



\$~9 & 10

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **MAC.APP. 386/2016&CM APPL. 16743/2016**
RELIANCE GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY LTD

.....Appellant
Through: Mr. Rajeev M Roy with Mr. P.
Srinivasan, Advocates

versus

SHOBHNA & ORSRespondents

Through: None for R-1/Shobhna.
Mr. Manish Maini & Ms. Anjali
Singh, Advocates for R-2 & 3

10

+ **MAC.APP. 819/2016**

SAROJ & ANRAppellants

Through: Mr. Manish Maini & Ms. Anjali
Singh, Advs.

versus

MOHD TASAM & ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Rajeev M Roy with Mr. P.
Srinivasan, Advocates

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

ORDER
09.02.2026

%

1. Some arguments have been led by *Mr. Rajeev M Roy*, counsel for appellant/Insurance Company, and *Mr. Manish Maini*, counsel for parents of the deceased. However, there is no appearance on behalf of respondent/*Smt. Shobhna*, widow of deceased.



2. Court notice be issued to counsel who had appeared for *Smt. Shobhna*, intimating about the next date of hearing.
3. The issue in these appeals essentially relates to contention of contributory negligence on part of driver of the motorcycle, since collision occurred as the motorcycle dashed into rear of the stationary truck standing on the extreme left side of the road.
4. On the other hand, enhancement of compensation is sought on two grounds: *firstly*, that the salary has been computed incorrectly and allowances have been deducted; *secondly*, that a 50% increase ought to have been provided considering the deceased had a confirmed job, as is evident from the confirmation letter.
5. *Mr. Rajeev M Roy*, counsel for appellant, refers to the site plan and charge-sheet in support of his arguments, while *Mr. Manish Maini*, Advocate, has referred to evidence of **PW-4**, the eyewitness, who was not cross examined and contends that driver did not lead any evidence.
6. List on 27th March 2026.
7. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

ANISH DAYAL, J

FEBRUARY 9, 2026/sm/tk