

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

**MAIN CASE No: M.A.C.M.A.NO.482 OF 2012
PROCEEDING SHEET**

Sl. No	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
	14.11.2025	<u>AHHS, J</u> <u>I.A.Nos.1 & 2 of 2025</u> Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the respondent No.2/Insurance Company. Despite Order XLI Rule 14(3) of the CPC and the fact that Respondent No.1 remained ex parte before the learned MACT, in the specific context of this case, where the claim was dismissed against R1 and the liability of R2 arises only as a consequence of the liability of R1, R2 being the insurer and R1 being the principal tortfeasor, notice to R1 is found necessary in this appeal. For want of taking steps to serve notice on R1, the matter was dismissed on 12.09.2011. No steps were taken for restoration by the appellant, and the matter stood dismissed pursuant to the said orders. Till now, no steps have been taken to enable the appellant to take proper	

