



'CR'

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JOHNSON JOHN

FRIDAY, THE 7TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2025 / 18TH MAGHA, 1946
MACA NO. 2483 OF 2019AGAINST THE AWARD DATED 16.10.2015 IN OP(MV) NO.1072 OF 2011 OF
MOTOR ACCIDENT CLAIMS TRIBUNAL, IRINJALAKUDAAPPELLANT/PETITIONER:FEBIN RAJ.N., S/O. NIJAMUDHEEN, MANAKULANGARA PARAMBIL
HOUSE, KOMBIDINJAMAKKAL DESOM, THAZHEKKAD VILLAGE.BY ADVS.
T.K.KOSHY
SMT.V.V.RISANI
SRI.ANIL GEORGERESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS 1 TO 3:

1 RAJAN.T.C (DELETED)
S/O. CHERUKUTTY, THOLATH, PAZHANJI PATTITHADAM DESOM,
KATTAKAMBAL VILLAGE, THRISSUR, PIN-680 001

2 JOY, S/O. CHERUKUTTY, THOLATH HOUSE, KATTAPPANA P.O, IDUKKI,
PIN-685 508.

3 THE NEW INDIA ASSURANCE CO. LTD.,
BRANCH OFFICE, STAR BUILDING, 2ND FLOOR, CHENNATTUMATTOM
JUNCTION, KATTAPPANA, PIN-685 508.
(R1 IS DELETED FROM THE PARTY ARRAY AT THE RISK OF THE
APPELLANT AS PER ORDER DATED 27.03.2024 IN IA 1/24 IN M.A.C.A
NO. 2483/2019)

BY ADVS.
R2 BY SRI. ALIAS M.CHERIAN
SRI.K.M.RAPHY
SMT.ANJALY ELIAS
SHRI.BRISTO S PARIYARAM
R3 BY SRI. LAL K.JOSEPH
SRI. SURESH SUKUMAR(K/634/1997)
SRI. ANZIL SALIM(K/000447/2018)THIS MOTOR ACCIDENT CLAIMS APPEAL HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
07.02.2025, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



'CR'

JOHNSON JOHN, J.

I.A. Nos. 2 of 2024 & 1 & 2 of 2025 &
M.A.C.A No. 2483 of 2019

Dated this the 7th day of February, 2025.

JUDGMENT

The petitioner in O.P.(MV) No. 1072 of 2011 on the file of the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Irinjalakuda filed this appeal challenging the quantum of compensation fixed by the Tribunal under various heads.

2. According to the claim petitioner, on 08.04.2011, at about 10.30 a.m., while he was riding a motorcycle through Vellikulangara-Aloor road, jeep driven by the 1st respondent in a rash and negligent manner caused to hit the motorcycle and thereby, he fell down and sustained serious injuries. The 2nd respondent is the owner of the offending vehicle and 3rd respondent is the insurer.

3. Before the Tribunal, PW1 examined and Exhibits A1 to A19 were marked from the side of the petitioner and no evidence adduced from the side of the respondents. The Tribunal recorded a finding that the accident occurred because of the negligence on the part of the 1st



respondent and that respondents 1 to 3 are jointly and severally liable to pay compensation. The Tribunal awarded a total compensation of Rs.14,82,685/- to the petitioner.

4. Heard Sri.T.K. Koshy, the learned counsel for the appellant, Sri. Alias M. Cherian, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent and Sri. Lal K. Joseph, the learned counsel for the 3rd respondent insurance company.

5. According to appellant, at the time of the accident, he was aged 27 years and working as driver-cum-clerk in KSFE on daily wage basis and earning Rs.9,000/- per month. The learned counsel for the appellant argued that Exhibit A7 letter dated 22.07.2011 from Kerala Public Service Commission would show that the appellant was advised for recruitment as Forest Guard on the scale of pay of Rs.10,480/- -18,300/- in the Forest Department and because of the injury sustained in the accident, he could not join for duty as Forest Guard and subsequently, he applied for change of category because of the disability and later, he was appointed as LD clerk in the Forest Department. It is argued that the Tribunal has not properly appreciated the above



circumstances, while fixing the notional income of the appellant as Rs.9,000/- per month.

6. The appellant filed I.A. No. 2 of 2024 to receive Annexures A1 to A7 series and B1 to B5 series as additional evidence in appeal. According to the appellant, as a result of the accident, he sustained clavicle fracture, crush degloved (Rt) foot with multiple fractures and type III A Open fracture BB (R) leg and he underwent below knee amputation of right leg and he had to spend huge amounts towards treatment and fixation of prosthetic leg. Annexures A1 to A7 series are invoices issued from Saji's Rehabilitation Centre, Thrissur in connection with the purchase of prosthetic leg and its parts for the period from 02.12.2015 to 08.12.2018. Invoices from Endolite India Limited, Ernakulam for the purchase of prosthesis and its parts for the period from 29.10.2018 to 11.5.2023 are produced as Annexure B1 to B5 series. Considering the circumstances stated in the affidavit, I am satisfied that the said documents are relevant for deciding the just compensation towards medical expenses and therefore, the same can be admitted as additional evidence in appeal. Therefore, I.A. No. 2 of 2024



is allowed and Annexures A1 to A7 series are marked as Exhibits A20 to 26 and Annexures B1 to B5 series are marked as A27 to 31.

7. I.A. No. 1 of 2025 is filed by the appellant for receiving the documents produced as Annexures D to I. It is stated that subsequent to Exhibit A7 advice memo, he received Annexure D appointment order for the post of Forest Guard in the scale of pay of Rs.10,480/- – 18,300/-; but, he could not join the post because of the permanent disability sustained in the accident.

8. According to the appellant, he filed an application before the Forest Department for change of category and after considering his application, the Government issued Annexure E order approving the change of category from the post of Forest Guard to Lower Division Clerk in the Forest Department. Subsequently, he received Annexure F appointment order dated 23.08.2012 as LD Clerk in Chalakudy Division Office and he joined for duty in the afternoon of 24.08.2012. His appointment to the post of LD clerk was regularized as per Annexure G order dated 30.04.2013.

9. It is stated that because of his permanent physical disability, the Department withheld his promotions and a communication dated



19.08.2024 of the Divisional Forest Officer in this regard is produced as Annexure H. Annexures I , I(a) and I(b) are documents to show that his colleagues who had joined in the same post, got timely promotions and hike in salary. There is no reason to suspect the genuineness of documents produced as Annexures D to I and since the said documents reveals the occupation and income of the petitioner subsequent to the occurrence, I am satisfied that the said documents can be received as additional evidence in appeal and therefore, Annexures D to I are marked as Exhibits A32 to A37 series.

10. I.A. No. 2 of 2025 is also a petition for receiving additional documents. According to the appellant, due to the infection on the amputated stump, he had to take leave for medical treatment at Taluk Headquarters Hospital, Kodungallur and Metro Hospital, Irinjalakuda for the period from 06.10.2019 to 20.12.2020 and he has produced the original documents in that connection before the Government Authorities for sanctioning his leave. Annexure J is the copy of a certificate issued by the Chairman, Medical Board of the District Medical Office of Health, Thrissur in this connection.



11. According to the appellant, he would be eligible to get the next regular promotion as Head Accountant only if the Government sanctions his leave and Annexure K is the salary slip of his colleague Ravish N. for the month of December, 2024 and Annexure L is the pay slip of another colleague Lineesh C.A for the month of September, 2012. The salary slip of Lineesh C.A. for the month of December, 2024 is produced as Annexure M. According to the appellant, Annexures J to M will show the disparity in the income earned by the appellant and his colleagues who joined the Government service either as clerk or Forest Guard in 2004.

12. According to the appellant, he last changed his prosthetic limb in 2019 and prosthetic limb requires replacement after 3 or 4 years and the annual maintenance including the cost of parts will come to Rs.50,000/-. It is stated that recently, the appellant changed his combi socks after consulting Endolite India Limited and Annexure N is a receipt voucher for payment of Rs.500/- in this regard. Another invoice dated 01.02.2025 for Rs.210/- for the purchase of combi socks is produced as Annexure O. Annexure P is an estimate issued by Endolite India Ltd. to



show that the cost of a new prosthetic limb is Rs.3,89,445/-. In the absence of any serious dispute regarding the genuineness of Annexures J to P, I am satisfied that the said documents can be accepted as additional evidence in appeal and hence, the said documents are marked as Exhibits A38 to A44.

13. The learned counsel for the respondent insurance company argued that before the Tribunal, the appellant has suppressed his employment as a Government servant earning a fixed salary and it was in that circumstance, the Tribunal calculated the compensation for permanent disability by adopting the multiplier-multiplicand method and that in ***Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Hariprasad*** [2005 (4) KLT 977 (FB)], a Full Bench of this Court had considered the question whether compensation could be awarded separately on account of permanent disability as also on account of loss of earning capacity and it was held that an injured in a motor vehicle accident who suffered permanent disability could be compensated either for permanent disability or for loss of earning capacity and not for both. It is pointed out that the additional documents produced would clearly show that there was no



loss of earning for the appellant and that he would retire only on attaining the age of superannuation and therefore, there is no justification for calculating the compensation towards loss of earning capacity by applying the multiplicand-multiplier method.

14. In ***Kumily Panchayat v. Maniammal*** [2017 (4) KLT 909] a Division Bench of this Court considered the question of applicability of split multiplier in the case of a Government servant who died in an accident and for computing the compensation for loss of dependency, pertaining to the post retirement period, this Court took the monthly income as 50% of the income of the deceased as on the date of accident.

15. In ***Raju Sebastian v. United India Insurance Co. Ltd,*** [2021 (5) KHC 662 =2021 (6) KLT 136], this Court calculated the compensation for loss of earning power of the appellant for the post retirement period by taking 50% of his income as on the date of the accident.

16. In ***Raj Kumar v. Ajay Kumar, (2011) 1 SCC 343],*** a Division Bench of the Honourable Supreme Court summarised the



principles for ascertainment of loss of earning capacity due to permanent disability as follows:

- (i) All injuries (or permanent disabilities arising from injuries), do not result in loss of earning capacity.
- (ii) The percentage of permanent disability with reference to the whole body of a person, cannot be assumed to be the percentage of loss of earning capacity. To put it differently, the percentage of loss of earning capacity is not the same as the percentage of permanent disability (except in a few cases, where the Tribunal on the basis of evidence, concludes that the percentage of loss of earning capacity is the same as the percentage of permanent disability).
- (iii) The doctor who treated an injured claimant or who examined him subsequently to assess the extent of his permanent disability can give evidence only in regard to the extent of permanent disability. The loss of earning capacity is something that will have to be assessed by the Tribunal with reference to the evidence in entirety.
- (iv) The same permanent disability may result in different percentages of loss of earning capacity in different persons, depending upon the nature of profession, occupation or job, age, education and other factors.

17. In **George v. E.T. Thomas** [2013 (1) KLT 575], a Division Bench of this Court held that the compensation for disability arising out



of an accident has to be assessed only under two heads:- (i) physical disability; or loss of amenities of life; and (ii) loss of earning power arising out of the functional disability.

18. In ***National Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Anoopkumar*** [2014 (1) KLT 266] a Division Bench of this Court held that when a person is employed in a salaried job, notwithstanding the disabilities suffered by him on account of the injuries in the accident, he will not be entitled to any compensation for loss of earning capacity and that he will only be entitled to compensation for the loss of amenities in life.

19. The learned counsel for the appellant cited a three-Judge Bench decision of the Honourable Supreme Court in ***Dinesh Singh v. Bajaj Allianz General Insurance Co Ltd.*** [2014 KHC 4294] and argued that the claimant in a motor vehicle accident is entitled to compensation for permanent disability even in the absence of any evidence to show that he suffered any financial loss because of the permanent disability. In paragraph 10 of the said decision, the Honourable Supreme Court held thus:

“10. We have considered the material placed before us, particularly the evidence of the Doctor, who stated that the appellant suffered 60% disability of the total body, and in his



cross - examination denied the suggestion that the appellant does not require any further treatment. The fact that the appellant has resigned as Quality Engineer from Hospet Steels Ltd and took up desk job in Industrial Development Bank of India because of his permanent disability, suffered by him in the accident is not in dispute. Obviously, because of the permanent disability suffered by the appellant, who is an Engineer by profession, cannot take up such profession, which requires moving from one place to other place. Therefore, the reasoning of the High Court that the appellant has not suffered any financial loss because of permanent disability having regard to the fact that subsequently he took up employment in Industrial Development Bank of India as Grade - B Officer, cannot be sustained. Once the permanent disability is fixed, taking into consideration, its impact on the employment / profession of the claimant, the compensation has to be awarded. Since the disability suffered by the appellant, which is fixed at 60% and which is permanent in nature, impacted his employment and future prospects, we are of the considered opinion that the Tribunal has rightly determined the compensation $Rs.12,840/- \times 12 \times 17 = Rs. 26,19,360/-$ towards loss of future earnings, and taking into consideration the 60% permanent disability suffered by the appellant, awarded him the actual compensation under the head 'loss of future earnings' at Rs. 15,71,616/- by rounding off the same to Rs. 15,72,000/-.”

20. The learned counsel for the appellant also cited the decision of this Court in **New India Assurance Company Ltd. v. P. Narayani and others** [judgment dated 20.10.2017 in M.A.C.A. No. 2170 of 2005



=2017: KER: 41862], wherein this Court held in paragraph 10 as follows:

“... The long and short of the discussion is that in the case of a Government employee who sustained injuries in a motor vehicle accident resulted in permanent disability, sans the impact of reduction of earning power, for the purpose of fixing the multiplicand for calculating compensation for permanent disability, his net salary, in the manner aforesaid shall be taken to fix his monthly income for calculation purpose.”

In paragraph 12 of the above decision, this Court held as follows:

“... Therefore, in a case where the left over service of a person in permanent employment is less than the multiplier applicable to him with reference to his age, we are of the view that the principle of splitting the multiplier should be applied.”

21. The Tribunal accepted 40% functional disability after considering the percentage of permanent disability in Exhibit A9 and the below knee amputation of the right leg. It cannot be disputed that disability limits one's capacity to engage in activities in any domain of life, from work to recreation. The principle consistently followed by the court in assessing motor accident compensation claims is to place the victim in as near a position as she or he was in, before the accident, as



held by the Honourable Supreme Court in **Pappu Deo Yadav v. Naresh Kumar and Others** [2020 KHC 6547].

22. It is in evidence that the appellant herein sustained physical disability and functional disability because of the injury sustained in the accident and it is well settled that just compensation should include all elements that would go to place the victim in as near a position as she or he was in, before the occurrence of the accident.

23. According to the appellant, he was working on daily wages as driver cum clerk in KSFE at the time of the accident. The specific contention of the appellant is that the Tribunal ought to have considered his selection as a Forest Guard as per Exhibit A7 while fixing the notional income. The learned counsel for the respondent insurance company pointed out that the appellant claimed Rs.9,000/- as his monthly income in the claim petition and the same was accepted by the Tribunal while fixing the notional income. But, I find force in the argument of the learned counsel for the appellant that the Tribunal has a duty to fix the just compensation, irrespective of the amount claimed in the petition.



24. In ***Nagappa v. Gurudayal Singh and others*** [(2003) 2 SCC 274] the Honourable Supreme Court held that in the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, there is no restriction that compensation could be awarded only upto the amount claimed by the claimant and that in appropriate case, where from the evidence brought on record, if the Tribunal/court considers that the claimant is entitled to get more compensation than claimed, the Tribunal may pass such award and the only embargo is that it should be just compensation. Exhibit A32 appointment order shows that the scale of pay of Forest Guard is Rs.10,480/- - 18,300/-. It is not in dispute that the Kerala Public Service Commission has selected the appellant to the post of Forest Guard and he could not join for duty because of the injuries and disabilities and therefore, considering the facts and circumstances, I find that his notional income at the time of occurrence can be fixed at Rs.10,000/- per month.

25. It is in evidence that the appellant applied for change of category and subsequently got compassionate appointment as LD Clerk and joined for duty on 24.08.2012. Therefore, I find merit in the argument of the learned counsel for the appellant that he is entitled for



loss of earnings from 08.04.2011 to 24.8.2012. In that circumstance, the appellant is granted Rs.1,60,000/- towards loss of earnings [10000 x 16].

26. The documents admitted as additional evidence in appeal would clearly show that the disability has adversely affected the career prospects of the appellant and the disparity in the income earned by the appellant and his colleagues who joined the Government service either as clerk or Forest Guard in 2004 as is revealed from Exhibits A38 to A41 would clearly show that the appellant also suffered loss of earning. The decision of the Honourable Supreme Court in ***Dinesh Singh*** (supra) would show that even in the absence of any loss of earning, a person who lost his bodily integrity due to the tortious action of another is entitled to get compensation for that.

27. The learned counsel for the appellant pointed out that the left over service of the appellant is more than the multiplier applicable to him. The appellant was aged 27 years at the time of the accident and the multiplier applicable as per the decision of the Honourable Supreme Court in ***Sarla Varma v. Delhi Transport Corporation [2010 (2) KLT 802 (SC)]*** is 17. It is brought to my notice that for State Government



employees, the age of superannuation is 56 and in that circumstance, his left over service is more than the multiplier applicable to him. Therefore, I find no reason to interfere with the multiplier-multiplicand method adopted by the Tribunal for calculating the compensation for permanent disability. When the compensation for permanent disability of the appellant is calculated as per the revised criteria, he will be entitled for Rs.8,16,000/- $[10,000 \times 12 \times 17 \times 40/100]$. The Tribunal has already granted Rs.7,34,400/- under this head and therefore, the appellant is granted Rs.81,600/- as additional compensation under this head.

28. The learned counsel for the appellant argued that the Tribunal granted only Rs.50,000/- towards pain and suffering. Considering the nature of injuries, period of treatment and disability, I find that the amount awarded by the Tribunal under this head is on the lower side and therefore, the appellant is granted an additional compensation of Rs.1,00,000/- under the head 'pain and suffering'. Towards future medical expenses, the Tribunal allowed only Rs.2,00,000/-. The learned counsel for the appellant argued that it is required to replace the prosthetic limb after 3-4 years and considering the annual maintenance



and the cost of parts, the compensation granted by the Tribunal is on the lower side. It is also pointed out that the appellant had to take leave for the period from 06.10.2019 to 20.12.2020 for availing treatment in connection with the infection on the amputated stump. Therefore, considering the circumstances, I find that it is just and reasonable to allow an additional compensation of Rs.5,00,000/- to the appellant under the head ' future medical expenses'. The compensation granted by the Tribunal under the other heads are reasonable and requires no interference.

29. Accordingly, the appellant is entitled to the enhanced compensation as given below:

Particulars	Compensation awarded by the Tribunal (Rs.)	Additional amount granted by this Court (Rs.)
Loss of earnings	NIL-	1,60,000/-
Compensation for permanent disability	7,34,400/-	81,600/-
Pain and sufferings	50,000/-	1,00,000/-
Future medical expenses	2,00,000/-	5,00,000/-
Total enhanced compensation		8,41,600/-



17. Thus, a total amount of Rs.8,41,600/- (Rupees Eight Lakhs Forty One Thousand Six Hundred only) is awarded as enhanced compensation. The said amount shall carry interest at the rate of 8% per annum from the date of the application till realization (excluding the period of delay of 1204 days in filing the appeal). The appellant would also be entitled to proportionate costs in the case. The claimant shall furnish the details of the bank account to the insurance company for transfer of the amount.

The appeal is allowed as above.

sd/-
**JOHNSON JOHN,
JUDGE.**

Rv

APPENDIX OF MACA 2483/2019APPELLANT'S ANNEXURES:

Annexure A1: ANNEXURE A1: ORIGINAL TAX INVOICE DATED. 02-12-2015 FOR RS: 1,18,000/- ISSUED FROM SAJI'S REHABILITATION CENTRE

Annexure A2: ANNEXURE A2: ORIGINAL TAX INVOICE DATED. 07-08-2016 FOR RS. 21,240/-ISSUED FROM SAJI'S REHABILITATION CENTRE

Annexure A3: ANNEXURE A3: ORIGINAL TAX INVOICE DATED. 17-12-2016 FOR RS. 31,860/-ISSUED FROM SAJI'S REHABILITATION CENTRE

Annexure A4: ANNEXURE A4: ORIGINAL TAX INVOICE DATED. 06-04-2017 FOR RS. 94,400/-ISSUED FROM SAJI'S REHABILITATION CENTRE

Annexure A5: ANNEXURE A5: ORIGINAL TAX INVOICE DATED. 02-10-2017 FOR RS. 35,400/-ISSUED FROM SAJI'S REHABILITATION CENTRE

Annexure A6: ANNEXURE A6: ORIGINAL TAX INVOICE DATED. 5-3-2018 FOR RS.24,190/-ISSUED FROM SAJI'S REHABILITATION CENTRE

Annexure A7: ANNEXURE A7: ORIGINAL TAX INVOICE DATED. 08-12-2018 FOR RS. 1,41,600/-ISSUED FROM SAJI'S REHABILITATION CENTRE

Annexure B1: ANNEXURE B1: ORIGINAL TAX INVOICE DATED. 29-10-2018 FOR RS. 16,000/-ISSUED FROM ENDOLITE INDIA LTD. ERNAKULAM

Annexure B2: ANNEXURE B2: ORIGINAL TAX INVOICE DATED. 13-04-2019 FOR RS. 1,04,280/- ISSUED FROM ENDOLITE INDIA LTD. ERNAKULAM

Annexure B3: ANNEXURE B3: ORIGINAL TAX INVOICE DATED. 09-07-2019 FOR RS. 27,000/-ISSUED FROM ENDOLITE INDIA LTD. ERNAKULAM

Annexure B4: ANNEXURE B4: ORIGINAL TAX INVOICE DATED. 15-12-2022 FOR RS. 18,091/-ISSUED FROM ENDOLITE INDIA LTD. ERNAKULAM



Annexure B5: ANNEXURE B5: ORIGINAL TAX INVOICE DATED. 11-05-2023 FOR RS. 200/- ISSUED FROM ENDOLITE INDIA LTD. ERNAKULAM

Annexure D: ANNEXURE D: TRUE ATTESTED COPY OF THE APPOINTMENT ORDER. NO. TE-5175/11 DATED. 19-08-2011 ISSUED BY THE DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER, THRISSUR

Annexure E: ANNEXURE E: TRUE ATTESTED COPY OF THE GOVERNMENT ORDER DATED. 23-03-2012 ISSUED BY THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF FOREST & WILDLIFE

Annexure F: ANNEXURE F: TRUE ATTESTED COPY OF THE GOVERNMENT ORDER NO. E2-3304/2012 DATED. 23-08-2012 ISSUED BY THE CHIEF CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS, CENTRAL CIRCLE, THRISSUR, NO. E2-3304/12

Annexure G: ANNEXURE G: : TRUE ATTESTED COPY OF THE ORDER DATED. 30-04-2013 ISSUED BY THE CHIEF CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS, CENTRAL CIRCLE, THRISSUR

Annexure H: ANNEXURE H: TRUE ATTESTED COPY OF THE LETTER DATED. 19-8-2024 OF THE DIVISIONAL FOREST OFFICER, VAZHACHAL ADDRESSED TO THE CHIEF FOREST CONSERVATOR, CENTRAL CIRCLE, THRISSUR.

Annexures I series -I, I (a) & I(b): ANNEXURES I SERIES -I, I (a) & I(b): THE TRUE ATTESTED COPIES OF THE SALARY SLIPS FOR THE MONTHS OF SEPTEMBER 2012, AUGUST 2019 AND DECEMBER 2024 RESPECTIVELY ISSUED BY THE DFO, VAZHACHAL

Annexure J: ANNEXURE J: ATTESTED TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE DATED 28-01-2020 ISSUED BY THE CHAIRMAN, MEDICAL BOARD, OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT MEDICAL OFFICE OF HEALTH, THRISSUR.

Annexure K: ANNEXURE K: ATTESTED TRUE COPY OF THE SALARY SLIP FOR DECEMBER, 2024 OF RAVISH .

Annexure L: ANNEXURE L: ATTESTED TRUE COPY OF THE PAY SLIP OF LINEESH C.A FOR THE MONTH OF SEPTEMBER, 2012

Annexure M: ANNEXURE M: ATTESTED TRUE COPY OF THE SALARY SLIP OF LINEESH C.A FOR THE MONTH OF DECEMBER, 2024

Annexure N: ANNEXURE N: THE ORIGINAL RECEIPT VOUCHER FOR



2025:KER:9923

CONSULTATION FEE OF RS. 500/- DATED 01-02-2025
FROM ENDOLITE INDIA PVT.LTD

Annexure O:

ANNEXURE O: ORIGINAL TAX INVOICE DATED. 01-02-2025 FOR RS.210/- FOR THE PURCHASE OF COMBI SOCKS FROM ENDOLITE INDIA LTD.

Annexure P:

ANNEXURE P: ORIGINAL CERTIFICATE DATED 01-02-2015 ISSUED BY ENDOLITE INDIA LTD. FOR THE ESTIMATED COST OF A NEW PROSTHETIC LIMB.

RESPONDENTS' ANNEXURES: NIL

True Copy

P.S to Judge.

rv