

M.A.C.T 114/20
Nirpat Kumar Vs. Shailendra Singh Bisht

24.11.2025

Present : Mr. Mohit Kumar, Ld. Proxy Counsel for the petitioner
Mr. Nirpat Kumar.
Mr. Satyam Thareja, Ld. Counsel for respondent no. 1.
Ms. Tanya Kushwaha, Ld. Counsel for respondent no.
2/Insurance Company.

It is submitted by Ld. Proxy Counsel for the petitioner that during pendency of this case, Smt. Muniya Devi, mother of the deceased has died.

Record is perused.

Application under Order 1 Rule 10 of CPC filed by the petitioner for bringing on record his father and mother as petitioners is pending for consideration.

In view of the submission that the mother has died, the said application is to be considered only to bring on record the father of the deceased.

Ld. Counsel for respondent no. 2 submits that the respondent no. 2 does not have an objection if the application is allowed.

Ld. Counsel for respondent no. 1 submits that he has two objections to the application. He submits that vakalatnama signed by the father has not been filed. He points out that the application is not of the father, but of the petitioner.

His second objection is that since a father is not dependent on the son, father cannot be impleaded.

He seeks adjournment to file judgments on this aspect.

Let vakalatnama signed by the father, namely, Sh. Jhallu Ram and his affidavit affirming that he wants to be a petitioner in the present case for seeking compensation, be filed by the next date of hearing.

To come up on 12.01.2026.

(Shirish Aggarwal)
Judge, PO, MACT-01
New Delhi, 24.11.2025