

GAHC010036032024



undefined

THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

Case No. : I.A.(Civil)/691/2024

ORIENTAL INSURANCE COMPANY LTD.
HAVING ITS REGISTERED OFFICE AT ORIENTAL HOUSE, A-25/27, ASAF ALI
ROAD, A 25/27 ASAF ALI ROAD, NEW DELHI 110002 AND REGIONAL
OFFICE AT GUWAHATI 7, REPRESENTED BY THE REGIONAL MANAGER

VERSUS

HAMIDA BIBI AND 7 ORS.
W/O LATE ABDUS SAMAD, R/O VILLAGE NO. BHANDARA, PO BHANDARA
BAZAR. PS MANIKPUR, DIST. BONGAIGAON, ASSAM

2:NASER ALI
S/O LATE ABDUS SAMAD VILLAGE NO. BHANDARA
PO BHANDARA BAZAR. PS MANIKPUR
DIST. BONGAIGAON
ASSAM

3:HASEN ALI
S/O LATE ABDUS SAMAD VILLAGE NO. 4 BHANDARA
PO BHANDARA BAZAR. PS MANIKPUR
DIST. BONGAIGAON
ASSAM

4:AMJAD ALI
S/O AHER ALI VILLAGE NO. BHANDARA
PO BHANDARA BAZAR. PS MANIKPUR
DIST. BONGAIGAON
ASSAM

5:ASHIRUDDIN AHMED
S/O MD. ABDUL REZZAK
RESIDENT OF VILLAGE DOLAIGAON
PO
PS AND DIST BONGAIGAON

ASSAM

6:THE UNIVERSAL SOMPO GENERAL INSURANCE CO. LTD.
UNIT NO. 1
COM B 1ST FLOOR
ADAMS PLAZA
GS ROAD
CHRISTIAN BASTI
BONGAIGAON
ASSAM

7:SHRI. NARAYAN PAL
S/O R. PAL RESIDENT OF B/28
HARIDARSHAN SOCIETY
NAVA VASTRAL
R.T.O ROAD
VASTRAL AHMEDABAD
380027

8:SRI NARAYAN R. BAGHEL
S/O RAMSEWAK RESIDENT OF B/28
HARIDARSHAN SOCIETY
NAVA VASTRAL
R.T.O ROAD
VASTRAL AHMEDABAD
38002

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR. S DUTTA, MR. S DUTTA

Advocate for the Respondent : MR. K R PATGIRI,

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE MALASRI NANDI

ORDER

02.12.2024

Heard Mr. S. Dutta, learned counsel for the applicants. Also Heard Mr. M. Khan, learned counsel for the respondent/claimant.

By this interlocutory application, the applicant has prayed for modification and/or alteration of the order dated 30.01.2024 passed by the this Court in I.A.

(C) No. 1730/2023 (arising out of MACApp. 53/2024).

Mr. Dutta, learned counsel for the applicant, submits that due to miscommunication/inadvertent mistake the names of the respondent Nos. 7 and 8 were struck off by this Court from the memo of appeal vide order dated 30.01.2024 in I.A.(C) No. 1730/2023. Learned counsel further submitted that respondent Nos. 7 and 8 are the necessary parties in the appeal and their names could not be struck off in the array of the respondents from the memo of appeal.

After hearing the learned counsel for the applicant and as learned counsel for the respondent/claimant has no objection, considering the grounds cited in the petition, the prayer as sought for by the applicant, is allowed.

Accordingly, the names of respondent Nos. 7 and 8 be restored in the memo of appeal.

Registry is directed to do the needful.

With the above direction, the interlocutory application stands disposed of.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant