

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

FAO No. 144 of 1994

Date of Decision: 07.04.2016

Jaswinder Kaur and others

.....Appellants

Vs.

Sadhu Singh

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Munish Gupta, Advocate,
for the appellants.

Mr. Lalit Garg, Advocate,
for respondent No. 7-Insurance company.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

In response to the order dated 25.02.2016, Mr. Munish Gupta, Advocate, has appeared in Court today for the appellants and submitted that he is unable to contact the appellants despite having sent a registered letter to them; hence, he is unable to deposit the fee for effecting substituted service on respondent No. 2, i.e. the owner of the 'offending vehicle' bearing registration No. PCT-4196.

In view of the fact that the liability of the insurance company that insured the said vehicle was limited to Rs. 1,50,000/-, obviously the only contesting respondent qua the issue of enhancement of compensation, would be respondent No. 2 (Respondent No. 1, i.e. the driver of the vehicle, having

died).

In view of the fact that the said respondent cannot be served, in view of what has been submitted above, the appeal is dismissed for non-prosecution.

A copy of this order be sent to the appellants.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

April 07, 2016
nitin