

2026:PHHC:029800



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

202

FAO-4344-2006 (O&M)
Date of decision: 24.02.2026

Jarnail Kaur and another

...Appellants

Versus

Piara Singh and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI

Present: None.

VIKAS SURI, J. (Oral)

1. The present appeal has been preferred by the claimant/appellants for enhancement of compensation awarded by the learned Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal (Ad hoc), Fast Track Court, Bathinda, vide impugned award dated 17.12.2005.

2. It appears that the case file was fully burnt in the fire incident in January 2011. A copy of the impugned award has been called from the learned Tribunal and the appeal paper-book furnished by learned counsel for the appellants is available on record. No one had put in appearance on behalf of the parties on 29.04.2025 and the position was no different on a subsequent hearing on 07.11.2025, when the following order was passed:

“Despite intimation of the hearing to learned counsel for the appellants, there is no appearance on behalf of the appellants.

A perusal of the record shows that Mr. Rishabh Gupta, Advocate, had supplied a copy of the paper



book in the Registry, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions.

As per office report, respondent no.1 is stated to have died and the particulars of the insurance company (respondent No.2) are not provided in the memo of parties, whereas notice issued to respondent No.3 has been received back unserved with a report by the sister-in-law that respondent No.3 got married somewhere else after the death of her husband Balwinder Singh.

A perusal of the memo of parties would show that Gurpreet Kaur (respondent No.3) is a proforma respondent being a co-claimant with the appellants in the present appeal. As such, her service is dispensed with at this stage.

Learned counsel for the appellants is directed to take steps to bring on record the legal representatives of deceased respondent No.1.

List on 28.01.2026.

Needful be done in the meantime.”

3. The case has been called out twice and today also, no one puts in appearance on behalf of the parties.

4. It is noticed from the file that the liability to pay compensation is upon respondent No.1 who is reported to have died and no steps have been taken to bring on record the legal representatives of deceased respondent No.1, i.e. owner-cum-driver of the offending vehicle.

5. In view of the aforesaid, this Court is left with no other option but to infer that the appellants are not interested to further pursue



the present appeal.

- 6. Dismissed for want of prosecution.
- 7. However, liberty is reserved to the appellants to seek revival of the appeal, in case any grievance still survives.

February 24, 2026
sumit.k

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

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