

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

**FAO No.706 of 2000 (O&M)
Date of Decision: February 02, 2014**

Surjit Singh

..Appellant(s)

Versus

Rattan Singh and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE ANITA CHAUDHRY

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment? Yes/No
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not? Yes/No
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest? Yes

Present: Mr. A.D.S. Sukhija, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. H.S. Gharoo, Advocate for
Mr. V.K. Garg, Advocate
for respondent no.3-insurance company.

ANITA CHAUDHRY, J.

1. This is appeal by the claimant dissatisfied with the award. His claim for damages to the scooter had been declined by the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Faridkot (here-in-after referred to as the Tribunal), vide award dated 14.10.1999.

2. The claimant approached the Tribunal claiming damages to his scooter to the tune of Rs.3,540/-. His case was that the scooter was damaged in the accident, regarding which the FIR was registered. He had claimed that he had spent his amount on its repair.

3. The Tribunal noticed that the claimant did not lodge any complaint with the insurance company. He did not get the photograph of the scooter. He did not get the scooter checked from an authorized surveyor. The bills adduced in evidence were in the name of Sunil Madan. The original bill book was not summoned. It noted that three different bills had been issued on 15.07.1997 and there was no explanation as to why a composite bill had not been prepared and refused to grant any damages.

4. I have gone through the award. I find no merit in the appeal. The Tribunal had recorded its detailed reasons for declining the claim. The original bills were not produced. The photocopy of the bills produced by the claimant were in the name of Sunil Madan. There is no reason to take different view. The appeal is dismissed.

(ANITA CHAUDHRY)
JUDGE

February 02, 2014
sunil