



Digitally
signed by
BHOLA
NATH
KHATAI
Date:
2026.07.22
10:23:06
+0530



CGHC010139122016

2026:CGHC:30787

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MAC No. 1342 of 2016

1 - Devsharan Chandravanshi S/o Budhru Ram Chandravanshi, Aged About 26 Years R/o Village Vicharpur, Nawagaon, Post Tendunala, Police Station Dongargaon, District Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh Owner **... Appellant**

versus

1 - Shashikala Kanwar Wd/o Late Banshiram Kanwar, Aged About 28 Years R/o Village Vicharpur, Nawagaon, Post Tendunala, Police Station Dongargaon, District Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh

2 - Ku. Jyoti Kanwar D/o Late Banshiram Kanwar, Aged About 9 Years Minor, Through Natural Guardian Mother Smt. Shashikala Kanwar, R/o Village Vicharpur, Nawagaon, Post Tendunala, Police Station Dongargaon, District Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh

3 - Priyanshu Kanwar S/o Late Banshiram Kanwar, Aged About 6 Years Minor, Through Natural Guardian Mother Smt. Shashikala Kanwar, R/o Village Vicharpur, Nawagaon, Post Tendunala, Police Station Dongargaon, District Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh

4 - Ku. Bhumika D/o Late Banshiram Kanwar, Aged About 4 Years Minor, Through Natural Guardian Mother Smt. Shashikala Kanwar, R/o Village Vicharpur, Nawagaon, Post Tendunala, Police Station Dongargaon, District Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh Claimants

5 - Branch Manager, H.D.F.C. Ergo General Insurance Company Limited, Devendra Nagar Road, Near Vanijya Bhawan, Raipur, Tahsil And District Raipur, Chhattisgarh Insurer

... Respondent(s)

For Appellant	: None
For Respondents No.1 to 4	: Ms. Pranoti Das, Advocate, on behalf of Mr. Goutam Khetrapal, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal

Order On Board

20/07/2026

1. The present appeal under Section 173 of the Motor Vehicles Act has been filed against the impugned award dated 28.07.2016 passed by the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Rajnandgaon, CG in Claim Case No.169/2014.
2. On the previous date of hearing, i.e., 23.06.2026, there was no representation on behalf of the appellant.
3. Today, when the matter was called for hearing, there was again no representation on behalf of the appellant, which shows that the appellant is no longer interested in pursuing the appeal.
4. Hence, in the absence of any representation on behalf of the appellant, this Court is left with no other option but to dismiss the appeal for want of prosecution.
5. Accordingly, the present appeal stands **dismissed** for want of prosecution.

**Sd/-
(Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal)
JUDGE**