

M.A.C.T 85/23

**PANKAJ KUMAR RAJAK Vs. LAXMAN RAI AND ORS.**

**19.03.2025**

**Present:** Ms. Sneha, Ld. Proxy Counsel for petitioner.  
None for R-1 and R-2.  
None for R-3/Insurance Company.

Heard. Record perused.

Despite service of notice upon the Designated Officer of R-3 on 12.11.2024, none has appeared or filed reply to the present petition.

Issue show cause notice to the Designated Officer of the Insurance Company to explain as to why cost of Rs. 10,000/- be not imposed and be deducted from his/her salary as the matter remains unrepresented on behalf of Insurance Company despite service of notice, in view of the guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in case *Gohar Mohammad Vs. Uttar Pradesh State Road Transport Corporation, Civil Appeal No. 9322 of 2022 (arising out of Special Leave Petition (C) No. 32448 of 2018)*. Further, the Designated Officer is directed to file reply/legal offer within two weeks from the date of receipt of notice failing which the right to file the same stands closed.

R-1 has been served by WhatsApp. Despite waiting and repeated calls, R-1 has not appeared.

Contd....

-2-

The notice to R-2 is back with the report that she does not reside at the given address.

An opportunity is granted to the petitioner to file fresh address of R-2 or to take steps for service of R-2 by substitute means.

Now to come up for further proceedings on **24.09.2025**.

**Short date is not possible as there is pendency of more than 3000 cases out of which approx. 500 cases are old matters, which shall be taken up on priority.**

(Vrinda Kumari)  
Judge / PO, MACT  
New Delhi/19.03.2025(R)