



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

245-2

**FAO-6796-2017 (O&M)  
Date of decision: 12.08.2025**

**D.L.Jetwani****...Appellant(s)**

**Vs.**

**Tilak Raj and others****...Respondent(s)****CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA**

Present:- Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate  
for the appellant.

Ms. Nilakshi Joseph, Advocate  
for respondents No. 1 to 3.

\*\*\*

**NIDHI GUPTA, J.**

The present appeal has been filed by the owner of the Tanker bearing registration No.RJ-31-GA-2079 (hereinafter “the offending vehicle”) against the Award dated 07.02.2014 passed by the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar (hereinafter “the learned Tribunal”) in MAC Petition No. 48 dated 06.09.2012 filed under Section 166 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, whereby the claimants/respondents no.1-3 herein, have been awarded compensation of Rs.5,54,400/-.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the Tribunal on the basis of pleadings and evidence adduced before it concluded that deceased-Veena Devi had died due to the injuries suffered by her in a motor vehicular accident that took place on 04.08.2012 due to the rash and negligent driving of a Tanker bearing registration No.RJ-31-GA-2079/the offending vehicle being driven by respondent No.4; owned by the appellant; and



insured by respondent No.5. The above said compensation has been awarded along with interest @ 7.5% p.a. Respondents No. 4 and the appellant were held jointly and severally liable to pay the above said compensation. No liability was fixed upon respondent No.5-Insurance Company in view of the fact that on the date of accident, respondent No.4 was not holding a valid driving license. Copy of driving license Ex.R2 produced by respondent No.4 showed that he was holding driving license dated 17.03.2011 which authorised him to drive scooter/LTV only and not HTV/tanker.

3. It may be pointed out that the connected FAO-3694-2015 titled as 'Tilak Raj and others versus Harjinder Singh and others' filed by the claimants seeking enhancement of compensation, has been partly allowed by this Court vide order of even date; and compensation of ₹5,54,400/- awarded to the claimants has been enhanced to ₹8,78,200/- as nothing had been awarded by the learned Tribunal towards future prospects and under the conventional heads.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant/owner of the offending vehicle seeks one last opportunity to bring on record the LRs of the deceased-appellant. However, a perusal of the order sheets shows that learned counsel for the appellant had first sought time to implead LRs of the deceased appellant as far back as on 10.11.2022 i.e. almost 3 years ago. The needful has not been done till date despite grant of several opportunities in the intervening years. Clearly therefore, neither the learned counsel nor the LRs of the appellant are serious in pursuing the present litigation. Valuable public time of this Court has been expended in



affording numerous opportunities to do the needful but to no avail. In this situation, this Court is left with no alternative but to **dismiss** the present Appeal.

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

12.08.2025  
Divyanshi

(NIDHI GUPTA)  
JUDGE

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