



2026:CGHC:10350



2026:CGHC:10350

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MAC No. 804 of 2022

* - Neelkanth Patel S/o Santram Patel Aged About 55 Years R/o Village Malidih, Police Station Pithaura, Tumgaon, District Mahasamund (C.G.) (Registered Owner Of Vehicle Harvester No. CG 06 D 9571)

... Appellant

Versus

1 - Smt. Leela Bai Dhruv W/o Late Leeladhar Dhruv Aged About 26 Years R/o Village Sinodha, Police Station Patewa, District Mahasamund (C.G.)

2 - Netesh Kumar Dhruv S/o Late Leeladhar Dhruv Aged About 1 Years (Netesh Kumar Dhruv Minor Represented Through Mother Leela Bai Dhruv) R/o Village Sinodha, Police Station Patewa, District Mahasamund (C.G.)

3 - Chain Singh Dhruv S/o Heera Singh Dhruv Aged About 50 Years R/o Village Sinodha, Police Station Patewa, District Mahasamund (C.G.)

4 - Smt. Radha Bai Dhruv W/o Chain Singh Dhruv Aged About 47 Years R/o Village Sinodha, Police Station Patewa, District Mahasamund (C.G.)

5 - Setram Yadav S/o Purushottam Yadav Aged About 28 Years R/o Village Dadargaon, Police Station And Tahsil Pithaura, District Mahasamund (C.G.) (Driver Of Vehicle Harvester No. CG 06 D 9571)

6 - Smt. Neera Bai Lodhi W/o Gulalram Lodhi Aged About 40 Years R/o Village Lamidih, Police Station Pithaura, District Mahasamund (C.G.) (Registered Owner Of Tractor No. CG 04 GF 4212)

... Respondents

For Appellant	:	None appeared even two rounds
---------------	---	-------------------------------

For Respondents	:	None appeared even two rounds
-----------------	---	-------------------------------

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey
Order on Board

27/02/2026

1. This is owner's appeal against the judgment and award dated 09.03.2022 passed by the Additional Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal



(Fast Track Court), Mahasamund, District Mahasamund (C.G.) in
Claim Case No. H-111/2018.

2. It appears that the appellant/owner of the offending vehicle has not deposited the mandatory receipt till date. Though this appeal was preferred in the year 2022, this Court granted sufficient time to the appellant herein.
3. Taking into consideration the fact that the appellant herein has not deposited the mandatory deposit till date, this appeal is **dismissed**.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
Judge