



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

213

FAO-1950-2013 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 22.05.2025

Savitri Devi and others

.... Appellants

Versus

Chain Singh and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - None for the appellants.

Mr. Aseem Aggarwal, Advocate
for respondent No. 3-Insurance Company.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

The appellant-claimants have filed the instant appeal against the impugned Award dated 10.01.2013 passed by the learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Panchkula, whereby the claim petition bearing MACT Case No. 235 of 2011 dated 01.06.2011 filed by the claimants under Section 166 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, was dismissed on the ground that they were unable to prove the involvement of the alleged offending vehicle in the accident dated 09.04.2011.

The present appeal is of the year 2013.

Perusal of the order-sheets reveals that notice in the present appeal was issued way back on 23.07.2013. Thereafter, on account of regular non-appearance of learned counsel for the appellants, the present appeal was dismissed for non-prosecution vide order dated 26.10.2016. Subsequently, the present appeal was restored vide order dated 30.01.2017 and thereafter, the same was listed for hearing as many as 09 times i.e. on 22.08.2017, 14.03.2018, 19.03.2018, 23.04.2018,



12.10.2018, 26.08.2019, 22.08.2022, 15.09.2022 and 26.07.2024 when the same was adjourned, either at request of, or on account of non-appearance of learned counsel for the appellants.

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

A bare reading of the above facts shows that the appellants have exhibited an utterly casual attitude in their 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 appellants in the interest of justice. On the other hand, the appellants have adopted an utterly casual and careless approach. It is clear that neither the appellants nor their counsel are seriously interested in pursuing the present matter. Thus, this Court is left with no other option except to **dismiss** the same for non-prosecution.

Ordered accordingly.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stands disposed of.

22.05.2025
rishu

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned **Yes/No**

Whether Reportable **Yes/No**