

MACT 366/22  
NAINA Vs. MUKESH PASWAN

07.11.2025

Present: Shri Amit Ranjan, Ld. Counsel for petitioner alongwith petitioner.  
None for driver and owner (**defence struck off and ex parte vide order dated 22.09.2022**).  
Shri Ankit Sharma, Ld. Proxy Counsel for insurance company.  
IO in person.

IO has filed the report stating that no objection was raised in the reply to the application for releasing the vehicle on superdari as the documents that is insurance policy was verified online and it is only upon physical verification that the police was found to be fake. He further submitted that he has not filed any application for cancellation of superdari.

Affidavit in evidence of PW-1 Bahadur alongwith documents filed.  
Copy supplied.

There are three connected claim petitions arising out of the same Motor Vehicular Accident.

It is jointly submitted on behalf of the parties that since there are common witnesses to be examined on behalf of petitioners in all the claim petitions, same may be consolidated for the purpose of recording of evidence by the parties. Accordingly, all the claim petitions bearing MAC Petition Nos. 366/22, 367/22 and 368/22 are consolidated for the purpose of recording evidence to be led by the parties and present **MAC Petition No. 366//22 titled as Naina Vs. Mukesh Paswan & Ors. is treated as the leading case.**

Application under order 1 Rule 10 filed on behalf of petitioner for impleading driver, owner and insurance company of the vehicle bearing registration number HR69 D7099.

**Issue notice of the application to proposed respondents driver, owner and insurance company on filing of PF within 10 days from today, for NDOH.**

Put up on 09.01.2026.

(Richa Manchanda)  
Judge MACT-2 (North)  
Rohini Courts, Delhi/07.11.2025