

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**M.C.C No.330 of 2019**

The Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd. Branch Office- Calcutta, Through Sambhagiya Prabhandhak Sambhagiya Karyalaya, Kuchery Chowk, Jail Road, Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Applicant

Versus

1. Smt. Pushpa Choudhary W/o Jagdish Singh Chauhan Aged About 63 Years Occupation- House Wife, R/o Village Lbhandi, Tahsil And District Raipur Madhya Pradesh Now Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Jagdish Singh Chauhan S/o Ram Singh Chauhan Aged About 68 Years Occupation- Agriculturist , R/o Village Lbhandi, Tahsil And District Raipur Madhya Pradesh Now Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Jai Prakash Mishra S/o Rammilan Mishra Aged About 55 Years Occupation Truck Driver, R/o 5-A Nawab Dilranjan Road , Calcutta -2.....Driver, District : Kolkata, West Bengal
4. M/s Ramraj Tiwari And Amarjit Mishra Occupation- Truck Owner Nawab Dilranjan Road, Kashipur, Calcutta-2.....Owner., District : Kolkata, West Bengal

---- Non-Applicants

For Applicant:
For Non-Applicants:-

Shri Abhishek Sinha, Advocate.
None.

Single Bench: Hon'ble Shri Sanjay Agrawal, J
Order On Board

15.04.2019

1. Heard on M.C.C, which has been filed for marking the presence of Counsel for Respondent No.3 in the earlier order passed on 07.03.2019, wherein, inadvertently, the same could not be marked.
2. On due consideration of the reasons assigned therein, the same is allowed and the order dated 07.03.2019 is being modified to the extent that presence of Respondent No.3/Insurance Company is marked against "For

Respondent No.3 as Shri Abhishek Sinha” in place of “For Respondents: None” and the order dated 07.03.2019 shall now be read as follows:-

“For Appellants:	None.
For Respondents 1 & 2:	None.
For Respondent No.3:	Shri Abhishek Sinha, Advocate.

Single Bench: Hon'ble Shri Sanjay Agrawal, J
Order On Board

07.03.2019

1. None appears nor any representation is made on behalf of the Appellants even when the case is called in the second round of hearing.
2. In view of above, this Court is left with no other option but to dismiss the Appeal for want of prosecution.
3. Accordingly, the instant Appeal is dismissed for want of prosecution.”

3. Accordingly, the instant M.C.C stands disposed of with the aforesaid modification.

Sd/-
(Sanjay Agrawal)
JUDGE

Anjani