

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

**FAO No.3942 of 2013 (O&M)
Date of Decision: September 15, 2016.**

Sushila Devi and others

.....APPELLANT(s).

VERSUS

Banwari Lal and others

.....RESPONDENT(s).

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA

Present: Mr. Anil Kumar Gahlawat, Advocate
for the appellants.

Mr. Subhash Goyal, Advocate
for respondents No.3.

SURINDER GUPTA, J.

CM-15943-CII-2013

Heard. There is delay of 211 days in filing the appeal.

Learned counsel for the appellants submits that appellant No.1 is a poor lady, who has been wrongly advised that there is no limitation for filing the appeal for enhancement of compensation and when she received the summons of cross-appeal FAO No.6586 of 2012 titled ICICI Lombard General Insurance Com. Ltd. Vs. Sushila Devi and others, she contacted her counsel telephonically and came to know about the limitation for filing appeal for enhancement of compensation. Thereafter she contacted him but in the meantime, summer vacations started and he had gone out of station with his family and after coming back to Chandigarh, he filed the appeal

with a delay of 211 days, which was neither intentional nor wilful.

The application, which is supported by affidavit, is allowed and delay of 211 days in filing the appeal is hereby, condoned.

FAO-3942-2013

For orders, see FAO No.6586 of 2012 (ICICI Lombard General Insurance Com. Ltd. Vs. Sushila Devi and others).

September 15, 2016.
Sachin M.

(SURINDER GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: ***Yes/No***

Whether Reportable: ***Yes/No***