

2026:PHHC:009615



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

202

FAO-3842-2006 (O&M)
Date of decision: 22.01.2026

Rajinder Singh Bagga

...Appellant

Versus

Dharmender and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI

Present: None.

VIKAS SURI, J.(Oral)

1. This case pertains to the category of fully burnt cases, which has been attempted to be reconstructed on the basis of relevant material obtained from different sources.
2. No one appears on behalf of either of the parties.
3. As per office report, notice issued to the appellant has also been received back unserved with the report that the address was not found and request by the process server is for providing a landmark or any nearby place to locate the address.
4. A perusal of the record would show that three cases were tagged together and two appeals, bearing FAO No.3843 of 2006 titled as '*Rajinder Singh Bagga and another vs. Dharmender and others*' and FAO No.3844 of 2006 titled as '*Seema Bagga vs. Dharmender and others*', are shown to have been disposed of by the Daily Lok Adalat on 29.01.2010, by recording the following order in both the said appeals:



“As per statements of the representatives of the insurance Company and counsel for the appellant, separately recorded, a sum of Rs15.000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand only) over and above the amount awarded by the Tribunal is allowed to the appellant in full and final settlement of the claim. Two months, time is allowed to the Insurance Company to deposit the amount before the MACT, failing which, interest at the rate of 9% per annum shall be paid on this amount till payment from the date of this order. The enhanced amount would be paid to the appellant in cash by the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal. The Court fee, if paid, by any of the parties be refunded.

The appeal is disposed of accordingly.

Copy of the order be supplied/sent to the counsel/parties and file be returned to the High Court.”

5. In view of the aforesaid, the only inference that can be drawn for the non-appearance of the appellant or his counsel is that he is no more interested to pursue the present appeal, as the matter appears to have been settled before the Lok Adalat.

6. Dismissed for want of prosecution.

7. However, liberty is reserved to the appellant to seek revival in case any grievance still survives.

January 22, 2026

sumit.k

(VIKAS SURJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes / No
Whether Reportable :	Yes / No