



FAO-1721-2017 (O&M)

-1-

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

FAO-1721-2017 (O&M)

MANGI DEVI & ANR.

.....Appellants

Vs.

RANI KAUR & ORS.

.....Respondents

Reserved on: 08.04.2026

Pronounced on: 29.04.2026

Uploaded on: 06.05.2026

Whether only the operative part of the judgment is pronounced? NO*Whether full judgment is pronounced?* YES**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA**

Present: Mr. Vinay Bajaj, Advocate for
Mr. G.L. Bajaj, Advocate
for the appellants.

None for respondents No.1 and 2.

Mr. Suvir Dewan, Advocate
for respondent No.3-Insurance Company.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA J.

1. The present appeal has been preferred against the award dated 14.01.2016 passed by learned MACT Tribunal, Bathinda on the ground of fixing the liability to pay compensation of appellant.

2. Since in the present appeal owner is disputing the liability to pay compensation only, therefore, brief facts of the claim petition are not required to be reproduced.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant contends that learned MACT Tribunal, Bathinda has wrongly held appellant liable to pay the compensation. He further contends that driver was holding a valid driving license, registration certificate and fitness certificate but because of fault of the Advocate appearing before the Tribunal, the same could not be placed on record because of the lapse



FAO-1721-2017 (O&M)

-2-

on the part of the counsel before learned MACT Tribunal, Bathinda who failed to tender the same. He, therefore, prays that the present appeal be allowed and appellant be absolved from liability to pay the compensation.

4. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondent contends that learned Tribunal has rightly appreciated the evidence on record and held appellant liable to pay the compensation. He, therefore prays that the present appeal be dismissed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the whole file of this case with their able assistance.

6. A perusal of the record shows that appellant was granted ample opportunities to produce the driving license, registration certificate and fitness certificate even written statement was filed by the appellant. Therefore, Advocate cannot be held liable for non-production of driving license, registration certificate and fitness certificate. Further perusal of record shows that appellant was granted opportunity to adduce evidence as well, still driving license, registration certificate and fitness certificate were never produced by the appellant at that point of time. Therefore, learned Tribunal has rightly held that driver did not place on record driving license to show that he was having valid driving license at the time of accident and owner did not prove the registration and fitness certificate of offending vehicle.

7. In view of the above, I do not find any merit in the present appeal and the same is ***dismissed***.

8. Pending application (s), if any, also stand disposed of.

29.04.2026

Ayub/Sahil

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/non-speaking : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No