

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

Order Sheet

MAC No. 835 of 2014

- Shriram General Insurance Company Ltd. Through Branch Manager, Shriram General Insurance Co.Ltd., Branch Office, Near Gayatri Mandir, T.P. Nagar, Korba, Distt. Korba C.G.

---- Appellant

Versus

1. Smt. Minakshi Pandey W/o Late Sunil Kumar Pandey Aged About 21 Years, R/o N.E. 123, Chhattisgarh Vidiyut Mandal Colony, Korba, Distt. Korba C.G.
2. Minor Aditya Pandey S/o Late Sunil Kumar Pandey Aged About 1 Year, being Minor represented through Mother Smt. Minakshi Pandey, R/o N.E. 123, Chhattisgarh Vidiyut Mandal Colony, Korba, Distt. Korba C.G.
3. Yag Narayan Pandey S/o Vipin Bihari Pandey Aged About 52 Years R/O N.E. 123, Chhattisgarh Vidiyut Mandal Colony, Korba, Distt. Korba C.G.
4. Smt. Vinita Pandey W/o Yag Narayan Pandey Aged About 44 Years R/O N.E. 123, Chhattisgarh Vidiyut Mandal Colony, Korba, Distt. Korba C.G.
5. Bisauha Ram Thakur S/o Basant Ram Thakur resident of village Khorpa, P.S. Patan, Distt. Durg C.G.
6. Devnarayan Bhale S/o Rampratap Bhale, resident of House No. 17, Rajiv Chowk, Patan, P.S. & Tah. Patan, Distt. Durg C.G.

---- Respondents

14.08.2015	Mr. Sachin Singh Rajput, counsel for the appellant. Heard on I.A.No.1 for condonation of delay in filing the appeal. This appeal is barred by limitation of 608 days. It is stated that copy of the award was sent to the head office of the appellant Company at Jaipur and after taking instructions from the head office and after obtaining legal opinion from the counsel of High Court it was decided to file the present appeal. In the meanwhile, the law officer of the Company had left the job and the matter could not be	

Rao	preprocessed as the file could not be traced by the staff of appellant and subsequently when the file was traced, the file was sent for preparation of appeal, as such, the delay of 608 days was caused. I have considered the application for condonation of delay. The reasons which have been assigned by the Company appellant do not inspire confidence. No document has been placed on record along-with such application so as to show the bonafide grounds and only bald statements have been made for condonation of delay. It is also observed that the delay is not of few days but is of 608 days. Therefore, in order to condone the delay, the genuineness and sufficient reasons must exist and as a matter of right, such long delay cannot be condoned in absence of bonafide valid reasons. In the result, the application for condonation of delay is rejected. Consequently, the appeal stands finally dismissed. Sd/- (Goutam Bhaduri) Judge	
-----	---	--