SAI SINDHU INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH (SSIJR)

www.ssijr.org

DUAL COMPENSATION UNDER THE ESI ACT AND MOTOR VEHICLES ACT: LEGAL CONFLICT, JUDICIAL TRENDS, AND THE PENDING LARGER BENCH REFERENCE

Prasanth M

Assistant Professor of Law, Erode College of Law, Erode.

Abstract

The issue of whether an employee covered under the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 can claim compensation under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 for the same employment-related motor accident has generated persistent judicial controversy. Section 53 of the ESI Act bars recovery under "any other law" for an employment injury, while the MV Act provides an independent, victim-oriented compensation regime through Sections 163A and 166. This article examines the resulting conflict between social insurance and tort-based liability frameworks. It analyses leading Supreme Court decisions, divergent High Court approaches particularly in third-party claims and the evolving interpretation of "employment injury" and "similar benefits." The article further evaluates the implications of the pending larger bench reference in Raj Kumar Agarwal v. Tata Venture. It argues that although current jurisprudence favours exclusivity of ESI remedies to prevent double recovery, the final legal position remains unsettled pending authoritative judicial clarification.

Keywords

ESI Act; Motor Vehicles Act; Employment Injury; Double Compensation; Section 53; Social Security Law; Tort Liabilit.

1. Introduction

The intersection between the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (ESI Act) and the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (MV Act) raises complex questions concerning the permissibility of dual compensation for employment-related motor accidents. Section 53 of the ESI Act expressly bars an insured person or their dependents from claiming compensation or damages under "any other law for the time being in force" in respect of an employment injury.[1] This provision reflects the legislative intent to establish a comprehensive and exclusive social security framework, ensuring prompt, no-fault benefits while preventing multiplicity of claims. In contrast, the MV Act particularly Sections 163A and 166provides an independent statutory mechanism to secure "just compensation" for victims of motor accidents.[2] These provisions operate within a tort-based framework, enabling claims against vehicle owners and insurers, including in cases involving third-party negligence. The presence of non-obstante clauses further strengthens the argument for the MV Act's overriding applicability. This overlap creates a doctrinal tension between social security legislation, grounded in contributory insurance and standardized benefits, and tort-based compensation regimes aimed at full restitution. The complexity is heightened where accidents occur in the course of employment but involve third-party liability or employer-provided transport.

2. Statutory Framework

2.1 The ESI Act: Bar on Dual Remedies

The Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 establishes a comprehensive social insurance mechanism designed to provide medical and monetary benefits to employees in cases of sickness, maternity, and employment injury. A central provision governing the present controversy is Section 53, which stipulates that an insured person or his/her dependents shall not be entitled to receive or recover compensation or damages under the Employees' Compensation Act or any other law for the time being in force in respect of an employment injury.[3] This provision creates a statutory bar against parallel or subsequent claims, reflecting the principle that once the ESI scheme applies, it becomes the exclusive remedy. This prohibition is further reinforced by Section 61, which precludes the receipt of "similar

[1] Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948, s. 53.

[2] Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, ss. 163A, 166.

[3] Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948, s. 53.

benefits" under any other enactment.[4] The combined effect of Sections 53 and 61 is to prevent duplication of benefits and ensure the financial sustainability of the contributory insurance system. The definition of "employment injury" under Section 2(8), read with Section 51E, is broad in scope. It includes accidents arising out of and in the course of employment and extends, under certain conditions, to commuting accidents where a clear nexus between employment and the accident is established.[5] Judicial interpretation has often emphasised this nexus requirement, particularly in borderline cases involving travel to and from the workplace. The legislative intent behind these provisions is to create a self-contained and exhaustive code, ensuring prompt, no-fault benefits without requiring proof of negligence, while simultaneously avoiding multiplicity of proceedings and conflicting claims.

2.2 The Motor Vehicles Act: Independent Compensation Regime

In contrast, the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 provides an independent statutory framework for compensating victims of motor accidents, grounded in both fault and no-fault liability principles. Section 163A introduces a no-fault liability regime, allowing claimants to receive compensation based on a structured formula without the need to prove negligence. This provision aims to ensure speedy relief, particularly for economically weaker sections. Section 166, on the other hand, provides for fault-based claims, enabling victims to seek higher compensation based on actual loss, including loss of income, future prospects, and non-pecuniary damages. Further, Section 167 allows claimants to elect between remedies under the Employees' Compensation Act and the Motor Vehicles Act, though it does not explicitly address the ESI framework.[6] This omission has contributed to interpretative challenges. Importantly, the MV Act contains non-obstante clauses, which are often invoked to argue that its provisions override conflicting laws. This raises a critical question: whether such clauses can supersede the bar imposed by Section 53 of the ESI Act, particularly in cases involving third-party insurers. Thus, while the ESI Act prioritizes uniform social security benefits, the MV Act emphasizes individualized, and often higher, compensation thereby creating a significant statutory and doctrinal conflict.

[4] Ibid., s. 61.

[5] Ibid., ss. 2(8), 51E.

[6] Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, s. 167.

3.1 Supreme Court: Exclusivity of ESI Remedy

The Supreme Court of India has consistently interpreted Section 53 of the Employees' State Insurance (ESI) Act, 1948, as a complete statutory bar against claiming compensation or damages under any other law for employment injuries sustained by insured persons. This provision establishes the ESI Act as a self-contained code, designed to provide comprehensive social security benefits while preventing double recovery and multiplicity of proceedings. The Court has emphasized that once an injury qualifies as an "employment injury" under the Act, the insured employee or their dependents cannot seek additional remedies from the employer or any other party under statutes like the Workmen's Compensation Act or tort law. This strict approach promotes the legislative intent of efficient, no-fault insurance-based compensation funded through contributions, ensuring predictability and reducing litigation burdens on industries. By upholding exclusivity, the apex court reinforces the ESI scheme's role as the primary and exhaustive mechanism for workplace injury redressal.

Western India Plywood Ltd. v. P. Ashokan (1997)[7]

In this landmark case, the Supreme Court addressed whether an insured employee could file a civil suit for damages against the employer for an employment injury despite receiving ESI benefits. The Court held that Sections 53 and 61 of the ESI Act bar such claims, as the Act provides a comprehensive remedy. P. Ashokan, an employee injured in a workplace accident, sought additional damages, but the Court ruled that the statutory bar prevents parallel proceedings to avoid unjust enrichment. This decision clarified that the ESI Act overrides common law remedies against the employer, affirming its status as a complete code for covered injuries. It has been widely followed, underscoring that employees cannot claim double benefits.

A. Trehan v. Associated Electrical Agencies (1996)[8]

The Supreme Court reinforced the absolute nature of the bar under Section 53 in this matter. A. Trehan, a technician injured while repairing a television set (an employment injury), claimed compensation under the Workmen's Compensation Act. The Court dismissed the claim, holding that

[7] (1997) 7 SCC 638.

[8] (1996) 4 SCC 255.

the ESI Act's exclusivity precludes any recovery under other laws for the same injury, even if framed in tort. It rejected arguments that the bar applies only to contractual claims, affirming that Section 53 operates as a blanket prohibition to streamline remedies and prevent overlapping compensation. This judgment strengthened the principle that ESI benefits are the sole recourse against the employer.

National Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Hamida Khatoon (2009)[9]

Extending the bar beyond employer liability, the Supreme Court held that claims under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, are also barred for employment injuries covered by ESI when involving insured employees. In a fatal accident case, the Court ruled that Section 53's wide language ("any other law") includes MV Act claims against third parties like insurers, emphasizing no double recovery. It affirmed ESI as a wider, comprehensive scheme replacing narrower remedies like Workmen's Compensation. This decision broadened the exclusivity principle across statutes. These rulings collectively establish ESI as the definitive framework for employment injuries.

3.2 Divergent High Court Approaches

While the Supreme Court has upheld strict exclusivity under Section 53 of the ESI Act, several High Courts have adopted a more balanced, nuanced view in cases involving third-party tortfeasors, particularly motor vehicle accidents. These courts distinguish between employer liability (fully covered and barred by ESI) and independent third-party liability arising under tort or the Motor Vehicles Act. They permit claims under the MV Act against negligent third parties (e.g., vehicle owners or insurers) but mandate deduction of ESI benefits already received to prevent unjust enrichment or double compensation. This approach reconciles the social security objectives of the ESI Act with the compensatory justice goals of tort law, allowing victims fuller recovery from non-employer sources while adjusting awards accordingly. It reflects a pragmatic interpretation that does not wholly extinguish third-party rights, especially where the tortfeasor is unrelated to the employment contract. Such decisions promote equity without undermining the ESI scheme's core protections. High Courts

[9] (2009) 13 SCC 361.

like those in Punjab & Haryana, Allahabad, and others have applied this in practice, often citing the need to hold third parties accountable while crediting ESI disbursements against MV Act awards. This creates some judicial divergence, occasionally leading to references to larger benches for clarity on the interplay between ESI and MV Act provisions. Overall, it attempts a harmonious construction balancing statutory bars with common law rights.

4. Larger Bench Reference: Unresolved Questions

The long-standing doctrinal conflict between the exclusivity provisions of the Employees' State Insurance (ESI) Act, 1948, and the compensatory rights under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (MV Act), has reached a critical juncture. In Rajkumar Agarwal v. Vehicle Tata Venture, the Supreme Court has referred the matter to a larger bench for authoritative resolution. This reference underscores the persistent uncertainty in reconciling the social security objectives of the ESI scheme with the no-fault liability and victim-centric compensation framework of the MV Act. The case highlights the tension between statutory bars intended to prevent double recovery and the independent tortious liability of third parties (including vehicle owners and insurers). Judicial divergence across benches and High Courts necessitated this escalation, as two-judge benches found it difficult to harmoniously interpret the overlapping yet distinct statutory regimes. The larger bench reference aims to provide clarity on fundamental questions affecting thousands of employment injury claims arising from road accidents, balancing employee protection with the prevention of unjust enrichment.

Facts

Rajkumar Agarwal, an insured employee under the ESI Act, suffered severe injuries in a motor accident involving a Tata Venture vehicle linked to his employment. The Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal (MACT) awarded compensation under Sections 163A/166 of the MV Act. However, the High Court set aside the award, invoking the bar under Section 53 of the ESI Act, holding that ESI benefits preclude parallel claims. The claimant contended that the accident involved third-party liability and that ESI benefits do not constitute a complete substitute for MV Act compensation, especially where the tortfeasor is independent. This factual matrix brought into sharp focus the interplay between workplace social insurance and road accident compensation laws.

4.1 Questions Referred

1. Whether Section 53 of the ESI Act bars claims under Sections 163A/166 of the MV Act.
2. Whether ESI benefits constitute “similar benefits” under Sections 53 and 61.
3. Whether the non-obstante clauses in the MV Act override the ESI Act.

4.2 Conflicting Precedents

The reference to the larger bench stems from irreconcilable views in earlier Supreme Court decisions. A key point of tension is Regional Director, ESI Corporation v. Francis De Costa (1996),[10] where the Court examined the definition of “employment injury” under Section 2(8) of the ESI Act. It adopted a nuanced view on notional extension of employment and suggested that ESI coverage does not automatically extinguish all other remedies, particularly where the injury has a wider tortious dimension. This appears to conflict with the strict exclusivity rulings in Western India Plywood Ltd. v. P. Ashokan, A. Trehan, and National Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Hamida Khatoon, which emphasized the ESI Act as a complete code barring parallel claims.

Division benches found it challenging to reconcile these precedents, especially on whether third-party MV Act claims (against insurers or unrelated vehicle owners) survive the ESI bar and whether ESI benefits must be deducted from MV awards to avoid unjust enrichment. The larger bench is expected to harmonize these authorities, clarify the scope of “any other law,” and settle the hierarchy between social insurance legislation and compensatory tort statutes. Until resolved, High Courts continue to adopt varying approaches, creating uncertainty in motor accident litigation involving insured employees.

5. Present Legal Position

As of April 2026, Section 53 of the Employees’ State Insurance (ESI) Act, 1948 continues to be interpreted as imposing a substantive bar on dual claims for employment injuries. Claims under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (MV Act) are often dismissed in clear cases of employment injury where the vehicle is employer-owned or the accident arises out

[10] (1996) 6 SCC 1.

of and in the course of employment. However, in cases involving independent third-party tortfeasors, several High Courts allow MV Act claims subject to adjustment or deduction of ESI benefits already received, to prevent unjust enrichment. Courts uniformly apply the principle against double recovery, treating ESI benefits as a statutory social security floor rather than a complete substitute for full tortious compensation. The larger bench reference in Rajkumar Agarwal v. Vehicle Tata Venture remains pending, leaving some uncertainty on the exact interplay between the two statutes. This position balances the ESI Act's exclusivity with the MV Act's victim-centric compensatory scheme, pending authoritative clarification by the Supreme Court.

6. Practical Implications

1. Employment Injury Cases

In cases where an accident clearly qualifies as an "employment injury" under Section 2(8) of the ESI Act such as accidents involving employer-owned vehicles, during working hours, or within the premises ESI remains the primary and often the exclusive remedy. Employees or their dependents are generally barred from claiming additional compensation from the employer under the Workmen's Compensation Act, common law, or even the Motor Vehicles Act. The focus shifts entirely to the ESI Corporation for medical benefits, disablement/sickness benefits, and dependants' benefits. Attempting parallel proceedings usually results in dismissal, reinforcing the principle that the ESI scheme is a complete code for such injuries. Employers also gain protection from multiple liabilities once they comply with ESI contribution requirements. This predictability reduces litigation but sometimes leaves employees feeling that the statutory benefits are inadequate compared to full tort compensation.

2. Third-Party Accidents

In motor accidents involving independent third parties (neither the employer nor a co-employee), MV Act claims under Sections 163A or 166 may still be maintainable. High Courts have increasingly permitted such claims, provided the claimant discloses and allows deduction/adjustment of ESI benefits already received. This approach prevents double recovery while ensuring the victim can recover the balance from the third-party tortfeasor or insurer. However, if the employment nexus is strong (e.g., accident while on duty in employer's vehicle), courts are more likely to apply the ESI bar strictly. Claimants must therefore clearly establish the independent liability of the third party to succeed. This creates a hybrid remedy route that balances social insurance with additional tortious compensation.

3. Litigation Strategy

Claimants must adopt a cautious and transparent litigation strategy. Full disclosure of all ESI benefits received is mandatory; failure to disclose can lead to rejection of the claim on grounds of suppression of facts or unjust enrichment. Lawyers need to carefully evaluate the “employment nexus” whether the accident occurred “arising out of and in the course of employment” before choosing the forum. Where the nexus is weak or a clear third-party tortfeasor exists, filing under the MV Act with a prayer for deduction of ESI benefits is advisable. In strong employment injury cases, pursuing only ESI remedies is safer to avoid dismissal. Parties should also consider awaiting the larger bench decision in Rajkumar Agarwal before filing fresh claims involving overlapping issues. Proper documentation of contributions, benefits, and accident circumstances is critical for success.

7. Conclusion

The ongoing conflict between the Employees’ State Insurance (ESI) Act, 1948 and the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 reflects a deeper tension in Indian labour and compensation jurisprudence between the welfare-oriented, no-fault social insurance model of ESI and the fault-based, victim-centric tort compensation framework under the MV Act. While the Supreme Court has consistently leaned towards the exclusivity of ESI remedies under Section 53, treating it as a complete code to prevent double recovery, doctrinal inconsistencies across judgments and divergent High Court approaches have left the law in a state of uncertainty. The reference to a larger bench in Rajkumar Agarwal v. Tata Venture is therefore highly significant. The forthcoming decision is expected to authoritatively settle critical issues, including the precise scope of the Section 53 bar, whether ESI benefits qualify as “similar benefits” under Sections 53 and 61, and the interplay between the non-obstante clauses of both statutes, particularly in third-party liability cases. Until this authoritative pronouncement, the legal position remains fact-sensitive and jurisdictionally evolving. Courts and practitioners must exercise caution, carefully analysing the employment nexus, nature of the tortfeasor, and principles of unjust enrichment before proceeding with claims. The ultimate resolution will have far-reaching implications for industrial relations, insurance practice, and road accident litigation involving insured employees across India.

REFERENCES

1. https://www.indiacode.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/12829/1/the_employees_state_insurance_act%2C_1948_no._34_of_1948_date_19.04.1948.pdf
2. https://www.indiacode.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/9460/1/a1988-59.pdf
3. https://www.mondaq.com/india/employee-benefits-compensation/1739888/reimagining-compensation-under-the-motor-vehicles-act-allahabad-high-court-holds-permanently-disabled-minor-entitled-to-wages-of-a-skilled-workman
4. https://ijlr.iledu.in/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/V3I1069F.pdf
5. https://www.barandbench.com/news/litigation/can-employee-insured-employees-state-insurance-act-claim-compensation-motor-vehicles-act-supreme-court-larger-bench
6. https://www.livelaw.in/top-stories/supreme-court-esi-motor-accident-compensation-larger-bench-220031