

M.A.C.T 114/20

NIRPAT KUMAR Vs. SHAILENDRA SINGH BISHT

04.02.2025

Present: Sh. Ramkesh Kaushal, Ld. Counsel for petitioner by VC.
Sh. Satyam Thareja, Ld. Counsel for R-1.
Sh. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Counsel for R-2 by VC.
None for R-3/Insurance Company.

Heard. Record perused.

Let copy of application u/O 1 R 10 CPC filed by the petitioner be supplied to Ld. Counsel for R-1 within a week.

In the meantime, I have heard arguments on the application u/O 1 R 10 CPC filed by R-2. Record perused carefully.

The contention of R-2 is that it is not an insurance company but is insurance broking entity licensed with IRDAI and mainly acts as a facilitator of modern insurance products offered by various insurance companies including R-3. This position has not been disputed by any of the parties. The WS of R-3/Insurance Company would show that it has not been disputed that R-3 is the insurer of the offending vehicle.

In these circumstances, where R-2 is merely an agent through whom R-1 purchased the Insurance Policy from R-3, it (R-2) is not a necessary party in the present case. **R-2 is directed to be deleted from the array of parties. Let the amended memo of parties be filed by the petitioner on or before the NDOH. Application stands disposed of.**

Contd....

-2-

Now to come up for reply, if any and arguments on the application u/O 1 R 10 CPC filed by the petitioner on **05.05.2025**.

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/04.02.2025(R)