

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

253

**FAO-3905-2022
Date of decision: 19.12.2022**

SARITA AND ORS.

..Appellant (s)

Versus

ANIL SINGH AND ORS.

..Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

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

NIDHI GUPTA, J (Oral)

It is submitted by learned counsel for the appellants that the Tribunal has dismissed the claim petition only on the ground that Jagat Singh PW3 purported eye-witness of the accident that took place on 03.03.2018, who disclosed number of the offending vehicle, was admittedly co-villager of the deceased. However a perusal of the impugned Award shows that even though Jagat Singh had witnessed the accident on 03.03.2018 yet he did not disclose the number of offending vehicle to the police or to the family members of the deceased for three months. When confronted with this statement, learned counsel submits that this was because said Jagat Singh did not know who had been involved in the accident. Perusal of the Award further shows that RW4 SI Sushil Kumar had stated that he was appointed investigating officer in this case in June, 2018 and by that time no offending vehicle was found by the previous investigating officer.

Learned counsel for the appellants is unable to controvert the finding given by the Ld. Tribunal or give any explanation for the same.

Accordingly, I find no error and no ground to interfere in the Award passed by the Ld. Tribunal.

Dismissed.

**(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE**

19.12.2022

ashok

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No Whether reportable : Yes/No