



\$~65

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **MAC.APP. 144/2026 & CM APPL. 11514 & 11517/2026**

ANJU DHIMAN

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Kamlesh Kumar Mishra, Mr.
Subodh Kr. Jha, Ms. Swagta Gupta
and Ms. Renu, Advocates.

versus

MR D N GROVER AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Roshan Lal Goel & Mr. Bhuvan
Goe, Advs, fir R-3 NIA,

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

ORDER

08.04.2026

%

**MAC.APP. 144/2026, CM APPL.11516/2026 & CM APPL
11517/2026 (Condonation of delay)**

1. *Vide* order dated 19th February 2026, this Court directed the appellant to file the documents on which reliance is sought. The relevant extract is as under:

“1. This appeal concerns a claim filed by respondent no.1/D N Grover in relation to an accident that took place on 19th January 2009, when he was crossing road with his wife. While crossing the road near Girdhari Lai Hospital, Rajnagar, respondent no.1 was hit by a motorcycle bearing no. DL- 8-SW-3571 and sustained grievous injuries.

2. A claim petition was filed against the driver and registered owner. Admittedly, Satish Kumar Arya, respondent no.2, was the driver who



was apprehended at the spot, whereas Anju Dhiman, the appellant herein, was the registered owner. Previous owner of the vehicle was one Suresh Kumar, from whom the vehicle was transferred to appellant, and she stated that she had further transferred the vehicle to Satish Kumar Arya, respondent no.2.

3. Initially, the award was passed but was challenged before this Court, which set aside the award vide order dated 14th September 2017. The matter was remanded back, particularly in relation to registered owner. Subsequently, an award was passed ex-parte on 29th November 2024, as appellant [Anju Dhiman], failed to appear before the Tribunal and could not, therefore, corroborate the contention of having sold motorcycle to Satish Kumar Arya.

4. Appellant then moved an application under Order IX Rule 13 of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 (CPC) in 2025, stating that she could not appear as she had moved to Himachal Pradesh. The application was dismissed by the Tribunal vide order dated 01st November 2025.

5. Relevant orders passed by this Court and relevant documents that form part of the Trial Court Record ('TCR') are required to be placed on record of this Court for the grounds of appeal to be appreciated."

2. Pursuant to previous order, the relevant documents on which appellant seeks to rely upon have been filed and placed on record, which includes the original Registration Certificate of the vehicle which was in name of *Suresh Kumar*, the transfer/ delivery receipt in favour of *Anju Dhiman* (appellant herein) dated 27th November 2026, and transfer/delivery receipt executed by the appellant in favour of *Satish Kumar Arya*, dated 26th October 2008.

3. It is stated these documents were available before the MACT; however, the same could not be proved due to the absence of the appellant, for the reasons noted in the previous order, and therefore, were not taken into consideration.

4. The liability has since been fastened on *Anju Dhiman* and *Satish Kumar Arya*, while the registered owner, whose name appears on the Registration



Certificate, has been completely exonerated..

5. Since the vehicle was not insured, the Insurance Company (*respondent no.3*), is only a proforma party.
6. Issue notice to respondent Nos. 1-2, on steps being taken by appellant through all permissible modes including email.
7. It is informed that execution is listed on 22nd May 2026.
8. There is no requirement for respondent no.3 in subsequent proceedings unless it is directed.
9. List on 19th May 2026
10. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

ANISH DAYAL, J

APRIL 8, 2026/RK/bp