



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. 34864 OF 2025 (GM-AC)

BETWEEN:

THE DIVISIONAL MANAGER
RELIANCE GENERAL INSURANCE
COMPANY LIMITED,
MAXIMUS COMMERCIAL COMPLEX
4TH FLOOR, LIGHT HOUSE HILL ROAD,
OPPOSITE KMC COLLEGE,
MANGALURU, DAKSHINA KANNADA-575001
ALSO AT RELIANCE GENERAL INSURANCE
COMPANY LIMITED,
NO.28, 5TH FLOOR, EAST WING,
CENTENARY BUILDING, M.G. ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 001.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. ASHOK N PATIL., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SATHISH
S/O LATE MANJUNATH,
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS,
RESIDING AT DOOR NO.2-81,
AMMA NILAYA, AMMUNJE
NEAR UPPOOR SCHOOL, THENKABETTU POST,
BRAHMAVAR TALUK, UDUPI DISTRICT-576105
2. UMESH SANIL





S/O LATE GANGADHAR
AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS
RESIDING AT H.NO.3-7-5A,
SEQUERA BUILDING
PADUKALMANJE, MANIPURA POST,
KAUP, UDUPI DISTRICT-574106.

...RESPONDENTS

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES
226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA
PRAYING TO QUASH THE COMMON ORDER DATED
10.09.2025 IN MVC NO.1034/2024 PASSED BY THE
COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE AND
ADDITIONAL MACT, AT UDUPI ALLOWING IA NO.1 AN
APPLICATION FILED UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE
LIMITATION ACT READ WITH 151 OF CIVIL PROCEDURE
CODE AND IN REJECTING THE IA NO.III AN
APPLICATION UNDER ORDER VII RULE 11(D) READ
WITH SECTION 151 OF CIVIL PROCEDURE CODE READ
WITH SECTION 166(3) OF MOTOR VEHICLES ACT, AT
ANNEXURE-G. AND ETC.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ORDERS, 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.1034/2024 on the file of the Principal Senior Civil Judge and Additional MACT, at 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 06.09.2025, 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.: 1 Sl No.: 10