



In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Civil Revision No. 50 of 2025

Date of Decision: 10.01.2025

Neeraj Verma

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

Mohd. Nadeem and Others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal.

Present: Mr. Pardeep Kumar Rapria, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) through Video Conferencing.

Anil Kshetarpal, J.

1. This revision petition has been filed against the order dated 06.09.2024, passed by the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Gurugram, which reads as under:-

“Today the case is fixed for evidence on behalf of respondent No.2. No RW is present on behalf of respondent No.2 despite last opportunity. From the perusal of the file reveals that respondent No. 2 is in the habit of play hide and seek with the Court. Earlier vide order dated 29.07.2024, the application of respondent No.2 for setting aside ex parte order dated 05.07.2024 was allowed and order dated 5.7.2024 was set aside subject to payment of cost and the case was adjourned to 09.08.2024 for evidence on behalf of respondent No.2 and a last opportunity was granted. However, on 09.08.2024, one more last opportunity was granted to the respondent No.2 for

concluding evidence on behalf of respondent No.3 for today. However, no evidence on behalf of respondent No.2 is present today. The above facts made it clear that respondent No.2 himself intentionally in not appearing in the Court. Hence, no case is made out to adjourn the case on behalf of respondent No.2. Hence, the evidence on behalf of respondent No.2 is hereby closed by court order.

At this stage, an application under Order XVIII Rule 17 CPC for recalling witnesses namely Irfan (PW-2) for re-cross examination, has been filed on behalf of respondent No.2. Copy supplied.

List on 20.09.2024, for filing reply as well as consideration on aforesaid application.”

2. It is evident that the Tribunal has formed an opinion that the petitioner is in the habit of playing hide and seek with the Court.
3. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, this Court is not inclined to interfere with the impugned order passed by the Tribunal. However, the petitioner shall have the liberty to file an application before the Tribunal for recall of the impugned order.
4. The present revision petition stands disposed of.

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge

January 10, 2025
“DK”

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