheeler in a rash and negligent manner and dashed against Karuppiah and that therefore, the second respondent has committed the offences punishable under Sections 279 and 304-A I.P.C.

10. As already pointed out, the claimans examined P.W.3- Gurusamy as an occurrence witness and he has deposed about the manner of the accident and the involvement of the Apache vehicle in the accident. It is pertinent to note that P.W.3 – Gurusamy was cited as an eye witness in the charge sheet filed under Ex.P.11. Though P.W.3 was subjected to cross-examination, nothing favourable to the third respondent has been elicited from him. Though the third respondent has alleged that the unregistered Apache vehicle was not involved and that the case put forth by the claimants with regard to the manner of the https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis accident is false, they have not chosen to adduce any evidence in support of their defence. The third respondent has neither examined any eyewitness to the occurrence nor produced any other evidence to substantiate their contention that the unregistered Apache vehicle was not involved in the accident and that the Splendor Plus two-wheeler alone was involved in the accident. In the absence of any contra evidence, the Tribunal, on considering the evidence adduced on the side of the claimants, has rightly come to the conclusion that the accident had occurred due to the rash and negligent riding of the unregistered Apache vehicle by the second respondent and the said finding cannot be found fault with.

11. The learned Counsel for the appellant/third respondent would then contend that the owner of the vehicle should register the vehicle within seven days from the date of delivery and no person shall drive any motorcycle in any public place or any other place, unless the vehicle is registered, that the first respondent booked the Apache vehicle, took delivery of the same from the third respondent, and that the first respondent who allowed the second respondent to ride the two wheeler https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis without registration and insurance, has violated the provisions of the Motor Vehicles Act and the Motor Vehicle Rules and that the Tribunal without considering the above, has erred in mulcting the liability on the third respondent.

12. The learned Counsel would further contend that the dealer would not be considered to be the owner of the vehicle, that the dealer is in possession of the vehicle till it is sold to the customer and the dealer never purchased the vehicle from the manufacturer to call the daler as the owner of the motorcycle and that since the third respondnet cannot be considered as the owner of the vehicle, no liability can be fastened on them. The learned Counsel placed reliance on the judgment of this Court in M/s Chinnasamy Agencies Authorised Main Dealer TVS Motor Company Ltd., VS. Amala Jesudas and Others reported in 2024-1-L.W. 267 and the relevant portion sare extracted hereunder:

> “14. Can it be now said that by breaching Rule 42, a dealer has allowed the use of the motor vehicle in a public place, without insurance, to invite upon itself the liability to meet a third party claim to compensation? Here comes Rule 47. Its opening lines are:
>
> https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis Application for registration of motor vehicles (1) An application for registration of a motor vehicle shall be made in Form 20 to the registering authority within a period of 1 week [seven days] from the date of taking delivery of such vehicle, excluding the period of journey and shall be accompanied by...

> Therefore, while Rule 42 forbids the dealer from delivering a motor vehicle without a registration, Rule 47 enables registration within one week after delivery of a motor vehicle. This reduces Rule 42 proscription to a directory requirement, lest it will create a situation where both Rule 42 and Rule 47 cannot co-exist. And, this apparent conflict between Rule 42 and Rule 47 can be harmonised only through Rule 44. If it were to be contended, as argued by the counsel for the claimant, that Rule 42 violation will have the effect of fastening third party liability for the negligent use of a motor vehicle by the buyer thereof, then Rule 47 providing for seven days for applying for registration since taking delivery, cannot be reconciled with Rule 42.

Therefore, the statutory intent behind violation of Rule 42 is penalising the dealer with cancellation or suspension of trade certificate, and not mulcting it with any liability which the buyer of a motor vehicle is principally required to meet. This apart, once the property in a motor vehicle is vested in the buyer there can be no vicarious liability between the https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis dealer and the buyer either, for, otherwise, it will lead to a jurisprudential conundrum which cannot be reconciled if Rule 42 is read as stand alone provision, ignoring Rules 44 and 47, and Sec.39 of the MV Act."

17. It is to state the obvious: This appeal is allowed, and the appellant is relieved of the obligation to pay the compensation as awarded by the Tribunal, and the first respondent, the claimant, is at liberty to realise the compensation from the second respondent. ....."

13. To counter the said contentions, the learned Counsel for the claimants placed reliance on the following two judgments:

> (i) Managing Director, Sakthi Auto Agencies, T.P.S. Nagar, Thanjavur Vs. Santhi and others (2023(1) TN MAC 584):
>
> "22. The appellant had contended that the vehicle has been registered in the name of the first respondent and insured with the second respondent and on subsequent date to the accident and therefore, the first respondent and the Insurance Company alone are liable to pay the compensation. The judgment of the Honourable Supreme Court reported in (2016) 4 SCC 82 (Commissioner of Commercial Taxes, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala V.K.T.C. Automobiles) in paragraph No.20 and 21 reads as follows:
>
> https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis "20. But this legal proposition does not take the appellant for. It must be carefully seen as to when the properties, particularly possession of a motor vehicle passes or can pass legally to the purchaser, authorizing him to apply for registration. Only after obtaining valid registration under the Motor Vehicles Act, the purchaser gets entitled to use the vehicle in public places. Under the scheme of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the Central motor Vehicles Rules 1989 the dealer cannot permit the purchaser to use the motor vehicle and thus enjoy its possession unless and until a temporary or permanent registration is obtained by

> him. Only thereafter, the vehicle can safely be said to be no more under possession of the dealer. Clearly, mere mentioning of engine number and chassis number of a motor vehicle in the invoice of sale does not entitle the intending purchaser to appropriate all the goods i.e. the motor vehicle till its possession is or can be lawfully handed over to him by the dealer without violating the statutory provisions governing motor vehicles. Such transfer of possession can take place only when the vehicle reaches the place where the registering authority will be obliged to inspect for the purpose of finding out whether it is a https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis roadworthy and registrable motor vehicle and whether its identification marks tally with those given in the sale invoice and the application for registration. The possession can lawfully be handed over to the purchaser at this juncture because law requires the purchaser as an "owner" to make an application for registration but at the same time the law also prohibits use of the motor vehicle by the owner until is duly registered by the registering authority.
>
> 21. Hence, in order to satisfy the requirement of law noticed above, the dealer can deliver possession and owner can take possession and present the vehicle for registration only when it reaches the office of the registering authority. With the handing over of the possession of a specific motor vehicle just prior to registration, the dealer completes the agreement of sale rendering it a perfected sale. The purchaser as an "owner" under the Motor Vehicles Act is thereafter obliged to obtain certificate of registration which alone entitles him to enjoy the possession of the vehicle in practical terms by enjoying the right to use the vehicle at public places, after meeting the other statutory obligations of insurance, etc. Hence, https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis technically though the registration of a motor vehicle is a post-sale event, the event of sale is closely linked in time with the event of registration.

Neither the manufacturer nor can the dealer of a motor vehicle permit the intended purchaser having an agreement of sale to use the motor vehicle even for taking it to the registration office in view of the statutory provisions already noticed. Hence lawful possession with the right of use is permissible to be given to the intended owner only after reaching the vehicle to the office of the registering authority. Thus seen, in practical terms though sale precedes the event of registration, in normal circumstances and as the law stands, it is coterminous with registration of a new motor vehicle".

23. The judgment of the Honourable Supreme Court reported in (2020) 15 SCC 438 (Tata Motors Limited V. State of Jharkhand and others) in paragraph No.7 reads as follows:

> "7 ..... In case a dealer or a manufacturer is not having trade certificate, in order to drive the motor vehicle during the period it remains with him, he is supposed to get the vehicle registered for a temporary period. This temporary registration is to be done as per the provisions contained in Section 43 of the MV

> https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis Act. It may be clarified that such temporary registration can be obtained by any person who is the owner of a motor vehicle and is not confined to a dealer or a manufacturer."

24. A combined reading of the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court will make it clear that the ownership of the vehicle legally passes to the purchaser only after temporary/permanent registration of the vehicle in the name of the purchaser. Any handing over of the possession to the purchaser without registration of the vehicle has to be considered to be violation of the statuary provisions as contemplated under Section 41 of the Motor Vehicles Act. An application for registration can be made only on behalf of the owner of a Motor vehicle. Therefore, when the vehicle is in the possession of a dealer and if he wants to use the vehicle in a public road for any other purpose, other than what is stated under Rule 41 of Central Motor Vehicle Rules, the dealer has to apply for temporary certificate of registration. The judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in (2020) 15 SCC 438 (Tata Motors Limited V. State of Jharkhand and others) paragraph No.7 has clarified that the temporary registration can be obtained by any person who is the owner of a motor vehicle and is not confined to a dealer or manufacturer. Therefore, it is clear https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis that a dealer can also be considered to be a owner of the vehicle provided he applies for a temporary registration under Section 43 of the Motor Vehicles Act, for the purposes of usage of the vehicle in a public road other than the purposes those enumerated under Rule 41 of Central Motor Vehicles Rules.

25. In the present case, the appellant/dealer had permitted the usage of the vehicle in a public road by one Ramesh without obtaining any temporary registration and admittedly, not for the purposes mentioned under Rule 41 of Central Motor Vehicles Rules. A dealer is expected to obtain a trade certificate under Rule 34 of Central Motor Vehicles Act, for operating the vehicle in a public road without registration for certain limited purposes. The dealer has to obtain either the trade certificate for using the vehicle for limited purposes or should go for a temporary registration of the vehicle under Section 43 of the Motor Vehicle Act, if he wants to use the vehicle in a public road. Merely by avoiding temporary registration under Section 43 of the Act, a dealer cannot claim that he is not the owner of the vehicle. The appellant/ dealer cannot take advantage of his own wrong and contend that having not obtained temporary registration under Section 43 of the Act, he is not the owner of the vehicle.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

26. The deliberations made above will clearly establish that the vehicle that was in possession of the dealer has been permitted by the dealer to be used by one Ramesh to drive the vehicle in a public place without any temporary/permanent registration. A perusal of Rule 42 of Central Motor Vehicle Rule, clarifies that a dealer in possession of a trade certificate shall not deliver a motor vehicle to a purchaser without temporary/permanent registration. Therefore, it is clear that the appellant has handed over the vehicle to the said Ramesh without any kind of registration in violation of the statutory provisions and the Rules under the Motor Vehicles Act.

.....

28. The appellant /dealer is expected to follow Section 43 of the Motor Vehicles Act and get the vehicle temporarily registered for using the Motor vehicle for the purposes other than mentioned under Rule 41 of Central Motor Vehicle Rules. On such temporary registration, the dealer would be the owner of the vehicle for the limited period of one month as per Section 43(2) of Motor Vehicles Act. By avoiding such a temporary registration, the appellant tries to escape from the liability by contending that he is not the owner of the vehicle at the time of accident. A dealer who uses the vehicle or permits some one to use the vehicle for the purposes other than enumerated under Rule 41 of Central Motor Vehicles https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis Rules without temporary registration should be considered to be the deemed owner, for the purpose of payment of compensation for the injuries/death arising out of an accident.

29. In view of the above said deliberations, the Tribunal has rightly arrived at a finding that the appellant is the deemed owner of the vehicle and mulcted the liability to pay compensation."

(ii) Sree Sakthi Bajaj Vs. S.Prabhakaran and others (passed in C.M.A.No.2326 of 2021, dated 28.06.2024):

> "27. The above discussion and declaration made by the Apex Court shows that even though the motor vehicles were to be treated as specific and ascertained goods at the time when the sale invoice with all specific particulars may be issued, according to Section 21 of the Sale of Goods Act, in case of such a contract for sale also, when the seller is bound to do something to the goods for the purpose of putting them into a deliverable state, the property does not pass until such thing is done and the buyer has notice thereof.
>
> 28. Since the Apex Court has considered all the provisions including Sale of Goods Act and delivered a specific finding as discussed above, I am of the view that the https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis observations made by the Apex Court in the Commissioner of Commercial Taxes case in the above paragraphs, is applicable to the facts of this case. In this case, even though delivery challan was issued on the date of registration, since the dealer, who is effecting the sale, is bound to deliver the property only near the office of the Registering Authority, normally at the time of registration, the issuance of delivery challan could not be considered as the property already been delivered to the first respondent.
>
> 29. In this case, admittedly, the accident had taken place while the vehicle was taken to the Registering Authority. The purchaser is not having any right over the vehicle since permitting the purchaser to use the vehicle shall not be considered as a delivery of property. The purchaser of the vehicle shall not be considered as the owner of the vehicle for the purpose of claiming compensation under the Motor Vehicles Act. Admittedly, the vehicle was plied in the road without temporary or permanent

registration, the dealer/trade certificate holder has violated the policy conditions and he is liable to pay the compensation for the accident caused by the first respondent, who shall not be considered as the owner of the vehicle." https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

14. It is not in dispute that the offending vehicle TVS Apache two wheeler was neither registered nor covered by a policy of insurance on the date of accident. It is evident from the records that the third respondent – dealer permitted the first respondent-purchaser to take delivery of the vehicle and ply the same on the public road without getting registration or insurance which is very much against the provisions of the Motor Vehicles Act and Rules made thereunder.

15. As already pointed out, the main contention of the third respondent - dealer is that upon delivery of the vehicle, the ownership had passed to the first respondent and therefore, the dealer stood absolved of all liability. As rightly contended by the learned Counsel for the claimants, the accident did not occur after the purchaser had registered the vehicle and put it to lawful use. But on the other hand, the third respondent – dealer had permitted the first respondent to take delivery of the vehicle from the showroom and drive it to their place without registration and without insurance, with the knowledge and permission of the dealer.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

16. In Managing Director, Sakthi Auto Agencies Vs. Santhi and others, a learned Judge of this Court has rightly held that a dealer who permits the unregistered vehicle to be driven on a public road in violation of the provisions of the Motor Vehicle Act cannot be permitted to escape liability towards the third parties, on the ground that the property in the vehicle had passed to the purchaser. This Court, in the subsequent decision in Sree Sakthi Bajaj Vs. S.Prabhakaran and others has reiterated the said position. But the decision in M/s Chinnasamy Agencies Vs. Amala Jesudas and others is clearly distinguishable on facts. In the said decision case, the Court proceeded on the facts and circumstances available therein while considering the effect of the transfer of ownership of the vehicle. In the present case, the evidence available on record clearly reveals that the third respondent – dealer himself permitted the unlawful use of the vehicle on a public road by allowing to be taken without registration and insurance. Considering the above, this Court is of the view that the decision in Sakthi Auto Agencies case and Sree Sakthi Bajaj case squarely apply to the facts of https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis the case on hand. Hence, the finding of the Tribunal mulcting liability on the appellant/third respondent – dealer is perfectly in order and the same cannot be found fault with.

17. Turning now to the quantum of compensation, the learned Counsel for the third respondent would contend that the Tribunal without any basis determined a notional monthly income at Rs.9,000/-, which is excessive, that P.W.3 alleged occurrence witness has deposed that the deceased while returning from ration shop, met with an accident, but the claimants have failed to produce the

ration card to prove the age of the deceased, but the Tribunal, taking note of the postmortem certificate, has fixed the age of the deceased as 60 years and such a finding cannot be sustained. He would further submit that since P.W.3 has deposed that the deceased was aged about 70 years, the Tribunal ought to have fixed the age at 70 years and ought to have applied the appropriate multiplier. He would further submit that awarding of total compensation at Rs.8,62,800/- is very much excessive and is liable to be interfered with. https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

18. As already pointed out, the claimants have taken a stand that the deceased was owning 200 sheep and was doing agricultural work and that thereby he was earning Rs.7,00,000/- per year. Admittedly, they have not produced any evidence to substantiate the same. But P.W.1 in his evidence has stated that the deceased was owning 40 to 50 goats in his possession.

19. No doubt, as rightly pointed out by the learned Counsel for the third respondent, the Tribunal, taking note of the postmortem certificate determined the age of the deceased as 60 years. Though the third respondent has alleged that the claimants have failed to produce the ration card, it is not the case of the third respondent that they have taken any steps for production of ration card from the custody of the claimants, nor summoning the records relating to ration card from the competent authority. As rightly contended by the learned Counsel for the claimants, in the absence of any contra evidence, the determination of the age by the Tribunal cannot be found fault with.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

20. The Tribunal, considering the evidence available on record and taking note of the evidence of P.W.1 that the deceased was owning 40 to 50 goats and also the age of the deceased, fixed the notional monthly income at Rs.9,000/- and the same is reasonable and cannot be said to be excessive. The Tribunal, taking note of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in National Insurance Company Vs. Pranay Sethi and others reported in 2017(2) TNMAC 609 (SC) has rightly added 10% of the income towards future prospects. As per the dictum of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sarla Verma and others Vs. Delhi Transport Corporation and another reported in 2009(2) TNMAC 1 (SC) applied the multiplier of “9”.

21. The Tribunal, taking note of the dependants, has rightly deducted 1/3rd of the income towards personal and living expenses of the deceased and assessed the loss of dependency at Rs.7,12,800/- and the same cannot be faulted. The first claimant, being the wife, is entitled to Rs.40,000/- towards spousal consortium and the claimants 2 and 3 being the daughters of the deceased are certainly entitled to get Rs.40,000/- each towards loss of parental consortium. The Tribunal has awarded https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis Rs.40,000/- to the first claimant towards loss of consortium and Rs.40,000/- each to the claimants 2 and 3 under the heads of loss of love and affection, though under different heads, cannot be faulted. The Tribunal has also awarded Rs.15,000/- for funeral expenses and Rs.15,000/- for the loss of estate under the conventional heads and hence, the total award at Rs.8,62,800/- is just, fair and reasonable and the same does not warrant any interference. Except the above, the appellant has not canvassed any other reason to

impugn the award. Consequently, this Court concludes that the Civil Miscellaneous Appeal is devoid of merits and the same is liable to be dismissed.

22. In the result, the Civil Miscellaneous Appeal is dismissed. The appellant/Dealer is directed to deposit the entire award amount along with accrued interest and costs, to the credit of above said M.C.O.P.No. 79 of 2022, on the file of the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal / Subordinate Court, Mudukulathur, less the amount already deposited, if any, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this Judgment and on such deposit, the claimants are entitled to withdraw entire award amount as apportioned by the Tribunal along with https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis proportionate interest and costs on due application before the Tribunal. Consequently, the connected Civil Miscellaneous Petitions are closed. The parties are directed to bear their own costs.

31.07.2026

NCC : Yes : No
Index : Yes : No
Internet : Yes : No

SSL

To

1. The Motor Accident Claims Tribunal /
   Subordinate Court, Mudukulathur.

2.The Record Keeper,
  Vernacular Section,
  Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

K.MURALI SHANKAR,J.

SSL

PRE-DELIVERY JUDGMENT MADE IN

31.07.2026

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis