



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Date of decision: 20.11.2025
CR-2837-2024 (O&M)

203-14

ICICI Lombard General Insurance Company Ltd. ...Petitioner
V/s

Jarnail Kaur and others ...Respondents

2) CR-3199-2025 (O&M)

IFFCO Tokio General Insurance Company Ltd. ...Petitioner
V/s

Lakhwinder Singh and others ...Respondents

3) CR-1357-2025 (O&M)

Shriram General Insurance Company Ltd. ...Petitioner
V/s

Satbir and others ...Respondents

4) CR-2881-2025 (O&M)

Cholamandalam MS General Insurance Company Ltd and anr. ...Petitioners
V/s

Manjit Kaur and others ...Respondents

5) CR-3230-2024 (O&M)

ICICI Lombard General Insurance Company Ltd. ...Petitioner
V/s

Raj Kaur and others ...Respondents

6) CR-4224-2024 (O&M)

Shriram General Insurance Company Ltd. ...Petitioner
V/s

Smt. Kamal and others ...Respondents

7) CR-6307-2024 (O&M)

United India Insurance Company Ltd. ...Petitioner
V/s

Sunil (minor) and others ...Respondents

- 8)

The Oriental Insurance Company Ltd.

V/s

Maninder Singh and another

CR-7179-2024 (O&M)

...Petitioner

...Respondents
- 9)

Future Generali India Insurance Company Ltd.

V/s

Bhup Singh and others

CR-7503-2023 (O&M)

...Petitioner

...Respondents
- 10)

Shriram General Insurance Company Ltd.

V/s

Jasdeep Singh and others

CR-7511-2024 (O&M)

...Petitioner

...Respondents
- 11)

The ICICI Lombard General Insurance Company Ltd.

V/s

Veerpal Kaur and others

CR-6776-2025 (O&M)

...Petitioner

...Respondents
- 12)

ICICI Lombard General Insurance Company Ltd.

V/s

Bhateri and others

CR-6866-2025 (O&M)

...Petitioner

...Respondents
- 13)

ICICI Lombard General Insurance Company Ltd.

V/s

Smt. Phool Pati @ Phool Kumari and others

CR-5948-2025 (O&M)

...Petitioner

...Respondents

CORAM : HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Sachin Ohri, Advocate for the petitioner in CR-2837-2024.
 Mr. Lalit Garg, Advocate for the petitioner in CR-6307-2024;
 Mr. Vishal Aggarwal, Advocate
 for the petitioner in CR-7503-2023

 Mr. Punit Jain, Advocate
 for the petitioner(s) in
 CR-5948, 1357, 2881, 6776 and 6866 of 2025 and
 CR-2837, 3230, 4224, 7179 and 7511 of 2024.

Mr. Varlin Garg, Advocate
for respondents No.4 and 5 in CR-6776-2025.

Mr. Sanjeev Goyal, Advocate
for respondent No.5 in CR-6307-2024.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J (ORAL)

This is a bunch of 13 revision petitions, all assailing different orders passed by the Motor Accident Claims Tribunals (for short the “MACT”) on application(s) filed by the insurance company for dismissal of the claim petition(s) on the ground of the claim petition(s) being barred by limitation in view of the provisions of Section 166 (3) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (for short “MV Act”) as per which, no claim petition can be filed after a period of six months from the date of accident.

2. Concededly, the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India is seized of the matter. Recently, vide order dated 04.11.2025 passed in SLP(C)-8412-8413/2023 and other connected matters, the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India has ordered as under:-

“2. This Court has been informed that there are a number of petitions across the country filed on the same issue and any finding recorded by this Court would have bearing on the pending petitions. In that view of the matter, the hearing of these matters requires to be expedited.

3. Pleadings shall be completed, if not already completed, within two weeks from today, failure to do so would result in such those parties loosing their right to file pleadings.

4. It is made clear that learned counsel appearing for the parties are at liberty to file written synopsis, not exceeding five pages, within two weeks from today and each of the counsel would be permitted to address the oral arguments not exceeding half-an-hour.

5. It is made clear that during the pendency of these petitions, the tribunal or the High Courts shall not dismiss the claim petitions on the ground of such petitions as barred by limitation as prescribed under sub-section (3) or Section 16(3) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988.”

3. A perusal of the aforesaid directions makes it abundantly clear that during the pendency of the petitions before the Hon’ble Apex Court, neither the MACT nor the High Court would dismiss any claim petition on the ground of such petitions being barred by limitation as prescribed under Section 166(3) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988.
4. That being so, the present revision petitions have been rendered infructuous.
5. Needless to assert that all claim petitions in which application(s) had been filed by the insurance company shall of course proceed subject to the decision of the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India.
6. In view of the same, the present revision petitions are disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

November 20, 2025

vcgarg

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No