

29 MACT 250/21
SUNITA Vs. MUKESH KR. AGGARWAL

29.07.2026

Present : Mr. Upender Singh, Ld. Counsel for petitioner.
Mr. S. Ghosh, Ld. Counsel for R-1 with R-1.
Mr. Ajay Sharma, Ld. Counsel for R-3 / insurer (through VC).

1. Part submissions are already heard on previous date. Ld. Counsel for respondent No.1 sought time to file case laws to support his submissions. As per the record, as arguments of the respondent No.3 - insurer were pending, therefore the matter was adjourned for further arguments and for filing of case laws by the respondent No.1. Thereafter, vide order dated 27.03.2026, final arguments were addressed by Ld. Counsel for respondent No.3 - insurer and due to absence of Ld. counsel for respondent No.1, one final opportunity was granted for filing relevant case laws. The matter is accordingly listed today for compliance of the previous order.

2. At the outset, respondent No.1 Mukesh Kumar Aggarwal sought to hand over the photocopy of an application to the Tribunal. Ld. Counsel appearing for respondent No.1 Mr. S. Ghosh fairly submitted that he had no knowledge with respect to direct filing of the application by the respondent No.1. Therefore, this Tribunal directed the respondent No.1 to file original application, if any in accordance with law and establish procedure of court.

3. However, instead of complying the directions, respondent No.1 became argumentative and started raising his voice before the Tribunal. He repeatedly interrupted in the proceedings and persisted in addressing the Tribunal.

4. Mr. S. Ghosh, Ld. Counsel for respondent No.1 made sincere efforts to restrict and pacify his client and repeatedly requested him to maintain the decorum of the Tribunal. However, respondent No.1 paid no heed to the advice of his counsel and continued with objectionable conduct.

5. Despite repeated requests, warning and directions issued by this Tribunal to maintain the dignity and decorum of the court, respondent No.1 continued to interrupt the proceedings and adopted an unruly and confrontational attitude, thereby obstructing the smooth functioning of the judicial proceedings. His conduct compelled this Tribunal to caution him that such behaviour would not be tolerated. Nevertheless, the respondent No.1 persisted with his disruptive conduct, leaving this Tribunal with no option but to direct him to leave the court. Even thereafter, respondent No.1 continued to argue.

6. The conduct of respondent No.1 clearly resulted in unnecessary disruption of the proceedings and caused avoidable wastage of precious judicious time. This Tribunal also cannot lose sight of the fact that 7 other matters are listed today for final arguments, all of which require equal judicial attention. Owing solely to the conduct of respondent No.1 Mukesh Kumar Aggarwal, this Tribunal is constrained to adjourn the present matter without concluding the proceedings.

7. It is further observed that the conduct of respondent No.1 is not an isolated instance. Even Vide judicial order dated 26.04.2205, Ld. Predecessor of this Tribunal had recorded unruly conduct of the respondent No.1. Despite the said observation, the respondent No.1 has failed to mend his behaviour. The repeated conduct of the respondent No.1 indicates consistent attempt to delay the adjudication of the present

claim petition. Therefore, considering his age, a strict warning is tendered upon him and he is informed that in case he will repeat his misbehaviour, this Tribunal will initiate proceedings against him as per the law.

8. Nevertheless, in the interest of justice and keeping in mind the age of the respondent, a short adjournment is granted only for compliance of the directions contained in the order dated 27.03.2026.

9. Put up for compliance of the previous order and further proceedings on **29.08.2026**.

(Aparna Swami)
PO MACT (East)/KKD
Delhi/29.07.2026