

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

C.R. No.931 of 2014

Date of Decision.22.04.2016

Akhtari and others

.....Petitioners

Vs.

Nankau and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr.Ashok Kaushik, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Sandeep Suri, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

-.-

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. Learned counsel for respondent No.3 is present and discloses the facts of the case as involving a matter of dismissal of the case for default and application for restoration had been disallowed. It is a petition for compensation before the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal. The Courts ought to be liberal in their approach to allow for full adjudication on contest.

2. The order already passed is set aside and the matter is remanded to the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Palwal for disposal after full-fledged trial.

3. The revision petition is allowed. For appearance of the parties before the Tribunal on 05.05.2016.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

April 22, 2016
Pankaj*