



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 25TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B M SHYAM PRASAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 21020 OF 2024 (GM-AC)

BETWEEN:

BAJAJ ALLIANZ GENERAL INSURANCE CO. LTD.,
NOW REP. BY THE MANAGER
GOLDEN HEIGHTS, 4TH FLOOR, NO.1/2
59TH C CROSS, 4TH M BLOCK
RAJAJI NAGAR, BANGALORE - 560 010
BRANCH OFFICE, 3RD FLOOR
RAJ TOWERS, UDUPI

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. A N KRISHNA SWAMY., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. MR.RANJITH ACHARYA
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS
S/O SATHISH ACHARYA
RESIDING AT SHRINIVASA NILAYA
HIREBETTU, PADUBIDRI POST
NADSAL VILLAGE, KAUP TALUK
UDUPI DISTRICT - 574 106





2. MRS ARCHANA R
AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS
W/O P S RAGHAVENDRA BHATY
RESIDING AT H. NO.7/112
BENKA HOUSE, NEAR URDHU SCHOOL
BENGRE, PADUBIDRI POST
NADSAL VILLAGE, KAUP TALUK
UDUPI DISTRICT - 574 105

...RESPONDENTS

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE ORDER AS PER ANNEXURES- D AND E DATED 06.04.2024 PASSED BY II ADDITIONAL SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE AND ADDITIONAL MACT, UDUPI REJECTING THE APPLICATION BEARING NO.1 FILED BY PETITIONER UNDER ORDER VII RULE 11(d) R/W SECTION 151 OF CPC, R/W SECTION 166(3) OF IMV ACT AND ALLOWING THE APPLICATION BEARING NO. 2 FILED BY THE PETITIONER UNDER SEC 5 OF LIMITATION ACT IN MVC NO. 775/2023.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B M SHYAM PRASAD



ORAL ORDER

This petition is by the Insurer who is called upon to answer a claim under Section 166 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 [for short, '*the Act*'] in the claim petition in MVC No.775/2023 on the file of the II Additional Senior Civil Judge and Additional MACT, Udupi [for short, '*the Tribunal*']. If the claimant has filed an application under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 for condonation of the delay in filing the claim petition, the petitioner has filed an application under Order VII Rule 11[d] of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 read with Section 166[3] of the Act contending that the claim petition is not maintainable because it is filed beyond six months from the date of accident. The Tribunal, by the common impugned order dated 06.04.2024, has allowed the application filed by the claimant rejecting the application filed by the petitioner.



The question: whether a belated claim petition could be entertained condoning the delay under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 is pending with the Apex Court in SLP Nos.8412-8413/2023 and similar matters in the writ petition in WP [Civil] No. 166/2024 and connected matters. It remains undisputed that the Apex Court by its interim order dated 16.12.2025 has observed that the pendency of the writ petitions/special leave petitions before it shall not come in the way of the claim petitions being adjudicated by the Tribunals but with the stipulation that judgments shall not be finalized.

This Court is of the considered view that with the afore-stipulation, this petition must be disposed of observing that the Tribunal's impugned order will be subject to the outcome in the pending matters before the Apex Court. With this arrangement, the inquiry into the merits of the claim petition will continue, but the Tribunal will refrain from



pronouncing its judgment and award so that the decision on the merit of the claim petition otherwise will be subject to the Apex Court's decision on the afore question.

The petition stands disposed of accordingly.

Sd/-
(B M SHYAM PRASAD)
JUDGE

NV
List No.: 4 Sl No.: 1