



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

244-A

FAO-7231-2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 29.09.2025

S.B.I. General Insurance Company Ltd.

.... Appellant

Versus

Surender Saini and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - None for the appellant.

Ms. Anuradha, Advocate for

Mr. Shashi Kant Gupta, Advocate for respondent No. 1.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

1. The present appeal has been filed by the appellant-Insurance Company laying challenge to the Award dated 29.04.2017 passed by the learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Narnaul (hereinafter referred to as 'the learned Tribunal') whereby the claim petition bearing MACT Case No. RT36 of 2015 dated 29.04.2015 filed by the claimant/respondent No. 1-Surender Saini, under Section 166 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, has been partly allowed; and the claimant has been granted compensation of ₹80,000/-.

2. The present appeal pertains to the year 2017 and notice of motion was issued by the Predecessor Bench of this Court vide order dated 03.11.2017. On 07.01.2025, when this case was listed for hearing, the appellant had gone un-represented and the case was adjourned for today i.e. 29.09.2025. Further, the present appeal along with other connected appeals was put up before a co-ordinate Bench of this Court on 24.07.2025, in view of the '**Special Mediation Drive-Mediation for**



Nation', initiated under the aegis of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, but the same was returned to the Registry, as learned counsel for the appellant-Insurance Company had requested that the matter be adjudicated on merits.

3. Today again, none has put in appearance on behalf of the appellant, despite the case having been called twice.

4. A bare reading of the above facts shows that the appellant has exhibited an utterly casual attitude in its pursuit of the present litigation. It is to be appreciated that very valuable public time of the Court has been expended in affording opportunities to the appellant in the interest of justice. On the other hand, the appellant has adopted an utterly casual and careless approach. It is clear that neither the appellant nor its counsel is seriously interested in pursuing the present matter. Thus, this Court is left with no other option except to **dismiss** the same for non-prosecution.

5. Ordered accordingly.

6. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

29.09.2025
rishu

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether Reportable Yes/No