

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH :: AMARAVATHI

MAIN CASE NO: M.A.C.M.A.No.989 of 2016

PROCEEDING SHEET

SL. NO.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
10	11.07.2025	<u>AHHS, J</u> Learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the insurance policy was issued in the name of one K. Ramachandra Reddy, and it appears that the ownership of the offending vehicle was transferred between K. Ramachandra Reddy and K. Vamadeva Reddy. As per the impugned proceedings, K. Ramachandra Reddy is shown as the owner of the vehicle. However, he did not appear before the learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal (MACT) and was set ex parte. It is further submitted that the insurance policy is attached to the vehicle and the liability runs with the ownership of the vehicle. K. Ramachandra Reddy is shown as the owner in the impugned award, and as he remained ex-parte before the Tribunal, his presence in the appeal is not compulsory. It is also submitted that the appellant–Insurance Company has disputed its liability and,	

SL. NO.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
		in the event of allowing the appeal, the liability may shift to the first respondent (owner), to whom notice has not been served in the appeal. The Tribunal found the liability to be joint and several. The insurance policy places liability upon the owner under certain conditions. Hence, the presence of respondent No.1 is necessary for effective adjudication of the appeal. Learned counsel for the appellant is permitted to take out personal notice to respondent No.1 through registered post with acknowledgment due and file proof of service in the Registry. Post the matter on 22.08.2025. AHHS, J KKV	

SL. NO.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE