

KAUP020054512024



***BEFORE THE ADDITIONAL MOTOR  
ACCIDENTS CLAIMS TRIBUNAL & PRINCIPAL SENIOR  
CIVIL JUDGE AND CJM., UDUPI.***

**Present: Sri.M.Purushothama,  
*B.B.M, M.S.W., L.L.M.,P.G.D.H.R.M.***

Prl. Senior Civil Judge & CJM.,  
Udupi.

Dated this the 19<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2025

**M.V.C.No. 1053/2024**

**Petitioner** : Yallappa Hanjan,  
Aged about 44 years,  
S/o. Shekappa,  
R/at. Malagund, Kaliapur,  
Haveri,  
Karnataka – 581 102,  
Now r/at. Mathruchaya,  
Rented house of Sunanda Shetty,  
Hejamadi Village,  
Kaup taluk, Udupi district.

**[Rep.By Sri.P.K, Advocate]**

**V/s**

- Respondents:**
1. Mr. Ranganath Bhat,  
Aged bout 55 years,  
S/o. Late Padmanabha Bhat,  
R/at. #1-352, Gandhadi House,  
Adduru village and post,  
Polali,  
Mangalore taluk – 574 145.
  2. The United India Ins. Co.Ltd.,  
Rep. By its Div. Manager,  
Jewel Plaza,  
Maruthi Vithika Road, Udupi.

**[Rep.By Sri.M.R., Advocate for R2]  
R1 – Placed exparte]**

**In I.A. No.I**

Yallappa Hanjan : **Petitioner**

**Vs.**

1. Mr. Ranganath Bhat,
- 2.The United India Ins. Co.Ltd., : **Respondents**

**In I.A. No.II**

The United India Ins. Co.Ltd., : **Applicant**

**Vs.**

Yallappa Hanjan : **Opponent/petitioner**

**Order on I.A. No.I & II**

The petitioner has filed this application under Section 5, 29(2) of the Limitation Act r/w. 166(4) and Section 159 of Motor Vehicles Act (Amendment) 2019 and Rule 150(A) of Central Motor Vehicle Rules 1989 with Central Motor Vehicles Rules, 2022 and Section 94(e) and 151 of CPC and prayed this court to condone the delay of **6 months and 22 days** in filing the claim petition.

2. The respondent No.2 filed application u/o.VII Rule 11(d) of CPC to reject the claim petition on the ground that the application is not filed well within time as contemplated under Section 166(3) of IMV Act and the application is filed belatedly.

3. The petitioner has filed affidavit in support of his application and he has stated that the accident occurred on **24-10-2023** and police have filed charge sheet on **08-02-2024**. He frequently contacting the concerned police for giving police records for filing of claim petition, but they declined to give copy of charge sheet and finally after repeated request they gave copy of charge sheet two days prior to filing of this petition. As such he unable to file the petition within time and there was a delay of **6 months and 22days**. Among other

statutory grounds the petitioner prayed for allow the application.

4. On the other hand respondent No.2 has filed objections to I.A. No.I and also filed application filed u/o. VII Rule 11(d) i.e. I.A. No.III to reject the claim petition. The petitioner filed objections to the application filed by the respondent No.2 u/o.VII Rule 11(d).

5. Heard arguments. Perused the entire materials available on record.

6. The points that would arise for my consideration are;

*1. Whether the petitioner shown sufficient grounds to condone the delay of **6 months and 22days** in filing the claim petition u/s.166 of IMV Act?*

*2. What order?*

7. My answer to the above points are as follows:

Point No.1: In the affirmative

Point No.2 : As per final order

for the following:

### **REASONS**

8. The petitioner filed the petition u/s. 166 of IMV Act seeking compensation of Rs.2,49,601/- with interest at 7% p.a.

9. According to the petitioner the accident occurred on **24-10-2023**. Admittedly the present petition was filed on **08-02-2024**.

10. Section 166 of IMV Act reads as follows:

Application for compensation. - (1) An application for compensation arising out of an accident of the nature specified in sub-section (1) of section 165 may be made

(a) by the person who has sustained the injury;

or

(b) by the owner of the property; or

(c) where death has resulted from the accident, by all or any of the legal representatives of the deceased; or

(d) by any agent duly authorized by the person injured or all or any of the legal representatives of the deceased, as the case may be: Provided that where all the legal representatives of the deceased have not joined in any such application for compensation, the application shall be made on behalf of or for the benefit of all the legal representatives of the deceased and the legal representatives who have not so

joined, shall be impleaded as respondents to the application.[Provided further that where a person accepts compensation under section 164 in accordance with the procedure provided under section 149, his claims petition before the Claims Tribunal shall lapse.]

[(2) Every application under sub-section (1) shall be made, at the option of the claimant, either to the Claims Tribunal having jurisdiction over the area in which the accident occurred or to the Claims Tribunal within the local limits of whose jurisdiction the claimant resides or carries on business or within the local limits of whose jurisdiction the defendant resides, and shall be in such form and contain such particulars as may be prescribed:[\*\*\*]]

(3) No application for compensation shall be entertained unless it is made within six months of the occurrence of the accident.]

(4)The Claims Tribunal shall treat any report of accidents forwarded to it under [section 159] as an application for compensation under this Act.]

[(5) Notwithstanding anything in this Act or any other law for the time being in force, the right of a person to claim compensation for injury in an accident shall, upon the death of the person injured, survive to his legal representatives, irrespective of whether the cause of death is relatable to or had any nexus with the injury or not.]”

11. On plain reading of Section 166(3) of IMV Act, it is very clear that no application for compensation shall be entertained unless it is made within 6 months of the occurrence of the accident. The word used in the provision is shall, but the legislature did not stopped to that extent, but they continued to say in (4) of Section 166 of IMV Act which says that the claim Tribunal shall treat any report of accident forwarded to it under Section 159 as an application for compensation under this Act. From this it is very clear that if any accident occurred then, the police shall send the Accident information report to the Tribunal and Tribunal shall treat the said report as application to the compensation. It is the duty of the Tribunal to send notice to both parties based on the accident information report. In the case on hand the police have not sent the detailed accident report to the court to treat the said report as

application and as such the Tribunal has not known whether accident occurred and petitioner sustained injuries. There is no scope to the Tribunal to register the application for compensation in the absence of DAR report.

12. The respondent No.2 filed application u/o.VII Rule 11(d) of CPC to reject the claim petition on the ground that there is a delay of **385 days**. The alleged accident occurred on 23-11-2022 and present petition was filed on 18-08-2023. The respondent No.2 calculated the limitation from the date of accident and accordingly he filed application to reject the claim petition on the ground that there is a delay of **385 days**. This Tribunal very much surprised about the calculation made by the respondent No.2. The delay is to be calculated from the date when the petitioner failed to file the application after completion of 6 months. The respondent No.2 calculated the limitation from the date of accident which is not correct and not in accordance with Section 166(3) of IMV Act. The Hon'ble High Court of Madras in a citation between Malaravan Vs.Praveen Travels Pvt. Ltd. In Cr.P.No.2558/2023 dated 18-8-2023 held that the claim petition need not be commenced only by way of presentation of the petition under Section 166. This is clear from Section 166(4) which states that a report filed by the police including the stake holders Insurance

Companies and Jurisdictional Motor accident claims Tribunal, should be treated as claim petition. The main object to include (3) of Section 166 is the victims of Motor Accident need not depend upon stake holders in court for the initiation of proceedings. The proceeding itself is initiated on the basis of report filed by the police authorities. The limitation of 6 months will arise only in case where no report has been sent/uploading. In the present case also the report is not sent to the court and as such there is no scope for the court to treat the said report as application for compensation. Hence, the limitation of 6 months does not applicable.

13. The Hon'ble High court in writ petition 201961/2023 between divisional Manager United India Insurance Co. Ltd. Vs. Ramu and others held that Section 166 of the MV Act is a beneficial provision which is contained in the MV Act as amended from time to time to provide benefit to any injured or to the legal representative of deceased. The object of amendment is to see that the claimants either injured or legal representatives who may or may not know the provision of law are provided remedy through law automatically instead of they being required to approach the court. It is required that the police officers registering an FAR relating to an accident Adhere to the provision of Section 159 of the M.V.Act and

forward all first information reports registered in respect of the accident to the Claim Tribunal. The jurisdictional police have sent the FAR to the concerned jurisdictional magistrate, but have not filed either FAR or DAR to the Tribunal to register it as an application. Hence, this court is of the opinion that the respondent No.2 has urged before this Tribunal regarding 166(3) of IMV Act, but forget to mention Section 159 of IMV Rules. As stated above, the petitioner sustained grievous injuries. He unable to walk to contact his Advocate to file the petition. He has stated that he obtained the copy of the charge sheet prior to two days in filing the petition. When the investigation officer failed to submit charge sheet within time and failed to prepare the charge sheet within time and failed to furnish the copy to him for which he cannot be punished by rejecting the application filed by him seeking compensation. If the Tribunal based on the technical ground of limitation rejected the application, then the very ambit of the objective of the legislation passed by the legislature is defeated. Hence, this Tribunal is of the view that the petitioner has made out a ground to condone the delay of **6 months and 22 days**. In fact if the month is calculated then there is no delay in filing the petition. **Accordingly, I answered the point No.1 in the affirmative.**

**14. Point No.2:-** In view of the above discussion, I proceed to pass the following:

**ORDER**

The application i.e I.A. No.I filed by the petitioner is hereby allowed.

In the result the delay of **6 months and 22 days** in filing the application for compensation is condoned.

The I.A. No.II filed by the respondent No.2 u/o.VII Rule 11(d) of CPC is hereby rejected.

*(Dictated to the Stenographer, computerized by her, corrected, signed and then pronounced by me in the open court on this the 19<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2025).*

**(M.Purushothama)**

Prl. Sr. Civil Judge & ADDL.MACT,  
Udupi.