



\$~46 to 49

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CM(M) 1379/2025 & CM Appls. 45415-16/2025**

RELIANCE GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY LTD

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Nitesh Gupta, Adv.

versus

RAHUL MASIH & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through:

(47)

+ **CM(M) 1381/2025 & CM Appls. 45438-39/2025**

RELIANCE GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY LTD

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Nitesh Gupta, Adv.

versus

RAHUL MASIH & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through:

(48)

+ **CM(M) 1382/2025 & CM Appls. 45443-44/2025**

RELIANCE GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY LTD

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Nitesh Gupta, Adv.

versus

RAHUL MASIH & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through:

(49)

+ **CM(M) 1383/2025 & CM Appls. 45450-51/2025**

RELIANCE GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY LTD

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Nitesh Gupta, Adv.

versus

RAHUL MASIH & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through:

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE TARA VITASTA GANJU

ORDER

29.07.2025

%

1. The present Petitions have been filed under Article 227 of the



Constitution of India impugning the order dated 27.02.2025 passed by the learned MACT, Saket Courts, New Delhi [hereinafter referred to as “Impugned Order”]. By the Impugned Order, the learned Tribunal has dismissed the Application under Order I Rule 10 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 [hereinafter referred to as “CPC”] filed by the Petitioner who was Respondent No. 3/Reliance General Insurance Co. Ltd. for deletion of its name from the array of parties.

2. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner makes two submissions. Firstly, he submits that since the FIR was registered by the driver of the vehicle which was insured by the Petitioner [the Ertiga car] and that the chargesheet has already been filed in the matters, the investigation is complete and thus, the Petitioner should be deleted from the array of parties. Secondly, he submits that the Respondents/Claimants should have filed their own separate FIR/protest Petition if they wanted any relief.

3. The Learned Trial Court examined the Application and has found that the negligence of the driver of the Ertiga car will require evidence to be lead and thus the deletion of the Insurance Company cannot be allowed at this stage.

4. After some arguments, learned Counsel for the Petitioner seeks is granted permission of the Court to withdraw the present Petitions.

5. The Petitions are accordingly dismissed as withdrawn. All pending Applications also stand closed.

6. The parties will act based on the digitally signed copy of the order.

TARA VITASTA GANJU, J

JULY 29, 2025/r