

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

**T.A. No.677 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of decision : March 12, 2018**

Pinki Devi

..... Petitioner

Versus

Ramesh Kumar and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Pardeep Kumar Sehrawat, Advocate for
Mr. Vivek Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Rishi Nijhawan, Advocate for respondent Nos.1 to 4.
Mr. Vishal Aggarwal, Advocate for respondent No.7.

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

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Despite service, none has appeared for respondent Nos.5 and 6.

Heard.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that regarding the same accident, the parents of the deceased has filed a claim petition at Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Kaithal, whereas the petitioner-wife has filed a claim petition at Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Karnal. The request is for transferring the petition filed under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 from Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Kaithal to a competent Court at Karnal.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner-wife had filed a petition earlier in time and she has to come from Delhi and the case is at the evidence stage.

Considering the fact that the parents of the deceased-husband of the petitioner are old age, it is desirable that the petition filed by the petitioner-wife should be tried at Kaithal Courts.

As such, the claim petition titled as ***“Pinki vs Mithlesh Kumar and others”*** pending in the Court of learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Karnal is withdrawn from the said Court and transferred to the Court of learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Kaithal, where the petition filed by the respondents is already pending.

As such, the present petition is disposed of.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

March 12, 2018

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes

Whether Reportable: No