



2026:CGHC:3524



2026:CGHC:3524

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WP227 No. 82 of 2026**

- The Manager, Chola Mandalam M.S. Insurance Company Limited Paras Complex, Station Road Durg, District- Durg (C.G.) (Wrongly Mentioned In The Impugned Order As Branch Manager, United India Insurance Company Ltd., C/o Branch Manager, Office No. 403, Station Road, Near Gurudwara, Durg, District- Durg, Chhattisgarh) (Non-Applicant No. 2 Before Tribunal / Insurer Of Offending Vehicle Pulsar Reg. No. Cg 07 Cc 0743)

... Petitioner**versus**

1. Kavita Dewangan Wd/o Late Keshav Prasad Dewangan Aged About 31 Years (Wrongly Mentioned As D/o Late Keshav Prasad Dewangan), R/o Bajrang Para, Kohka, Road No. 16, Kohka, Supela, Bhilai, Tahsil And District- Durg, Chhattisgarh.
2. Manvi Dewangan D/o Late Keshav Prasad Dewangan Aged About 7 Years (Through Not Mentioned In The Impugned Order), Minor Through Natural Guardian Mother Smt. Kavita Dewangan Wd./o Late Keshav Prasad Dewangan, R/o Bajrang Para, Kohka, Road No. 16, Kohka, Supela, Bhilai, Tahsil And District- Durg, Chhattisgarh.
3. Khushal Dewangan S/o Late Keshav Prasad Dewangan Aged About 3 Years (Through Not Mentioned In The Impugned Order), Minor Through Natural Guardian Mother Smt. Kavita Dewangan Wd./o Late Keshav Prasad Dewangan, R/o Bajrang Para, Kohka, Road No. 16, Kohka, Supela, Bhilai, Tahsil And District- Durg, Chhattisgarh.
4. Sharda Prasad Dewangan S/o Late Dwarka Prasad Dewangan Aged About 61 Years R/o Bajrang Para, Kohka, Road No. 16, Kohka, Supela, Bhilai, Tahsil And District- Durg, Chhattisgarh.
5. Alka Dewangan W/o Sharda Prasad Dewangan Aged About 58 Years R/o Bajrang Para, Kohka, Road No. 16, Kohka, Supela, Bhilai, Tahsil And District- Durg, Chhattisgarh. (Claimants Before The Tribunal).



6. Devendra Singh Shekhawat S/o Naresh Singh Shekhawat Aged About 26 Years R/o Near Khel Singh Patrol Pump, House No. 581, Ward No. 35, Ganjpara, Durg, District- Durg, Chhattisgarh. (Non-Applicant No. 1 Before The Tribunal/owner And Driver Of Offending Vehicle Pulsar Reg. No. Cg 07 Cc 0743).

... Respondents

(Cause title taken from Case Information System)

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Siddharth Pandey, Advocate.
For Respondents	:	None.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sachin Singh Rajput

Order on Board

21/01/2026

1. Heard.
2. This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, challenging the order dated 12.09.2025 (Annexure-P/1) passed by the learned Fifth Additional Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Durg (C.G.) (for short 'Claims Tribunal') in MACT No.261/2022, whereby the application filed by the petitioner under Rule 225(4) of the Chhattisgarh Motor Vehicle Rules, 1994 (for short 'Rules, 1994) is rejected.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the respondents No.1 to 5/claimants have filed the claim application under Section 166 of the Motor Vehicle Act, 1988 (for short 'MV Act'), seeking compensation on account of death of Keshav Dewangan in an accident that occurred on 01.11.2021 and he died on 08.11.2021 during the course of treatment. The said application is pending consideration before the Claims Tribunal. Petitioner came to know that deceased did not died of any accident, rather he died by falling from the motor cycle. Thus, when this fact came to the knowledge of the insurance company, complaints were made to the concerned Superintendent of Police. Those documents, the petitioner wanted to bring on record by filing the said application. He further submits that in order to adjudicate the veracity of the claim application, the documents are necessary and learned Claims Tribunal



has committed an error in rejecting the said application. Thus, notices may be issued and the petition may be admitted for hearing.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the documents annexed along with this writ petition.
5. From perusal of the impugned order, it appears that claim application was filed on 11.05.2022. The application was made on 16.07.2025 after the delay of about 3 years & 3 months. Copy of the complaint made to the Superintendent of Police is also not a part of the record. The Claims Tribunal has observed that the documents are not at the time of the accident, rather and is created after 3 years, after filing of the claim application. The learned Claims Tribunal has also found that it is not a relevant document for adjudication of the claim application and rejected the same.
6. It is to be seen that claim applications are summary in nature. The findings so recorded by the Claims Tribunal appears to be based on proper appreciation of facts and circumstances of the case. This Court does not find any irregularity or illegality or jurisdictional error in passing the impugned order. In view of above, the instant writ petition stands dismissed.
7. Interlocutory application(s), pending if any, also stand dismissed.

Sd/-
(Sachin Singh Rajput)
Judge