

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

MCC No. 398 of 2015

1. Sanjay Kumar Dewangan S/o Bisahu Ram, Aged About 25 years,
R/o Sanjaynagar, Thana Champa District- Janjgir-Champa,
Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Gajanand Goand S/o Shri Tukaram Gaond, Aged About 28 Years,
R/o Village : Kohka, Thana Supela (Bhilai), Distt.- Durg,
Chhattisgarh
2. Smt. Rita Parihar W/o Shri Sunil Shinh Parihar, Aged About 37
Years, R/o 23/3 Nehru Nagar (West) Bhilai District- Durg,
Chhattisgarh
3. The Oriental Insurance Company Limited, Through : Division
Manager P.B. Malviy, R/o Nagar Durg, District Durg, Through:
Division Manager In Front Of High Court Road, Bilaspur,
Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

(Office reference)

Hon'ble Justice Mr. T.P. Sharma and
Hon'ble Justice Mr. I.S. Uboweja

Order on Board
(06.05.2015)

T.P. Sharma,

1. Letter of request dated 09.04.2015 sent by Member, Motor Accident
Claims Tribunal, Bilaspur (C.G.), relating to award passed in
M.A.No.1137/2005 by the learned Single Judge vide order dated
08.04.2013 perused.
2. M.C.C. stands disposed of with the observation that Court below is
required to abide by itself to the order of the High Court passed in
M.A.No.1137/2005.
3. In case of any difficulty, parties are required to take appropriate
steps before the High Court.
4. No order as to costs

J U D G E

J U D G E

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

SINGLE BENCH

HON'BLE MR.T.P. SHARMA, J

S. A. No. 106 of 2003

Appellants

1. Chhedilal Gupta and others

versus

Respondent

Dwarika Prasad Sharma

Appeal under Section 100 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908

Appearance:

None for the appellants.

None for the respondent.

ORDER
(22.08.2014)

5. This second appeal has been filed against the judgment and decree dated 27.07.2002 passed by IIIrd Additional District Judge, Bilaspur in Civil Appeal No.10-A/2002.
6. None appeared for the appellant even in three rounds when the case is called out for hearing, and no representation has been made in this behalf.
7. In absence of any representation on behalf of the appellants, this Court left with no other option except to dismiss the appeal for want of prosecution.
8. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed for want of prosecution.
9. No order asto costs.

J U D G E