



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

127

FAO-4245-2024 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 11.09.2025

Sushil

.... Appellant

Versus

Sanjay and others

.... Respondents

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

Present: - None.

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

1. By way filing the present appeal, the appellant/driver-cum-owner of the offending vehicle lays challenge to the Award dated 06.07.2024, passed by the by the learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Sonipat (for short-‘the learned Tribunal), in a Claim Petition bearing MACP No. 145 of 2023, whereby the learned Tribunal has affixed the liability of the appellant to pay the amount of ₹7,93,000/- to claimant-respondents No. 1 to 3.
2. Perusal of the order-sheets reveals that on 09.09.2024, when this case was listed for hearing, following order was passed by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court:-

*“Learned counsel appearing for the applicant/appellant prays for an adjournment on the ground that arguing counsel is in personal difficulty due to some personal emergency in his family.*

*In the interest of justice, adjourned to 04.02.2025.*

*On the next date of hearing, learned counsel for the applicant/appellant to first assist on the application seeking exemption from complying with mandatory statutory provisions.”*



3. Thereafter, on the next date of hearing i.e. 04.02.2025 the present appeal was adjourned at the request of learned counsel for the appellant. On the last date of hearing 08.07.2025, the appeal was adjourned on account of non-appearance on behalf of the appellant. Even the appellant has not deposited the statutory amount of ₹25,000/-.

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

5. A bare reading of the above facts shows that the appellant has exhibited an utterly casual attitude in his 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 his 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.

6. Ordered accordingly.

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

11.09.2025  
*rishu*

( NIDHI GUPTA )  
JUDGE

**Whether speaking/reasoned**    **Yes/No**

**Whether Reportable**            **Yes/No**