

**IN THE COURT OF DISTRICT JUDGE CUM P.O. M.A.C.T -III,
VAISHALI AT HAJIPUR**

Claim Case No. 25 of 2003

29.01.2025

ORDER

Heard, the petition filed on behalf of complainant stating therein that due to the ignorance of provision of law. This case has been filed u/s 140 of M.V. Act and case is pending for 21 years and claimant could not get even a single pany. Further he submitted that so far as the section 140 of M.V. Act is concerned, it is for the case of no fault liability when complainant required the extent relief and later on, he had the previledge to file a separate petition u/s 166 of M.V. Act but by the latest amendment he is debarred to file a fresh case u/s 166 of M.V. Act. So, in th interest of justice and to just decision of case where the provision of meant for the benefit of the society. Let, this petition may kindly be ordered to convert to u/s 166 of M.V. Act. Hence, considering facts and circumstances, for the interest of justice, let this Claim Case No. 25/2003 is hereby converted u/s 166 of M.V. Act.

Put up for settlement of issue on 05-02-2025.

Dictated

District Judge-cum-
M.A.C.T.-III
Vaishali at Hajipur.
29-01-2024