

21 MACT 34/21
AMAR WATI Vs. RAJEEV KUMAR

28.07.2026

Present : Ms. Sulekha Thakur, Ld. Counsel for petitioner.
Sh. Kapil Kumar, Ld. Counsel for R-1.
None for R-2.
Ms. Shivangi, Legal Officer of R-3/Insurance Company with
Sh. Sachin Kaushik, Ld. Counsel.

Ld. Counsel for petitioner submits that the evidence of IO is not required as the petitioner has proved the chargesheet herself. She strongly objects if the IO is called for evidence.

Ld. Counsel for R-3/Insurance Company submits that this is a doubtful case and as per their personal investigation, it is not a case of accident, therefore, the evidence of IO is very crucial for determining that it is an accidental case and covered under MACT Act.

Perusal of ordersheets reflects that the IO has not been appearing.

Summons be issued to IO through SSP concerned for
13.10.2026.

Ld. Counsel for petitioner further submits that she will file relevant judgments of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court on this aspect that the evidence of the IO is not required. Let the judgments be filed on NDOH.

(MANISH SHARMA)
PO-MACT/NE/KKD/Delhi/28.07.2026