



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

225

IOIN-1-FAO-4660-2012 in/and  
FAO-4660-2012 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 29.09.2025

Satyawan

.... Appellant

Versus

Lilu Ram and others

.... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA**

Present: - None.

**NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)**

1. By way of filing the present appeal, the appellant/injured-claimant is seeking enhancement of the compensation of ₹1,83,304/- awarded to him vide impugned Award dated 12.03.2012 by the learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Jind, in a claim petition bearing MACT Case No. 119 dated 19.11.2009/06.12.2011, filed under Section 166 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988.

2. Perusal of the order-sheet(s) reveal(s) that the present appeal has been listed under the **IOIN Category** for completion of service upon respondents No. 1 to 3 as, vide letter Nos. 2461 dated 02.04.2025 and e-mail dated 13.05.2025, learned counsel for the appellant has been requested to furnish correct addresses of respondent No. 1 to 3, but no step has been taken by learned counsel for the appellant.



3. Further, perusal of the case file reveals that since the inception of present appeal, the appellant had gone un-represented; and the present appeal was admitted by the Predecessor Bench of this Court vide order dated 07.03.2013, in the absence of learned counsel for the appellant. Thereafter, the matter was referred to Daily Lok Adalat of this Court for exploring the possibility of an amicable settlement between the parties, but before the Daily Lok Adalat as well on 02 dates i.e. on 05.08.2024 and 27.08.2024, the appellant had gone un-represented. Accordingly, the matter was remitted back to this Court for decision on merits vide order dated 10.09.2024.

4. Today, again none has put in appearance on behalf of the appellant, despite the case having been called twice. As such, the main appeal is ordered to be taken on Board, for final hearing today itself.

5. A bare reading of the above facts shows that the appellant has exhibited an utterly casual attitude in their pursuit of the present litigation. It is not for this Court to be chasing recalcitrant parties or their counsel to argue the matter before the Court; especially of such old vintage as the present one. It is to be appreciated that very valuable public time of the Court has been expended in affording multiple 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 his counsel is seriously interested in pursuing the present matter. Thus, this Court is left with no other option except to **dismiss** the main second appeal for non-prosecution.



6. Ordered accordingly.
7. Pending application(s), if any as well as IOIN, shall also stand(s) disposed of.

29.09.2025  
*rishu*

**( NIDHI GUPTA )  
JUDGE**

**Whether speaking/reasoned    Yes/No**

**Whether Reportable            Yes/No**