



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

128

CR-3039-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 08.04.2026

Smt. Saroj Devi and others

...Petitioner(s)

Vs.

Surender and others

...Respondent(s)


CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present:- Mr. Parveen Kaushik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

NIDHI GUPTA, J.

Present Civil Revision Petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India has been filed by the claimants praying for direction to the learned MACT, Sonapat to decide CM-202-2025 (Annexure P-5) filed by the petitioners in a time bound manner.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the petitioners had previously filed Claim Petition dated 18.01.2024 (Annexure P-1) before the MACT Sonipat seeking compensation on account of death of their son **Mohit** in a motor vehicular accident that had transpired on the intervening night of 25/26-07.2023. On 14.12.2024, the Insurance Company had offered an amount of Rs.16 lacs by way of Settlement (Annexure P-2). Consequentially, vide order dated 17.12.2024 (Annexure P-3), Claim Petition (Annexure P-1) filed by the petitioners was partly allowed by the learned MACT, Sonapat and Rs.16 lacs was awarded to the petitioners by way of compensation.



3. Thereafter, on 05.07.2025, petitioners moved the instant application (Annexure P-5) under Sections 151, 152 and 153 CPC before the learned MACT, Sonapat on behalf of the applicant, namely, **Sohit** praying, that in the Claim Petition, name of petitioner No.3 has been wrongly mentioned as Mohit but in actual fact, Mohit was the deceased son of petitioners No.1 and 2 and brother of petitioner No.3, namely, Sohita. However, inadvertently in the Claim Petition, name of petitioner No.3 has been mentioned as Mohit instead of Sohita.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that due to a typographical mistake, name of petitioner No.3 has been mentioned in Claim Petition as Mohit and has accordingly been mentioned in the Award dated 17.12.2024 also as Mohit; whereas Mohit had expired in the accident on 25/26-07-2023. It is submitted that the name of the petitioner No.3 is entered as Sohita in the record of Aadhar Card et cetera. For this reason, for the correction of the name, the present application dated 05.07.2025 (Annexure P-5) was moved before the learned MACT, Sonapat.

5. It is accordingly prayed that the present Revision Petition be allowed; and direction be issued to learned MACT, Sonapat to expeditiously dispose of the said CM-202-2025 dated 05.07.2025 (Annexure P-5) in a time bound manner.

6. No other argument is raised by learned counsel for the petitioners. I have heard learned counsel and perused the file. I find no merit in the submissions advanced on behalf of the petitioners.



7. The facts have already been recounted here in above. Perusal of the record of the case shows that notice in the application of the petitioners has already been issued by the learned Tribunal. On 27.02.2026, the respondents had put in appearance before the learned Tribunal. As of now, the matter stands adjourned to 10.04.2026 before the learned Tribunal for arguments.
8. Consequentially, in the face of the entire above noted facts and circumstances of the case, no direction as prayed for, is called for.
9. In view of the afore-noted facts, present Revision Petition stands **dismissed**.
10. Pending application(s) if any also stand(s) disposed of.

08.04.2026

Divyanshi

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE