

PAWAN KUMAR & ANR. ETC.

v.

M/S HARKISHAN DASS MOHAN LAL & ORS.
(Civil Appeal No. 5906 of 2008)

JANUARY 29, 2014

[P.SATHASIVAM, CJI, RANJAN GOGOI AND
SHIVA KIRTI SINGH, JJ.]

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT, 1988:

Fatal accident - Collusion between a truck and a jeep -- Claim petition in respect of victims traveling in jeep - High Court apportioning the liability of driver/owner of truck at 70% and that of driver/owner of jeep at 30% -- Held: Since the victims were third parties, High Court was not correct in apportioning the liability for the accident between drivers/owners of the two vehicles -- Drivers/owners of both the vehicles are jointly and severally liable to pay compensation and it is open to claimants to enforce the award against both or any of them -- Order of High Court modified accordingly.

Motor accident - Compensation - Principles of composite and contributory negligence - Explained.

A jeep owned by respondent No.1 and driven by respondent No.2 met with an accident with a truck resulting into death of two passengers of the jeep and serious injuries to third one. As the truck involved in the accident had fled from the spot, the driver/owner and insurer of the said truck could not be impleaded in any of the claim petitions filed by the claimants. The High Court held that both the truck as well as the jeep were responsible for the accident and apportioned the liability of the driver/owner of the truck at 70% and that of the driver/owner of the jeep at 30%.

A In the instant appeal filed by the claimants, it was
contended for the appellants that since the victims were
third parties traveling in the jeep, the correct principle to
determine the liability was that of composite negligence,
and the High Court committed an error in invoking the
B principle of contributory negligence and in apportioning
the liability between the drivers/owners of the two
vehicles.

Allowing the appeal, the Court

C HELD: 1.1 The distinction between the composite
and the contributory negligence is clear. Where the
plaintiff/claimant himself is found to be a party to the
negligence the question of joint and several liability
cannot arise and the plaintiff's claim to the extent of his
D own negligence, as may be quantified, will have to be
severed. In such a situation the plaintiff can only be held
entitled to such part of damages/compensation that is not
attributable to his own negligence. "Composite
negligence" refers to the negligence on the part of two
E or more wrong doers. In such a case, each wrongdoer
is jointly and severally liable to the injured for payment
of the entire damages and the injured person has the
choice of proceeding against all or any of them. [para 6-
7] [6-C; 7-C-G]

F *T.O. Anthony Vs. Karvaman & Ors.* 2008 (2) SCR 291 =
(2008) 3 SCC 748 - relied on.

*Winfield & Jolowicz on Tort (Chapter 21) (15th Edition,
1998) - referred to.*

G *Andhra Pradesh State Road Transport Corporation &
Anr. Vs. K. Hemlatha & Ors.* 2008 (8) SCR 1201 = (2008) 6
SCC 767 - cited.

H 1.2 In the instant case, neither the driver/owner nor
the insurer has filed any appeal or cross objection

against the findings of the High Court that both the vehicles were responsible for the accident. The High Court was not correct in apportioning the liability for the accident between drivers/owners of the two vehicles. [para 8] [8-F-H]

1.3 This Court, therefore, holds that the drivers/owners of both the vehicles are jointly and severally liable to pay compensation and it is open to the claimants to enforce the award against both or any of them. The order of the High Court is modified accordingly. [para 9] [9-A-B]

Case Law Reference:

2008 (2) SCR 291 relied on para 4

2008 (8) SCR 1201 cited para 4

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION : Civil Appeal No. 5906 of 2008.

From the Judgment and Order dated 05.07.2006 of the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh in F.A.O. No. 407 of 1995.

Rishi Malhotra, Prem Malhotra for the Appellants.

Dr. Kailash Chand, B.K. Satija for the Respondents.

The Judgment of the Court was delivered by

RANJAN GOGOI, J. 1. The appellants were the claimants in the proceedings instituted for award of compensation under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act"). They are aggrieved by the decision of the High Court of Punjab & Haryana at Chandigarh in F.A.O. Nos. 695, 407 and 408 of 1995 dated 05.07.2006 by which, though their claim for compensation has been upheld, the liability to pay the same has been apportioned between the drivers/owners of the two vehicles involved in the motor accident. The appellants contend

A that as they were third parties to the claim, the High Court ought to have made the drivers/owners of the vehicles jointly and severally liable to pay compensation in view of their composite negligence instead of apportioning their liability by invoking the principle of contributory negligence.

B 2. The brief facts that will be required to be noticed may now be set out:

C Deceased Yogesh (12 years) and Parshotam D. Gupta and injured Salochna were travelling in Jeep No.PB-03-6848 from Sirsa, Haryana to Vaishno Devi on 19.06.1993. The jeep which is owned by the respondent No.1 and driven by the respondent No.2 met with an accident with a truck coming from the opposite direction as a result of which Parshotam D. Gupta and Yogesh died on the spot whereas Salochna received serious injuries. Claim petitions were filed by the parents of D Yogesh and the legal heirs of deceased Parshotam Dass including Salochna who is his wife. The injured Salochna also filed a separate claim petition in respect of the injuries sustained by her in the same accident. As the truck involved in E the accident had fled from the spot, the driver/owner and insurer of the said truck could not be impleaded in any of the claim petitions filed by the claimants.

F The Motor Accident Claims Tribunal (for short "the Tribunal) by its award dated 07.11.1994 held that the truck alone was responsible for the accident and in the absence of the driver/owner or the insurer of the said vehicle, no compensation can be awarded to any of the claimants. Aggrieved, the matter was carried in appeal. The High Court by its order dated G 05.07.2006 held that both the truck as well as the jeep, in which the deceased and the injured were travelling, were responsible for the accident. The High Court further held that the liability of the driver/owner of the truck should be estimated at 70% and that of the driver/owner of the jeep at 30%. Accordingly, the High Court held that in respect of the death of Yogesh,

H

compensation of Rs.2,00,000/- would be the just and fair A
compensation payable to the legal heirs. 30% thereof i.e.
Rs.60,000/- was held to be payable by the driver/owner/insurer
of the jeep. In respect of deceased Parshotam, the High Court
held that the amount of compensation payable would be B
Rs.5,76,000/- and accordingly made the respondent Nos.1, 2
and 3 (insurer) liable to pay 30% of the said compensation
which comes to Rs.1,72,800/-. Insofar as the injuries sustained
by Salochna is concerned, the High Court computed the amount
of compensation payable at Rs.2,00,000/- and made the
respondent Nos. 1, 2 and 3 liable for compensation to the extent C
of 30% of the said amount i.e. Rs.60,000/-. Aggrieved by the
said order, the appellants/claimants have filed the present
appeal.

3. We have heard the learned counsels for the parties. D

4. Learned counsel for the appellants has contended that
though the High Court has rightly held both the vehicles to be
responsible for the accident it has committed a glaring error in
invoking the principle of contributory negligence in the present
case and in apportioning the liability between the drivers/owners E
of the two vehicles. Relying on the decision of this Court in *T.O.
Anthony Vs. Karvarnan & Ors.*¹ which has been followed in a
subsequent decision in *Andhra Pradesh State Road Transport
Corporation & Anr. Vs. K. Hemlatha & Ors.*², learned counsel
has urged that in a case where the claimant is a third party (other F
than the driver/owner of the vehicles involved in the accident)
the correct principle for determination of the liability is that of
composite negligence which would make the drivers/owners of
the two vehicles jointly and severally liable. The principle of
contributory negligence so as to apportion the liability between
the drivers/owners would be relevant only if the claim for
compensation is by one of the drivers himself or by his legal
heirs, as the case may be. It is, therefore, contended that the G

1. (2008) 3 SCC 748.

2. (2008) 6 SCC 767.

A apportionment made by the High Court is against the settled principles of law laid down by this Court.

B 5. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent No.1 has argued that even if the view taken by the High Court that both the vehicles were responsible for the accident is to be accepted, the liability of the joint tortfeasors has to be apportioned which has been so done by the High Court. It is also submitted that in the absence of any specific material the apportionment of compensation, as determined by the High Court, ought not to be disturbed.

C 6. The distinction between the principles of composite and contributory negligence has been dealt with in *Winfield & Jolowicz on Tort* (Chapter 21) (15th Edition, 1998). It would be appropriate to notice the following passage from the said work:-

E "WHERE two or more people by their independent breaches of duty to the plaintiff cause him to suffer distinct injuries, no special rules are required, for each tortfeasor is liable for the damage which he caused and only for that damage. Where, however, two or more breaches of duty by different persons cause the plaintiff to suffer a single injury the position is more complicated. The law in such a case is that the plaintiff is entitled to sue all or any of them for the full amount of his loss, and each is said to be jointly and severally liable for it. This means that special rules are necessary to deal with the possibilities of successive actions in respect of that loss and of claims for contribution or indemnity by one tortfeasor against the others. It is greatly to the plaintiff's advantage to show that that he has suffered the same, indivisible harm at the hands of a number of defendants for he thereby avoids the risk, inherent in cases where there are different injuries, of finding that one defendant is insolvent (or uninsured) and being unable to execute judgment against him. The same picture is not, of course, so attractive from the point of view

F

G

H

of the solvent defendant, who may end up carrying full responsibility for a loss in the causing of which he played only a partial, even secondary role. A

.....

The question of whether there is one injury can be a difficult one. The simplest case is that of two virtually simultaneous acts of negligence, as where two drivers behave negligently and collide, injuring a passenger in one of the cars or a pedestrian, but there is no requirement that the acts be simultaneous." B C

7. Where the plaintiff/claimant himself is found to be a party to the negligence the question of joint and several liability cannot arise and the plaintiff's claim to the extent of his own negligence, as may be quantified, will have to be severed. In such a situation the plaintiff can only be held entitled to such part of damages/compensation that is not attributable to his own negligence. The above principle has been explained in *T.O. Anthony* (supra) followed in *K. Hemlatha & Ors.* (supra). Paras 6 and 7 of *T.O. Anthony* (supra) which are relevant may be extracted hereinbelow: D E

"6. "Composite negligence" refers to the negligence on the part of two or more persons. Where a person is injured as a result of negligence on the part of two or more wrongdoers, it is said that the person was injured on account of the composite negligence of those wrongdoers. In such a case, each wrongdoer is jointly and severally liable to the injured for payment of the entire damages and the injured person has the choice of proceeding against all or any of them. In such a case, the injured need not establish the extent of responsibility of each wrongdoer separately, nor is it necessary for the court to determine the extent of liability of each wrongdoer separately. On the other hand where a person suffers injury, partly due to the negligence on the part of another person or persons, and H

A partly as a result of his own negligence, then the negligence
on the part of the injured which contributed to the accident
is referred to as his contributory negligence. Where the
injured is guilty of some negligence, his claim for
damages is not defeated merely by reason of the
negligence on his part but the damages recoverable by
B him in respect of the injuries stand reduced in proportion
to his contributory negligence.

7. Therefore, when two vehicles are involved in an
accident, and one of the drivers claims compensation from
C the other driver alleging negligence, and the other driver
denies negligence or claims that the injured claimant
himself was negligent, then it becomes necessary to
consider whether the injured claimant was negligent and
if so, whether he was solely or partly responsible for the
D accident and the extent of his responsibility, that is, his
contributory negligence. Therefore where the injured is
himself partly liable, the principle of "composite
negligence" will not apply nor can there be an automatic
inference that the negligence was 50:50 as has been
E assumed in this case. The Tribunal ought to have examined
the extent of contributory negligence of the appellant and
thereby avoided confusion between composite negligence
and contributory negligence. The High Court has failed to
correct the said error."

F 8. In the present case, neither the driver/owner nor the
insurer has filed any appeal or cross objection against the
findings of the High Court that both the vehicles were
responsible for the accident. In the absence of any challenge
to the aforesaid part of the order of the High Court, we ought
G to proceed in the matter by accepting the said finding of the
High Court. From the discussions that have preceded, it is
clear that the High Court was not correct in apportioning the
liability for the accident between drivers/owners of the two
vehicles.

H

PAWAN KUMAR & ANR. ETC. v. M/S HARKISHAN 9
DASS MOHAN LAL & ORS. [RANJAN GOGOI, J.]

9. We, accordingly, hold that the drivers/owners of both the vehicles are jointly and severally liable to pay compensation and it is open to the claimants to enforce the award against both or any of them. The order of the High Court dated 05.07.2006 is modified to the extent indicated above and the appeal is allowed.

A

B

R.P.

Appeal allowed.