



HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR
MAC No. 838 of 2025

1 - Magma General Insurance Limited Through- Its Branch Manager,
 Present And Correct Address- 1st Floor, Block A1, Pujari Complex,
 Pachpedi Naka, Raipur (C.G.)

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - Sadhram Satnami S/o Mangaldas Satnami Aged About 50 Years R/o-
 Village Sankara, Post- Tarpongi, P.S. Nevra, District- Raipur, (C.G.)

2 - Raju Chandre S/o Sadhram Chandre Aged About 33 Years R/o- Village
 Sankara, Post- Tarpongi, P.S. Nevra, District- Raipur, (C.G.)

3 - Pooja Bai Banjare W/o Mangaldas Aged About 30 Years R/o- Village
 Sankara, Post- Tarpongi, P.S. Nevra, District- Raipur, (C.G.)

4 - Aarti D/o Sadhram Aged About 20 Years R/o- Village Sankara, Post-
 Tarpongi, P.S. Nevra, District- Raipur, (C.G.)

5 - Sondas S/o Sadhram Aged About 18 Years R/o- Village Sankara, Post-
 Tarpongi, P.S. Nevra, District- Raipur, (C.G.)

6 - Sevandas S/o Sadhram Aged About 18 Years R/o- Village Sankara,
 Post- Tarpongi, P.S. Nevra, District- Raipur, (C.G.)

7 - Arjun Singh Thakur S/o Prahlad Singh Thakur R/o Ward No. 04,

Thakurpara, Village Bartori, P.S. Nevra, District- Raipur (C.G.) (Owner)

8 - Prakash Agrawal S/o Subhashchandra Agrawal R/o- 25, Arjun Enclave, Boriya Main Road, Bhairav Nagar, Mathpuraina Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.)(Driver)

... Respondent(s)

Order Sheet

25/02/2026	Ms. Harneet Kaur, counsel for the Appellant. Mr. Rakesh Thakur, counsel for Respondents No.1 to 3. Mr. Abhishek Vinod Deshmukh, counsel for Respondent No.8. Heard on I.A. No.01/2025 – an application for condonation of delay. Ms. Kaur, counsel submits that this appeal has been preferred by the Insurance Company with delay of 33 days and the same has been explained properly. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the respondent would oppose. Taking into consideration the submission of Ms. Kaur, counsel and the reasons assigned in the application, the same is allowed. Delay of 33 days caused in filing the appeal is hereby

Saxena	condoned. Also heard on I.A. No.02/2025 – an application for grant of stay. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the Tribunal has treated the major son and daughter of the deceased as dependents. She further submits that they do not fall within the definition of “dependents.” She also contends that the learned Tribunal has deducted one-fourth of the income towards personal expenses, whereas the proper deduction ought to have been one-third. Therefore, she prays for the grant of stay. Learned counsel for the respondent oppose her. Taking into consideration the submissions made by learned counsel for the appellant, if the insurance company deposits the 80% amount with interest component within a period of 60 days, the execution of remaining part shall remain stayed. The claimants would be at liberty to withdraw the amount as per terms mentioned in the award. Sd/- (Rakesh Mohan Pandey) Judge
--------	---