CGHC010449802024 2026:CGHC:47100

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MAC No. 2466 of 2024

1 - Ghuram S/o Biganram Aged About 42 Years R/o Village Keshavnagar P.S. Vishrampur Tahsil And District - Surajpur (C.G.).

2 - Krishnavati W/o Ghuran Aged About 40 Years Their Natural Guardian Applicant No. 02 Mother Krishnavati R/o Village Keshavnagar P.S. Vishrampur Tahsil And District - Surajpur (C.G.).

3 - Mamta D/o Ghuran Aged About 16 Years Minor Represented Through Their Natural Guardian Applicant No. 02 Mother Krishnavati R/o Village Keshavnagar P.S. Vishrampur Tahsil And District - Surajpur (C.G.).

4 - Snehlata D/o Ghuran Aged About 5 Years Minor Represented Through Their Natural Guardian Applicant No. 02 Mother Krishnavati R/o Village Keshavnagar P.S. Vishrampur Tahsil And District - Surajpur (C.G.).

5 - Divya D/o Ghuran Aged About 2 Years Minor Represented Through Their Natural Guardian Applicant No. 02 Mother Krishnavati R/o Village Keshavnagar P.S. Vishrampur Tahsil And District - Surajpur (C.G.).

... Appellant(s)

versus

1 - Naresh Kumar Sinha S/o Badri Prasad Sinha Aged About 48 Years R/o Near Church Kedarpur Ambikapur P.S. And Tahsil Ambikapur District - Sarguja (C.G.) (Driver Of Vehicle Santro No. Cg 15/b/ 2077).

2 - Smt. Saraswati Badgotya W/o R.B. Badhgotya Aged About 45 Years R/o Patpariya Ambikapur P.S. And Tahsil Ambikapur District - Sarguja (C.G.) (Ower Of Vehicle Santro No. Cg 15/b/ 2077).

3 - Branch Manager United India Insurance Company Ltd. Branch

Brahmroad Ambikapur District - Sarguja (C.G.) (Insurer Of Vehicle Santro No. Cg 15/b/ 2077).

... Respondent(s)

For Appellants	**:**	None.
For Respondent No.3	**:**	Mr. Dashrath Gupta, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal

Order on Board

16/11/2026

1. Heard on admission.

2. This is the claimants' appeal for enhancement against the award dated 26.08.2014 passed by the 02nd Additional Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Surajpur, District - Surajpur (C.G.) in Motor Accident claim case No. 12/2013 whereby a compensation amount of Rs. 3,75,000/- has been awarded in favour of the claimants.

3. Learned counsel for Respondent No. 3 submits that the appellants/claimants have already preferred another appeal, i.e., MAC No. 1211 of 2014, against the aforesaid impugned order, which was dismissed for want of prosecution. Therefore, the present appeal, being second in nature, is redundant.

4. In view of above, the present appeal is **dismisse**d as redundant.

Sd/-
(Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal)
Judge

$ourabh