



CANCELLED



CANCELLED

Single Bench

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

M.A.(C.) No....1143/2013

APPELLANT

(Vehicle Owner)

Abdul Safique S/o Abdul Hakim
aged about 58 years, R/o near
Sahara Battery, K.K. Road,
Moudahapara, Raipur, Civil &
Revenue District Raipur (C.G.)

A.No. MAE 1143/13
Presented by Shri T. Darseng
dated 10/12/13

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :

- 1) Mohammad Rafique S/o
Mohammad Ismaile, aged about 40
years, R/o Farid nagar Nizamee
Chowk, Supela Bhilai, District Durg
(C.G.) (Driver of offending vehicle
Bus bearing registration
C.G.04E/1830)
- 2) The New India Insurance Company
through Divisional Manager, the
New India Insurance Company
Limited, Madeena Building, Jail
Road Raipur, Tahsil & District
Raipur (C.G.) (Insurer of offending
vehicle Bus bearing registration
C.G.04E/1830)
- 3) Smt Chandana Devi Choubey W/o
Late Narendra Choubey, aged about
30 years,
- 4) Ku. Gudiya @ Nidhi Choubey D/o
Late Narendra Choubey, aged about
05 years,
- 5) Ku. Minakshi Choubey D/o Late
Narendra Choubey, aged about 03
years, No.4 & 5 Minor through
mother Smt Chandana Devi
Choubey
- 6) Smt Hirawati Choubey W/o
Rajkishore Choubey, aged about 65
years, All are resident of village
Chakdhanwa (Sonpara) Devanpur,
Police Station Kaptanganj, Block
Mahrajganj, Tahsil Sakdi, District
Ajamgarh (U.P.) (appellant No.1 to 6
are claimants)

Handwritten signature

MEMO OF MISCELLANEOUS APPEAL UNDER SECTION
173 OF MOTOR VEHICLE ACT 1988 AGAINST THE
AWARD /ORDER DATED 24/07/2013 PASSED IN
M.A.C.T.NO. 244/2012 BY THE SECOND ADDITIONAL
MOTOR ACCIDENT CLAIMS TRIBUNAL RAIPUR
DISTRICT RAIPUR (CHHATTISGARH)



XI-HC-22

SI

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक

MAC 1143/13

सन् 20

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	<u>SB: Hon'ble Shri Goutam Bhaduri, J.</u> <u>24.06.2015</u> None for the appellant. Shri P. Dutta, counsel for respondent No.3. The matter was passed over once in absence of any representation on behalf of the appellant. No one appears for the appellant even in the second call. In the circumstances, there is no other option left with the court but to dismiss the MAC for want of prosecution. Accordingly, MAC is dismissed for want of prosecution.	Sd/- Goutam Bhaduri Judge

[पीछे देखिये]